

A B S T R A C T

CONTENT

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. WHAT IS POLITICAL DISCOURSE?.....	9
2.0. Introduction	9
2.1. Linguistic and Philosophical Approaches to Political Discourse Analysis.....	10
2.1.1. An Overview of Romanian Political Discourse.....	14
2.1.2. Critical Discourse Analysis Approach.....	18
2.3. Communication or Manipulation?.....	22
2.3.1. Political Communication from the Perspective of the Theory of Communication Processes.....	24
2.4. Representation and Transformation in Political Discourse.....	29
3. TYPES OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE.....	32
3.0. General considerations.....	32
3.1. The Strategic Functions of Political Language.....	33
3.2. Political Language as Political Manifestation.....	35
3.2.1 Ideological Political Language.....	35
3.2.2. Propagandistic Political Language.....	38
3.2.3. Indoctrination Political Language.....	40
3.3. Categories of Political Discourse.....	44
3.3.1. Democratic and Totalitarian Discourse.....	47
3.3.2. Official Political Discourse.....	49
3.3.3. Electoral Political Discourse.....	51
3.3.4. Institutionalized Discourse.....	53
3.3.5. Direct Political Discourse and Mediated Political Discourse.....	55
3.4. A Political Discourse Pattern?	60
4. TECHNIQUES OF MANIPULATION IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE.....	62
4.1. Background considerations.....	62
4.2. The Role of the ``Word``	64
4.3. The Concept of ``Manipulation``	66
4.4. Techniques of Manipulation.....	74
4.4.1. Publicity.....	74

4.4.2. Propaganda.....	78
4.4.3. Disinformation.....	85
4.4.4 The Pep Talk.....	86
4.5 Elements of Discourse in Political Language.....	90
4.5.1. Logical Elements.....	90
4.5.2. Rhetorical Elements.....	93
4.5.3 A Practical Analysis.....	95
4.6 Conclusions.....	99
5. THE ROLE OF SEMANTICS AND PRAGMATICS IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE.....	100
5.1. Introduction.....	100
5.2. Pragmatics: Language as action.....	103
5.3. Semantics: Words, Worlds and the Role of Stylistic Features.....	104
5.4. Conceptual Metaphors.....	109
5.4.1. Conceptual Blending.....	114
5.5. Metaphor, Metonymy and Analogy in Political Discourse.....	120
5.6. A Practical Analysis.....	125
5.7. Conclusions.....	135
6. METHODS OF ANALYSIS IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE.....	136
6.1. Introduction.....	136
6.2. Inventory of Grammatical Structures.....	137
6.3. Corpus Analysis.....	140
6.3.1. Corpus Sample.....	141
6.3.2. Qualitative Analysis.....	147
6.3.3. Quantitative Analysis.....	151
6.3.4 Swot Analysis.....	172
6.4. Conclusions.....	175
7. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.....	176
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	181
ANNEXES.....	192
SPEECHES.....	206

KEY WORDS:

Political discourse, critical discourse analysis, communication, manipulation, representation/transformation, political discourse categories, techniques of manipulation, logical elements, rhetoric elements, conceptual metaphors, conceptual blending, qualitative analysis, quantitative analysis, Swot analysis.

ABSTRACT:

Taking into consideration the role that power plays within the context of social life, it becomes obvious that without this attribute called “power” there could be no ordinate human activity (Bordeiu, 2006). Seen as a political phenomenon, power seems to be the most important component of political institutions. In this regard, it is being used for keeping and consolidating a certain social order, for ensuring the functionality of all social institutions, for keeping the social cohesion in a society, for controlling the citizens’ behavior, as well as for unwanted behavior prevention (Mihailescu, 2000).

The most general and well-known form of power is social power and the literature of the field (Downing, 1998; Hastings, 2000; Balandier, 1998; Valsan, 1997) describes it as the means through which society adjusts itself and self-regulates its mechanism with the purpose of ensuring and sustaining its optimum functionality. Bordeiu (2006) sees it as the element that sets in motion all the social gearing towards historical progress, the propelling force which accomplishes social and sustainable development, the binding concept among all the social structures and phenomena, which it definitely organizes (forming its hierarchical systems), coordinates and orchestrates according to the target agenda.

Like any other social phenomena, the social power phenomenon distinguishes itself through a series of specific traits and the question is whether these traits that personalize social power do need the use of language or not, and if they do, at what level? In what follows, I will briefly summarize the traits of social power as proposed by Bordeiu (2006) and the diverse manifestations of power forms in society, trying to determine (via logical assumptions) the relevance of language for each category:

→ Display as social relation – social power relies invariably on the existence of a specific social relation (subordination: leader to obedient, also co-operation for achieving conjoint goals) between people or groups of people, typical of any community, no matter its size (family, tribe, nation). Among the members of any groups appear different relations based on interests (power, solidarity, collaboration, conflict, etc), relations that come into being according to a specific context and are submitted to the filter of language.

→ Display as organization and management of social life – power constitutes the most important element in organizing, ruling and adjustment setting of social life. It imposes the goals of human activity, the necessary means and strategies for achieving them and in this way power becomes the vital component that establishes and applies social order on the social level, an order that in its turn generates the phenomenon of power. So, social order depends on organization in order to validate power and vice versa, but neither of them can materialize themselves without the support of language.

→ Essentiality and Permanence - power is an essential and a permanent element for social relations and therefore ensures the normal functioning of society. But the normal functioning of a society could never be achieved without the patterns of communication and verbal interaction. Language itself becomes this way essential and permanent to society.

→ Global Display – power has, among other things, the quality of a global factor and becomes an integrator that orchestrates and incorporates all the other forms of ruling and organization of social activities. During the integration process, language plays a decisive role, as it ensures the uniformity of the system (language performing values).

→ Social Values Synthesis Display – The values promoted by power represent a synthesis of the other values manifested on the social level, which reflect the interests of the social majority, taking into consideration those related to the historical, moral or cultural tradition. In this case, language has the capacity to store these values, ensures fluency in passing on specific values and provides the opportunity to form a majority which will share the same ideological language.

→ Roles Asymmetry within Power Relationships – The need for organizing and ruling different forms of activity (within complex human groups) determines social divisions, respectively asymmetries in the roles assumed by different categories of individuals (leaders and obeyers). The roles asymmetry provokes a relationship asymmetry which is established

between leaders and obeyers (domination and subordination). These relationships go through a constant fluctuating process and are subject to spectacular changes, most of them using language as a vehicle to establish the new asymmetries created and to maintain the new operational roles.

→ The Use of Coercion Display – Once the asymmetry has been established (leaders/obeyers), power may use coercion (constraint) to ensure the correct enforcement of organizational rules and the right fulfillment of attributions. All democracies resort to physical coercion instruments (police, army, and constabulary) in order to maintain public order, citizens' safety, political stability and so on. But even coercion has to rely on language, first because the rules have to be written in order to be followed (official language), then warnings are being issued in specific formulae (which only language can shape).

