

“BABEȘ-BOLYAI” UNIVERSITY  
THE FACULTY OF LETTERS

**PERSPECTIVES IN FICTION.**  
**A LINGUISTIC STUDY BASED ON FAY WELDON’S NOVEL**  
***THE LIFE AND LOVES OF A SHE-DEVIL***

SCIENTIFIC ADVISER:  
PROF. ȘTEFAN OLTEAN Ph.D

Ph.D CANDIDATE:  
ADINA-MARIA MEZEI

**CLUJ-NAPOCA**  
**2011**

## SUMMARY

<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	6
 <i>CHAPTER 1</i>	
<b>ON NARRATIVE THEORY</b> .....	9
1.1. Diverging Standpoints .....	9
1.1.1. Historical Backgrounds .....	9
1.1.2. The Object of Narrative Fiction .....	15
1.1.3. Structural Levels of Narratives .....	17
1.1.4. Narrator's Functions .....	20
1.1.5. Variations on Terminology .....	24
1.2. Poetic Frame of Reference .....	29
1.2.1. Reality Statement and Fiction .....	29
1.2.2. Fictional Markers .....	32
1.2.3. Feigned Reality Statement and Fiction .....	34
1.2.4. (Non-)Temporality .....	36
1.2.5. Reportive and Nonreportive Modes of Language Use .....	39
1.2.6. SELF and SPEAKER .....	42
1.3. On Narrative Theory. Overview .....	46
 <i>CHAPTER 2</i>	
<b>SEMANTIC ACCOUNTS ON FICTION</b> .....	49
2.1. The <i>Worlds</i> of the Story .....	49
2.1.1. Possible Worlds Semantics Framework .....	50
2.1.2. Possible Worlds in Fiction .....	53
2.1.3. Situation Theoretical Insights .....	57
2.2. Formal Apparatus .....	62
2.2.1. Predicate Calculus .....	62
2.2.2. Possible Worlds Enlarged Model .....	67
2.2.3. Context and Situations .....	75

2.2.4. A Brief Discussion .....	78
2.3. Semantic Accounts on Fiction. Overview .....	82

*CHAPTER 3*

<b>SUBJECTIVITY IN NARRATIVE FICTION</b> .....	84
3.1. Narrative Involvement .....	84
3.1.1. Indexical and Inferential Perspectives .....	84
3.1.2. Deixis in Fiction .....	89
3.1.3. The DC. The WHEN .....	91
3.1.4. The DC. The WHERE .....	93
3.1.5. The DC. The WHO .....	95
3.1.6. Anaphora, Deixis and Context-Building .....	99
3.2. Perspective. Other Interpretative Tools .....	103
3.2.1. Definition of Perspective .....	103
3.2.2. Types of Perspective .....	105
3.2.3. Linking.....	109
3.2.4. SCPs and non-SCPs .....	112
3.2.5. Objective Sentences .....	115
3.3. Subjectivity in Narrative Fiction. Overview .....	118

*CHAPTER 4*

<b>PERSPECTIVES IN WELDON'S <i>THE LIFE AND LOVES OF A SHE-DEVIL</i></b> .....	121
4.1. The SPEAKER-Perspective .....	121
4.1.1. The Emergence of the SPEAKER .....	121
4.1.2. Who is the SPEAKER? .....	125
4.1.3. <i>I, Now</i> and <i>Here</i> .....	127
4.1.4. Who is the <i>You</i> ? .....	133
4.1.5. The Present Tense .....	137
4.2. Representation in First-Person Contexts .....	148
4.2.1. Authentication .....	148
4.2.2. Imagining the Other: Inferential Perspective .....	152

4.2.3. Sentences Containing Parentheticals .....	160
4.2.4. Questions .....	167
4.3. CHARACTER-Subjective or Objective Perspectives .....	176
4.3.1. CHARACTER-Subjective and Objective Sentences .....	176
4.3.2. Time Deictics .....	186
4.3.3. Gnommic Sentences .....	193
4.3.4. Questions .....	197
4.4. Perspectives in Weldon's <i>The Life and Loves of a She-Devil</i> . Overview and Conclusions .....	204
<b>FINAL REMARKS</b> .....	215
<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	224

## KEY WORDS:

fiction, perspective, point of view, narrator, speaker, poetics, narratology, possible worlds, situations, the deictic centre, objective sentences, subjective sentences

## ABSTRACT:

The starting point of our work is the controversy surrounding the *narrator* issue, which has given birth to two main trends of interpreting fiction: the communicative and the non-communicative/poetic approaches. First, we want to have a look at the two accounts in order to point out in what ways they differ and how these differences have come about. Next, we begin to develop a linguistic model for interpreting narrative fiction.

This model is, first of all, defined from a theoretical point of view, by taking into account suggestions offered by various approaches. Perspective, viewed as a cognitive process, will be used to account for the way readers get involved into and (re-)create the fictional world. Finally, we put to work our observations by analysing Fay Weldon's novel *The Life and Loves of a She-Devil* (1989[1983]). Our final purpose is to lay the foundations of a reader-oriented interpretative model for analysing narrative fiction, placing *perspective* at its basis.

### Chapter 1

In the first chapter, we discuss some major ideas belonging to the communicative and non-communicative/poetic approaches to narrative fiction. The reason for this survey lies in the fact that a discussion on the notion of *perspective* should take as a starting point the accounts from which the notion emerged.

**1.1.** The first part of this chapter deals with drawing a comparison between the two approaches under discussion. First, we take into consideration the historical background which has led to the emergence of the two positions on how to interpret fiction (§ 1.1.1.). Next, we discuss how the two accounts view their object of study (§ 1.1.2.). Finally, we deal with various terminological usages and definitions relative to the layers of the narrative (§ 1.1.3.), the narrator's functions (§ 1.1.4.), *perspective* and other related terms (§ 1.1.5.).

**1.2.** The second part mainly concentrates on the poetic framework. It discusses the most relevant aspects developed by the three main proponents of this approach, i.e. Hamburger

(1986[1977]), Kuroda (1979[1973]) and Banfield (1982). The first sections present Hamburger's main ideas: the distinction between the reality statement and fiction (§ 1.2.1.), fictional markers (§ 1.2.2.), feigned reality statement and fiction (§ 1.2.3.), and (non-)temporality (§ 1.2.4.). The fifth section discusses Kuroda's observations on the reportive and non-reportive modes of language use (§ 1.2.5.). Finally, we focus on the differentiation between SELF and SPEAKER operated by Banfield (§ 1.2.6.).

**1.3.** The final part presents our main conclusions referring to § 1.1. and § 1.2.

The main differences between the two frameworks are due to the fact that they take different standpoints diachronically and synchronically. The communicative accounts take into consideration Plato's theory, while the poetic ones start from Aristotle's ideas. Their theoretical starting point is based on the distinction between the terms *mimesis* and *diegesis*.

Plato sees *mimesis* as one of the characters' speeches, while *diegesis* refers to the poet speaking as him/herself in the parts between the speeches. In Aristotle, *mimesis* no longer designates "impersonation" by means of direct speech, but the representation of fictional reality. The difference in how *mimesis* is interpreted will give rise to the distinction between *showing* and *telling*.

