UNIVERSITY OF CRAIOVA
"ALEXANDRU PIRU" DOCTORAL SCHOOL

UTTERANCE

IN ROMANIAN POSTMODERNIST POETRY

PhD Thesis

Doctoral supervisor:

Professor Emeritus Emilia Parpală Afana, PhD, Dr. Habil.

PhD student:

Beatrice Diana Burcea

Craiova, 2016

UTTERANCE IN ROMANIAN POSTMODERNIST POETRY

ABSTRACT

Our doctoral research is focused on a fundamental aspect of pragmatic analysis – poetic utterance. In the context of twentieth-century linguistic theories, utterance, more specifically, the enunciatory dimension of language, generated numerous controversies within the framework of structural linguistics. Notwithstanding all this, as Dominique Maingueneau (2008) contends, the attention granted to this phenomenon by Charles Bally, Gustave Guillaume, Roman Jakobson and Émile Benveniste laid the foundations of scholarly research on utterance for several decades to come. Today we are witnessing a revival of interest in this field.

In Romanian scholarship, receptiveness toward the theories of continental and Anglo-American pragmatics has reached very high standards, the seminal studies elaborated in this regard, positioned on either side of the barricade, having launched ample heuristic debates. The researches undertaken by Romanian linguists pertain to a broad spectrum of scholarly concern, in the areas of textual linguistics, discourse analysis and literary pragmatics.

The main achievement of our research resides in outlining the relation between concept and its application, through a systematic work methodology, which exceeds the limits of a strictly literary approach. Adopting a pragmatic perspective on Romanian postmodernist poetry has enabled us to set aside the controversies of literary criticism. Thus, chronological demarcations (the poets of the 1980s' or 1990s' generation) have constituted an operating criterion for our research; on the contrary, the pragmatic concepts adopted have granted unity and fluency to our arguments.

In this thesis, the lines of force along which the arguments are structured have enabled us to grasp the intimate workings of the phenomenon of poetic utterance, to sense its specific creative underpinnings. The pragmatic dimension does not exclude the poetic potential of discourse, whose resources lie not so much in "the spirit of the age" as, especially, in "the spirit of utterance", with which postmodernist poets have synchronized themselves, regardless of the generation they belong to. The syntagm suggested above does not entail a distancing from "the spirit of the letter", but evokes the interrelation between the two aspects that are reflected in the working method we have chosen.

Taking into account the relations between literature and linguistics, generated by a new linguistic approach to textual cohesion and coherence, we started from the premise that poetic

utterance, in its entire complexity, may explain the innovations in Romanian postmodernist poetry. This choice is motivated by the hypothesis that poetry is a language act. We have focused, in this respect, on a representative corpus of poetry written by poets belonging to the 1980s' generation and have come to the conclusion that this experimental, heterogeneous and intriguing poetry allows an – often ostentatious – display of the mechanisms of utterance, revealing the specificity of this phenomenon; given the large amount of information, we have targeted our attention, in selective manner, on the poetry of the 1980s and, partially, the 1990s, in an attempt to illustrate the matter under examination, rather than to produce a monographic survey.

Through the research we have undertaken, we have endeavoured to establish a manner of approaching literary texts from the perspective of literary linguistics, by focusing our attention on discourse, in which both text (as a structured whole) and context (as a discursive manifestation of the pragmatic instruments) converge. The references to the cultural context in question, developed in a special chapter, ensure the unity of the corpus, while the poets selected for analysis guarantee a diversity of the poetic discourses analysed here.

It has been noted that the opening towards a pragmatic approach has led to a replenishment of perspectives on the text. Over the past few decades, frequent references have been made to "literary linguistics," which exceeds the boundaries of a strictly descriptive attempt. The subject under consideration is no longer the "text", but "discourse". We have subscribed to this methodological framework which encompasses the vast spectrum of textual linguistics, discourse analysis and literary pragmatics. The proposed analytical trajectory goes from the theoretical corpus to the set of poetic works analysed. The interdisciplinary valences of this PhD thesis have been highlighted as such by applying the theories of utterance (Benveniste – deictic subjectivity; Bakhtin – dialogism), by recourse to methods of stylistics or poetics, as required by this analysis. The methodology is dependent on the investigated subject, the general framework consisting of utterance theories, poetics and discourse analysis. We have also resorted to recent research in the fields of linguistics and literary studies: Manar Hammad (1983), Herman Parret (1983), J. Authier-Revuz (1984), ScaPoLine (2004) etc.

We found it necessary to start by presenting the social, philosophical and literary context that generated, within the framework of postmodernity, a changing perspective on literary texts. Thus, in the chapter dedicated to postmodernism (*Romanian Literary Postmodernism, Centre And Margins*), we explored the social aspects outlined by Jean François Lyotard and Jean Baudrillard (incredulity towards metanarratives, the climax of simulacra, hyper-reality), philosophical aspects, as analyzed by Gianni Vattimo and Jacques Derrida (the end of

logocentric thinking, the new humanism, deconstruction) and literary aspects (the poeticity of language, concrete poetry, the manifestos of the Russian Cubo-Futurists, the literary orientations of Romanian postmodernism), which have fostered our systematic understanding of this phenomenon – a mandatory condition given that the line of demarcation between postmodernism and postmodernity is often shifting.

The correlation between literary theory and practice, which is characteristic of postmodern poetics, represented an operating criterion for our research. Exploring the enunciative strategies (text production and reception, the polyphony of textual worlds, interlocution) allowed us to detach ourselves from the frequent parallelisms drawn between the modernist and the postmodernist epistemes. We found it necessary to provide an overview of the theoretical approaches made by some critics and poets belonging to the 1980s' generation, without turning them into the subject of our research. In our opinion, Romanian postmodernism is tributary to the university configuration and, in the post-December 1989 period – to the trend of recuperating postmodernity. The issue of utterance cancels the divides between generations, allowing us to focus on the complexity of pragmatic achievements.

In the chapter dedicated to the theoretical frame of utterance (*Literary Pragmatics. Theories of utterance*), we presented two concepts – the "subjectivity of language" and "dialogism" – promoted by Émile Benveniste and Mikhail Bakhtin, these notions having changed the perspective on the linguistics of literary texts. The substitution of the opposition language – speech (Saussure) with the opposition utterance – statement (Benveniste) has led to the establishment of a research field that was soon to be embraced by the theorists of pragmatics. While Émile Benveniste posited the fact that utterance is conditional upon the presence of a locutor, considered to be the source of the utterance, Mikhail Bakhtin claimed that the production of an utterance is predicated on the interdependence between the locutor and the aperceptive background of the interlocutor.

Of major importance for subsequent studies and, implicitly, for our research, are the theoretical aspects envisaged by Émile Benveniste, which were applied in the early stages of the analysis of pragmatic elements: identifying the formal apparatus of the utterance, acknowledging the subjectivity of language, identifying the correlation between the category of person and the category of tense, discovering the deictic category. Particularly useful for this research has been the analysis of the enunciative dimension of language, not only synchronically, but also diachronically. We have noted the receptivity of posterity as regards certain concepts: "utterance", "subjectivity", "discourse", "deictics" etc.