Language also plays a decisive role in shaping the forms of power manifestations. The field of Political Sciences considers that there are as many forms of power manifestations as the stable social groups that exist in the world and, following this criterion (Nazare, 2002), they may be divided into:

a) Related to the domain of human activity:

→political power – manifested between the members of society during the process of social organization and political leadership (uses the specialized political language which offers patterns that enable the appliance of rules, decisions, discussions, and so on)

→legislative power – produces or cancels laws built for society, which establish the behavioral norms (uses the legislative language, a specialized law language which allows the character of the law to be preserved within language)

→executive power – applies the laws and maintains order within the system (uses a specialized type of language which ensures the continuity of action)

→judiciary power – imposes authority and deals with any kind of contentions that might appear due to the misunderstanding of the laws (uses a specialized law language that operates in courts)

→budgetary power – elaborates the political decisions regarding the income and the expenditures within the public monetary system (uses a specialized financial language which allows the setting of new profitable financial strategies)

→economic power – determined by the possibilities of action of a certain person, group or organization, in promoting their very own interests (uses a specialized type of language that incorporates structures from all the above-mentioned specialized languages)

→military power, civil power, cultural power, religious power, technical power and so on (they all use specialized types of language in order to incorporate their own ideologies and to offer social support)

b) Related to the specific of the human community:

→family power – institutionalized within the family, it covers the relationships between parents and children (informal language)

→societal power – covers the relationships created between the leaders and obedients (formal language)

→internal power and international power – decides what role the states play on the international stage according to the role that each state plays within its own borders (uses a specialized international political language)

c) Related to means and targets:

→democratic power – an outcome of citizens' consulting and consent (uses the democratic political language, prone to debate, public speeches, political confrontations and so on)

→dictatorial power – does not take into consideration the public opinion and sets itself as an autocratic force (wooden language)

The present study sets out to be a statistic, corpus-based, at times descriptive and mainly randomized approach to political language, sustained by occasional interpretative case studies, and content analysis. Its main task is to describe and identify the functioning of political language as a specialized type of language and to detect the strategies of communication employed by the very specificity of this kind of discourse. A comprehensive study of political discourse in general is hard to deliver especially due to the difficulties in

delineating the borders of the disciplines involved, such as linguistics, political science, political sociology or sociolinguistics, and then such a study would definitely require more than the limits imposed by a single work.

As a specific register, political language has managed to develop and apply its very own set of linguistic features; adapting language is such a way that eventually would serve its interests completely, most of the time leaving no observable traces that might make us consider “it’s all about manipulation”. At the same time, it’s the only type of specialized language that borrows structures from all the other registers (e.g. the language that represents political power may use structures from all the other languages that represent legislative power, economic power, judiciary and so on) and that makes it quite distinct and tricky.

On the other hand, since society needs it for a good organization and without the use of language our sustainable development as civilized Homo sapiens would reach no progress, one may pose the question: Where is the line between well intentioned political language and the devious one? Of course, answering such a question is probably almost impossible, since history itself demonstrates that good intentions and bad intentions cannot be traced in their early stages and only the outcome of an action may stand as a point of reference for the good impact or the bad impact of that action on society. Following this experiential pattern, political language becomes just a tool: handed with good or sometimes bad intentions.

SCOPE

Besides the specific structures and strategies that show up in political discourse, my intent is to correlate them in such a way as to generate a model of analysis that will cover as many elements as possible and to establish a correlation pattern.

The route that I have followed has led me to an integrated interdisciplinary approach and has offered interesting possible combinations of elements and theories from fields such as: rhetoric, linguistics, political sciences, sociology. The most interesting outcome has been to observe that the universal binding of so many elements from so many different fields proves to be the language and the power of the word.

Furthermore, it is almost impossible to create categories of “good political language” or “bad political language” (to create divisions of this kind, which is possible at a linguistic

level but, generally applied, would compromise the relevance of possible combinations), since language seems to offer only the specialized political structures applied in such a type of discourse and could not cover the instances, contexts or the intentions of the sender (although there are instances when political language encodes the above-mentioned elements, the frequency of such instances could not reach such a high degree of generalization as to be set as a proven rule).

In this regard, my scope is not to draw the line between “the well intentioned political language and the devious one”, but rather to work on a review of all the possible elements that could at some point be used in manipulative and persuasive ways, pointing out the possibility of shifting according to intention and context.

DATA

→the corpus selected for examination comes from different sources (governmental sites, newspaper entries, political publications)

→it is authentic political discourse (both English and Romanian, for contrastive values)

→the translations of the Romanian speeches are posted in the Annexes

→the corpus is built up from different types of political texts (to demonstrate the theoretical background principles and to serve as evidence for the research)

STRUCTURE

The current thesis is organized in seven chapters, a bibliography, an annexes unit and a speeches unit, with each chapter and/or subchapter including a presentation of the background considerations (introduction), theoretical orientation, explanation of hypotheses, corpus description (wherever needed), content analysis and conclusions.

CHAPTER I is an INTRODUCTION to the concept of social power phenomena, the “core concept” from which the entire present study emerged. It tries to offer a perspective on how language can be linked to the political concepts that underpin our societal system and in what ways language has been shaped for serving specific purposes simultaneously with the

act of gaining its own well determined status among society's socio-political patterns of organization. It also delivers a synoptic view of the thesis, its practical intentions, research variables and proposed orientation.

Political power appears due to a process of social innovation and is legitimated through one of acknowledgement, this way the innovation answers to the political ``need of being``, while the acknowledgement expresses ``the right of being`` of a legitimate political power (Bordeiu, 2006) In this respect, innovation and acknowledgement become two complementary processes that undoubtedly configure political power and implicitly the efficiency of a political system through language.

As a specific register, political language has managed to develop and apply its very own set of linguistic features; adapting language is such a way that eventually would serve its interests completely, most of the time leaving no observable traces that might make us consider ``it's all about manipulation``. In the same time, it's the only type of specialized language that borrows structures from all the other registers (e.g. the language that represents political power may use structures from all the other languages that represent legislative power, economical power, judiciary and so on) and that makes it quite distinct and tricky.

There are no categories of ``good political language`` or ``bad political language``, since language seemed to offer only the specialized political structures applied in such a type of discourse and could not cover the instances, contexts or the intentions of the sender.

CHAPTER II: WHAT IS POLITICAL DISCOURSE? offers a panoramic view upon the notion of ``political discourse``, delineating the concepts of ``discourse`` and ``political discourse`` (as used in the current work), offering a theoretical background to linguistic and philosophical approaches to political discourse analysis, an essential overview of Romanian political discourse and a description of how critical discourse analysis tackles political discourse analysis. It also tries to make a distinction between communication and manipulation patterns from the perspective of the Theory of the Communication Processes and finally deals with transformation and representation in political discourse.

It has been stated that the study of political discourse has been around for as long as politics itself. From Cicero (1971) to Aristotle (1991) it seemed that the major concern was

mostly about how different methods of social and political competence managed to achieve specific objectives (Wilson: 2001). In general lines, this approach is still continued today.

From the perspective of the position of the analyst (Marga: 2004), on the other hand, the approaches tackled the following angles:

- A) The role that language plays in politics;
- B) The relation between language and ideology;
- C) The relation between language and power;

As regards a possible categorization of political text as a distinct type of text, Coşeriu (1996) underlines that the collocation “political language” may have at least three different understandings:

A) Political lexicon: terminology referring to the designation of political notions and institutions (particular to each and every country);

B) Appliance method: the linguistic use determined by the political ideologies and attitudes; covering all the ways in which language is used, subjective ways orientated towards extra linguistic facts, ways determined by the adopted attitudes of the speakers, through the use of words towards the designated objects;

C) The use of language in political “discursive chunks”/ “texts”, observing the specific linguistic traits of such a type of text

The last category proposed by Coşeriu in his article, implies the study of political texts from three different perspectives:

C1) as any type of texts, within the philological area, texts being regarded as documents in this case;

C2) as typical examples of “efficient” discourses, orientated towards “the practical values of efficiency”; in this context, a political text is determined through its own finality and the functions corresponding to this finality (the final finality of such a text is its practical efficiency and the function that corresponds to such a type of finality is that of “appealing”, orientated towards the listener (receiver), whom it has to determine to act or to adopt a specific attitude;

C3) individually, within the area of speech stylistics and text linguistics as the hermeneutics of meaning.