The communicative theorists postulate that all linguistic performances involve a speaking subject and an addressee. In other words, both *telling* and *showing* have 'telling' as an underlying phenomenon. The poetic framework posits that *telling* and *showing* are actually two modes of linguistic performance. The text in its surface structure is analysed in terms of its displaying or not the signals of a speaking subject. Both linguistic and epistemological data need to be taken into account (§ 1.2.).

The object of study is also a relevant factor. Patron (2006) remarks that the poetic proponents study fictional narrative as "fiction" rather than as "narrative", the latter being the object of study of the communicative approaches. Additionally, poetic studies concentrate mainly on fiction, ignoring the question of non-fictional texts. Their main focus is on the third person narrative text, which is taken by some to be the prototypical narrative (§ 1.1.2., 1.2.2. etc.).

Interpretations vary also in what concerns the definition of a *narrator* and his/her/its functions. According to some, it is the interpretative function which signals a narrator for those supporting the poetic view. However, some poetic supporters do not consider it a condition that necessarily applies only to a narrator. The interpretative function may embody the attitudes of

social groups or characters at the story level etc. (§ 1.1.4.). Additionally, the interpretative function is sometimes reflected in the way the idea of an *implied author* is envisaged (§ 1.1.3.).

The variations in the way terminology is used is another factor to be considered when accounting for the differences between the two frameworks. *Point of view* is either conceived as a synonym for *perspective*, or as part of the latter. *Focalisation* is also defined as a variant term for *point of view* and is sometimes preferred to the latter as *point of view* may imply too strong a visual aspect. *Point of view* may also allude to an ideological attitude ('attitude towards a question', 'viewpoint'; cf. Rivara, 2000). *Focalisation* is also used as a 'camera-like' means of regulating narrative information (§ 1.1.5.).

*(Narrative) voice* is usually used when referring to the narrator, but there are cases when it makes reference to several attitudes expressed in a word/utterance (§ 1.2.6.). *Point of view* may be equalled with an agentless positioning in a/the world of the story. Additionally, *perspective* has been defined as an agent's positioning in the world of the story (§ 1.1.5.).

Postulating a narrator in the deep structure of a text has as one consequence the fact that the past tense always has the present of a narrator as its reference time (communicative approach). Rejecting this idea means that the past is taken only as a signal of fictionality, and not necessarily of temporality (§ 1.2.4.).

Hamburger (1986) (§ 1.2.) differentiates between the poetic and the communicative accounts as follows: the former follow the *subject-object* structure of the language, whereas the latter represent the paradigm *I-(message)-you*. The *subject-object* structure means that fiction does not tell about people/situations, it tells people and situations.

Hamburger introduces three categories: *reality statements*, *fiction*, and *feigned reality statements*. The first category represents the situations which occur in the real world: the reality of the statement-subject and the fact that the statement-subject can only speak about other people as objects not as subjects is what counts.

Fiction and feigned reality statements are to be linked to narratives. Fiction can be regarded as the only situation in which a third person can be represented as a subject. The third person narration represents a case of the fiction category. The first person narration illustrates the category of feigned reality statement. A 1<sup>st</sup> person narrator can speak about other persons only as objects, because he/she is a pretense of a real statement-subject (§1.2.1., 1.2.3.).

Hamburger's fictional markers are: non-temporality of the past tense, verbs indicating interior processes and deictics in combination with past tense verbs (§ 1.2.2.). Hamburger's theory leads her to exclude the first person narrative from the category of fiction (as a general term), a fact which was much criticised later on.

Kuroda (1979[1973]) proposes to include narratives into two categories: the reportive mode (including first person narratives and third person narratives with an omnipresent, but not omniscient narrator), and the nonreportive mode (including here third person narratives which display direct access to the consciousness of third person characters.

It is Banfield who coins the terms SPEAKER and SELF. The term SELF refers to the subject of consciousness to whom all expressive elements occurring in one text must be linked. SPEAKER is the term to be used when talking about a first-person, linguistically marked consciousness.

We take as a starting point the idea that a fictional text is not necessarily (/entirely) framed by a narrator's subjectivity and maintain the use of the term *voice* in connection with the term *narrator*. By *narrator* we refer to a SPEAKER, who needs to be linguistically signalled in the text. We also accept Banfield's main suggestions linked to the concepts of SELF and SPEAKER as explained by Galbraith (1995): an expressive element is referentially assigned to the SELF or SPEAKER using it in the NOW, even if it might have been used by another character at some other time in the story (§ 1.2.6.).

## **Chapter 2**

The second chapter deals with semantic accounts on fiction: Possible Worlds Semantics (PWS) and Situation Theory (ST). Here, we mainly try to establish an ontological model for fiction and to create the basis for an analytical model. We take into consideration the opportunities offered by these two approaches as the structural approach (Narratology) seems to be insufficient in the determination of an ontological model. Additionally, from an analytical point of view, Possible Worlds Semantics provides us with a set of precise, interesting tools.

**2.1.** In the first part of the second chapter, we are concerned with the Possible Worlds Semantics framework. More exactly, we focus on various ontological aspects linked to the interpretation of narrative fiction. First, we talk about the various ways in which the term *possible worlds* has been treated in this framework (§ 2.1.1.). Then, we establish how we

conceptualise the realm of fiction in terms of possible worlds (§ 2.1.2.). Finally, we add the term *situation* to the idea of possible world (§ 2.1.3.).

**2.2.** In the second part of this chapter, we establish the basis for an analytical model by appealing to the formal apparatus developed within the framework of the so-called Referential theories. First, we present Predicate Calculus (PC) (§ 2.2.1.). We notice that it is limited to some extent (it can only deal with present tense declarative sentences and solve certain ambiguities). Next, we discuss about other interpretative principles, which were added to the PC, and which allow us to interpret past, future, questions, exclamations etc. (§ 2.2.4.).

Then, the context coordinate is introduced in order to be able to account for indexicals (Chierchia and McConnel-Ginet, 1990). Now, we define *a situation* and *a state of affairs* (§ 2.2.3.) and then we develop on the idea of situation and state of affairs by briefly referring to an example (§ 2.2.4.).

**2.3.** The final part presents our main conclusions related to § 2.1. and § 2.2.

We start from David Lewis's counterpart theory (§ 2.1.1.). He considers that the notion of *actual world* is applicable to any world where an utterance is located. This leads to both desirable and undesirable results. Accepting his solution means that we solve such problems as the transworld identity, but, on the other hand, this theory contradicts our 'belief' that language can refer to the same individuals in different situations in such a way that their main identity is maintained.

We believe that the common usage of the language does not allow us to accept the counterpart theory because the identity of the same individual needs to be maintained. Additionally, we consider that a non-referential account of fiction is counter-intuitive.

The interpretation of a fictional text needs to take into consideration the explicit text, the implicit text, prevalent beliefs and readers' inclinations (§ 2.1.2.). The fictional text evokes at least one fictional world to be treated the same way we treat our actual world in real-life situations; we name it the *story world*, S.W. Additionally, there are possible-story worlds (P-S.W), which may account for subjective characters' visions, dreams, hopes etc.

The story worlds are viewed as maximal entities, which can be made up of a series of situations. A situation is either equal to a maximal story world or a maximal story world restricted in space and/or time. It can also be defined as an organised state of affairs. Several situations may come out of a sentence, i.e. by having the state of affairs anchored to individuals,

and to worlds and times. When analysing a sentence in semantic terms only one such situation is usually represented/selected.

