

## A PRAGMA-STYLISTIC APPROACH ON DEIXIS

Raluca Galita

Assistant Lecturer, Faculty of Letters  
"Vasile Alecsandri" University of Bacău  
[raluca.galita@yahoo.com](mailto:raluca.galita@yahoo.com)

### Abstract:

Both linguistic stylistics and pragmatics have as a starting point the spoken language. Linguistic stylistics regards language from the perspective of the subjectivity that embellishes its use. Pragmatics is, in its turn, concerned with subjectivity in language; in this case, however, subjectivity is not reduced only to the mere expression of affectivity, but it also encloses all the elements in a spoken language used by people to meet their specific activities. That is why the research in the field of stylistics comprises all linguistic means of expression of subjectivity (phonetic, morphological, syntactic, lexical, semantic means), while pragmatic research focuses on the speakers' usage of language depending on their mood, on the time and place of the utterance and on any other matters that may influence the process of communication.

Deixis is one of the pragmatic elements that help granting a meaning to the speakers' utterances in a given context, indicating at the same time their position towards themselves, towards the message and the interlocutor, from whom they require a certain action/expect a certain reaction.

**Keywords:** deixis, stylistics, pragmatics, subjectivity, negotiation.

### 1. Introduction

*Deixis* [as n. from Greek *deiktikos* = reference, from v. *deiknunai* = to show, to point out] represents the connection between language and context through the use of personal pronouns, of demonstratives, of different adverbs of place and time. It allows the identification of the locutor and interlocutor, the time at which the communication occurred and the place of the utterance.

Language is thus anchored in the real world by 'pointing at variables along some of its dimensions' (Verschueren 1999: 18). The *pointers* that make this connection are called deictic elements (or indexical expressions), and they represent 'a class of lexical elements whose reference can be determined only in relationship to a pragmatic context' (Bar-Hillel 1954: 360). All these expressions depend, for their interpretation, on the speaker and hearer sharing the same context (Yule 1996: 9). At the same time, the interpretation of deictic expressions depends on the locutor's intention (an expression is deictic if, in a particular context, its referent can be determined only in relation to the identity and situation of the interlocutor in the moment

of the utterance). Being an expression of the relative distance from the persons and objects aimed at through the act of communication in a given situation, the deictic elements in the oral communication send to the immediate context not only through verbal but also through nonverbal means.

Taking into consideration not only the context of communication, but also the cotext (the linguistic elements that precede or follow the deictic elements) and the paraverbal signs (intonation, pauses, stress), we can say that deixis may have a stylistic value as well, subjectively underlying the emotional side of the locutor, his perspective upon things, his various feelings, ranging from enthusiasm to irritation, from irony or banter to satisfaction.

We are going to exemplify the different types of deixis and their roles in twelve (recorded and transcribed) negotiations; some of them took place in a formal setting (in a TV studio, at University), while others – in an informal one (negotiations at the market, between colleagues or members of the family).

## 2. Typology of deixis

From a linguistic point of view, *deixis* has a certain internal organization, K. Bühler (1990: 117) considering that it makes reference to an *indexical field*, whose *zero* point, called *origo*, includes the person who speaks (*I*), the place from where he/she speaks (*here*) and the moment when he/she speaks (*now*). That is why deixis was divided into three main categories: personal, spatial and temporal deixis, to which Fillmore and Lyons (Levinson 1983: 62) added other two, namely social deixis (related to person deixis) and discourse deixis (related to spatial and temporal deixis). Thus, deixis can be classified into:

1. *person deixis* – refers to the identity of the interlocutors in a communication situation;
2. *social deixis* – highlights ‘the social relationships on the part of the participants in the conversation, that determine, for example, the choice of honorific or polite or intimate or insulting speech levels etc.’ (Fillmore 1997: 61)
3. *temporal deixis* – takes into account the time at which the communication act takes place;
4. *spatial deixis* – makes reference to the place or places where individuals are located;
5. *discursive deixis* – refers to ‘the matrix of linguistic material within which the utterance has a role, that is the preceding and following parts of the discourse’ (Fillmore 1997: 70)

From the perspective of our pragma-stylistic approach, we come up with a distinction (within the categories mentioned above) between two types of deictic elements: on the one hand, the *objective* deixis that provides clear, objective information about the speaker, interlocutor, time/place of the utterance, and also the necessary data for deciphering the message; on the other hand, the *subjective* deixis, which follows the logic of the locutor's affectivity, emphasizing his/her emotional involvement, the perspective from which he regards things.