CHAPTER III: TYPES OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE sets out to be an agenda of the types of political discourse, in the sense that it structures these types of discourse according to their linguistic functions and specialized political traits. The categories proposed are mainly defined from the linguistic point of view, but also take into consideration the principles postulated in the field of political sciences.

In order to establish (or at least to try to) a typology of political discourse, some of the following characteristics have to be taken into consideration:

- Political discourse makes use of a complex ideological assembly of representations
- Political discourse subscribes to an intentionality process which has as the main vector the principle of Credibility and not that of the Truth
- Political discourse always delivers itself in a logico-syntactical surrounding (scene)
- The discursive masks make up a strategic program (a plan where the multiple linguistic combinations have to provoke effects according to the current political stake and the characteristics of the audience
- Political discourse rallies itself to history, context and questionability (to a common shared reality identifiable through the interlocutors' body).

CHAPTER IV: TECHNIQUES OF MANIPULATION IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE squares up to the issues of "manipulation" in political discourse and goes beyond the general interpretation of cases of manipulation in political discourse, linking the role of the "word" to that of the concept of "manipulation" and analyzes the four famous categories of manipulation in political discourse: publicity, propaganda, disinformation and the pep talk. The final part of the chapter deals with the logical and rhetorical elements of discourse in political language, offering a case analysis to back up the theoretical hypotheses.

Manipulation will not be viewed and discussed as a phenomenon that may occur in discourse (any type of discourse), but as an important procedure widely used nowadays in political discourse, as well as an important tool for gaining control and power within the political arena.

The concept of manipulation will be seen as “making people behave in certain way without their knowing why, and perhaps even against their best interests and wishes” (J. Mey : 1993) , furthermore, how this linguistic power triggers certain effects in the minds of the audience based on different political ideologies. For the content of this paper I have chosen not to deal with manipulation on different levels (grammatical, morphological or syntactical), as this needs much more attention than I could provide within the limits of this paper, but to deal with manipulation on a larger scale (as a general concept) and its applicability to the political discourse. The issues will be treated from the linguistic point of view, given the fact that language plays a decisive role in the process of manipulation and that “words” become more than just an abstract representation of the facts.

According to this, *The Role of the “Word”* tries to place “the word” into a context related to the topic discussed throughout the paper; *The Concept of Manipulation* focuses upon the specific elements that constitute the mechanism of manipulation and draws a distinction between the concept of manipulation and that of persuasion; *Techniques of Manipulation* discusses the typology of the manipulation acts as proposed by Philippe Breton and analyzes phenomena as political publicity, political propaganda and the art of “disinformation”; *Elements of Discourse in Political Language* underlines the logical and the rhetorical elements that appear in any type of discourse with relevance to the political discourse and uses the Semiotic Model of Discourse Analysis (Constantin Sălăvăstru : 1996) to throw light upon the specific logical and rhetorical elements in political discourse; *A Practical Analysis* proposes a personal analysis of an extract from a political text, using all the elements underlined in the previous subchapters.

Finally, the chapter intends to draw attention to the fact that the concept of manipulation exists and it is widely used (though hidden or covered by modern techniques of persuasion) and that maybe the audience is not always aware of the fact that it becomes, somehow, the target of such manipulative attempts, even if we live in democratic societies and we use the media means to share the democratic values which are at the basis of our “freedom”.

CHAPTER V: THE ROLE OF SEMANTICS AND PRAGMATICS IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE acknowledges the importance of semantics and pragmatics in political discourse analysis (stating the main pragmatical features that have to be taken into

consideration whenever dealing with political discourse as text or talk) and is orientated towards the role of stylistic features in political discourse, presenting the paradigm of conceptual metaphors as postulated in Cognitive Linguistics. It also describes the mechanisms of metaphor, metonymy and analogy as they are used in political discourse and proposes a practical analysis to demonstrate the integration of such categories of stylistic features into that of “building up an embellished political speech”.

The “concept definition” assumed in the present chapter will be that of “language in action”. More exactly, the communicative motivations for the selection of linguistic forms, as “language is inseparable from other aspects of our life and the selection of linguistic form should be explained in terms of authentic human communicative needs (i.e. social, interactional, cognitive, affective needs). This position is compatible with and inspired by insights from a number of different sources, including anthropology, cognitive science, functional linguistics, psycholinguistics, philology and, sociology” (Weiyun He: 2003).

Among the most important semantical structures in the production of political meanings, there are the mechanisms of stylistic features, especially that of metaphor.

Stylistic features play an important role in any type of discourse (except scientific discourse). Ancient Rhetoric considered that “adorning” discourse meant guaranteeing the success of the speaker. Nevertheless, in order to determine the public to adhere to a certain idea, it takes more than just a simple, “barren” discourse, especially in political discourse, where being successful in action means being successful in discourse. It is a well known fact that style defines each type of discourse and that discourse itself functions as a whole in order to reach its goal, so one of the stages that make up this whole is that of searching the means to embellish discourse.

One of the recent concepts of great relevance to political discourse is that of the conceptual metaphor proposed by George Lakoff in his book *Moral Politics* (2002). It mainly deals with conceptual systems, what our unconscious systems of concepts are and how we think and talk using that system of concepts.

Another concept that seems to be of relevance to political discourse is that of Radial Categories. Lakoff defines them in terms of the most common of human conceptual categories, being characterized by variation on a central model.

The Conceptual Integration or Conceptual Blending Theory, nowadays called Blending Theory in Cognitive Linguistics, derives from two well known approaches within cognitive semantics, that of Conceptual Metaphor Theory and Mental Spaces Theory. It has been stated by some cognitive semanticists that Blending Theory is somehow closely related to the Mental Spaces Theory, maybe even an extension of the latter, due to the fact that they both share the same dependence upon mental spaces and mental spaces construction as part of their processes. However, “the crucial insight of Blending Theory is that meaning construction typically involves integration of structure that gives rise to more than sum of its parts. Blending theorists argue that this process of conceptual integration or blending is a general and basic cognitive operation which is central to the way we think” (Vyvyan Evans, 2006: 400).

CHAPTER VI: METHODS OF ANALYSIS IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE explores two of the most important linguistic methods of analysis: qualitative and quantitative analysis, and proposes an integrated method of analysis: swot analysis.

The quantitative research is contrasted with qualitative research which is the examination, analysis and interpretation of observations for the purpose of discovering underlying meanings and patterns of relationships, including classifications of types of phenomena and entities (linguistic entries).

Swot analysis is a modern tool in monitoring the overall strategic position of a political group and its environment and it offers a panoramic perspective upon all the elements involved, for example the position of the party, its members, types of discourses delivered and the final impact upon the environment (political group and public, as well).

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The current paper demonstrates that political discourse is a distinctive type of discourse, in the sense that it complies with linguistic rules and political rules in the same time, and serves the phenomena of *social power*, which is the propelling force of society.

The applied intergrated, interdisciplinary model of linguistics, political sciencies, sociolinguistics, rhetoric and occasionally journalistic perspectives, conducts to a more

complex insight into the organization of political discourse types and strategies.