We see the notion of *point of view* close to that of *states of affairs*, while the notion of *perspective* can be attached to the idea of *situation*. The *state of affairs*, in our interpretation, represents that which remains unchanged when a proposition is embedded. A *situation* is a state of affairs anchored to individuals, space and time.

The PC (Predicate Calculus) is a semantic model which provides a way of analysing declarative sentences referring to the present. As seen, it can deal with certain ambiguities (§ 2.2.1.). However, when it comes to sentences referring to the past/future, the PC model cannot accommodate such phenomena. This is why, the intensional PC was developed (§ 2.2.2.).

The context coordinate is determined to stand for situations in the semantic analytical interpretation. The contextual coordinate chooses one situation out of the situations which can be expressed by a proposition. This situation may be equivalent to a maximal world or to a small world (part of the maximal world restricted in time and space). The contextual coordinate has been developed as an answer to the existence of indexicals (§ 2.2.3.).

Chierchia and McConnel-Ginet (1990) differentiate between the discourse situation and the circumstances. The discourse situation is what helps us determine the extension of such indexical items as “I” in, for example, “I am rich” (or other contextually-dependent expressions), while the circumstances help us determine the truth-value of the sentence (§ 2.2.3.).

Some of the theoretical aspects discussed before are put to work in § 2.2.4. We see in what sense the context coordinate proves to be useful, and try to provide a ‘solution’ for ‘what’ changes/not when a proposition is embedded in intensional contexts (difference signalled between PWS and ST): in our opinion, it is the *state of affairs* which remains unchanged, while the truth-conditions change in such a situation.

### **Chapter 3**

Readers’ narrative involvement is the main topic of the third chapter. Our discussion focuses on observations operated within Deictic Shift Theory (DST), Situation Theory and by some other linguists. Our main purpose is to define narrative involvement both in general, cognitive terms and more specifically in terms of perspective. We manage to find common points between different/similar terms extracted from different approaches (perspective, deictic centre, narrative involvement etc.), which allows us to define and classify *perspectives*.

**3.1.** Here, we dwell on how readers process the narrative fictional text. First, we talk about perspective as a general, cognitive process (§ 3.1.1.). Next, we deal with Segal's (1997) idea that deixis in fiction is different from deixis in real-life situations – idea put forward, but which needs to be demonstrated (§ 3.1.2.). Our discussion then turns to the three main coordinates established for the deictic centre (DC): time (§ 3.1.3.), place (§ 3.1.4.), person (§ 3.1.5.). Finally, in § 3.1.6., we add to the idea of narrative involvement some of Emmott's ideas linked to context building.

**3.2.** In the first section, we point out some common points regarding the acceptances linked to perspective and the DC (§ 3.2.1.). Then, several types of perspective are defined (§ 3.2.2.). Ehrlich (1990) and Oltean (1995) bring about some useful interpretative suggestions (§ 3.2.3., § 3.2.4.). A first way of interpreting objective sentences is put forward in § 3.2.5.

**3.3.** The final part presents our main conclusions from § 3.1. and § 3.2.

The first part of this chapter discusses the notion of *perspective* from the viewpoint of readers' narrative involvement. The DST and ST help us better understand the concept of *perspective*. Situation Theory mainly applies to real-life situations. It makes use of two main types of perspective: the *indexical* and the *inferential* one. The former occurs in situations relative to the "I" in the NOW, and at its origin it applies only to real-life situations. The *inferential* perspective emerges when somebody else's perspective is adopted.

In the case of the DST we deal with the same object of interest, i.e. perspective, but with a different scope. If Situation Theory focuses on real-life situations, DST's main objective is to account for the way readers comprehend the narrative fictional text. Starting from DST's theoretical insights, linked to some extent to those of ST, we observed that the creation of fiction and the reading of fiction are at their basis inferential processes. An inferential process/perspective means the adoption of an indexical perspective or deictic centre other than your own. Additionally, the authorial act was explained as an intentional act: the author intends his readers to adopt an attitude of make-believe towards the content of what is read (§ 3.1.1.).

Deixis in fiction functions differently as compared to standard discourse because it is not always linked to the discourse situation, but to some other situation. Free indirect style is a clear situation in which one cannot postulate that a narrator, designated by the pronoun "I", may emerge in the story at any point without changing the meaning and the reference of that passage (§ 3.1.2.).

The deictic centre (DC) is defined in terms of three coordinates: time (the WHEN), space (the WHERE) and person (the WHO). The temporal structure of a narrative is made up of a string of current NOWs. The narrative-line is a stretch of narrative that is controlled by a single reference time. We equal this reference time to the “narrative present” (Ehrlich, 1990) (§ 3.1.3.). The idea of the NOW seen as either a specific point in time (a NOW-point), or a timeline (a NOW-timeline) is brought about in another part of this paper (§ 4.3.2.).

Spatial relations are organised relative to the observer and to the observed objects. Thus, we come back to the fact that humans need to organise spatial information by taking a perspective ego into account. This perspective ego may be a narrator/SPEAKER, or it may be just a projection needed to be postulated in order for the text to make sense. The notion of *perspective* as defined up to now can be attached to the idea of *situation*, i.e. an organised state of affairs from the viewpoint of a perspective ego (§ 3.1.4, 2.1.3.).

The WHO is divided into four main categories (according to the DST): the focalising WHO, the focal WHO, the non-focal WHO and the narrating WHO. The narrating WHO is the psychological entity who tells the story from a different epistemological level than that of the story: level marked by time or ontology. The focalising WHO mediates a subjective perspective on some part of the world. The focal WHO is part of both objective and subjective perspectives (§ 3.1.5.).

The idea that the creation and the reading of fiction are inferential processes at their basis can also be related to Emmott’s (1995) study. She explains her *context building* as a process of mentally bringing forward information gathered about the characters. Additionally, we understand that the story world shouldn’t be defined only in terms of the explicit and implicit text (see § 2.1.2.), but also in terms of narrative inferences. Context-building involves the ideas of initial knowledge, expectations, confirmations, readjustments and the current DC (§ 3.1.6.).

In § 3.2.1. we focus more on the notion of *perspective* and pinpoint its characteristics. Perspective is a two-faceted phenomenon: it encompasses both the observer and the observed, and it contains the same coordinates as the deictic centre: the time, space and person coordinates.

Next, *perspective* is divided into two main categories, the *focalising/origin-perspective* and the *focalised/content-perspective*. The different types of perspective are defined starting from the three coordinates mentioned above (§ 3.2.2.).

Several interpretative tools are also discussed: temporal, semantic and referential linking and controlling predicates. Referential, semantic and temporal linking are devices which can mark cohesiveness within a discourse unit/episode (§ 3.2.3., 3.2.4.).

Finally, in this chapter we establish a new definition for the term *viewpoint*, which renders the fact that something in a sentence is expressed by taking a character's personal coordinate into account. This actually reflects the idea the DC tracks one of the coordinates of a focal WHO (§ 3.2.5.).

## **Chapter 4**

In this chapter, we apply the theoretical findings established in the previous chapters to Fay Weldon's novel *The Life and Loves of a She-Devil* (1989[1983]). The novel is made up of both first person and third person parts, which is the main reason for choosing it. By discussing both 1<sup>st</sup> person and 3<sup>rd</sup> person texts, we try to develop a pertinent analytical model, which focuses both on texts where usually a narrator is easily detected (1<sup>st</sup> person; preferred by the communicative proponents) and on 3<sup>rd</sup> person texts, in which case a narrator is not necessarily placed by the poetic supporters. The model is mainly semantic, but takes into consideration other linguistic data, as well.