### 3. Person deixis

Objectively, *person deixis* provides information on the identity and roles of participants in the communicative interaction, particularly marked by the morphological category of personal pronouns.

*Person deixis* operates on a basic three-part division, exemplified by the pronouns for the first person (*I; we*), second person (*you*) and third person (*he; she; it; they*).

The pronouns of 1st and 2nd person, which refer to the locutor and interlocutor, respectively, represent a class of deictic elements that have in view different persons in different communication situations. Certain personal referents can be identified starting from the communicative contexts where these pronouns appear and from their lexical meaning (revealed through the association with the locutor/interlocutor).

E.g. : Y: there are no places available anymore and *I* can't do anything for *you*.<sup>1</sup>

(where *I* sends to the locutor and *you* sends to the interlocutor)

The plural form *we* can usually refer:

1. to the locutor and interlocutor together (the inclusive *we*, that means *me + you*):

E.g.: Y: what are *we* talking about?

X: [...] <R so here *we*'re not talking about the policy in Romania> or <R about a political party> but *we*'re talking about a constant policy against the <H education system> against <H the teacher's stimulation> a policy which leads to a <H counterselection in the education system><sup>2</sup>

2. to the locutor and (an)other person(s), excluding the interlocutor (the exclusive *we*, that means *me + other(s) – you*):

E.g.: X: [...] you will write <P my daughter's name> on the list won't you

Y: I'm sorry but <S *we* also have some rules> =

X: = come on who's obeying the rules nowadays? come on you'd better say how much it costs ++

Y: ++ <L I don't understand> ++<sup>3</sup>

*You* (plural) may have in view:

a) *you* (singular) + *you* (singular)

E.g.: Y: = <S yes but *you* two must realize> that if there are any wounds this means they are <P OLD> otherwise there wouldn't have been WOUNDS

Z: <W you are right but>

Y: = <S you KNOW this thing> <sup>4</sup>

b) *you* (singular) + *he/she/they*

E.g.: X: you and the other <S two colleagues> that have just left work on another book ↓ *you* three should then work independently. <sup>5</sup>

In deictic terms, III<sup>rd</sup> person is not a direct participant in basic *I-you* interaction and, being an outsider, is necessarily more distant. The III<sup>rd</sup> person pronouns individualize certain personal or non-personal referents in a certain communication situation and clarify the message.

From the point of view of the elements in the communication situation to which the III<sup>rd</sup> person pronouns make reference, there can be distinguished:

a) person deictic elements, which send to persons involved in a certain communication situation:

E.g.: X: mister A <R did a thing which SURPRISED> ++ the delinquent NAMELY *he* <R took a GUN>

Y: <L yes> <R and *he* went hunting> <sup>6</sup>

b) object deictic elements, which send to non-personal referents (objects, plants, animals) involved in a certain communication situation:

E.g.: Z: how much do you want for this pair?

X: <P six hundred>

Z: oh (puts down the shoes)

X: <S as you wish> take *it* or leave *it*. <sup>7</sup>

From a subjective point of view, we noticed in our corpus that person deixis can mark:

a) the speaker's desire to impress the interlocutor (in our example, the first person personal pronoun *I* is accompanied by the verb *to have*, aiming to gain the listener's confidence, providing guarantees regarding the proposed business):

E.g.: W: WHERE do you currently <S deploy your activity>? ↓

X: So now ↑ *I* have <S a building of forty square feet> ↑ where the studio functions. <sup>8</sup>

b) the interlocutor's apostrophizing (the second person personal pronoun *you*, stressed in speech, is correlated with a negative adjective):

E.g.: X: ok. you know what the problem is ↑ we are both bidding on some <R unknown things> ↓ I mean we talk [about ++ W: well that's] our problem ↓ we are bidding on some things that are unknown to *YOU*.<sup>9</sup>

c) the imposing of the personal viewpoint in a contradictory discussion (the personal pronoun is correlated to the verb of mental activity *to think*, which underlines the personal opinion):