For derivation of this political discourse models, the research methods addressed were corpus based, essentially randomized and basically contrastive and statistical. Insights from informal political case studies and content analyses completed the approach.

For the methods of analysis proposed to be relevant and applicable to other similar texts, the corpora of political text were significant and broad enough, ranging from the Romanian examples of speeches to the English ones.

The political discourse variables considered (synchronic: media, product, target audience, types of political discourse, linguistic elements, and diachronic, as well as their combination) were researched within a relevant diversity of theoretical perspectives including political sciences theories, linguistical theories, journalistic theories, communication theories and sociolinguistic theories.

The previous conclusions as extracted in chapter order are defining for a strategy of political communication model.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. ADAM, JEAN-MICHEL, BONHOMME, MARC (2005) *Argumentarea publicitară*, Iași: Institutul European.
2. AGAR, M. (1994) *Language Shock: Understanding the Culture of Conversation*, New York: William Marrow.
3. ALFORD, R. R. (1992) *The Political Language of the Nonprofit Sector In Language, Symbolism, and Politics*. San Francisco, CA: Westview Press.
4. ALLAN, K (1986) *Linguistic Meaning*: Routledge.
5. ANGLIN, J.M. (1977) *Word, Object, and Conceptual Development*, New York: Norton.
6. ANKERSMIT, FRANK (1993) *Metaphor in Political Theory*, in Ankersmit and Mooij (eds.), *Knowledge and Language*, vol. Iii, *Metaphor and Knowledge*.
7. ATKINSON, R. (1984) *Our masters' voices: The language and body language of politics*: New York" Methuen.
8. ANKERSMIT, FRANK (1993) *Metaphor in Political Theory*, in Ankersmit and Mooij (eds.), *Knowledge and Language*, vol. Iii, *Metaphor and Knowledge*.
9. AUSTIN, J.L., (1962) *How To Do Things with Words*. The William Jones Lectures, 1955, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
10. BAKHTIN, M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination*, Austin: University of Texas Press.
11. BALANDIER, GEORGES (2000) *Scena Puterii*, Oradea: Aion.
12. BALL, M. A. (2000) *Political language and the search for an honorable peace: President's Kennedy and Johnson, their advisors, and Vietnam decision making*. In C. De Landtsheer & O. Feldman (Eds.) *Beyond speech and symbols: Explorations in the rhetoric of politicians and the media*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
13. BALAN, NINA AURORA (2005) *Discursul Politic Romanesc*, Craiova: Universitaria.
14. BARTHES, R. (1967) *Elements of Semiology*, New York: Hill and Wang.

15. BARTHES, R. (1973) *Mythologies*, London: Paladin.
16. BARTHES, R. (1977) *Image-Music-Text*, London: Fontana.
17. BAUGH, J. (2000) *Beyond Ebonics: Linguistic Pride and Racial Prejudice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
18. BAZERMAN, C. (1989) *Shaping Written Knowledge*, Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
19. BEARD, A. (2000) *The Language of Politics*. New York, NY: Routledge. [British politics]
20. BEAUGRANDE, ROBERT (1984) *Text Production (Toward a Science of Composition)*, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing House.
21. BECIU, CAMELIA (2000) *Politica discursiva: Practici politice intr-o campanie electorala*, Iasi: Polirom.
22. BECHTEL, W. and RICHARDSON, R. C. (1993) *Discovering Complexity: Decomposition and Localization in Scientific Research*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
23. BECHTEL, W. and ABRAHAMSEN, A. (1990) *Connectionism and the Mind: An Introduction to Parallel Processing in Networks*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
24. BENVENISTE, E.(2000) *Probleme de lingvistica generala*, Bucuresti: Teora
25. BESANCON ALAIN (1993) *Originile intelectuale ale leninismului*, Bucuresti: Humanitas.
26. BESANCON ALAIN (1992) *Anatomia unui spectru*, Bucuresti, Humanitas.
27. BETEA, LAVINIA (2001) *Psihologie Politica. Individ, lider, multime in regimul comunist*, Iasi: Polirom.
28. BIEN, PETER (1989) *Kazantzakis – Politics of the Spirit*, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press
29. BIOCCA, FRANK (1991) *Television and Political Advertising*, Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
30. BIRCH, D. and O'TOOLE, M. (eds) (1988) *Functions of Style*, London: Pinter.
31. BOD, LADISLAS (1975) *Langage et pouvoir politique: reflexions sur le stalinisme*”, in *Etudes*, pp 177-213.
32. BORCILA, MIRCEA (1987) *Contributii la elaborarea unor tipologii a textelor politice*, in *SCL*, nr. 3, 1. 185-198.
33. BOURDIEU, P.(1982) *Ce que parler veut dire*, Paris: Fayard.
34. BORDIEU, P. (1992) *Language and symbolic power*. Polity Press
35. BORDEIU, PUIU, DUMITRU (2006) *Fundamentele Puterii Politice*, Constanta: Editura Fundatiei Andrei Saguna.
36. BOUGNOUX, DANIEL (2000) *Introducere in Stiintele Comunicarii*, Iasi: Polirom.
37. BLOMMAERT, JAN, (2005) *Discourse*. Cambridge University Press.
38. BLOOR, M. and BLOOR, T. (2007) *The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis: an Introduction*. London: Hodder Education.
39. BRETON, P. (2006) *Manipularea cuvintului*, Institutul European, Iasi.
40. BROWN, G. and YULE, G. (1983) *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
41. BROWN P. and LEVINSON S. (1987) *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
42. BUNGER, A. (2001) Rights talks as a form of political communication. In R. P, Hart and B H. Sparrow (Eds.), *Politics, discourse, and American society: New agendas*, Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Pub., Inc.
43. BURNARD, L. (1992) ‘*Tools and Techniques for computer assisted text processing*’, in C.S. Butler (ed.) *Computers and Written Texts*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1-28.