**4.1.** First of all, we are concerned with the emergence of a SPEAKER in the first person parts, more exactly, we deal with how readers interpret the text as they read and how the image of the SPEAKER is created by adding successive details (§ 4.1.1.). A semantic 'solution' to Segal's idea (deictic terms refer as a function of some situation) evoked in § 3.1.2. is also provided (§ 4.1.2.). The deictics "I", "now", "here" are interpreted in § 4.1.3, while the values of the "you" are dealt with in § 4.1.4. The values of the present tense are established in § 4.1.5.

**4.2.** The authentication function has been considered to have an important role in the determination of a SPEAKER and his/her role. How this function is put to work in Weldon's novel is the topic of § 4.2.1. The SPEAKER in Weldon's fiction makes use of the inferential perspective to a large extent: i.e. she puts herself in somebody else's shoes. In § 4.2.2., we deal with the linguistic signals which give birth to an inferential perspective and offer a semantic interpretation. In § 4.2.3., we provide a semantic interpretation for sentences containing parentheticals, which occur in the first person parts, and then we turn our attention to questions (§ 4.2.4.).

**4.3.** If the first two parts focused on the first person texts (SPEAKER-perspective, i.e. a subjective perspective), in this part we discuss the third person parts. First of all, we try to offer a solution of interpretation for CHARACTER-subjective sentences (part of a SELF-perspective, i.e. a subjective perspective) and objective sentences (part of an objective perspective, i.e. a STORY WORLD-perspective). These two may resemble to some degree, which is why it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between the two (§ 4.3.1.). Next, we analyse time deictics (§ 4.3.2.), gnomic sentences (§ 4.3.3.) and questions in a third person context (§ 4.3.4.).

**4.4.** The final part presents our main conclusions from § 4.1., § 4.2. and § 4.3.

We have decided to analyse the most controversial aspects linked to the issue of SPEAKER/narrator and SELF. For example, deictics are usually taken to signal automatically signal a narrator in a more traditional interpretation. As seen in our study, they may be interpreted in various ways depending on the context. The values of the present tense and of the past tense are also taken into account.

Gnomic sentences are also attached to the interpretative function attributed to the narrator by the communicative approach. Our analysis starts from Galbraith's (1995) suggestions and shows that they may be interpreted in a different way: as expressing the attitudes of a social group/of a character at a social level. Questions also constitute an interesting topic of discussion – sometimes they may be used by a SPEAKER, but they may also be used without a communicative aim (Cohn, 1978).

At the end of our analysis we are able to draw some conclusions regarding the main characteristics of Weldon's novel and also some general conclusions regarding the possibilities of interpretation of narrative fiction.

#### **§ 4.1., § 4.2.**

The SPEAKER is not introduced in a 'traditional' way. Her identity is established by taking into account information from both the first and the third person parts. Several factors contribute to the establishment of the SPEAKER's identity: linguistic information, context building, narrative inferences, semantic linking etc.

The usage of the "you" does not necessarily bring about the "I" as a pole of interaction, even in the first person parts. It may be used as an addressee-oriented constituent or, in a non-communicative way, as a "dummy agent".

Four types of present tense are used: the punctual present (verbalisation synchronised with experience), iterative-durative present (repetitive events) - most frequently used, gnomic present (used to express the SPEAKER's opinion) and the punctual past (actualisation of past events rendered by the SPEAKER in the present tense).

Iterativity is used to a large extent: the iterative-durative present, typifying and typical discourse (Rosier, 1999). We also notice the preference for rhetorical questions. The SPEAKER adopts many inferential perspectives, which is explainable by the fact that she is a woman cheated on, who tries to cope with her situation, first of all, by understanding her situation.

We think that the first-person texts should not be placed in entirety under the framework *I tell you*. We interpret the first-person texts as cases of verbalised thoughts, which in some cases fringe on the monologic, while in others are rather dialogic in nature. This is one of the reasons why we call our SPEAKER an experiencing SPEAKER. Another reason is that we are not here in the presence of a situation in which there is a unique, clearly-definable SPEAKER's vantage point/narrative timeline different from the story itself. The SPEAKER is represented in the NOW of both experience and recollection.

#### § 4.3.

We treat the past tense in the third person texts as a NOW which is not linked to the present time of a SPEAKER. Readers treat the past tense as a narrative present (Ehrlich, 1990; DST). The CHARACTER-subjective sentences occurring in Weldon's novel are both sentences containing parentheticals and sentences not containing parentheticals. The former case is higher in frequency. In order to consider a sentence to be a CHARACTER-subjective sentence, the semantic content needs to be compatible with the focalising WHO's thinking act, opinion, belief etc. The controlling predicates are many times triggered by the context.

Objective sentences – STORY WORLD-perspective – are also analysed. They are regarded as sentences which go for their extension to the story-world, i.e. the actual world of the story. The expressives which may appear in such sentences are interpreted as rendering a viewpoint (the v coordinate is made use of). Sometimes there are some ambiguous cases regarding whether or not to treat a sentence as an objective sentence or a CHARACTER-subjective one.

The “now” may act as a reference time to which a new narrative timeline anchors, a NOW-point in the narrative timeline, which marks a specific event out of a series of events, or is a signal for a SELF-perspective. Gnomic sentences can express the attitude of a social group, a

SOURCE's attitude, or may be part of a SELF-perspective. Some questions also have a rhetorical quality in the third person context, as well.

All these data concur to support the idea that Weldon's purpose was to render the 'interiour' process cheated women may go through: finding out what is going on, imagining or understanding the other woman, coping with the situation and, finally, in this case, taking action.

In our study we manage to account for both first person and third person texts by using the same formal apparatus, which goes hand in hand with an ontological model. The semantic model helps account for some interesting phenomena, but it also has some limitations, which is why we need to make use of other interpretative tools, as well. We believe the semantic model needs to be developed in order to capture more in depth certain aspects related to the analysis of narrative fictional sentences. Applying the model to other types of fictional texts could be the next step.

*Perspective, point of view* and *viewpoint* are the main terms we use in our model. We find common links and differences between them by appealing to various approaches and extracting the most relevant parts in order to define and put to work these terms. We believe that some of the most relevant theoretical aspects to be retained from our study are: the distinctions traced/specified here between *perspective, viewpoint, point of view* and, possibly, the connections found between these terms and the semantic terms *states of affairs* and *situations*. Hopefully, this study will provide some help in further investigations of *perspective* in narrative fiction.

Furthermore, we believe we offer a variant for the interpretation of certain debatable aspects related to the topic at hand:

i. Banfield's 1E/1SELF idea can be accepted on the following lines: we consider that there is only one SELF at the origin of a perspective (who can also be a SPEAKER, in Banfield's approach); he/she bears the responsibility for the ideas expressed and the expressions used; however, the SELF may choose to render somebody else's viewpoint which he/she may adopt or put at a distance.

ii. The interpretative function, which has been considered by some to be the basic thing which finally distinguishes between texts with a narrator or lacking one, does not necessarily signal a SPEAKER. This is shown in our analysis of gnomic sentences in a third-person context.

iii. Certain fictional narrative texts can be interpreted without postulating a fictional teller at the origin.