E.g.: X: <W that was my business concept> I have also thought of advertising on the internet a page with OUR products and a selling space  
Y: <R I think that the positioning on the market is not very well defined> we are trying a very expensive distribution + and a very low price.<sup>10</sup>

d) the speaker's enthusiasm (the personal pronoun is subject for the verb *to tell* used in the progressive aspect, as a mark of immediacy):

E.g.: X: we + have + the pharmaceutical and cosmetic glycerin ↑ so we can open this factory  
Y: <H this would be interesting> I'm telling you. I think this is very good business.<sup>11</sup>

e) an ironic warning of the speaker (the pronoun for the 2nd person is stressed in speech and cotextually joined with the modal verb *should* suggesting recommendation, advice):

E.g.: Y: first of all ↑ I'm sorry ↑ but I haven't heard your answer ↑ and the question you asked ↓ anyway [in this context ↑  
X: <L I haven't asked] any question ↓ you know> ↓ it is suggested that *YOU* should ask me questions.<sup>12</sup>

f) verbal attack on the interlocutor (the pronoun *you* is stressed and uttered with powerful intensity; at the same time, it functions as the indirect object for the verbal expression *to have a problem (with someone)*):

E.g.: Y: you'd better say YOUR client <H declared> =  
X: = there isn't any problem related to our client ↓ we have a problem with <P *YOU*>.<sup>13</sup>

#### 4. Social deixis

From an objective point of view, *social deixis* is closely linked to person deixis, indicating the social roles of the participants in communication and also ‘those aspects of the utterance which reflect or involve certain realities connected to the social situation in which the act of speech, of communication occurs’ (Fillmore 1997). Social deixis refers to the use of deictic expressions, which signal aspects of social status and/or forms of respect. In English, there can be included under this label the honorifics, the vocative expressions and titles of address that indicate higher status. (Verschueren 1999: 21)

E.g.: Z: *minister* ↓ let’s get straight to the point. <sup>14</sup>

From a subjective point of view, our corpus revealed that social deixis may indicate:

a) irritation (suggested by the interruption of the interlocutor’s arguments in order to express a contrary opinion):

E.g.: Y: So here is my PROPOSAL ↓ the government maintains the availability of FINANCING infrastructure projects and the allocation of five percent of gross domestic product ↑ and at the same time ASKS the unions that together with the education ministry to allocate DIFFERENTIATED wage growth ↑ meaning that the YOUNG ↑ ++ under ten years of work to receive a higher share ↑ [because they are =

X: *mr. Y*]

Z: higher share] ↓ I understand ↓ so now you're able to go over eight percent. [by how much? ↓

X: allow me] ↓ *mr. Y* ↓ out of eight per cent what you are saying is impossible to achieve. <sup>15</sup>

b) protest (suggested by the association of the title of address *Mr.* with a rhetorical question, an answer to an implicit order of the interlocutor) coupled with hesitation (indicated by the extension of the final consonant):

E.g.: Z: [...] please <P KEEP THAT IN MIND> we are not here to judge *mrs.Y*

X: but who judges her ↑ *mister:::* ↓ <sup>16</sup>

#### 5. Spatial deixis

*Spatial deixis* refers to the relative location of people and things in a certain communication situation. It indicates the coordinates of the place where the verbal exchange occurs, depending on the position of the participants in the moment of the utterance. The most obvious place-deictic terms in English are the adverbs *here* and *there* and the demonstratives *this* and *that* (along

with their plural forms). (Fillmore 1997: 62) There may also be nonverbal indices, such as selective gestures accompanying demonstrative pronouns to indicate the person or object spoken about.

1. *Here* indicates the place where the locutor is in the moment of communication that may:

a) coincide with the place where the interlocutor is:

E.g.: X: <H what are you doing *here*?> get out of *here*.<sup>17</sup>

b) be different than the place where the interlocutor is:

E.g.: X: <H I won't come down> until you release MY brother  
Y: <S if you come down *here* > we'll call the lawyers and in their presence <R we go together to the prosecutor's office><sup>18</sup>

2. *There* indicates the remoteness from the locutor's place in the moment of speech. It may have three different uses (Fillmore 1997: 63):

a) gestural use (the locutor also indicates, using gestures):