44. BUSSE, D. (1993) "Semantic Strategies as a Means of Politics: Linguistic Approaches to the Analysis of *Semantic Struggles*". In *Tracing the Semiotic Boundaries of Politics*, ed. P. Ahonen, New York: Mouton.
45. CALHOUN, C. (1995) *Critical Social Theory*. London: Blackwell.
46. CAMPBELL, P. HOVARD (1957), *America Needs and Ideology*, London.
47. CARTER, Ronald (2004) *Language and Creativity. The Art of Common Talk*, London.
48. CATHALA, H.P. (1993) *Epoca Dezinformarii*, Bucuresti: Editura Militara.
49. CHILTON, P. (2004) *Analysing political discourse: Theory and Practice*. New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group.
50. CHILTON, PAUL & SCHAFFNER, CHRISTINA, (2002) *Politics as Talk and Text: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*, Norwich: University of London Press.
51. CHILTON, PAUL (1996) *Security metaphors. Cold war discourse from containment to Common House*, New York: Lang.
52. CHILTON, PAUL (1990) Politeness and politics. *Discourse and Society* 1(2), 201-24
53. CHOULIARAKI, L. and FAIRCLOUGH, N. (1999) *Discourse in late modernity: rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
54. CHOULIARAKI, L. (2000). *Political discourse in the news: democratizing responsibility or aestheticizing politics?* *Discourse and society*, 11 (3):293-314.
55. CLARK, H.H. (1996) *Using Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
56. COFFIN, C., HEWINGS and O'HALLORAN (ed.) (2004) *Applying English Grammar: Functional and Corpus Approaches*, London: The Open University Press.
57. COHEN, A. D. (1996) 'Developing the ability to perform speech acts', in *Studies of Second Language Acquisition*, vol.18, pp. 253~267.
58. COSERIU, EUGENIU (1999) *Creatia metaforica in limbaj*, in *Revista de Lingvistica si Stiinta Literara*, nr.4, Chisinau.
59. CMECIU, CAMELIA-MIHAELA (2005) *Strategii persuasive în discursul politic (Persuasive Strategies in Political Discourse)*. Iași: Universitas XXI.
60. CMECIU, CAMELIA-MIHAELA (2006) "Iconic Faces of Corruption", in *Proceedings of the 1st ROASS Conference Semiotics beyond Limits*, Ed Alma Mater, Bacău, 2006, pp. 580-593.
61. CONNOLLY, W. E. (1993) *The terms of political discourse*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
62. CONNOLLY, W. E. (1987) *Politics and ambiguity*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
63. CORCORAN, P. E. (1979) *Political language and rhetoric*. Austin: U. of Texas Press.
64. DANES, F (ed.) (1974) *Papers on Functional Sentence Perspective*, Prague: Academia.
65. DANESI, MARCEL (2002) "Abstract Concept-Formation as Metaphorical Layering", in: *Studies in Communication Sciences*. Journal of the Swiss Communication and Media Research Association, volume 2, number 1, 1-22. http://www.scoms.ch /current_issue /abstract.asp?id=73
66. DARWIN, C. (1859) *The origin of species by means of natural selection*, New York: Avenel Books, 1979.
67. DAVIS, S. (ed.) (1991) *Pragmatics. A Reader*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
68. DEACONESCU, ION (2007) *Discurs si Limbaj Politic*, Craiova: Europa.
69. DEFLEUR, MELVIN & SANDRA, BALL-ROCKEACH (1998) *Teorii ale comunicarii in masa*, trans. Doru Harabagiu, Iasi: Polirom.
70. DINU, MIHAI (1997) *Comunicarea – Repere Fundamentale*, Bucuresti: Ed. Stiintifica.
71. DOMENACH, J.M. (2004) *Propaganda Politica*, Institutul European: Iasi.
72. DOUGLAS, M. (ed.) (1973) *Rules and meanings: the anthropology of everyday*

- knowledge, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
73. DRUGUS, LIVIU 'Ethics is Political Economics. Moral behaviour is Good Management' at: <http://www.isfp.co.uk/businesspathways/> Philosophy for Business, Issue 9, 13 June 2004.
 74. DRUGUS, LIVIU (1998) *Radicalismul economic american*, Iași: Editura Institutului Național pentru Societatea și Cultura Română.
 75. DUCROT, O. (1972). *Dire et ne pas dire: principes de semnatiques linguistique*, Paris: Hermann.
 76. DUNMIRE, P.L (1995) *Realising the hypothetical: a critical linguistic analysis of a projected event*. Paper presented at the conference on Political Linguistics, University of Antwerp.
 77. DUNNE, J.W., (1934) *The Serial Universe*, London: Faber.
 78. DURANTI, ALESSANDRO (1994) *From Grammar to Politics*, Berkley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
 79. DURANTI, ALESSANDRO (1997) *Linguistic Anthropology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 80. DUTU, ALEXANDRU (1999) *Ideea de Europa si Evolutia Constiintei Europene*, Bucuresti: All.
 81. ECO, UMBERTO (2002) *In cautarea limbii perfecte*, Iasi: Polirom.
 82. ECO, UMBERTO (1976) *A Theory of Semiotics*, Bloomington, IN :Indiana University Press.
 83. EDLEMAN, MURRAY (1999) *Politica si utilizarea simbolurilor*, Iasi: Polirom.
 84. EDLEMAN, MURRAY (1977) *Political language*, New York: Academic Press.
 85. EDWARDS, D. and POTTER, J. (1992a) *Discursive psychology*, London: Sage.
 86. EVANS, VYVYAN and GREEN, MELANIE (2006) *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*, Edinburgh: University Press.
 87. EWEN, S. (1983) *Consciencs sous influence*, Aubier: Res, Paris.
 88. FAIRCLOUGH, N. (1989) *Language and Power*, London: Longman.
 89. FAIRCLOUGH, N. (1992a) *Critical Language Awareness*, London: Longman.
 90. FAIRCLOUGH, N. (1992b) *Discourse and text: linguistic and intertextual analysis within discourse analysis*, *Discourse & Society* 3 193-217
 91. FAIRCLOUGH, N. (1995a) *Media Discourse*, London: Edward Arnold.
 92. FAIRCLOUGH, N. (1995b) *Critical Discourse Analysis. The Critical Study of Language*, London: Longman.
 93. FAIRCLOUGH, N. and R. WODAK (1997) *Critical Discourse Analysis*. In T. van DIJK (ed.), *Discourse as Social Interaction*, London: Sage.
 94. FAIRCLOUGH, N. (2000) *New Labour, New Knowledge?* London: Routledge.
 95. FAYE, JEAN PIERRE, (2004) *Langages totalitaires*, Paris: Herman.
 96. FAUCONNIER, G. (1994) *Mental Spaces*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 97. FAUCONNIER, G. and MARK TURNER (2002) *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blendind and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*, New York: Basic Books.
 98. FERGUSON, C.A. and FARWELL, C. B. (1973) 'Words and sounds in early language acquisition: English initial consonants in the first fifty words' *Paper and Reports in Child Language Development* 6(Stanford University Committee on Linguistics).
 99. FICEAC, BOGDAN (2006) *Tehnici de Manipulare*, Bucuresti: Beck.
 100. FILLMORE, C. (1985) Frames and the Semantics of Understanding, *Quaderni di Semantica*, 6(2):222-254.
 101. FIRBAS, J (1964) 'On defining the theme in functional sentence analysis', *Travaux Linguistique de Prague* 1.