A reconsideration of the phenomenon of linguistic subjectivity has allowed us to understand utterance both as a discursive dimension, as suggested by Herman Parret, and as a semiotic dimension, as proposed by Manar Hammad. A different paradigm, advanced by Francis Jacques, derives from the perspective on locutor, who is no longer the centre of utterance, but only a discursive participant, alongside the speaker, within the interlocution. Understanding the philosophical dimension of subjectivity has brought to our attention two interesting analyses: the first, made by Guillaume Paugam, adopts a polemic stance on Benveniste's overlap between the transcendental and the linguistic dimension of the "I", while the second, carried out by the Romanian scholar Vlad Alexandrescu, considers the "I" as a self-referential fact, in the proximity of the Cartesian "cogito". In discursive practice, we emphasized aspects of modalization and deictization, according to the theory of Herman Parret, illustrated the marks of utterance in the statement, in the spirit of the theory set forth by Manar Hammad, and valorised aspects of interlocution, in the terms of the theory outlined by Francis Jacques. The originality of the application is supported by the propriety of the corpus used.

Equally, we also deemed it necessary to approach the ample register of the pragmatics of utterance, from the perspective of the *translinguistics* developed by Mikhail Bakhtin, highlighting several concepts that have had a major impact on other scholars: "dialogism", "polyphony", "heteroglossia", "carnival", etc. At the centre of the theory of dialogism was the concrete manifestation of the word, hence, the importance attached to diphone words oriented toward the object of utterance and toward the speaker's utterance. The analysis of Mikhail Bakhtin's concepts is of major importance in the sense that it has expanded research into the field of literary discourse. For our study, what is important is the idea that speech finds fulfilment in dialogue. The Russian specialist in poetics associated the origin of dialogism with ancient genres marked by a carnivalesque vision of the world (Socratic dialogue, Menippean satire), the dialogical plurilinguism of the "lower" genres is being oriented toward parody and polemic. In this research, we went beyond the restrictive idea promoted by Bakhtin, according to whom "poetic bivocality" remains entrenched within the patterns of the "unique linguistic system", without plurilinguistic echoes, reinforcing my option to focus in my analysis on the implications of the voice at the level of poetic discourse (cf. Liviu Ioan Stoiciu, Daniel Pişcu, Andrei Bodiu).

Our interest in the concepts imposed by Mikhail Bakhtin determined us to present them in various domains: the philosophy of language (Martin Buber), the logic of dialogue (Francis Jacques), textual linguistics (Oswald Ducrot, ScaPoLine). The contrastive studies of Francis Jacques had suggested a new perspective on the relation between polyphony and intertextuality,

which we have valorised in discursive practice. The correlation between dialogism and the internal structure of discourse determined Francis Jacques to advocate, in reply, the ideological dimension of Bakhtinian dialogism, as a result of the social relationship between languages. This parallelism is continued with regard to the relationship between dialogism and intertextuality. Oswald Ducrot addresses the theory of polyphony in a linguistic context, using a terminology of his own, and emphasizes the polyphonic nature of his discourse, correlating polyphony with utterance. Scapoline has studied polyphony in a twofold register: language and speech. The opposition established by Oswald Ducrot between speaker and utterer is toned down, in the Scandinavian theory, by the relationship between "points of view" and the "speaker of the utterance". Aspects concerning the analysis of polyphony carried out by O. Ducrot and Scapoline have been valorised in textual analyses, and may form the starting point in future approaches to the discourse of postmodern texts. The above-mentioned considerations on the theories of utterance developed by Émile Benveniste and Mikhail Bakhtin are essential to understanding the phenomenon as a whole and to expanding discursive analysis.

The discursive projection in the ample chapter entitled *Poetic Utterance* represents the substantial and original part of this PhD thesis, in which the theoretical concepts are applied to the analysis of several texts. We considered it necessary to dedicate one chapter to each of the marks of the enunciative subjectivity: deixis, anaphora, language acts. Each concept has been presented at large, within theoretical (definitions, typologies) and discursive paradigms.

In relation to the category of "deixis" (*Deixis in Romanian Postmodernist Poetry*), we have reviewed the diverse terminology (Charles Sanders Peirce, Bertrand Russell, Yehoshua Bar-Hillel, Émile Benveniste, Hans Reichenbach), the controversies of topical interest formed around the concept (Catherine Kerbrat-Orecchioni, Georges Kleiber, Dieter Wunderlich) and its typology (C. Stephen Levinson, Catherine Kerbrat-Orecchioni, Adriana Gorăscu, Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu). We have also reviewed the traditional classification (personal, spatial and temporal *deixis*). Optionally, researchers may add to this classification two other categories: discursive (textual) *deixis* and social *deixis*. In Romanian linguistics, the classification criteria are reorganized according to the co-ordinates of grammaticalization. In the text analysis, we selected particularly realizations of the *deixis* pertaining to the traditional classification.

The pragmatic perspective on postmodernist texts has allowed us to highlight some theoretical aspects of deictic subjectivity in literature: the doubling of the uttering entities, personal deixis, the emergence of lyrical voices, which create the illusion of authenticity. We had in mind considerations on the deixis of the person that encompasses the lyrical voices and the polyphonic effects (cf. Daniel Pişcu). The discursive analysis itself is distinguished through the

diversity of the subjectivity register, through the singular valorisation, in the postmodern poetic discourse, of some concepts: "uttered utterance" (cf. Andrei Bodiu), "*de dicto* time" (cf. Liviu Ioan Stoiciu), "deictization" and "modalization" (cf. Ion Stratan, Florin Iaru, Radu Andriescu, Mariana Marin, Matei Vişniec, Liviu Ioan Stoiciu). At the centre of attention have been the following: the diversity of deictic projection, the utterance game, the interference of lyrical voices, the time of utterance, epistemic modalizers, the latter aspect opening the perspective of analytical continuity within the context of the entire work. Through the space granted to relativizing the uttering stance (cf. Liviu Ioan Stoiciu), we have anticipated the polyphonic aspects of the postmodern discourse which may constitute the starting point in a subsequent investigation. In the analysis of postmodernist poetic discourse, the pragmatic perspective on expressions with intrinsic deictic anchors is singular. This perspective has enabled us to maintain our intention to establish connections, at the level of discursive practice, with the other two chapters in which we have presented the anaphoric valences and, respectively, the pragmatic operation of phemes. In a communication context, this type of expressions can signal the detachment of the speaking I, encode interpersonal relationships, or emphasize the discursive value of certain interjections (cf. Liviu Ioan Stoiciu). Far from conducting an exhaustive approach, we believe that the typology of the "deixis" category may constitute a working instrument for future pragmatic analyses.

As regards the category of "anaphora" (*Anaphora in Romanian Postmodernist Poetry*), we have considered it necessary to introduce the two perspectives on the concept of "reference": logical-philosophical (Gottlob Frege, Bertrand Russell, Peter Frederick Strawson, Saul Kripke) and linguistic (Jean-Claude Milner). While in logical-philosophical studies, "reference" is correlated with other concepts: "significance", "sense", "truth", in linguistic approaches, with a major impact on the subsequent evolution of the phenomenon, the *virtual - actual* systematic relationship becomes operational. We have signalled the complexity entailed by definitions of anaphora in the light of the traditional and cognitive criteria, as well as its typology, which has offered us a vast instrument of analysis. The presentation of the related connections between anaphora and deixis and coreference have aimed to highlight certain contrastive features designed to eliminate the existing conceptual confusions. Similarly, the controversial relationship between anaphora and cataphora has been solved by means of the term *diaphora* or through the assimilation of cataphora by anaphora, as accomplished, for instance, in Romanian studies.