E.g.: Z: how much do you want for this pair?  
X: <P six hundred>  
Z: oh (puts down the shoes)  
X: <S as you wish> take it or leave it. put them *there* (indicates a place among the other shoes).<sup>19</sup>

b) symbolic use (in this case *there* means close to the interlocutor in the moment of receiving the message):

E.g.: X: <H I won't come down>  
Z: <L come down from *there* ↓ come on> ↓<sup>20</sup>

c) anaphoric use (*there* refers to a place already identified earlier in the discourse):

E.g.: Y: he was not wounded in the house. [...]  
Z: <S I saw WOUNDS ↓ MARKS> on B's leg. <S would it be wrong> to consider they had been inflected *there*?<sup>21</sup>

3. *This/these* are used to:

a) talk about people and things which are closer to the speaker:

E.g.: X: <P *this* is our problem> how much can we include in the book? ↓<sup>22</sup>

b) refer to situations and experiences which are going on or just about to start:

E.g.: X: I need <P money> to invest in a showroom that I intend to open.  
Y: what's <P surface> of *this* [showroom ↓]? <sup>23</sup>

4. *That/those* are used to:

a) talk about people and things which are more distant from the speaker, or not present at all:

E.g.: X: <W *that* was my initial business concept> <sup>24</sup>

b) refer to experiences which have just finished, or which are more distant in the past, on the time axis:

E.g.: Y: = <S yes but you should have realised> that if there are any wounds this means they are <P OLD> otherwise they wouldn't have been WOUNDS

Z: <W you're right but>

Y: <S you KNOW this thing> but let's not talk about *those* wounds anymore. <sup>25</sup>

c) show something that has come to an end:

E.g.: W: ok. *that's* it. you're a nice guy ↑ you know how to sell your stuff ↑ but your business idea <P won't work> we're sorry but we can't close the deal. <sup>26</sup>

Analysing our corpus of negotiations, we noticed that, from a subjective point of view, spatial deixis can show:

a) the speaker's dissatisfaction (the demonstrative *this* appears in cotextual correlation with a negative adjective and the adverb of place, *here*, is followed by a negation):

E.g.: X: I will answer you WHY mr. Y ↓ because *this* is the [IRRESPONSIBLE policy =

Y: = whose policy?]

X: the policy of the last fifteen years of government in romania.

<R so *here* we're not talking about the policy in romania> or

<R about a political party> but we're talking about a constant policy against the <H education system> <sup>27</sup>

b) the speaker's satisfaction (the demonstrative is stressed in pronunciation):

E.g.: W: what's the <P surface> of this [showroom ↓

Z: *THIS*] is what I wanted to ask you. <sup>28</sup>

c) the irritation of the speaker (the explanation introduced by the demonstrative *this* follows an attempt of imposing a conclusion, marked by



the conclusive conjunction *so* and the imperative *believe me*, showing that the speaker wishes to be considered an authority, the only one worthy to formulate conclusions and to be trusted):

E.g.: Z: but <W one can see] marks in the photos>  
X: so ↑ believe me. <S maybe you haven't noticed>. *THIS* <H is a show> ↑ where you have also the OTHER PARTY in front of you.<sup>29</sup>

d) distrust and banter of the interlocutor (suggested by the fact that both the demonstrative *these* and the adverb of place *there* occur in questions with a falling intonation):

E.g.: Y: [...] those <P FINGERPRINTS> belonged either to <P mr. A> ↑ or to <P mrs. A> ↓  
X: how do you know *these*? ↓  
Y: <S they are photographed> on the photo board  
X: was it written *there* <L that they were Mr. A's>? ↓<sup>30</sup>

## 6. Temporal deixis

From an objective point of view, *temporal deixis* concerns the encoding of the time when the utterance occurred. A distinction should be made between the moment when the linguistic message is uttered ('coding time' = CT) and the moment when the linguistic message is received ('receiving time' = RT) (Fillmore 1997: 103). If the receiving time is identical with the coding time (RT = CT) there is a deictic simultaneity. (Lyons 1999: 111)

Temporal deixis includes adverbs of time (the most prominent being *now* and *then*) and the choice of verb tenses. Tense relates the time of an event to the situation of the utterance (the speech moment *now*); it is a deictic category as it expresses proximity (present tense) or distance (past tense).