In the present study we try to find a common ground between several approaches in what concerns the *perspective* issue. Perspective is taken to be at the heart of human beings' interaction with the world, be it real or imaginary. We think that having resorted to a variety of accounts, though challenging, has brought about richer possibilities in interpretation.

## REFERENCES

### CRITICAL REFERENCES

- ABBOTT, H. Porter (2004[2002]). *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative*, Cambridge University Press
- ADAM, Jean-Michel (1994[1981]). *Le texte narratif*, Paris: Nathan Université
- ADAM, Jean-Michel (2001). *Les textes: types et prototypes*, Paris: Nathan Université
- ALMEIDA, Michael J. (1995). "Time in Narratives". In Judith F. Duchan *et alii* (eds.). *Deixis in Narrative: A Cognitive Science Perspective*: 159-189
- AUERBACH (1995). *Mimesis. Reprezentarea realității în literatura occidentală*, București: Editura pentru literatură universală
- AUTHIER Revuz, Jacqueline (1992). "Pour l'Agrégation. Repères dans le champ du discours rapporté (suite) ". In *L'Information grammaticale*, 56: 10-15
- AUTHIER Revuz, Jacqueline (2004). "La Représentation du discours autre : Un champ multiplement hétérogène". In Lopez Muñoz *et alii* (eds.). *Le discours rapporté dans tous ses états*: 35-53
- ASPESLAGH, Ellen (1999). "Language as Ideology: Transitivity and Ergativity in the Female Voices of Virginia Woolf's *The Waves*". In [http:// www.pala.ac.uk/resources/op/Paper10.pdf](http://www.pala.ac.uk/resources/op/Paper10.pdf)
- BACH, Emmon (1989). *Informal Lectures on Formal Semantics*, State University of New York Press
- BAKHTIN, Mikhail (1998). "Discourse in the Novel". In Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan (eds.). *Literary Theory: An Anthology*: 32-45
- BAL, Mieke (1985[1946]). *Narratology. Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press
- BANFIELD, Ann (1979). "Où l'épistémologie, le style et la grammaire rencontrent l'histoire littéraire : le développement de la parole et de la pensée représentée". In *Langue française*, 44: 9-27
- BANFIELD, Ann (1982). *Unspeakable Sentences. Narration and representation in the language of fiction*, Boston, London, Melbourne and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul

- BANFIELD, Ann (1998). "The name of the Subject: The "I"?" In *Yale French Studies*, no. 93: 133-174
- BARTHES, R., W. Kayser, W.C. Booth, Ph. Hamon (1977, a). *Poétique du récit*, Paris: Éds. du Seuil
- BARTHES, R. (1977, b). "Introduction à l'analyse structurale des récits". In Barthes *et alii*, *Poétique du récit*: 7-59
- BARWISE, Jon and John Etchemendy (1990). "Information, Infons and Inference". In Cooper *et alii* (eds.). *Situation Theory and Its Applications*, 1: 33-78
- BARWISE, John, Jean Mark Gawron, Gordon Plotkin, Syun Tutiya (eds.) (1991). *Situation Theory and Its Applications*, 2, Leland Stanford Junior University: Center for the Study of Language and Information
- BENVENISTE, Emile (1966). *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, Bibliothèque des Sciences Humaines: Éds. Gallimard
- BRUDER, Gail A. (1995). "Psychological Evidence That Linguistic Devices are Used by Readers to Understand Spatial Deixis in Narrative Text". In Judith F. Duchan *et alii* (eds.). *Deixis in Narrative: A Cognitive Science Perspective*: 243-260
- BIDU-VRÂNCEANU, Angela *et alii* (2001). *Dicționar de științe ale limbajului*: Nemira
- BOOTH, Wayne (1976). *Retorica romanului*, București: Univers
- BORCILĂ, Mircea (ed.) (1980). *Studii de Stilistică, Poetică, Semiotică*, Cluj-Napoca
- BRÈS, Jacques (1994). *La Narrativité*, Duculot: Lonvain-la-Neuve
- BROOKE-ROSE, Christine (1994[1990]). "Ill Locutions". In Nash (ed.). *Narrative in Culture. The Use of Storytelling in the Sciences, Philosophy and Literature*: 154-172
- CAPONE, Alessandro (n.d.). "The Structure of an Event". In <http://semanticsarchive.net/Archive/TM4YzJjY/event.rtf>
- CHARAUDEAU, Patrick (1992). *Grammaire du sens et de l'expression*: Hachette Éducation
- CHIERCHIA, Gennaro and Sally McConnell-Ginet (1990). *Meaning and Grammar. An Introduction to Semantics*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: The MIT Press
- CHIERCHIA, Gennaro and Sally McConnell-Ginet (2000). *Meaning and Grammar: An Introduction to Semantics*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.: The MIT Pres

- CHUN, Soon Ae and David A. Zubin (1995). "Experiential versus Agentive Constructions in Korean Narrative". In Judith F. Duchan *et alii* (eds.). *Deixis in Narrative: A Cognitive Science Perspective*: 309-323
- COHN, Dorrit (1978). *Transparent Minds*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press
- COHN, Dorrit (1990). "Signposts of Fictionality: A Narratological Perspective". In *Poetics Today*, vol. 11, no. 4: 775–804
- COHN, Dorrit (n.d.). "Discordant Narration". In [http://findarticles/p/articles/mi\\_m2342/is\\_2\\_34/ai\\_68279078](http://findarticles/p/articles/mi_m2342/is_2_34/ai_68279078) (published in *Style*, Summer, 2000)
- COMRIE, Bernard (1991[1976]). *Aspect*, New York, Port Chester, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press
- COMRIE, Bernard (1990[1985]). *Tense*, New York, Port Chester, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press
- COOPER, Robin, Mukai Kuniaki, John Perry (eds.) (1990). *Situation Theory and Its Applications*, 1, Leland Stanford Junior University: Center for the Study of Language and Information
- CROW, Judith Merriam (1990). "Locations Now and Then". In Cooper *et alii* (eds.). *Situation Theory and Its Applications*, 1: 355-377
- CURRIE, Gregory (1990). *The Nature of Fiction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- DEVLIN, Keith (1990). "Infons and Types in an Information-Based Logic". In Cooper *et alii* (eds.). *Situation Theory and Its Applications*, 1: 79-95
- DOLEŽEL, Lubomir (1998). *Heterocosmica. Fiction and Possible Worlds*, Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press
- DORON, Edith (1991). "Point of View as a Factor of Content". In Steven Moore and Adam Zachary Wyner (eds.). *Proceedings from Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, I: 51-64
- DOWNING, Laura Hidalgo (1994). "Foregrounding of Structural Patterns and Mind-Style in Two Literary Texts". In <http://www.pala.ac.uk/resources/op/Paper04.pdf>
- DRY, Helen Aristair (1990). "Language Change, 'Naturalization,' and Free Indirect Speech". In *Journal of Literary Semantics*, 19/3: 135-149
- DUCHAN, Judith F., Gail A. Bruder, Lynne E. Hewitt (eds.) (1995). *Deixis in Narrative: A Cognitive Science Perspective*, Hillsdale, New Jersey, Hove, U.K., State University of New York at Buffalo: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