102. FIRBAS, J. (1968) 'On the periodic features of the modern English finite verb as means of functional sentence perspective' *Brno Studies in English* 7.
103. FONTANIER (1977) *Figurile limbajului*, Bucuresti: Univers.
104. FOUCAULT, MICHEL (1972) *The Archeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*, New York: Tavistock Publications Ltd.
105. FOUCAULT, MICHEL (1971) *L'ordre du discours*, Paris: Gallimard.
106. FOWLER, ROGER (1991) *Language in the News. Discourse and Ideology in the Press*, London: Routledge.
107. FOWLER, R., HODGE, R., KRESS. G., and TREW, T.(1979) *Language and control*, London: Routledge.
108. FRIES, P.H. (1994) 'On theme, rheme and discourse goals' in M.COULTHARD (ed.), *Advances in Written Text Analysis*, London: Routledge.
109. FRIES, P.H. (1996) 'Theme, methods of development, and texts' in R.HASAN and P.H.FRIES(eds.)
110. FRIES, P.H and GREGORY, M. (eds.) (1995) *Discourse in Society: Systemic Functional Perspectives*, Norwood, NJ: Ablex (Advances in Discourse Processes).
111. FRIGIOIU, NICOLAE (2004) *Imaginea publică a liderilor și instituțiilor politice*, București: comunicare.ro.
112. FUNERIU, I. (1998) *Eseuri Lingvistice Antitotalitare*, Timisoara: Marineasa.
113. GEIS, M. L. (1987) *The language of politics*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
114. GERSTLE, J (2002) *Comunicarea Politică*, Institutul European: Iași.
115. GIBBS, RAYMOND W. (1994) *The Poetics of Mind. Figurative Thought, Language and Understanding*, Cambridge.
116. GOATLY, ANDREW (1997) *The Language of Metaphors*, London.
117. GOFFMANN, E.(1967) *Interaction Ritual*, New York: Doubleday.
118. GOLDING, W.(1955) *The inheritors*, London: Faber.
119. GRABER, D.A.(1981) Political languages. In D. NIMMO and K. SANDERS (eds.), *Handbook of Political Communication*, Beverly Hills: Sage, 195-224.
120. GREGORY, M.(1967) *Aspects of varieties differentiation*, *Journal of Linguistics*, 3.2.
121. GREGORY, M. (1985) "Towards communication linguistics: a framework", in J.D. BENSON and W.S GREAVES (eds.).
122. GRICE, H.P. (1989) *Studies in the Way of Words*, Harvard University Press
123. GRIMES, J. (1977) *The Thread of Discourse*, The Hague: Mouton.
124. GUMPERZ, J.J. and LEVINSON, S.C. (eds.) (1997). *Rethinking linguistic relativity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
125. GUTU, DORINA (2007), in the article *Political Discourse: A Guide Book*, <http://www.masteratpolitic.ro/analiza-politica/discursurile-politice-ghid-de-utilizare/>
126. GUTWINSKI, W. (1974) *Cohesion in Literary Texts: A study of some grammatical and lexical features of English discourse*, The Hague: Mouton.
127. HABERMAS, JURGEN, (2000) *Constiința morală și acțiune comunicativă*, Bucuresti: All.
128. HABERMAS, JURGEN (1983) *Cunoastere și Comunicare*, Bucuresti: Ed. Politica.
129. HAINES, ROSEMARIE (2002) *Televiziunea și Reconfigurarea Politicului*, Iasi: Polirom.
130. HALLIDAY, M.A.K. (1994) *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd edn), London: Edward Arnold.
131. HALLIDAY, M.A.K. (1978) *Language as Social Semiotic*, London: Edward Arnold.
132. HARTLEY, JOHN (1999) *Discursul Stirilor*, Iasi: Polirom.
133. HASAN, R. (1985) *Linguistics, Language and Verbal Art*, Geelong, Vic: Deakin

- University Press, Reissued Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
134. HASAN, R. (1989) 'Semantic variation and sociolinguistics', *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 9.
 135. HASAN, R. and FRIES, P.H. (eds.) *On Subject and Theme: A discourse Functional Perspective*, Amsterdam: Benjamins.
 136. HAUGEN, E. (1966/1972) Dialect, Language, Nation. In PRIDE, J.B, and J.HOLMES (eds.) *Sociolinguistics*: Penguin.
 137. HENTEA, CALIN, (1995) *Propaganda fara frontiere*, Bucuresti: Nemira.
 138. HODGE, B. and KRESS, G. (1988) *Social Semiotics*, Cambridge: Polity.
 139. HODGE, B. and FOWLER, R. (1979) *Orwellian Linguistics*. In Fowler et al.(1979)
 140. HOLLANDER, GAYLE, D. (1972) *Soviet political indoctrination*, New York.
 141. HOLLY, W. (1989) *Credibility and political Language*. In R. WODAK (ed.), *Language Power and Ideology*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 115-35.
 142. HYMES, D.H. (1971) 'Competence and performance in linguistic theory' in R.HUXLEY and E .INGRAM (eds.), *Language Acquisition: Models and Methods*. London: Academic Press.
 143. ILIESCU, ADRIAN-PAUL (2002) *Introducere in Politologie*, Bucuresti: All.
 144. IOAN, AUGUSTIN (1999) *Power, Play and National Identity: Politics of Modernization in Central and East-European Arhitecture. The Romanian File*. Bucuresti: Editura Fundatiei Culturale Romane.
 145. IONESCU-RUXANDOIU, LILIANA, (1995) *Conversatia: structuri si strategii*, Bucuresti: All.
 146. IRIMIAS, GEORGE (2003) *Structuri textual ale discursului politic totalitar*, Cluj Napoca: Clusium.
 147. JACOB, MEY (1993) *Pragmatics*, Oxford: Blackwell.
 148. JACKENDOFF, RAY (2007) *Language, Consciousness, Culture – Essays on Mental Structure*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: MIT Press.
 149. JORGENSEN, MARIANNE; PHILLIPS, LOUISE (2002) *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*, London: Sage Publications.
 150. JOHANSEN, JORGEN DINES/ LARSEN, SVEND ERIK (2002): *Signs in Use – An Introduction to Semiotics*, London: Routledge.
 151. JONES, C. (1989) *The Search for Meaning*, vol 2, Sydney: ABC Publications.
 152. KAPFERER, JEAN-NOEL (2002) *Caile Persuasiunii*, Bucuresti: Comunicare:ro
 153. KASPER, G. (1996) 'Introduction: interlanguage pragmatics in SLA', in *Studies of Second Language Acquisition*, vol. 18, pp 145~148.
 154. KAUFMAN (1989) in Tatiana Slama – Cazacu (2000) *Stratageme Comunicationale si Manipularea*, Iasi: Polirom.
 155. KASPER, G. & SCHMIDT, R. (1996) 'Developmental issues in interlanguage pragmatics', in *Studies of Second Language Acquisition*, vol. 18, pp149~169.
 156. KRAMARAE, C., SCHULZ, M and O'BARR, W. (1984) *Language and Power*, London: Sage.
 157. KRESS G. (1988) *Linguistic Processes in Sociocultural Practice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 158. KRESS, G. and HODGE, B. (1979) *Language as Ideology*, New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
 159. KRESS, G. and VAN LEEUWEN, T. (1990) *Reading Images*, Deakin, Vic: Deakin University.
 160. LABBE, DOMINIQUE (1977) *Le discours communiste*, Paris: Presses de al Fondation nationale des Sciences Politiques.