1. *Now* may refer to:

a) the time coinciding with the locutor's utterance and the interlocutor's receiving it (CT = RT):

E.g.: X: for fifteen years] =  
Y: = I want to say something *now* =  
X: = <R for fifteen years all kinds of social budgetary categories have had [their salaries raised >= <sup>31</sup>

b) unlimited period of time (not restricted to CT):

E.g.: X: I know that <R a young teacher earns six million lei> *now*.<sup>32</sup>

2. *Then* may apply to:

a) past:

E.g.: X: <S I started my business with a machine> <R that was designed in the nineteen seventies> ↓ I was working in a factory *then*.<sup>33</sup>

b) future time relative to the speaker's present time:

E.g.: Y: ok ↓ I'll correct your paper FIRST. you can come on wednesday. I'll see you *then*.<sup>34</sup>

From a subjective point of view we have noticed in our corpus that temporal deixis can express:

a) determination (indicated by the stressed utterance of the adverb of time and its joining with an imperative and another adverb of time, which is also stressed):

E.g.: Z: minister ↓ let's get straight to the point ↓ make them a proposal *NOW* [LIVE at OBSERVATOR].<sup>35</sup>

b) complaint (by using it as a linking element between two sentences that express contrary ideas):

E.g.: Z: you have always complained that she did not talk to the  
[POINT ↑  
X: well <H this is true>]  
Z: and *now* what are you doing? ↓ you are turning back to  
media.<sup>36</sup>

## 7. Discourse deixis

*Discourse deixis* is involved whenever a form of expression points at earlier, simultaneous or following discourse. Discourse deixis implies 'the use of expressions in an utterance to refer to certain parts of the discourse containing that utterance' (Levinson 1983: p.85), using spatial and temporal elements, which sometimes may change their values between them (spatial deictics may express temporal values and vice versa). Discourse deixis may consist in:

a) temporal expressions:

E.g.: Y: <S I don't know what to say> *the previous* business proposal sounded more convincing.<sup>37</sup>

b) spatial expressions or demonstrative pronouns and adjectives:

E.g.: X: [...] <R so *here* we're not talking about the policy in Romania> or <R about a political party> but we're talking about a constant policy against the <H education system>

against <H the teacher's stimulation> a policy which leads to a  
<H counterselection *in* the education system><sup>38</sup>

From a subjective perspective, our corpus of negotiations revealed that discourse deixis can express:

a) uncertainty:

E.g.: W: what's the <P surface> of this [showroom ↓

Z: THIS] is what I wanted to ask you.

X: the area I was thinking of ↑ is *somewhere* around five hundred square meters.<sup>39</sup>

b) distrust:

E.g.: X: after] the first <R fifteen meters> ↑ they turned on the light on the FIRST floor in the living room

Y: what fifteen meters? ↓ measured since *when?* ↓<sup>40</sup>

## 8. Conclusions

As we can see from our examples, the viewpoints on deixis are transdisciplinary, because the deictic elements can be analysed not only from a pragmatic perspective, but also from a stylistic one, which adds the locutor's affectivity and emotion to the pieces of information provided by the first.

## Notes

[1] Negotiation in a kindergarten (Stirile PRO TV, September 3, 2005); the participants: X (parent), Y (headmistress)

[2] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (Observator, Antena 1, November 22, 2005); the participants: X (union leader), Y (prime minister), Z (TV host)

[3] Negotiation in a kindergarten (Stirile PRO TV, September 3, 2005); the participants: X (parent), Y (headmistress)

[4] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (OTV, Dan Diaconescu in direct, November 15, 2005); the participants: X (lawyer), Y (prosecutor), Z (prosecutor)

[5] Negotiation recorded in the English Department (the Faculty of Letters, University of Bacau, November 10, 2005); the participants: X (teacher), Y (teacher), Z (teacher)

[6] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (OTV, Dan Diaconescu in direct, November 15, 2005); the participants: X (lawyer), Y (prosecutor)

[7] Negotiation recorded in the market (April 8, 2006); the participants: X (seller), Z (customer), Y (Z's friend)