- DUCROT, Oswald (1984). *Le dire et le dit*, Minuit
- DUCROT, Oswald and Jean-Marie Schaeffer (eds.) (1996). *Noul Dicționar Enciclopedic al Științelor Limbajului*, București: Babel
- EHRlich, Susan (1990). *Point of View: A Linguistic Analysis of Literary Style*, London and New York: Routledge
- EMMOTT, Catherine (1995). "Consciousness and Context-Building: Narrative Inferences and Anaphoric Theory". In Green (ed.). *New Essays in Deixis*, Amsterdam, Atlanta, Costerius New Series: 81-97
- ENGDAHL, Elisabet (1990). "Argument Roles and Anaphora". In Cooper *et alii* (eds.). *Situation Theory and Its Applications*, 1: 395-431
- FERNANDO, Tim (1990). "On the Logic of Situation Theory". In Cooper *et alii* (eds.), *Situation Theory and Its Applications*, 1: 97-116
- FILIP, Hana (n.d.). "Psychological Predicates and the Syntax-Semantics Interface". In <http://semanticsarchive.net>. (published in *Conceptual Structure, Discourse and Language*, 1996, Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information. Goldberg, A. E. (ed.): 131-147)
- FLEISCHMAN, Suzanne (1990). *Tense and Narrativity. From Medieval Performance to Modern Fiction*, The University of Texas Press
- FLOREA, Ligia-Stela (1999). *Temporalité, modalité et cohésion du discours*, București: Babel
- FLOREA, Ligia-Stela (2004). "Temps, aspect et perspective de locution". In *Studia Universitatis Babeș-Bolyai, Philologia*, XLIX, no. 3: 19-25
- FLOREA, Ligia-Stela (ms.). *Narration au présent, deixis fictionnelle et point de vue*, Université Babeș-Bolyai, Cluj-Napoca
- FLUDERNIK, Monika (1993). *The Fictions of Language and the Languages of Fiction*, New York: Routledge
- FLUDERNIK, Monika (1995, a). "Pronouns of Address and 'Odd' Third Person Forms: The Mechanics of Involvement in Fiction". In Green (ed.). *New Essays in Deixis*, Amsterdam-Atlanta, Costerius New Series: 99-129
- FLUDERNIK, Monica (1995, b). "The Linguistic Illusion of Alterity: The Free Indirect as a Paradigm of Discourse Representation". In *Diacritics*, vol. 25, no. 4: 89-115

- FLUDERNIK, Monica (2001). "New Wine in Old Bottles? Voice, Focalization, and New Writing". In *New Literary History*, 32: 619-638
- FREEMAN, Margaret (2007). "Cognitive Linguistic Approaches to Literary Studies: State of the Art in Cognitive Poetics". In Geerarts, Dirk and Hubert Cuyckens, *The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics*: 1175-1202.  
In [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=1427409](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1427409)
- FRIEDMAN, Norman (1967[1955]). "Point of View in Fiction. The Development of a Critical Concept". In Philip Stevick (ed.). *The Theory of the Novel* (1967[1955]): 108-137
- GALBRAITH, Mary (1995). "Deictic Shift Theory and the Poetics of Involvement in Narrative". In Judith F. Duchan *et alii* (eds.). *Deixis in Narrative: A Cognitive Science Perspective*: 19-59
- GAWRON, Jean Mark and Stanley Peters (1990). "Some Puzzles About Pronouns". In Cooper *et alii* (eds.), *Situation Theory and Its Applications*, 1: 395-431
- GENETTE, Gérard (1972). *Figures III*, Paris: Éditions du Seuil
- GENETTE, Gérard (1991). *Fiction et diction*, Paris: Éditions du Seuil
- GORMAN, David (2000[1998]). "The Logic of Literature, 2d. rev. ed – Review". In [http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m2342/is\\_1\\_32/ai\\_54019328/](http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2342/is_1_32/ai_54019328/). (published in *Style*, Spring, 1998)
- GRAESSER, Arthur C. and Cheryl A. Bowers (1996). "Review of *Deixis in Narrative*". In <http://www.cs.buffalo.edu/pub/WWW/faculty/rapaport/graesser.rev.forhtml>
- GREEN, Keith (1995). *New Essays in Deixis*, Amsterdam-Atlanta: Costerius New Series
- GREEN, Keith (1995). "A Revaluation of Concepts and Categories". In Keith Green (ed.), *New Essays in Deixis*: 11-25
- HAS, Gheorghe (1989). *Une Introduction à la Sémantique*, Universitatea Babeş-Bolyai, Facultatea de Litere, Cluj-Napoca
- HAMBURGER, Käte (1986[1957]). *Logique des genres littéraires* (préface de Gérard Genette), Paris: Éditions du Seuil
- HANOTE, Sylvie (2004). "Des introducteurs de discours aux indices de frayage". In Lopez Muñoz *et alii* (eds.). *Le discours rapporté dans tous ses états*: 538-548
- HEWITT, Lynne E. (1995). "Anaphor in Subjective Contexts in Narrative Fiction". In Judith F. Duchan *et alii* (eds.). *Deixis in Narrative: A Cognitive Science Perspective*: 325-339

- HURFORD, James R. and Brendan Weasley (1983). *Semantics - A Coursebook*, Cambridge University Press
- HYVÄRINEN, Matti Anu Korhonen and Juri Mykkänen (eds.), (2006). *The Travelling Concept of Narrative*, Helsinki: Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies
- JANUŠKEVIČIŪTĖ, Irena and Linas Selmistraitis (2005). “Deictic Markers in Monologue and Dialogue”. In *Kalbotyra* 55(3): 22-30
- JAUBERT, Anna (2004). “Parler au deuxième degré : Du discours rapporté au discours déporté”. In Lopez Muñoz *et alii* (eds.). *Le discours rapporté dans tous ses états*: 153-161
- JEFFRIES, Lesley (2000). “Don’t throw out the baby with the bathwater: in defence of theoretical eclecticism in Stylistics”. In <http://www.pala.ac.uk/resources/op/Paper12.pdf>
- JONES, Peter E. (1995). “Philosophical and Theoretical Issues in the Study of Deixis: A Critique of the Standard Account”. In Keith Green (ed.). *New Essays in Deixis*: 27-48
- KAYSER, Wolfgang (1977). “Qui raconte le roman?”. In Barthes *et alii*. *Poétique du récit*: 59-84
- KARPENKO, Tatyana (1993). “Pragmatic Aspects of Literary Communication”. In <http://www.pala.ac.uk/resources/op/Paper03.pdf>
- KATAGIRI, Yashuhiro (1991). “Perspectivity and the Japanese Reflexive ‘zibun’”. In Barwise *et alii*. *Situation Theory and Its Applications*, 2: 425-447
- KRATZER, Angelika (2001). “Facts: Particulars or Information Units?” In <http://semanticsarchive.net/Archive/zAxODQ5Y/Facts.pdf>
- KRATZER, Angelika (2003). “A Note on Choice Functions in Context”. In <http://semanticsarchive.net/Archive/zIyNTMxZ/Choice%20Functions%20in%20Context.pdf>
- KURODA, S.-Y. (1979[1973], a). *Aux quatre coins de la linguistique*, Paris: Éditions du Seuil
- KURODA, S.-Y. (1979[1973], b). “Où l’épistémologie, la grammaire et le style se rencontrent : examen d’un exemple japonais”. In Kuroda (1979). *Aux quatre coins de la linguistique*: 235-259
- KURODA, S.-Y. (1979, c). “Grammaire et récit”. In Kuroda (1979). *Aux quatre coins de la linguistique*: 261-271
- LAKOFF, George and Mark Johnson (1985[1980]). *Les Métaphores dans la vie quotidienne*, Paris: Minuit