Anaphoric projection in postmodernist discourse, which makes this a singular approach, has led to the discovery of the multiple aspects of referential continuity. We have focused on

several anaphoric valences by reference to the triontic model of the person (cf. Mariana Marin, Florin Iaru, Marta Petreu), and signalled the emergence of the poetic voice along the line of demarcation between the deictic and the anaphoric (cf. Florin Iaru). In singular manner, we have also applied the theoretical considerations of Georges Kleiber, Richard Patry, Nathan Ménard, Rodica Zafiu and we have extended discursive analysis by identifying the pragmatic instantiations for associative anaphora (cf. Nichita Danilov, Magdalena Ghica, Traian T. Coșovei). The singular pragmatic perspective on cumulative anaphora has led us to illustrate the phenomenon of "coreferentiality" (cf. Magdalena Ghica), interpreting this type of anaphora as textual / discursive deixis (cf. Traian T. Coșovei). In the discursive analysis, we have highlighted the potential of indexed nominal expressions to change the perspective through progressive chaining (cf. Nichita Danilov, Magdalena Ghica, Petru Romoșan). In the same singular manner, we have expanded the concept of the "narrative cataphora" (M.-J. Reichler-Béguelin) to postmodernist poetic discourse. We have identified the progressive instantiation of the "universe of reference", in the poetic text, through original communication with ambiguous entities (cf. Magdalena Ghica), through approximations of contemplated illeity (cf. Ioan Flora, Romulus Bucur), or through valorisations of "zero anaphora" (cf. Petru Romoșan). Our intention of granting unity and originality to this pragmatic analysis has been ensured by the presentation of the deictic and anaphoric valences of interjections in his postmodernist poetic discourse. Starting from theoretical considerations (Marcela Swiatkowska, Mariana Țuțescu), we have underlined the diversity of the occurrences of "epistemic modalizers": expressions with deictic anchorage can be found at the limit of discursive *deixis* (cf. Marta Petreu, Andrei Bodiu). Interjections may lose their intrinsically deictic essence (cf. Marta Petreu). The linguistic context plays a major role in supporting the anaphoric valences of interjection (cf. Mircea Cărtărescu). The complexity of the phenomenon of anaphora has not been not exhausted, the discursive perspectives launched by this research remaining open.

As regards the category of speech acts (*A Pragmatic Perspective: The Power of Words*), we have deemed it necessary to motivate, through theoretical references, the unanimous opinion with regard to the theory of the acts as the foundation of linguistic pragmatics. Understanding language from the vantage point of the fulfilment of certain acts was the point of departure of the Austinian theory of speech acts, which had a major impact on subsequent research (John Rogers Searle, Peter Frederick Strawson, François Récanati, Alain Berrendonner, Émile Benveniste, Dan Sperber, Deirdre Wilson). The theoretical paradigm established on the grounds of filiation and polemic departure has led to the removal of confusion between illocutionary verbs and illocutionary acts, to developing the concepts of "illocutionary value" and "perlocutionary act",

to identifying and avoiding the contradictions of the Austinian theory of locutionary acts, to the prospect of alternatives that take language into account as a substitute for action, to understanding performative utterances solely in the light of the concept of "Ego", and to correlations between the Austinian theory and the theory of pertinence.

The pragmatic functioning of speech acts has offered us the possibility of an original and unitary approach. In the discursive projection, we have focused on the substitution system of the language (cf. Ioan Flora), the illocutionary force of utterances (cf. Simona Popescu, Romulus Bucur, Mariana Marin, Petru Romoşan, Magdalena Ghica), the authority of the uttering entity (cf. Matei Vişniec, Mariana Marin). By highlighting the pragmatic peculiarities of the texts, we outlined an ample register of "illocutionary force marks" and "propositional content", from progressive series of speech acts to micro speech acts with complex values, pointing out, at the same time, the combinatorial possibilities of speech acts in postmodernist poetic discourse, as well as in the illocutionary - perlocutionary rapport. In singular manner, we have identified in postmodernist discourse the representative description of the "to do" type, which has offered us another dimension of the authority of uttering entity (cf. Matei Vişniec), and also the difficulty, acknowledged by Austin, in distinguishing between illocutionary and perlocutionary acts (cf. Mariana Marin). Austin's observations relating to the relationship between words and things and, in particular, the theory of locutionary acts, with the subtle contradictions signalled by François Récanati, offered us the possibility to address, in singular manner, in postmodernist discourse, the pragmatic operation of phemes that cannot achieve descriptive-referential meaning (cf. Florin Iaru, Liviu Ioan Stoiciu). From the theory of John Rogers Searle, we have valorised, in singular manner, the relationship between words and things, in particular, the criterion of adjustment between words and the world, revealing aspects of the illocutionary purpose (cf. Alexandru Muşina).

In textual linguistics, the functional dynamic of text and metatext is well recognized. We have assigned metalanguage a similar functionality, reasserted in an extensive discursive analysis. The analysis of pragmatic textuality, carried out in the spirit of the theory proposed by Heinrich Plett, has rounded off the perspective on postmodernist poetic texts from the vantage point of pragmatic extension (cf. Marta Petreu, Florin Iaru, Andrei Bodiu), of pragmatic delimitation (cf. Cristian Popescu) and pragmatic coherence (cf. Mariana Marin). In this way, we have highlighted the criterion of textuality, the segmentation of the text according to the "communication units", namely the act of textualization and of text reception responsible for filling the "coerential gap". The functionality of the metatext in postmodernist poetic discourse has given us the possibility to approach it in relation to other transtextual relations (cf. Bogdan

Ghiu). We found it necessary to grant ample space to metalanguage, because of the massive textualization of the concept. Initially, we outlined, in singular manner, the poetic valences of the concept (cf. Ioan Flora), then we established, in the same original manner, the relationship between metalanguage and processes pertaining to the postmodernist poetic apparatus: intertext and catalogues (cf. Mircea Cărtărescu, Traian T. Coşovei), as well as the opening toward writing (cf. Mircea Cărtărescu). We have emphasized the discursive role of metalanguage, alongside those of the metatext and the intertext.

In the structure of this PhD thesis, we have consistently aimed to discursively valorise the marks of the enunciating subject, trying to avoid the discrepancy between the theory and its application through a fluent approach, through the singular adaptation of various consecrated concepts, aimed at expanding the perspective of the pragmatic interpretation. By rigorously respecting the relation between the concept and its application, we intended to distance ourselves from the limits of arbitrary interpretations; hence, the originality of the analyses. The uniqueness of the corpus used here comes from a rigorous selection of the texts that attest the correspondence with the conceptual instruments valorised in discursive manner. In this light, our research is distinguished by the consistency with which it has subjected to pragmatic interpretation various concepts that are ostensibly inoperative in poetic discursive practice; hence, the originality of our approach.