161. LAKOFF, GEORGE, (2002) *Moral Politics. How Liberals and Conservatives Think*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
162. LAKOFF, G., JOHNSON, M. (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago University Press: Chicago.
163. LANGACKER, R. (1987) *Foundations Of Cognitive Grammar*.Volume 1, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
164. LANGACKER, R. (1987) *Foundations Of Cognitive Grammar*.Volume 2, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
165. LARSON, CHARLES, U. (2003) *Persuasiunea. Receptare si Responsabilitate*, trans. Odette Arhip, Iasi: Polirom.
166. LAUWE, PAUL-HENRI CHOMBART (1982) *Cultura si Puterea*, Bucuresti: Editura Politica.
167. LEMKE, J. (1995) *Textual politics: discourse and social dynamics*, NY: Taylor& Francis.
168. LEMKE, J. (1983) "Technical Discourse and Technocratic Ideology". Paper presented at the English AILA Congress, University of Sydney.
169. LEECH, G.N (1983) *Principles of Pragmatics*, Longman
170. LEECH, G.N. (1995) *Semantics*, Handsworth: Penguin.
171. LEVINSON, S. (1983) *Pragmatics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
172. LEVINSON, S. (2000) *Presumptive Meanings: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature*, MIT Press
173. LIEDTKE, F. (1996), Indirect Speech and Conversational Implicatures: The Case for Contrastive Pragmatics. In A. Musolff, C. Schaffner and M. Townson (Eds). *Conceiving of Europe. Diversity in Unity*, Aldershot: Dartmouth: 121-8.
174. LIPPI-GREEN, R. (1997) *English with an Accent*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
175. LO CASCIO, VINCENZO (2002) *Gramatica argumentarii*, Bucuresti: Meteora Press.
176. LOHISSE, JEAN (2002) *Comunicarea. De la transmiterea mecanica la interactiune*, Iasi: Polirom.
177. LINDEKERS, R., (1985) *Semiotica discursului publicitar, în Semnificație și comunicare în lumea contemporană*, Ed. Politică, București, pp. 267-286
178. LWAITAMA, A.F. (1988) *Variations in the use of personal pronouns in the political oratory of J.K. NYERERE and A.H. MWINYI*, Belfast Working Papers in Language and Linguistics 1, 1-23.
179. MACDONNELL, D. (1986) *Theories of discourse*, Oxford: Blackwell.
180. MAFTEI, STEFAN (2004) "Note si comentarii", in *Aristotel, Retorica*, Bucuresti: IRI.
181. MAITLAND, K. and WILSON, J. (1987) Ideological conflict and pronominal resolution. *Journal of Pragmatics* 11, 495-512,
182. MALINOVSKI, B. (1923) The problem of Meaning in Primitive Languages. Supplement 1 to C.K. OGDEN and I.A. RICHARDS *The Meaning of Meaning*, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
183. MANET, PIERRE (2000) *Originile politicii moderne. Machiavelli, Hobbes, Rousseau*, Bucuresti: Nemira.
184. MARGA, ANDREI (1991) *Rationalitate, comunicare, argumentare*. Cluj Napoca: Dacia.
185. MARGA, ANDREI (1992) *Introducere in metodologia si argumentarea filosofica*. Cluj Napoca: Dacia.
186. MARGA, DELIA (2004) *Repere in Analiza Discursului Politic*, Cluj Napoca: Ed.

- Fundatiei pentru Stiinte Europene.
187. MARINESCU, VALENTINA (2003) *Introducere in teoria comunicarii – principii, modele, aplicatii*. Bucuresti: Tritonic.
 188. McCAIN, C. L. (1991) *Analyzing political persuasion and creating Camelots*. English Journal, 80, 61-65.
 189. McKELLER, G. B.(1985)'Social Man: On The foundations of a Contemporary Neurolinguistics: A Critical and Systematic Examination of Issues in the Science of Man'. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sydney.
 190. MEY, JACOB (1993) *Pragmatics: An Introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell.
 191. MILCA, MIHAI (1981) *Propaganda politica*, Bucuresti: Politica.
 192. MILIC, L.T. (1967) *Styles and Stylistics: An Analytical Bibliography*, New York: Free Press.
 193. MILIC, L.T.(1971) 'Rhetorical choice and stylistic option: the conscious and unconscious poles' in S.CHATMAN(ed.)
 194. MILLS, S. (1997) *Discourse*, London: Routledge.
 195. MINSKY, M. (1975) A Framework for Representing Knowledge in P.WINSTON (ed.) *The Psychology of Computer Vision*, New York, McGraw-Hill.
 196. MIHAILESCU, IOAN (2000) *Sociologie generala. Concepte fundamentale si studii de caz*, Bucuresti: Editura Universitatii.
 197. MOESCHLER, JACQUES, REBOUL, ANNE (1999) *Dictionar Enciclopedic de Pragmatica*, Cluj Napoca: Echinox.
 198. MOESCHLER, JACQUES, REBOUL, ANNE (1999) *Dictionar Enciclopedic de Pragmatica*, Cluj Napoca: Echinox.
 199. MORRIS, CHARLES, (1971) *Writings on the General Theory of Signs*, Mouton, The Hague: Paris.
 200. MONTGOMERY, M. (1992) *An Introduction to Language and Society*, London: Routledge.
 201. MOSS, P. (1985) "The rhetoric of defence in the United States : language myth and ideology". In P. Chilton (ed.), *Language and the Nuclear Arms Debate*, London: Pinter, 45-62.
 202. MUCCHIELLI, ALEX (2002) *Arta de a influența – Analiza tehnicilor de manipulare*, Iasi: Polirom.
 203. MUNGIU-PIPPIDI, ALINA (1995) *Românii după '89*, București: Humanitas.
 204. MUNGIU-PIPPIDI, ALINA (2002) *Politica după comunism*, București: Humanitas.
 205. MUNGIU-PIPPIDI, ALINA (coord.) (1998) *Doctrine politice: concepte universale si realitati romanesti*. Iasi: Polirom.
 206. MUSCA, V., BAUMGARTEN, A. (coord), (2002) *Filosofia politica a lui Aristotel*, Iasi: Polirom.
 207. NAVASKY, V. (1982) *Naming Names*, Boston: John Calder.
 208. NEAGU, MARIA-IONELA (2008). *Language and ideology in presidential speech*, Ploiesti: Petroleum and Gas University Bulletin.
 209. NEAMAN, J.S. and SILVER C.G.(1990) *Kind Words*, New York: Facts on File.
 210. NESU, NICOLETA (1999) *Aspecte pragmatice ale interpretarii discursului politic*, in "Analele Universitatii din Craiova", Lingvistica, nr. 1-2
 211. NESU, NICOLETA (1999) *Cliseul lexical in discursul politic actual*, in "Studia Universitatis Babes-Bolyai", Seria Philologia, nr. 3-4
 212. NESU, NICOLETA (2002-2003) *Specificul strategiei argumentative in discursul politic*, in "Dacoromania", nr. VII-VIII, Editura Academiei Romane.
 213. NESU, NICOLETA (2004) *Limbajul politicii si politica limbajului (II)*, in "Biblioteca

- si cercetarea XXIV”
214. NET, MARIANA (2002) *Literature, Strategies, and Metalanguage. A Semiotic Approach*, ISSS, Wien.
 215. NOLAN, R. (1994) *Cognitive Practices: Human Language and Human Knowledge*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 216. OBLER, L.K. and GJERLOW, K. (1999) *Language and the Brain*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 217. OCHS, E. and TAYLOR C., (1992) Family narratives as political activity *.Discourse and Society* 3(3), 301-40.
 218. OHMANN, R. (1967)’ Literature as sentences’, in S. CHATMAN and S.LEVIN (Eds.).
 219. OHMANN, R.(1971)’Speech, action, and style’ in S. CHATMAN(ed.)
 220. ORWELL, GEORGE (1968) *Politics and the English Language*, in *Collected Essays* (part IV), London: Seaker and Wartburg.
 221. ORWELL, GEORGE (1991) *1984*, Chisinau: Hyperion.
 222. ORWELL, GEORGE (2002) *Ferma Animalelor*, Iasi: Polirom.
 223. PALMER, F. R. (1986) *Mood and Modality*, London: Cambridge University Press.
 224. PALMER, F.R. (1996) *Toward a theory of cultural linguistics*, Austin: University of Texas Press.
 225. PARRET, H. (1978) *Elements d’une analyse philosophique de la manipulation et du mensonge*, Universita di Urbio, no.70, B, January.
 226. PATEMAN, T. (1980) *Language, Truth and Politics* (2nd edn), UK: Jean Stround.
 227. PETCU, MARIAN (2002) *Sociologia mass-media*, Cluj Napoca: Dacia.
 228. PIKE, K.L. (1959) ‘*Language as particle, wave and field*’, Texas: Quarterly 2.
 229. PINKER, S. (1994) *The language instinct*, London: Penguin.
 230. POP, D. (2000) *Mass media și politica*, Institutul European: Iasi.
 231. PSATHAS, G.(1995) *Conversation Analysis*, Thoudans Oaks: Sage.
 232. RANK, HUGH (1984) *The Pep Talk – How to Analyze Political Language*, Illinois: Propaganda Press.
 233. REBOUL, O. (1975) *Le slogan*, Bruxelles.
 234. REBOUL, O. (1980) *Langage et ideologie*, Paris: PUF
 235. REDDY, M. J. (1979) The Conduit Metaphor. In A.O.ORTONY (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 284-324.
 236. REID, T.B.W. (1956) ‘Linguistics, Structuralism, Psilology’, *Archivum Linguisticum* 8.
 237. ROVENTA-FRUMUSANI, DANIELA (1995) *Semiotica Discursului Stiintific*, Bucuresti: Editura Stiintifica.
 238. RYBACKI, KARYN C. & DONALD RYBACKI (2004) *O introducere in arta argumentarii: Pledarea si respingerea Argumentelor*, Iasi: Polirom.
 239. RUSSELL, B.(1905) On Denoting. *Mind*, a4:479-93.
 240. SACKS, H., SCHEGLOFF, E.A. and JEFFERSON, G. (1974) ‘A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking in conversation’, *Language* 50.
 241. SALAVASTRU, C., (2006) *Discursul Puterii*, Institutul European: Iasi.
 242. SCOTT, M. (1996) WordSmith Tools, to purchase from: www.oup.com
 243. SCHANK, R.C. and R.P.ABELSON (1977) *Scripts, Plans, Goals and Understanding*, Hillside NJ:Lawrence Erlbaum.
 244. SEARLE, J.R. (1984), *Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 245. SEBEOK, T.A. (ed.) (1960) *Style in Language*, Cambridge, MA: M.I.T.Press.