- LEECH, G. (1981). *Semantics. The Study of Meaning*, London: Penguin Books
- LEWIS, David (1979[1973]). "Possible Worlds". In Michael J. Loux (ed.). *The Possible and the Actual: readings in the metaphysics of modality*: 182-189
- LEWIS, David (1983[1978]). "Truth in Fiction". In David Lewis. *Philosophical Papers*, vol.1: 261-268
- LI, Naicong and David A. Zubin (1995). "Discourse Continuity and Perspective Taking". In Judith F. Duchan *et alii* (eds.). *Deixis in Narrative: A Cognitive Science Perspective*: 287-307
- LINTVELT, Jaap (1994[1981]). *Punctul de vedere. Încercare de tipologie narativă*, București: Univers
- LOUX, Michael J. (ed.) (1979, a). *The Possible and the Actual: Readings in the Metaphysics of Modality*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press
- LOUX, Michael J. (1979, b). "Introduction: Modality and Metaphysics". In Michael J. Loux (ed.). *The Possible and the Actual: readings in the metaphysics of modality*: 15-64
- LYONS, John (1995). *Introducere în lingvistica teoretică*, București: Științifică
- MACMILLAN DICTIONARY (2002). Macmillan Publishers Ltd.
- MAINGUENEAU, Dominique (1981). *Approche de l'énonciation en linguistique française*, Paris: Classiques Hachette
- MARGOLIN, Uri (1990). "Individuals in Narrative Worlds : An Ontological Perspective". In *Poetics Today*, vol. 11, no. 4 : 843-871
- MARNETTE, Sophie (2001). "The French *théorie de l'énonciation* and the study of speech and thought presentation". In Katie Wales *et alii* (eds.). *Language and Literature*, Sage Publications 10/3: 243-261
- MARTI, Luisa (2004). "Unarticulated Constituents Revisited". Paper presented at the EGG Summerschool, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, 2004. (Paper first presented at the Milan Meeting on Covert Variables at LF in Gargnano, Italy, June 2004.)
- MARTINEZ-DUENAS, Jose-Luis (1988). "A Critical Approach to Linguistic Categories and 'Literary' Discourse: Iris Murdoch's *The Book and the Brotherhood*". In <http://www.pala.ac.uk/resources/op/Paper01.pdf>
- MEZEI, Adina-Maria (2006). "Possible Worlds, Situations, and Meaning in Fiction. A Discussion". In *Lingua.B. Cultura și civilizație*, V: 97-105

- MEZEI, Adina-Maria (2008). "Narrative Theory: A Survey". In *Studia Universitatis*, 2: 187-196
- MEZEI, Adina-Maria (2008). "A Perspective-Based Approach to Fiction Origin – and Content-Perspectives". In Radu and Moldovan (eds.). *Constructions of Identity*, 2: 50-61
- MIÈGE, Bernard (1998[1995]). *Gândirea comunicatională*, Cartea Românească
- MOESCHLER, J. et alii (1998). *Le temps des événements. Pragmatique de la référence temporelle*, Paris: Kimé
- MOESCHLER, Jacques and Anne Reboul (1999[1994]). *Dicționar Enciclopedic de Pragmatică*, Cluj: Echinox
- MOESCHLER, Jacques and Antoine Auchlin (2005). *Introducere în lingvistica contemporană*, Cluj-Napoca: Echinox
- MOORE, Steven and Adam Zachary Wyner (eds.) (1991). *Proceedings from Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, SALT I, held at Cornell University, April 19-21, 1991, published under Cornell University Working Papers in Linguistics Number 10, Fall 1991
- MUÑOZ Lopez, Juan Manuel, Sophie Marnette, Laurence Rosier (eds.) (2004). *Le Discours rapporté dans tous ses états*, Paris: L'Harmattan
- NAKASHIMA, Hideyuki and Syun Tutiya (1991). "Inferring in a Situation about Situations". In Barwise et alii (eds.). *Situation Theory and Its Application*, 2: 215-227
- NASH, Christopher (1994[1990]) (ed.). *Narrative in Culture. The Uses of Storytelling in the Sciences, Philosophy and Literature*, London and New York: Routledge
- NORÉN, Coco (2004). "Le discours rapporté direct et la notion d'énonciation". In Muñoz et alii (eds.). *Le Discours rapporté dans tous ses états*: 97-104
- OLTEAN, Ștefan (1980). "Observații asupra structurii narative în stilul indirect liber". In Mircea Borcilă (ed.). *Studii de Stilistică, Poetică, Semiotică*, Cluj-Napoca: 96-102
- OLTEAN, Ștefan (1993). "A Survey of the Pragmatic and Referential Functions of Free Indirect Discourse". In *Poetics Today*, 14: 691–715
- OLTEAN, Ștefan (1994). *Teoria textului narativ și DIL*, Universitatea Babeș-Bolyai, Facultatea de Litere, Cluj-Napoca
- OLTEAN, Ștefan (1995). "Free Indirect Discourse: Some Referential Aspects". In *Journal of Literary Semantics. An International Review*, Heidensberg xxiv/1: 21-31
- OLTEAN, Ștefan (1997). "Possible Worlds and Truth in Fiction". In *Journal of Literary Semantics*, xxvi/3: 173-190

- OLTEAN, Ștefan (2003). *Lumile posibile în structurile limbajului*, Cluj-Napoca: Echinox
- OLTEAN, Ștefan (2006). *Introducere în semantica referențială*, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Presa Universitară Clujeană
- OVERSTEEGEN, Leonoor (2005). “Causality and Tense - Two Temporal Structure Builders”.  
In *J. Semantics*, August, 22: 307 - 337
- PALMER, F.R. (1991[1986]). *Mood and Modality*, New York, Port Chester, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press
- PATRON, Sylvie (2006). “On the Epistemology of Narrative Theory: Narratology and Other Theories of Fictional Narrative”. In Matti Hyvärinen, Anu Korhonen & Juri Mykkänen (eds.). *The Travelling Concept of Narrative*. Helsinki, Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies: 118-133
- PAVEL, Thomas, (1998[1986]). *Univers de la fiction*, Paris: Seuil
- PHILLIPES, Gilles (2000). “L’Ancre énonciatif des récits de fiction. Présentation”. In *Langue française*, 128: 3–8
- PINKER, Steven (2009[1997]). *Cum funcționează mintea*, București : Allfa
- PLETT, H.F. (1983). *Știința textului și analiza de text*, București: Univers
- PEPELARD, Marie-Dominique and Denis Vernant (2003). *Elemente de logică*, Iași: Institutul European
- RABATEL, Alain (1998). *La construction textuelle du point de vue*, Lausanne (Switzerland)-Paris: Collection Sciences des discours
- RABATEL, Alain (2004). “Les Verbes de perception, entre point de vue *représenté* et discours *représentés*”. In Lopez Muñoz *et alii* (eds.). *Le discours rapporté dans tous ses états*: 81-93
- RADU, Adrian and Rareș Moldovan (eds.) (2008). *Constructions of Identity*, volume 2, Cluj-Napoca: Napoca Star
- RAMAZANI, Vaheed K. (1988). *The Free Indirect Mode. Flaubert and the Poetics of Irony*, Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia
- RAPAPORT, William J. *et alii* (1994). “Deictic Centres and the Cognitive Structure of Narrative Comprehension”. In <http://www.cse.buffalo.edu/~rapaport/Papers/dc.pdf>
- REBOUL, Anne (2000). “Communication, Fiction et Expression de la Subjectivité”. In *Langue française*, 128: 9–29