At the end of this enunciative periplum, we may state that our research represents, through its novelty and methodological consistency, a contribution to the field of pragmatics, granting discursive identity to postmodernist poetic texts.

SURSE

Andriescu, Radu. 1992. *Oglinda la zid*. Iaşi: Canova.

Bodiu, Andrei. 2008. *Oameni obosiţi*. Piteşti: Paralela 45.

Bucur, Romulus; Ghiu, Bogdan; Lefter, Ioan Bogdan; Marin, Mariana; Muşina, Alexandru. 1982. *Cinci*. Bucureşti: Litera.

Cărtărescu, Mircea. 2003. *Levantul*. Bucureşti: Humanitas.

Coşovei, T. Traian. 1983. *Poemele siameze*. Bucureşti: Albatros.

Coşovei, T. Traian. 1998. *Ninsoarea electrică*. Bucureşti: Editura „Vinea".

Danilov, Nichita. 2005. *Ferapont (antologie de poezie 1980-2004)*. Piteşti: Paralela 45.

Flora, Ioan. 2004. *Trădarea metaforei / La Métaphore trahie*. Piteşti: Paralela 45.

Ghica, Magdalena. 1980. *Hipermateria*. Bucureşti: Cartea Românească.

Ghica, Magdalena. 1985. *O tăcere asurzitoare*. Bucureşti: Editura Eminescu.

Iaru, Florin. 1981. *Cântece de trecut strada*. Bucureşti: Albatros.

Iaru, Florin. 1984. *La cea mai înaltă ficţiune*. Bucureşti: Cartea Românească.

Marin, Mariana. 1981. *Un război de o sută de ani*. Bucureşti: Albatros.

Marin, Mariana. 1986. *Aripa secretă*. Bucureşti: Cartea Românească.

Marin, Mariana. 1990. *Atelierele (1980-1984)*. Bucureşti: Cartea Românească.

Muşina, Alexandru. 1984. *Strada Castelului 104*. Bucureşti: Cartea Românească.

Muşina, Alexandru. 2002. *Antologia poeziei generaţiei '80*. Ediţia a II-a. Braşov: AULA.

Muşina, Alexandru. 2003. *Poeme alese (1975-2000)*. Braşov: AULA.

Petreu, Marta. 2011. *Apocalipsa după Marta*. Iaşi: Polirom.

Romoşan, Petru. 1980. *Comedia literaturii*. Bucureşti: Editura Albatros.

Romoşan, Petru. 1982. *Rosa Canina*. Bucureşti: Cartea Românească.

Vişniec, Matei. 1980. *La noapte va ninge*. Bucureşti: Albatros.

Vişniec, Matei. 2004. *Oraşul cu un singur locuitor (antologie de poezie 1980-2004)*. Piteşti-Bucureşti: Paralela 45.

BIBLIOGRAFIE

Adam, Jean-Michel. 2008. *Lingvistica textuală. Introducere în analiza textuală a discursurilor*. Traducere de Corina Iftimia. Iași: Institutul European.

Adam, Jean-Michel, Petitjean, André. *Textul descriptiv*. 2007. Traducere de Cristina Strătilă. Iași: Institutul European.

Agamben, Giorgio. 2009. *Timpul care rămâne. Un comentariu al Epistolei către romani*. Traducere de Alex Cistelecan. Cluj-Napoca: Tact.

Alexandrescu, Vlad. 1998. «Descartes et la théorie de l'énonciation». *Autour des Descartes*. Textes réunis par Dolores Toma, Anca Christodorescu, Vlad Alexandrescu, pp. 239-248. Bucarest: Edition Crater.

Alexandrescu, Vlad. 2001. *Pragmatique et Théorie de l'énonciation. Choix de textes*. București: Editura Universității.

Andriescu, Radu. 2005. *Paralelisme și influențe culturale în lirica română actuală*. Iași: Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza".

Anscombre, Jean-Claude, Ducrot, Oswald. 1976. «L'argumentation dans la langue». *Langage*, nr. 42, pp. 5-27. http://www.persee.fr/doc/lgge_0458-726x_1976_num_10_42_2306. Accesat 15.02.2016.

Anscombre, M. Jean-Claude. 1979. «Délocutivité benvenistienne, délocutivité généralisée et performativité». *Langue française*, nr.42, pp. 69-84. http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/lfr_0023-8368_1979_num_42_1_6156. Accesat 25.02.2016.

Armengaud, Françoise. 1993. *La pragmatique*. 3° édition corrigée Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Austin, John Langshaw. 2005. *Cum să faci lucruri cu vorbe*. Traducere de Sorana Corneanu. Pitești: Paralela 45.

Authier-Revuz, Jacqueline. 1984. «Hétérogénéité(s) énonciative(s)». *Langages*. 19 (73): 98-111.http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/lgge. Accesat 10.05.2014.

Bahtin, Mihail. 1970. *Problemele poeticii lui Dostoievski*. Traducere de S. Recevschi. București: Univers.

Bahtin, Mihail. 1982. *Probleme de literatură și estetică*. Traducere de Nicolae Iliescu. București: Univers.

Bahtin, Mihail. 1992. *Metoda formală în știința literaturii. Introducere critică în poetica sociologică*. Traducere de Paul Magheru. București: Univers.

Bar-Hillel, Yehoshua. [1954] 2001. «Indexical expressions». Alexandrescu, Vlad. *Pragmatique et Théorie de l'énonciation. Choix de textes*, pp. 216-232. București: Editura Universității.

Bădulescu, Dana. 2005. „Dialogismul", în Sorin Pârvu (coord.). *Dicționar de postmodernism. Monografii și corespondențe tematice*, pp. 41-45. Iași: Institutul European.

Barthes, Roland. 1987. *Romanul scriiturii*. Traducere de Adriana Babeți și Delia Șepețean-Vasiliu. București: Univers.

Baudrillard, Jean. 1981. *Simulacres et simulation*. Paris: Éditions Galilée.

Benveniste, Émile. [1966] 2000. *Probleme de lingvistică generală*. Vol. I, II. Traducere de Lucia Magdalena Dumitru. București: Teora.

Benveniste, Émile. 1970. «L'appareil formel de l'énonciation». *Langages*, 17: 12-18. http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/lgge. Accesat 10.05.2014.

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

Bidu-Vrănceanu, Angela et al. 2001. *Dicționar de Științe ale Limbii*. București: Nemira.

Branca-Rosoff, Sonia. 1996. «Jacqueline Authier-Revuz. Ces mots qui ne vont pas de soi. Bucles reflexives et non-coïncidentes du dire». *Langage et société*. 75: 97-104. http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/lsoc_0181-4095_1996_num_75_1_2732.

Buber, Martin. 1992. *Eu și tu*. Traducere de Ștefan Augustin Doinaș. București: Humanitas.

Buzera, Ion. 1996. *Literatura română față cu postmodernismul. (Studiu critic despre Școala de proză de la Târgoviște)*. Craiova: Spirit Românesc.

Buzera, Ion. 2007. *Școala de proză de la Târgoviște*. Pitești: Paralela 45.