- [8] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (TVR 2, Arena leilor, September 10, 2007); the participants: X (initiator of a business proposal), Y, Z, W (potential investors)
- [9] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (TVR 2, Arena leilor, September 8, 2007); the participants: X (initiator of a business proposal), Y, Z (potential investors)
- [10] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (TVR 2, Arena leilor, September 5, 2007); the participants: X (initiator of a business proposal), Y, Z (potential investors)
- [11] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (TVR 2, Arena leilor, September 10, 2007); the participants: X (initiator of a business proposal), Y, Z, W (potential investors)
- [12] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (Observator, Antena 1, November 22, 2005); the participants: X (union leader), Y (prime minister), Z (TV host)
- [13] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (OTV, Dan Diaconescu in direct, November 15, 2005); the participants: X (lawyer), Y (prosecutor), Z (prosecutor)
- [14] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (Observator, Antena 1, November 22, 2005); the participants: X (union leader), Y (prime minister), Z (TV host)
- [15] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (Observator, Antena 1, November 22, 2005); the participants: X (union leader), Y (prime minister), Z (TV host)
- [16] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (OTV, Dan Diaconescu in direct, November 15, 2005); the participants: X (lawyer), Y (prosecutor), Z (prosecutor)
- [17] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (Stirile PRO TV, July 5, 2006); the participants: X (protestant), Y (mother-in-law), Z (X's sister)
- [18] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (Observator, Antena 1, June 14, 2006); the participants: X (protestant), Y (friend), Z (friend)
- [19] Negotiation recorded in the market (April 8, 2006); the participants: X (seller), Z (customer), Y (Z's friend)
- [20] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (Observator, Antena 1, June 14, 2006); the participants: X (protestant), Y (friend), Z (friend)
- [21] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (OTV, Dan Diaconescu in direct, November 15, 2005); the participants: X (lawyer), Y (prosecutor), Z (prosecutor)
- [22] Negotiation recorded in the English Department (the Faculty of Letters, University of Bacau, November 10, 2005); the participants: X (teacher), Y (teacher), Z (teacher)

- [23] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (TVR 2, Arena leilor, September 8, 2007); the participants: X (initiator of a business proposal), Y, Z(potential investors)
- [24] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (TVR 2, Arena leilor, September 5, 2007); the participants: X (initiator of a business proposal), Y, Z(potential investors)
- [25] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (OTV, Dan Diaconescu in direct, November 15, 2005); the participants: X (lawyer), Y (prosecutor), Z (prosecutor)
- [26] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (TVR 2, Arena leilor, September 8, 2007); the participants: X (initiator of a business proposal), Y, Z(potential investors)
- [27] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (Observator, Antena 1, November 22, 2005); the participants: X (union leader), Y (prime minister), Z (TV host)
- [28] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (TVR 2, Arena leilor, September 8, 2007); the participants: X (initiator of a business proposal), Y, Z(potential investors)
- [29] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (OTV, Dan Diaconescu in direct, November 15, 2005); the participants: X (lawyer), Y (prosecutor), Z (prosecutor)
- [30] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (OTV, Dan Diaconescu in direct, November 15, 2005); the participants: X (lawyer), Y (prosecutor), Z (prosecutor)
- [31] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (Observator, Antena 1, November 22, 2005); the participants: X (union leader), Y (prime minister), Z (TV host)
- [32] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (Observator, Antena 1, November 22, 2005); the participants: X (union leader), Y (prime minister), Z (TV host)
- [33] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (TVR 2, Arena leilor, September 10, 2007); the participants: X (initiator of a business proposal), Y, Z, W (potential investors)
- [34] Negotiation recorded in the English Department (the Faculty of Letters, University of Bacau, April 9, 2006); the participants: X (student), Y (teacher)
- [35] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (Observator, Antena 1, November 22, 2005); the participants: X (union leader), Y (prime minister), Z (TV host)
- [36] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (OTV, Dan Diaconescu in direct, November 15, 2005); the participants: X (lawyer), Y (prosecutor), Z (prosecutor)

[37] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (TVR 2, Arena leilor, September 10, 2007); the participants: X (initiator of a business proposal), Y, Z, W (potential investors)

[38] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (Observator, Antena 1, November 22, 2005); the participants: X (union leader), Y (prime minister), Z (TV host)

[39] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (TVR 2, Arena leilor, September 8, 2007); the participants: X (initiator of a business proposal), Y, Z (potential investors)

