

**„BABEŞ – BOLYAI” UNIVERSITY
CLUJ - NAPOCA
FACULTY OF LETTERS**

**DOCTORAL THESIS
DISCOURSIIVE VALENCIES OF SPEECH FIGURES AND TROPES
SUMMARY**

**COORDINATOR
PROF.UNIV. DR. ELENA DRAGOŞ**

**Ph.D. CANDIDATE
DIANA LAURA IACOB**

**CLUJ - NAPOCA
2010**

CONTENTS

Argument	2
----------------	---

Chapter I

FROM RHETORIC TO PRAGMATIC

- Discourse – from rhetoric to pragmatic 5
- Discourse – constitutive elements 20
- Types and genres of discourse 25
- Literary discourse 29
- Literal discourse vs Figurative discourse 37

Chapter II

CONCEPTS ABOUT SPEECH FIGURES AND TROPES

- The origins of speech figures and tropes 42
- Figures of speech – deviations and exceptions 46
- Figure of speech as deviation, trope as substitute 47
- Modern approach of speech figures and tropes 48
- Classification of speech figures and tropes 52
- Functionality of speech figures and tropes. Pragmatic perspective 58

Chapter III

DISCOURSIVE VALENCIES OF SPEECH FIGURES

• Syntactic figures. Repetition	71
• Rhetoric anaphora	73
• Anadiplosis	86
• Epanode	89
• Chiasmus	91
• Refrain	93
• Enumeration	102

Chapter IV

DISCOURSIVE VALENCIES OF TROPES

• Metaphor	116
• Spinning metaphor	117
• Hyperbole	126
• Complex image	128

Conclusions	131
--------------------------	-----

Bibliography of sources	138
--------------------------------------	-----

Bibliography	141
---------------------------	-----

Annexes	167
----------------------	-----

Key words

- discourse
- literal discourse
- literary discourse
- discursive valencies
- speech figures
- tropes
- rhetoric anaphore
- anadiplosis
- chiasmus
- epanode
- refrain
- spinning metaphore
- hyperbole
- complex image

ARGUMENT

For a very long time, speech figures and tropes have been considered by many rhetoricians as being „accessories” or „ornaments” of discourse. Our thesis reconsiders this approach changing the force poles „pour la rhétorique classique, les figures permettent à l'énoncé d'avoir belle figure. Pour la pragmatique contemporaine, elle permettent surtout aux énonciateurs de faire bonne figure” (C.Kerbrat-Orecchioni 1994:57-71) aiming to demonstrate the capacity of speech figures and tropes of building discourse, thus being endowed with discursive valencies „figuralité leads us to the reason of discourse itself” (Jenny 1998:81). According to Liana Pop (1987:378), the concept of discursive valence opens a dynamic perspective upon speech acts, and, as we all know, tropes are indirect speech acts, making their description possible from the point of view of connectivity. Our approach is sustained by the new perspective on discourse and at the same time by the occurrence of new investigation fields: new-rhetoric, discourse analysis, praxematics, pragmatics, all these coming to prove the novelty of the debated issue. Along with the occurrence of these fields, language sciences pass through a „resocialization” process (Roventă-Frumușani 2005:8), „that focuses on three main issues:

- setting mutual junction and fecundation spaces among the new rhetorics, discourse analysis and different pragmatic theories;
- replacement of atomist corpuscles, prefabricated with authentic debates which update ethical, judicial and political dilemmas;

- „rhetorization of linguistics” (F. Rastier) seen as an attempt to identify discursive methods of expressing opinions, of briefing situations and of focusing on qualifications.” (R.Koren 2002:13–14 apud Roventă-Frumușani 2005:8)

The perspective of our analysis is mainly pragmatic because we consider discourse as being a pragmatic unit that should be approached both as an enunciation, as a message, and as a process, structure and event. We couldn't omit, considering them a necessity, several notable contributions in the field of rhetorics and stylistics, taking into consideration the complexity of such an issue and such a deep analysis. Our research will be practically reflected in a corpus of literary discourses in poetry, but also in prose. We will try to demonstrate that literary discourse implies a complex mechanism of making meaning effects, while speech figures and tropes have a decisive contribution to the construction of meaning, providing coherence to the discourse. At the same time, the same as pragmatic connectors, speech figures and tropes are meant to organize and orientate discourse, defining themselves as cohesive factors.

Speech figures and tropes have a great functional impact on discourse, proving the quality of communication: „D'un côté, les figures contribuent au balisage et à la mémorisation des énoncés. D'un autre côté, par leur densité informative et par leur aptitude à concentrer des sens pluriels, elles illustrent le pouvoir de symbolisation du langage.” (Bonhomme 2005:259)

Although we have chosen to justify our approach using literary discourses, we pointed the power of figurative that is always in action, even in literal discourses, our opinion being that there are no exclusively literal discourses or purely figurative discourses.