Carnap, Rudolf. 1972. *Semnificație și necesitate. Un studiu de semantică și logică modală*. Cluj: Editura Dacia.

Călinescu, Matei. 1995. *Cinci fețe ale modernității. Modernism. Avangardă. Decadență. Kitsch. Postmodernism*. Traducere de Tatiana Pătrulescu și Radu Țurcanu. București: Univers.

Cărtărescu, Mircea. 1987. „Realismul poeziei tinere". *România literară*, 17, în Crăciun, Gheorghe. 1999. *Competiția continuă. Generația '80 în texte teoretice*. Pitești: Paralela 45.

Cărtărescu, Mircea. 1999. *Postmodernismul românesc*. București: Humanitas.

Ceauşu, George. 2005. *Spaţiul literar românesc şi „postmodernismul fără postmodernitate”*. Iaşi: Princeps Edit.

Chelaru-Murăruş, Oana. 2000. *Nichita Stănescu – subiectivitatea lirică. Poetica enunţării*. Bucureşti: Univers.

Ciocârlie, Livius. 1986. „Presupuneri despre postmodernism”. *Caiete critice. Postmodernismul*, nr. 1-2: 13-17. Viaţa Românească.

Codoban, Aurel. 1995. „Postmodernismul, o contrautopie?” în Codoban, A. (ed.). 1995. *Postmodernismul. Deschideri filosofice*. Cluj-Napoca: Dacia.

Codoban, Aurel. 2001. *Semn şi interpretare. O introducere postmodernă în semiologie şi hermeneutică*. Cluj-Napoca: Dacia.

Connor, Steven. 1999. *Cultura postmodernă. O introducere în teoriile contemporane*. Traducere de Mihaela Oniga. Bucureşti: Meridiane.

Cosăceanu, Anca. 1987. „Enunţarea – repere semiotice”, în SCL, XXXVIII, nr. 1, pp. 74-77.

Cotorcea, Livia. 1999. *Avangarda rusă*. Ediţia a II-a. Iaşi: Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”.

Crăciun, Gheorghe. 1999. *Competiţia continuă. Generaţia '80 în texte teoretice*. Piteşti: Paralela 45.

Croitor Balaciu, Blanca. 2005. „Interjecţia”. *Gramatica limbii române* (coord. Valeria Guţu Romalo), vol. I, pp. 657-685. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române.

Crohmălniceanu, Ovid. S. 1986. „Postmodernism; ce se spune şi ce nu”. *Caiete critice. Postmodernismul*, nr. 1-2: 10-12. Viaţa Românească.

Cuniţă, Alexandra. 2007. „Prefaţă”, în Maingueneau, Dominique. 2007. *Pragmatică pentru discursul literar. Enunţarea literară*. Traducere de Raluca-Nicoleta Balaţchi. Iaşi: Institutul European.

Dascălu, Crişu. 1986. *Dialectica limbajului poetic*. Timişoara: Facla.

Derrida, Jacques. 1967. *De la grammatologie*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.

Dinu, Camelia. 2011. *Avangarda literară rusă: configuraţii şi metamorfoze*. Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii.

Dubois, Jean et al. 1973. *Dictionnaire de linguistique*. Paris: Larousse.

Ducrot, Oswald. 1984. *Le dire et le dit*. Paris: Les Editions de Minuit.

Ducrot, Oswald; Schaeffer, Jean-Marie. 1996. *Noul Dicţionar enciclopedic al ştiinţelor limbajului*. Traducere de Anca Măgureanu, Viorel Vişan, Marina Păunescu. Bucureşti: Babel.

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

Ducrot, Oswald. 2001. «Quelques raisons de distinguer locuteurs et énonciateurs». http://www.hum.au.dk/romansk/polyfoni/Polyphonie_III/Oswald_Ducrot.htm.

Eco, Umberto. 1991. *Lector in fabula. Cooperarea interpretativă în textele narative*. Traducere de Marina Spalas. Bucureşti: Univers.

Eco, Umberto. 1996. *Limitele interpretării*. Traducere de Ştefania Mincu şi Daniela Bucşă. Constanţa: Pontica.

Eco, Umberto. 2002. *Kant şi ornitorincul*. Traducere de Ştefania Mincu. Constanţa: Pontica.

Felecan, Daiana. 2010. *Aspecte ale polifoniei lingvistice. Teorie şi construcţie*. Bucureşti: Tritonic Publishing.

Flew, Antony. 1996. *Dicţionar de filozofie şi logică*. Traducere D. Stoianovici. Bucureşti: Humanitas.

Frege, Gottlob. [1892] 2001. «Sens et denotation» în Alexandrescu, Vlad. *Pragmatique et Théorie de l'énonciation. Choix de textes*, pp. 95-113. Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii.

Friedrich, Hugo. 1998. *Structura liricii moderne de la mijlocul secolului al XIX-lea până la mijlocul secolului al XX-lea*. Traducere de Dieter Fuhrmann. Bucureşti: Univers.

Fürst, Maria; Jürgen, Trinks. 1997. *Manual de filozofie*. Traducere de Ioana Constantin. Bucureşti: Humanitas.

Genette, Gérard. 1994. *Introducere în arhitext. Ficţiune şi dicţiune*. Traducere de Ion Pop. Bucureşti: Univers.

Genette, Gérard. 1982. *Palimpsestes. La littérature au second degré*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Gorăscu, Adriana. 2005. „Deixis". *Gramatica limbii române* (coord. Valeria Guţu Romalo), vol. II, pp. 635-655. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române.

Graff, Gerald. 1986. *Mitul apariţiei pormodernismului*, în *Caiete critice. Postmodernismul*, nr. 1-2: 170-179. Viaţa Românească.

Grigorescu, Dan. 2000. *Jocul cu oglinzile. Însemnări despre literatura şi arta postmodernă*. Bucureşti: Universal Dalsi.

Grădinaru, Camelia. 2005. „Scriitura", în Sorin Pârvu (coord.), *Dicţionar de postmodernism. Monografii şi corespondenţe tematice*, pp. 249-266. Iaşi: Institutul European.

Habermas, Jürgen. 2000. *Discursul filosofic al modernităţii. 12 prelegeri*. Traducere de Gilbert V. Lepădatu, Ionel Zamfir, Marius Stan. Bucureşti: ALL.

Hammad, Manar. 1983. «L'énonciation: process et système», în *Langages*, vol. 18, nr. 70, pp. 35-46, http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/lgge. Accesat 8.01.2016.

Hamann, Johann Georg. 2001 [1784]. *Aesthetica in nuce, Métacritique du purisme de la raison et autres textes*. Traducere în franceză de R. Deygout. Paris: Vrin, în Paugam, Guillaume. 2008. «Benveniste, le <Je> et la langue. Des déictiques et de la <subjectivité>». *Texto!*, XIII, 3: 1-6. http://www.revue-texto.net/docannexe/file1622/paugam_benveniste.pdf. Accesat 15.08.2014.

Hassan, Ihab. 1986. „Sfâşierea lui Orfeu: Spre un concept de postmodernism", în *Caiete critice. Postmodernismul*, nr. 1-2: 180-187. Viaţa Românească.