[40] Negotiation recorded from a TV programme (OTV, Dan Diaconescu in direct, November 15, 2005); the participants: X (lawyer), Y (prosecutor), Z (prosecutor)

### References

**Armengaud, Françoise. 1993.** *La pragmatique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

**Bar-Hillel, Yehoshua. 1954.** "Indexical Expressions". *Mind* 63. 251: 359-379.

**Bălănescu, Olga. 2005.** *Texte și pre-texte. Introducere în pragmatică*. București: Ed. "Ariadna".

**Berrendonner, Alain. 1981.** *Éléments de pragmatique linguistique*. Paris: Minuit.

**Bühler, Karl. 1934/1990.** *Theory of language. The representational function of language*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

**Charaudeau, Patrick & Maingueneau, Dominique. 2002.** *Dictionnaire d'analyse du discours*. Paris: Ed. Du Seuil.

**Dragoș, Elena. 2000.** *Introducere în pragmatică*. Cluj: "Casa Cărții de Știință".

**Ducrot, Oswald; Todorov, Tzvetan. 1972.** *Dictionnaire encyclopédique des sciences du langage*. Paris: Ed. Du Seuil.

**Ducrot, Oswald; Schaeffer, Jean-Maire. 1972/1996.** *Noul dicționar enciclopedic al științelor limbajului*, (trad. Anca Măgureanu, Viorel Vișan, Marina Păunescu). București: Ed. "Babel".

**Fillmore, Charles. 1970.** "Verbes de jugement". *Langages*. 17 : 24-28.

**Fillmore, Charles. 1997.** *Lectures on Deixis*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

**Fludernik, Monika. 1993.** *The Fictions of Language and the Languages of Fiction*. London: Routledge.

**Gaynesford, (De) Maximilian. 2006.** *I. The Meaning of the First Person Term*. New York: Oxford University Press.

**Hoarță-Lăzărescu, Luminița. 1999.** *Lingvistica pragmatică*. Iași: Ed. "Cermi".

- Hoarță-Cărăușu, Luminița. 2003.** *Elemente de analiză a structurii conversației*. Iași: Ed. "Cermi".
- Hoarță-Cărăușu, Luminița (coord.)a. 2005.** *Pragmatica pronumelui*. Iași: Ed. "Cermi".
- Hoarță-Cărăușu, Luminița (coord.)b. 2005.** *Corpus de limba română vorbită actuală*. Iași: Ed. "Cermi".
- Leech, G.. 1983.** *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Levinson, Stephen C.. 1983.** *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Lyons, Christopher. 1999.** *Definiteness*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Merlan, Aurelia. 1998.** *Sintaxa și semantica-pragmatica limbii române vorbite*. Iași: Ed. Univ. „Al. I. Cuza”.
- Moeschler, Jacques. 1996.** *Théorie pragmatique et pragmatique conversationnelle*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Moeschler, Jean; Reboul, Anne. 1994/1999.** *Dicționar enciclopedic de pragmatică*, (trad. coord. De Carmen Vlad, Liana Pop). Cluj: Ed. "Echinox".
- Nachèze (de), Violaine & Colletta, Jean-Marie (ed.). 2002.** *Guide terminologique pour l'analyse des discours*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Reboul, Anne & Moeschler, Jacques. 1998.** *Pragmatique du discours*. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Verschueren, Jef. 1999.** *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Arnold.
- Yule, George. 1996/1998.** *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

## Annex

### Conventions for the phonetic transcription (Hoarță-Cărăușu 2005: 11-13)

|        |                                                        |
|--------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| TEXT   | emphatic accent                                        |
| text = | intervention started by a speaker and continued, after |
| = text | interruption, by another speaker                       |
| [text  | supersposed intervention                               |
| text]  |                                                        |
| +      | short pause                                            |
| ++     | longer pause                                           |
| ↓      | falling intonation                                     |
| ↑      | rising intonation                                      |
| ::     | prolonged sound in speech                              |
| <S>    | slow tempo of speech                                   |
| <R>    | rapid tempo of speech                                  |
| <H>    | high voice                                             |
| <L>    | low voice                                              |
| <P>    | powerful intensity                                     |
| <W>    | weak intensity                                         |