246. SFEZ, LUCIEN (2000) *Simbolistica Politica*, Iasi: Institutul European.
247. SINCLAIR, J.McH(1965)'Linguistic meaning in a literary text' Paper read to The Philological Society, Cambridge.
248. SINCLAIR, J.McH(1966) 'Taking a poem into pieces', in R.FOWLER(ed.).
249. SLAMA-CAZACU, T. (2000) *Stratageme comunicationale si manipularea*, Polirom: Iasi.
250. DE SAUSSURE, L. and SCHULZ, P. (ed.) (2006) *Manipulation and Ideologies in the 20th Century Discourse: Discourse, Language, Mind*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
251. SHAPIRO, M. (ed.) (1984) *Language and Politics*. Basil Blackwell.
252. SHORE, B (1996) *Culture in Mind: Cognition, Culture, and the Problem of Meaning*, New York: Oxford University Press.
253. SHIFFREN, D. (1994) *Approaches to Discourse*, London: Blackwell.
254. SINCLAIR, J. (1991) *Corpus Concordance Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
255. SOUNI, H. (1998) *Manipularea in negocieri*, Oradea: Antet.
256. STALIN, I. (1951) *Marxismul si problemele lingvisticii*, Bucuresti: EPMR
257. STEINER, JURG, ANDRE BACHTIGER, MARKUS SPORNDLI and MARCO STEENBERGEN (2004) *Deliberative Politics in Action: Analysing Parliamentary Discourse*, London: Cambridge.
258. STUBBS, M. (1983) *Discourse analysis: the sociolinguistic analysis of natural language*. Basil Blackwell.
259. SWALES, J. (1990) *Genre Analysis. English in Academic and Reseach Settings*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
260. ȘERBAN, MITREA HENRIETA (2006) *Limbai Politic în Democrație*, București: Editura Institutului de Stiinte Politice si Relatii Internationale.
261. TAKAHASHI, S. (1996) 'Pragmatic transferability', in *Studies of Second Language Acquisition*, vol. 18, pp.189~223.
262. TALMI, LEONARD (2000) *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*, Cambridge: MIT Press.
263. THIBAUD, P.J. (1991) *Social Semiotics as Praxis: Text, Social Meaning Making, and Nabokov's Ada* , Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press (Theory and History of Literature 74).
264. THOM, FRANCOISE (1993) *Limba de Lemn*, Bucuresti: Humanitas.
265. THOMAS, J. (1995) *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*, London: Longman.
266. THOVERON, G. (1996) *Comunicarea politica azi*, Oradea: Antet.
267. TODOROV, T. (1971) 'The place of style in the structure of the text' in S.CHATMAN.(ed.).
268. TODOROVA, MARIA (2000) *Balcanii si Balcanismul*, Bucuresti: Humanitas.
269. TOOLAN, M. (1996) *Total speech: an integrational linguistic approach to language*, Durham: Duke University Press.
270. TREW, T. (1979) *Theory and Ideology at Work*. In FOWLER, R.HODGE, B., KRESS, G., and TREW, T.
271. TROSBORG, A.(1997) *Text Typology: Register, Genre and Text Type*. In TROSBORG, A.(ed.) *Text Typology and Translation*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia:Benjamins:3-23.
272. ULLMAN, S. (1964) *Language and Style*, Oxford: Blackwell.
273. VACHEK, J. (1966) *The linguistic school of Prague*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
274. VAN DIJK, T (1997) *Discourse as Structure and Process*, Sage: London.

275. VAN DIJK, T (1998) *Ideology*, London: Sage.
276. VAN DIJK, T (1997) *Discourse as Social Interaction, volume II*, Sage: London, Paul Chilton and Christina Schaffner, *Discourse and Politics*.
277. VAN DIJK, T. (1981) *Studies in the Pragmatics of Discourse, Netherlands: The Hague*
278. VAN LEUWEN, T. (1993) *Genre and Field in Critical Discourse*, London: Longman.
279. VERSCHUREN, J. (1999) *Understanding Pragmatics*, Arnold.
280. VLAD, CARMEN (1994) *Sensul, dimensiune esentiala a textului*, Cluj: Editura Dacia.
281. WEBER, MAX (1992) *Politica: O vocatie si o profesie*, Bucuresti: Anima.
282. WEIHUN HE, Agnes (2003) "Discourse Analysis", in *The Handbook of Linguistics*, UK: Blackwell
283. WERTH, P. (1999) *Text Worlds. Representing Conceptual Space in Discourse*, London: Longman.
284. WHORF, B.L. (1956) *Language, Thought and Reality*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
285. WIERZBICKI, P. (1996) *Structura Minciunii*, Nemira: Bucuresti.
286. WILSON, J. (1990). *Politically Speaking: The pragmatic analysis of political language*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
287. WINNICOTT, D.W., (1971) *Playing and Reality*, London: Tavistock.
288. WIDDOWSON, H. G. (1979) *Explorations in applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
289. WODAK, R. and CHILTON, P. (ed.) (2005) *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis*, Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
290. WODAK, R. and MEYER, M. (2001) *Methods in Critical Discourse Analysis*, London: Sage.
291. WODAK, RUTH (2006) *Critical Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis*, in *Handbook of Pragmatics*, (eds.) Verschueren, Amsterdam: Philadelphia.
292. WODAK, R. (1996). *Disorders of discourse*, London and New York: Longman.
293. ZAFIU, RODICA (2007) *Limbaj si Politica*, Bucuresti: Editura Universitatii.
294. ZEMOR, PIERRE (2003) *Comunicarea Publica*, Iasi: Institutul European.
295. ZIJDERVELD, A.C., (1979) *On Cliches: The Supersedure of Meaning by Function in Modernity*, London: Routledge.
296. ZOLLI, PAOLO (1991) *Le Parole Straniere*, 2nd ed. Bologna: Zanichelli.