Hăulică, Cristina. 1981. *Textul ca intertextualitate*. Bucureşti: Eminescu.

Heidegger, Martin. [1946] 1988. „Scrisoare despre umanism", în Thomas Kleininger, Gabriel Liiceanu (eds). 1988. *Martin Heidegger. Repere pe drumul gândirii*. Traducere de Thomas Kleininger şi Gabriel Liiceanu, pp. 297- 343. Bucureşti: Editura Politică.

Hlebnikov, Velimir. [1920] 2009. „Temeiul nostru", în Livia Cotorcea. 2009. *Avangarda rusă*. Ediţia a II-a, pp. 172-185. Iaşi: Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza".

Hoarţă Cărăuşu, Luminiţa. 2004. *Pragmalingvistică. Concepte şi taxinomii*. Iaşi: CERMI.

Hobjilă, Angelica. 2003. *Microsistemul deicticelor în limba română vorbită neliterară actuală*. Iaşi: Casa Editorială Demiurg.

Hobjilă, Angelica. 2003. *Microsistemul deicticelor în limba română vorbită neliterară actuală*. Iaşi: Casa Editorială Demiurg.

Huizinga, Johan. 2002. *Homo ludens*. Traducere de H. R. Radian. Bucureşti: Humanitas.

Husted, Jørgen. 2003. „Gottlob Frege. Logicianul discret", în Hügli, Anton; Lübcke, Poul (coord.). *Filosofia în secolul XX*, vol. 2, Traducere de Andrei Apostol, Mihnea Căprău, Cristian Lupu, Marius Mureşan, Marius Stan, pp. 58-83. Bucureşti: ALL.

Husted, Jørgen. 2003. „Acte de vorbire. John Langshaw Austin: A acţiona prin limbaj", în Hügli, Anton; Lübcke, Poul (coord.). *Filosofia în secolul XX*, vol. 2, Traducere de Andrei Apostol, Mihnea Căprău, Cristian Lupu, Marius Mureşan, Marius Stan, pp. 204-215. Bucureşti: ALL.

Hutcheon, Linda. 1997. *Politica postmodernismului*. Traducere de Mircea Deac. Bucureşti: Univers.

Hutcheon, Linda. 2002. *Poetica postmodernismului*. Traducere de Dan Popescu. Bucureşti: Univers.

Indrieş, Alexandra. 1986. *Polifonia persoanei*. Timişoara: Facla.

Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Liliana. 1999. *Conversaţia. Structuri şi strategii*. Ediţia a II-a (revăzută). Bucureşti: ALL.

Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Liliana. 2003. *Limbaj şi comunicare. Elemente de pragmatică lingvistică* București: ALL.

Ionescu, Emil. 1992. *Manual de lingvistică generală*. București: ALL.

Iser, Wolfgang. 2006. *Actul lecturii. O teorie a efectului estetic*. Piteşti: Paralela 45.

Jacques, Francis. 1979. *Dialogiques. Recherches logiques sur le dialogue*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Jacques, Francis. 1983. «La mise en communauté de l'énonciation», în *Langages*, vol. 18, nr. 70, pp. 47-71. http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/lgge. Accesat 5.01.2016.

Jacques, Francis. 1985. *L'espace logique de l'interlocution. Dialogiques II*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Jakobson, Roman. 1963. *Essais de linguistique générale*, vol. I. Traduit par Nicolas Ruwet. Paris: Les Edition de Minuit.

Jakobson, Roman. 1964. „Lingvistică şi poetică. Aprecieri retrospective şi consideraţii de perspectivă". în *Probleme de stilistică. Culegere de articole*. Traducere de Mihai Nasta, pp. 83-125. București: Editura Ştiinţifică.

Kant, Immanuel. 2008 [1798]. *Anthropologie du point de vue pragmatique*. Traducere în franceză de Michel Foucault. Paris: Vrin, Paugam, Guillaume. 2008. «Benveniste, le <Je> et la langue. Des déictiques et de la <subjectivité>». *Texto!*, XIII, 3: 1-6. http://www.revue-texto.net/docannexe/file1622/paugam_benveniste.pdf. Accesat 15.08.2014.

Kerbrat-Orecchioni, Catherine. 1980. *L'énonciation. De la subjectivité dans le langage*. Paris: Librairie Armand Colin.

Kernbach, Victor. 1989. *Dicţionar de mitologie generală*. București : Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică.

Kleiber, Georges. 1986. «Déictiques, embrayeurs, token-reflexives, symbloles indexicaux etc.: comment les définir?». *L'Information Grammaticale*, 30: 3-32. http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/ingram. Accesat 16.06.2015.

Kleiber, Georges. 1991. «Anaphore-deixis: où en sommes-nous?» *L'Information Grammaticale*, 51, 3-18. http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/ingram_0222-9838_1991_num_51_1_3231. Accesat 18.06.2015.

Kleiber, Georges et al. 1993. «Anaphore associative: dans quel sens roule-t-elle?». *Revue québécoise de linguistique*, vol. 22, nr. 2: 139-162. http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/602773ar. Accesat 27. 04. 2016.

Kleiber, Georges. 1994. «Contexte, interprétation et mémoire: approche standard vs. Approche cognitive». *Langue française*, 103: 9-22. http://www.persee.fr/doc/lfr_0023-8368_1994_num_103_1_5722. Accesat 15.06.2016.

Kripke, Saul. [1980] 1982. «La logique des noms propres», în Alexandrescu, Vlad. *Pragmatique et Théorie de l'énonciation. Choix de textes*, pp. 150-169. Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii.

Kristeva, Julia. 1980. „Problemele structurării textului", în *Pentru o teorie a textului. Antologie „Tel Quel" 1960-1971*. pp. 250-272. Bucureşti: Univers.

Kunzmann, Peter; Burkard, Franz-Peter; Wiedmann, Franz. 2004. *Atlas de filozofie*. Traducere de Monica-Maria Aldea. Bucureşti: RAO.

Lefter, Ion Bogdan. 2002. *Postmodernism. Din dosarul unei „bătălii" culturale*. Ediţia a II-a. Piteşti: Paralela 45.

Levinson, C. Stephen. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: University Press.

Lyons, John. 1995. *Introducere în lingvistica teoretică*. Traducere de Alexandra Cornilescu şi Ioana Ştefănescu. Bucureşti: Editura Ştiinţifică.

Lyotard, Jean-François. 2003. *Condiţia postmodernă. Raport asupra cunoaşterii*. Traducere de Ciprian Mihali. Cluj: Idea Design & Print.

Maingueneau, Dominique. 2007. *Pragmatică pentru discursul literar. Enunţarea literară*. Traducere de Raluca-Nicoleta Balaţchi. Iaşi: Institutul European.

Maingueneau, Dominique. 2008. *Lingvistică pentru textul literar*. Traducere de Ioana-Crina Coroi şi Nicoleta Loredana Moroşan. Iaşi: Institutul European.

Manolescu, Nicolae. 1986. „Poeţii pereche". *Caiete critice. Postmodernismul*, nr. 1-2: 52-56. Viaţa Românească.