- REBOUL, Anne and Jacques Moeschler (2001[1998]). *Pragmatica, azi*, Cluj-Napoca: Echinox
- RECANATI, François (2002). “Unarticulated Constituents”. In *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 25: 299-345
- REINHART, Tanya (1986). “Principes de perception des formes et organisation temporelle des textes narratifs”. In *Recherches linguistiques de Vincennes*, 14/15: 45-92
- RIMMON-KENAN, Schlomith (2002[1983]). *Narrative Fiction. Contemporary Poetics*, London and New York: Routledge
- RIVARA, René (2000). *La langue du récit. Introduction à la narratologie énonciative*, L’Harmattan
- RIVKIN, Julie and Michael Ryan (1998). “Introduction”. In *Literary Theory: An Anthology*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers
- ROBINS, R.H. (2005[1967]). *Scurtă istorie a lingvisticii*, Iași: Polirom
- ROHDE, HANNAH (2006). “Rhetorical questions as redundant interrogatives”. In *San Diego Linguistic Papers*, 2: Department of Linguistics, UCSD, UC San Diego. In <http://escholarshp.org/uc/item/4xd7t5ww>
- ROSIER, Laurence (1999). *Le discours rapporté. Histoire, théorie, pratiques*, Paris, Bruxelles: Champs linguistiques
- RUSSELL, Bertrand (1905). “On Denoting”. In *Mind*, 14 : 479-493
- RYAN, Marie-Laure (1991). *Possible Worlds, Artificial Intelligence and Narrative Theory*, Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press
- RYLE, Gilbert (2000[1949]). *The Concept of Mind*, Penguin Books
- SANGER, Keith (2000[1998]). *The Language of Fiction*, London and New York: Routledge
- SCHAPIRA, Charlotte (2004). “Discours rapporté et parole prototypique”. In Muñoz *et alii* (eds.). *Le Discours rapporté dans tous ses états*: 131-138
- SCHREPFER-ANDRÉ, G. (2004). “[Selon X, p] versus [X dit / pense que p] : Information référencée versus discours rapporté”. In Lopez Muñoz *et alii* (eds.). *Le discours rapporté dans tous ses états*: 576-586
- SEGAL, (1995). “Narrative Comprehension and the Role of Deictic Shift Theory”. In Judith F. Duchan *et alii* (eds.). *Deixis in Narrative: A Cognitive Science Perspective*: 3-17
- SEGAL, Erwin M. (1997). “Deixis in Short Fiction: The Contribution of Deictic Shift Theory to Reader Experience of Literary Fiction.” In <http://pluto.fss.buffalo.edu/classes/psy/segal/>

- 2472000/IA93-10P.htm. A slightly edited version of this article. In Barbara Lounsberry (Ed.) *Telling Tales: Perspectives on the Short Story*, Westport, CT: Greenwood Press. 283-294.
- SELIGMAN, Jerry (1990). "Perspectives in Situation Theory". In Cooper *et alii* (eds.). *Situation Theory and Its Applications*, 1: 146-191
- SIOUFFI G., Raemdonck, Van D. (1999). *Fiches pour comprendre la linguistique*, Brial: Rosny
- SPERBER, Dan and Deirdre Wilson (1996). "Fodor's Frame Problem and Relevance Theory (reply to Chiappe & Kukla)". In <http://www.dan.sperber.cfr/?p=27>
- STANLEY, Jason and Zoltán Gendler Szabó (2000). "Reply to Bach and Neale". In *Mind & Language*, Vol. 15 Nos. 2 and 3 April/June: 295-298
- STANLEY, Jason (2000). "Context and Logical Form". In *Linguistics and Philosophy* 23: 391-434
- STANLEY, Jason (2005). "Semantics in Context". In *Contextualism in Philosophy: Knowledge, Meaning and Truth*, Oxford University Press: 221-253
- STANZEL, F.K. (1984[1982]). *A Theory of Narrative*, Cambridge, London, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press
- STEVICK, Philip (ed.) (1967[1955]), *The Theory of the Novel*, Free Press
- SULLET - NYLANDER, Françoise (2004). "Le Discours narrativisé : Quels critères formels? (Distribution et effets des emplois dans *Le Monde et Libération*)". In Muñoz *et alii* (eds.). *Le Discours rapporté dans tous ses états*: 386-396
- TALMY, Leonard (1995). "Narrative Structure in a Cognitive Framework". In Judith F. Duchan *et alii* (eds.). *Deixis in Narrative: A Cognitive Science Perspective*: 421-460
- TURNER, G.W. (1973[1973]). *Stylistics*, Penguin Books
- TOOLAN, M. (1988). *Narrative: A Critical Linguistic Introduction*, London: Routledge
- VALETTE, Bernard (1993). *Esthétique du roman moderne*, Eds. Nathan Université
- VITOUX, Pierre, "Le jeu de la focalisation". In *Poétique*, 51: 358–368
- VLAD, Carmen (1985). "Identité-Alterité Dans le Sens Narratif de la Première Personne". In *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique*, Tome xxx, no. 5
- VLAD, Carmen (2002). *Textul aisberg. Elemente de teorie și analiză*, Cluj: Casa cărții de știință
- VUILLAUME, Marcel (1990). *Grammaire temporelle des récits*, Paris: Minuit

- WALSH, Richard (n.d.). "Fabula and fictionality in narrative theory". In [http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_m2342/is\\_4\\_35/ai\\_97114240/?tag=content;col](http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2342/is_4_35/ai_97114240/?tag=content;col) 1 (published in *Style*, Winter, 2001)
- WEIMBERG, Henry H. (1981). "Irony and 'Style Indirect Libre'". In *Madame Bovary*, *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature*, vol. 8, no. 1: 1-9
- WERTH, Paul (1995). "How to build a world (in a lot less than six days, and using only what's in your head)". In Green (ed.), *New Essays in Deixis*: 49-80
- WIEBE (1995). "References in Narrative Text". In Judith F. Duchan *et alii* (eds.). *Deixis in Narrative: A Cognitive Science Perspective*: 263-286
- WILSON, Deirdre and Dan Sperber (2002). "Truthfulness and Relevance". In *Mind* 111, 583: 215-257
- YUHAN, Albert Hanyong and Stuart C. Shapiro (1995). "Computational Representation of Space". In Judith F. Duchan *et alii* (eds.). *Deixis in Narrative: A Cognitive Science Perspective*: 191-225
- ZALTA, Edward N. (1991). "A Theory of Situations". In Barwise *et alii* (eds.). *Situation Theory and Its Applications*, 2: 81-111
- ZUBIN, David A. and Lynne E. Hewitt (1995). "The Deictic Center: A Theory of Deixis in Narrative". In Judith F. Duchan *et alii* (eds.). *Deixis in Narrative: A Cognitive Science Perspective*: 129-158

### **LITERARY REFERENCES**

- KING, Stephen and Peter Straub (2001[1984]). *The Talisman*, New York: Ballantine Books
- WELDON, Fay (1989[1983]). *The Life and Loves of a She-Devil*, Hodder & Stoughton Ltd, Coronet Books