If in old rhetoric pragmatic dimension of figure focused especially on the persuasive aspect of discourse, our thesis reveals other methods of making discourse, achieved by means of figural: enunciation (refrain), argumentation (rhetoric anaphora, hyperbole, metaphor), narrative anticipation (complex image), concentration and focalization (chiasmus), explicitness (epanode), repetition (rhetoric anaphora, refrain), development or progression (anadiplosis, spinning metaphor, complex image) etc.

Discursive expression of figures depends either on their stability or on their development in statement network. Traditional analysis have never focused on these aspects; on the contrary, our aim is to watch the contextualization of figures, along with their enunciative implications.

Such an approach of figurative phenomenon creates on its turn, a different type of reading, pragmatic reading, in which the interpreter holds an active role, that of building a discursive representation, starting from statements, from its finality and from its psycho-social representations. (Adam 2008:129) The reader becomes co-enunciator, thus rendering the reading an enunciative nature.

Our thesis aims at demonstrating that tropes and speech figures are always active in discourse, thus motivating our choice of pragmatic perspective (pragma = action).

Chapter I

FROM RHETORIC TO PRAGMATICS

In the first section of the first chapter (*Discourse – from rhetoric to pragmatics*) we presented the origin of the term „**discourse**” resorting to ancient rhetoric, because it is among the first evidence in occidental world of a thinking on discourse. Rhetorics used to be defined as a theory of efficient discourse, but also as an art of building up discourse, being a metalanguage or a discourse about discourse. (Barthes 1970:172-223)

Also, we also sustained herein, pragmatic valences of rhetoric, taking into consideration the fact that it does not approach discourse only as a verbal statement (as a product), but moreover, as a process (enunciation).

The main object of discourse, from the point of view of rhetorics used to be persuasion; that is why it has been considered that „rhetorics used to be a means of getting to the authority of verbal speech.” (Vanoye 1975-50)

In this respect, we suggested the idea that, sometimes, ancient discourse used to be a means of survival, thus acquiring ontological function, but also a way of taking action as long as „to say” means „to do”.

Due to the fact that the term „discourse” changed the initial meaning conferred by ancient rhetoric, getting different definitions according to the approach it has been given (socio-linguistics, psycho-linguistics, new-rhetorics, stylistics, poetic, text theory, discourse analysis and pragmatics), we found

absolutely necessary to sum up these approaches, pointing out that all these share the status of discursive practice event. (Benveniste 2000I:67-74)

We also debated upon the controversy between the concept of „text” and that of „discourse”.

In our opinion, discourse can be resembled neither to speech (according to F. de Saussure), nor to an ordinary enumeration of phrases (stated by Z. Harris) and is neither a simple enunciation (E. Benveniste). We consider discourse as being a pragmatic unit and we think that it should benefit from an analysis and an interpretation that will point out its bivalent nature: statement and enunciation, message and process, structure and event. Moreover, discourse analysis means both overpassing of phrasal level and context free pattern. The analyse we have applied on speech figures and tropes, along the 3rd and the 4th chapter, wholly reflect the idea we have stated above. This is the reason why, we hope that through the practical analysis we have achieved in the above mentioned chapters, we succeeded in bringing some contribution to the discursive analysis of speech figures and tropes.

As D. Roventă-Frumușani (2005:9) used to point out, the different perspectives on the discourse have in comun both the interactive character of meanings and the actions taken in and through communication events, and also the contextualized and contextualizing character of discursive interactions.

As long as the term „discourse” sends us back to actual expressions of language, in the second chapter, we chose to make a short analysis of the locutor, of the referent and of communication situation, all these being its constitutive elements (*Discourse – constitutive elements*). Merging the theoretical efforts that were initiated by C.Bally, R.Jakobson, M.Bahtin and E.Benveniste, we came to the

conclusion that discourse is a product of linguistic information, but also of situational information, depending on the interaction and on social context.

In the next subchapter (*Types and genres of discourse*), we raised the issue of different types of discourse, pointing out the existence of a variety of positions according to the criteria that were taken into consideration as a basis of the different approaches. Thus, we could identify traditional approaches (for instance Coteanu 1978), but also newer approaches, that are based on pragmatic elements. (Maingueneau 2007c:209)

D.Maingueneau (2007c:209) states that discursive genres are not steady forms that the locutor chooses in order to „pour” his statement. Being a linguistic act with a high complexity level, a discursive genre is subjected to a whole assembly of conditions that are meant to activate more parameters: finality, partner status, adequate circumstances.