Manoliu-Manea, Maria. 1993. *Gramatică, pragmasemantică şi discurs*. Bucureşti: Litera.

Marcu, Florin. 2006. *Marele dicţionar de neologisme*. Ediţia a VIII-a. Bucureşti: Saeculum I. O.

Marcus, Solomon. 2011. *Paradigme universale*. Ediţie integrală. Piteşti: Paralela 45.

Martin, Robert. 1985. «Langage et temps *de dicto*». *Langue française*, nr. 67, pp. 23-37. http://www.persee.fr/doc/lfr_0023-8368_1985_num_67_1_4649. Accesat 20.02.2016.

Martinez, Peña Gemma; Pardo, Olivares Amparo. 2008. «L'anaphore associative: contigüité métonymique». http://roderic.uv.es/bitstream/handle/10550/2320/1_Pena_Iberica. Accesat 22.04.2016.

McHale, Brian. 2009. *Ficţiunea postmodernistă*. Traducere de Dan H. Popescu. Iaşi: Polirom.

Mey, L. Jacob. 1999. *When Voices Clash. A Study in literary Pragmatics*. Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Mihali, Ciprian. 2003. „Cuvânt înainte: Despre foloasele şi neajunsurile postmodernului”, în Jean-François Lyotard. 2003. *Condiţia postmodernă*. Traducere de Ciprian Mihali, pp. 5-10. Cluj: Idea Design & Print.

Mihăilă, Ecaterina. 1995. *Textul poetic. Perspectivă teoretică şi modele generative*. Bucureşti: Eminescu.

Milner, Jean-Claude. 1982. *Ordres et raisons de langue*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Milner, Jean-Claude. 1989. *Introduction à une science du langage*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Mincu, Marin. 1993. *Textualism şi autenticitate (Eseu despre textul poetic, III)*. Constanţa: Pontica.

Mincu, Marin. 2000. *Poeticitate românească postbelică*. Constanţa: Pontica.

Moeschler, Jacques; Reboul, Anne. 1999. *Dicţionar enciclopedic de pragmatică*. Traducere de Liana Pop şi Carmen Vlad (coords.). Cluj: Echinox.

Moeschler, Jacques; Auchlin, Antoine. 2005. *Introducere în lingvistica contemporană*. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Echinox.

Moeschler, Jacques; Reboul, Anne. 2010. *Pragmatica discursului*. Traducere de Irinel Antoniu. Iaşi: Institutul European.

Molendijk, Arie. 1985. «Point référentiel et imparfait». *Langue française*. Nr. 67. pp. 78-94. http://www.persee.fr/doc/lfr_0023-8368_1985_67_1_4652. Accesat 15.04.2016.

Monte, Michèle. 2007. Poésie et effacement énonciatif. *Semen [En ligne]*, no. 24. http://semn.revues.org./6113.

Nagy, Rodica. 2015. *Dicţionar de analiză a discursului*. Iaşi: Institutul European.

Nedelcu, Isabela. 2005. „Conectori frastici şi transfrastici”. *Gramatica limbii române* (coord. Valeria Guţu Romalo), vol. II, pp.728-737. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române.

Nølke, Henning. [2001] 2012. «La ScaPoLine 2001. Version révisée de la théorie Scandinave de la Polyphonie Linguistique». http://www.hum.au.dk./romansk/polyfoni/Polyphonie_III/Henning_Nølke.htm. Accesat 10.08.2015.

Nølke, Henning; Olsen, Michel. 2000 [2015]. «Polyphonie: théorie et terminologie». http://www.hum.au.dk./romansk/polyfoni/Polyphonie_II/poly2_NølkeOlsen_article.htm. Accesat 15.08.2015.

Ohmann, Richard. 1981. «Actele de vorbire şi definiţia literaturii». *Poetica americană. Orientări actuale* (coord. Mircea Borcilă; Richard McLain). pp. 179-199. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Dacia.

Ohmann, Richard. 1981. «Literatura ca act». *Poetica americană. Orientări actuale* (coord. Mircea Borcilă; Richard McLain). pp. 200-209. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Dacia.

Oprea, Ioan. 2006. *Elemente de filosofia limbii*. Iași: Institutul European.

Oroian, Elvira. 2006. *Anafora și catafora ca fenomene discursive*. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Risoprint.

Pamfil, Eduard; Ogodescu Doru. 1976. *Persoană și devenire*. București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.

Parpală Afana, Emilia. 1994. *Poezia semiotică. Promoția '80*. Craiova: Sitech.

Parpală, Emilia. 2007. *Semiotica generală. Pragmatica*. Craiova: Universitaria.

Parpală, Emilia. 2009. *Comunicarea verbală*. Craiova: Universitaria.

Parpală, Emilia *et al.* 2011. *Postmodernismul poetic românesc. O perspectivă semio-pragmatică și cognitivă*. Craiova: Universitaria.

Parpală, Emilia. 2011. „Introducere". *Postmodernismul. Creație și interpretare* (coord. Emilia Parpală, Carmen Popescu). pp. 11-12. Craiova: Editura Universitaria.

Parpală, Emilia. 2011. „Ioan Flora – un postmodern atipic". *Postmodernismul. Creație și interpretare* (coord. Emilia Parpală, Carmen Popescu). pp. 73-90. Craiova: Editura Universitaria.

Parpală, Emilia. 2015. "Speech Acts in Postmodern Poetry". *Contextual Identities: A Comparative and Communicational Approach* (eds. Emilia Parpală and Leo Loveday), 190-213. Cambridge Scolars Publishing.

Parret, Herman. 1983. «La mise en discours en tant que déictisation et modalisation», în *Langages*, vol. 18, nr. 70, pp. 83-97. http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/lgge. Accesat 12.01.2016.

Paugam, Guillaume. 2008. «Benveniste, le <Je> et la langue. Des déictiques et de la <subjectivité>». *Texto!*, XIII, 3: 1-6. http://www.revue-texto.net/docannexe/file1622/paugam_benveniste.pdf. Accesat 15.08.2014.

Peirce, Sanders Charles. 1990. *Semnificație și acțiune. Gândirea filosofică a secolului XX*. Traducere Delia Marga. București: Humanitas.

Petrescu, Liviu.1998. *Poetica postmodernismului*. Ediția a II-a. Pitești: Paralela 45.

Plett, Heinrich. 1983. *Știința textului și analiza de text. Semiotică, lingvistică, retorică*. București: Univers.

Popescu, Carmen. 2011. „De la palimpsest la deconstrucția clișeului. Intertext și interdiscurs în poezia postmodernă a anilor 90", în Parpală, Popescu *et al. Postmodernismul poetic*

românesc. O perspectivă semio-pragmatică şi cognitivă, pp. 183-190. Craiova: Universitaria.

Popescu, Iulian. 2006. *Timp şi limbaj. Introducere în lingvistica lui Gustave Guillaume*. Iaşi: Institutul European.

Rachieru, Adrian Dinu. 2000. *Elitism şi postmodernism. Postmodernismul românesc şi circulaţia elitelor*. Chişinău: Garuda-art.

Raţiu, Dan Eugen. 2001. *Disputa modernism-postmodernism. O introducere în teoriile contemporane asupra artei*. Cluj-Napoca: Dacia.

Reboul, Anne; Moeschler, Jacques. 2001. *Pragmatica azi*. Traducere de Liana Pop. Cluj: Echinox.

Récanati, François. 1979. «Le développement de la pragmatique». *Langue française*, nr. 42, pp. 6-20. http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/lfr_0023-8368_1979_num_42_1_6151. Accesat 15.02.2016.

Récanati, François. 2005. «Deixis and Anaphora», în Szabo Zoltan Gendler. 2005. *Semantics versus Pragmatics*, pp. 286-316. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Récanati, François. 1980. «Qu'est-ce qu'un acte locutionnaire?». *Communication*, nr. 32, pp. 190-215. http://www.persee.fr/doc/comm_0588-8018_1980_num_32_1_1485. Accesat 03.06.2016.

Reichler-Béguelin, Marie-José. 1988. «Anaphore, cataphore et mémoire discursive». *Pratiques*, 57: 15-40. http://www.pratiques-cresef.com/cres0588.htm. Accesat 18.06.2015.

Robins, R. H. 2003. *Scurtă istorie a lingvisticii*. Traducere de Dana Ligia Ilin şi Mihaela Leaţ. Iaşi: Polirom.

Rorty, Richard. (ed.). 1967. *The Linguistic Turn. Essays in Philosophical Method*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rorty, Richard. 2000. *Pragmatism şi filosofie post-nietzscheană. Eseuri filosofice II*. Traducere de Mihaela Căbulea. Bucureşti: Univers.

Russell, Bertrand. [1940] 2001. «Circonstanciels egocentriques», în Alexandrescu, Vlad. *Pragmatique et Théorie de l'énonciation. Choix de textes*, pp. 233-238. Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii.

Salles, Mathilde. 2010. «Anaphore associative et relations de cohérence: une expression particulière de la relation Assertion-Indice». http://discours.revues.org/7739. Accesat 10.04.2016.

Saussure, Ferdinand. 1998. *Curs de lingvistică generală*. Ediţie critică de Tulio de Mauro. Traducere de Irina Izverna Tarabac. Iaşi: Polirom.

Schulte, Joachim. 2003. „Peter Frederick Strawson", în Hügli, Anton; Lübcke, Poul (coord.). *Filosofia în secolul XX,* vol. 2. Traducere de Andrei Apostol, Mihnea Căprău, Cristina Lupu, Marius Mureşan, Marius Stan, pp. 382-395. Bucureşti: ALL.

Searle, John Rogers. 1972. *Les actes de langage. Essai de philosophie du langage.* Traduction par Hélène Pauchard. Paris: Hermann.

Searle, John Rogers. 1982. *Sens et expression. Études de théorie des actes de langage.* Traduction par Joëlle Proust. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.

Simion, Eugen. 1986. „Un concept care își caută sensurile". *Caiete critice. Postmodernismul.* nr. 1-2: 5-9. Viața Românească.

Sperber, Dan, Wilson, Deirdre. 1989. *La pertinence. Communication et cognition.* Traduction par Abel Gerschenfeld et Dan Sperber. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.

Strawson, Peter Frederick. 1977. *Études de logique et de linguistique.* Traduction par Judith Milner. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Strawson, Peter Frederick. [1950] 2001. «De l'acte de référence» în Alexandrescu, Vlad. *Pragmatique et Théorie de l'énonciation. Choix de textes*, pp. 126-149. Bucureşti: Editura Universității.

Swiatkowska, Marcela. 2006. «L'interjection: entre deixis et anaphore». *Langages*, 161: 47-56. http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/lgge_0458-726x_2006_num_40_161_2704. Accesat 18.06.2015.

TLFi (*Le Trésor de la Langue Française informatisé*). http://atilf.atilf.fr/dendien/scripts/tlfiv5/affart.exe?19;s=3526173405;?b=0. Accesat 20.12.2015.

Todorov, Tzvetan. 1970. «Problèmes de l'énonciation». *Langages*, 17: 3-11. http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/lgge. Accesat 23.06.2014.

Tonoiu, Vasile. 1995. *Omul dialogal. Un concept la răspântie.* Bucureşti: Editura Fundației Culturale Române.

Tuțescu, Mariana. 2006. «L'interjection – modalisation, axiologisation et grammaticalisation. Le cas des interjection roumaines *zău* et *vai*». *Langages*, 161: 37-46. http://www.persee.fr./web/revues/home/prescript/article/lgge_0458-726x_2006_num_40_161_2703. Accesat 18.06.2015.

Uliu, Adriana. 2014. „Dadaiştii ruşi. Grupul Nicevoki – o ipostază puțin cunoscută a avangardei literare ruse" (I). *Mozaicul*, serie nouă, XVII, nr. 5-6 (187-188): 5.

Uliu, Adriana. 2014. „Dadaiştii ruşi. Grupul Nicevoki – o ipostază puțin cunoscută a avangardei literare ruse" (II). *Mozaicul*, serie nouă, XVII, nr. 7-8 (189-190): 14-15.

Varzari, Elena. 2011. „Metatextualitate", în Constantinovici, Elena (coord.). *Teoria textului: termeni-cheie*, pp. 134-135. Chişinău: Academia de Ştiinţe a Moldovei. Institutul de Filologie.

Vasile, Marian. 2001. *M. Bahtin. Discursul dialogic. Istoria unei mari idei*. Bucureşti: Athos.

Vattimo, Gianni. 1993. *Sfârşitul modernităţii. Nihilism şi hermeneutică în cultura postmodernă*. Traducere de Ştefania Mincu. Constanţa: Pontica.

Vattimo, Gianni. 1995. *Societatea transparentă*. Traducere de Ştefania Mincu. Constanţa: Pontica.

Vattimo, Gianni; Rovatti, Pier Aldo. 1998. *Gândirea slabă. Texte de:Leonardo Amoroso et. al.* Traducere de Ştefania Mincu. Constanţa: Pontica.

Vântu, Ileana. 2005. „Vorbirea directă şi vorbirea indirectă". *Gramatica limbii române*, vol. II, pp. 818-827. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române.

Wright, Georg Henrik von. 1982. *Normă şi acţiune (Studiu logic)*. Traducere de Dragan Stoianovici şi Sorin Vieru. Bucureşti: Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică.

Wunderlich, Dieter. 1972. «Pragmatique, situation d'énonciation et deixis». *Langages*, 26: 34-58. http://www.persee.fr/web/revues/home/prescript/article/lgge. Accesat 16.06.2015.

Zafiu, Rodica. 2000. *Naraţiune şi poezie*. Bucureşti: ALL.

Zafiu, Rodica. 2004. „Observaţii asupra anaforei în limba română actuală", pp. 239-251. http://www.unibuc.ro/prof/zafiu_r/docs/res/2011maranafora_bd_560791.pdf

Zafiu, Rodica. 2005. „Anafora". *Gramatica limbii române* (coord. Valeria Guţu Romalo), vol. II, pp. 656-672. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române.

Zafiu, Rodica. 2005. „Modalizarea". *Gramatica limbii române* (coord. Valeria Guţu Romalo), vol. II, pp. 673-697. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române.