Literary discourse, as a particular type of discourse, raises the issue of convention: „literature has its own set of conventions, a lot different from those of any other type of discourse.” (Ohmann 1981:198) Thus, we dwelt upon the issue of literary convention, but also upon abstract discursive instance, which is that of the transmitter and of the receiver of a literary discourse (in the subchapter *Literary Discourse*). These two are built up through discourse, both being meaning effects.

While making up its discourse, the locutor integrates an image of „the other discourse”, the one that he lends to his interlocutor. The receiver of a literary discourse, described as „expectation horizon” is the one who builds up the coherence of literary discourse, thus becoming a co-author himself. Also, in order to decode a discourse, we have to take into consideration both context and co-text and most of all, all the other conventions that are specific to literary discourse, such as fictionality and transtextuality.

In the last part of chapter I (*Literal discourse vs Figurative discourse*) we raised the issue of the opposition between literal meaning and figurative meaning, pointing out the fact that classical rhetorics used to differentiate literal use of language from its non literal use, while several modern theoreticians (such as: D. Sperber and D. Wilson) state that there is no explicit difference between the two; there is only a continuous flow that goes from perfect literality to non-literality.

As far as we are concerned, we cannot stick to traditional opposition between common use of language (that is considered very clear) and a literary use of language (that would make it opaque); therefore, we think there are no exclusively literal discourses, idea that is confirmed by the assertions of D.Maingueneau (2007a:29): „in fact, the idea of a language that is ideally transparent for all things does not stand up; it cannot be applied not even on the most common discourse because enunciation always leaves tracks in any statement; language can only designate by designating itself.”

CHAPTER II

CONCEPTS ABOUT SPEECH FIGURES AND TROPES

Second chapter begins with the opinions stated by several researchers (Cicero, Du Marsais, P.Fontanier, Ch.Bally, M.Bréal, T.Vianu, Lakoff și Johnson) about the origins of speech figures and tropes. Thus, we showed that some authors find the origins of tropes in a shortcoming of the language that cannot cover in words all the objects and phenomena in nature (Cicero 1973:312-313), while others state that our conceptual organization about the world itself is based on metaphoric processes (Lakoff și Johnson, 1985:16).

In time, two approaches on speech figures and tropes became distinctive. For most researchers speech figures are deviations from standard normatives of literality (such as Cicero, Du Marsais), while tropes are meaning substitutes (such as P. Fontanier).

Modern approaches of speech figures and tropes are based on new entities such as enunciation and discourse, a new attitude towards figural phenomenon being imposed. Thus, speech figures and tropes „make discourse more descriptive” (Ricoeur 1984:235), or, on the contrary, they infringe on conversational maxims (H.P.Grice 1975) or they represent ways of expressing politeness. (C.K.Orecchioni 1994:57-71)

We regard speech figures and tropes as pragmatical elements that can be analysed from the point of view of a unique discourse every time, a singular discourse, a discourse that belongs to a subjective locutor .

In the subchapter „*Classification of speech figures and tropes*” we pointed out the diversity of classifications, all of them being based on two typology classes, as M. Bonhomme states (1998:12-13): functional (figures are classified according to discourse motivations and effects), that, on their turn can be divided in psychologic, argumentative and aesthetic typologies, and structural typologies (based on the components of discourse) that are ranged according to word form, the way words build up enunciations, meaning of words.

We also showed that the distinction between speech figures and tropes occurred at the same time with rhetorics, but it was put into theory later on, the focus being mainly on tropes. Taking into consideration the object of our study, we decided to stick to traditional classification, which is also the most spread, and to make a difference between syntactic figures and semantic figures or tropes.

Taking notice of the fact that syntactic and semantic figures „rearrange” discourse, we found inevitable the approach on their functionality in discourse (in the subchapter *Functionality of speech figures and tropes – pragmatic perspective*). We pointed out that this functionality has a great impact on the whole structure on which discourse is built up: production conditions, interlocutors, purpose. The functionality of figures can be drafted more or less at the level of defining characteristics; it is their contextualization in a particular occurrence that determines discursive efficiency (Bonhomme 2005). But this is the object of the following chapters.

CHAPTER III

DISCOURSIIVE VALENCIES OF SPEECH FIGURES

This chapter has a highly practical character and aims to demonstrate the discursive valences of speech figures, their ability to call each other, thus enrolling in a wide action, more or less figuratively, the purpose of which is the discursivisation.

I shared the pragmatic perspective on the figural made by M. Bonhomme (1998:7), who stated that "the figure is a marked discursive form, free and measurable that strengthens the meaning of the statements."

Because of its components' codependence, syntactic figures (anaphora anadiplosis, epanode, chiasmus, refrain, enumeration) mobilize procedures of calling and anticipation on statements, which leads to a certain dynamism and discursive meanings.

Due to its cumulative capacity, the rhetorical anaphora emphasizes the communicating ideas, contributing to optimal reception. It may have the following

features: architectural and updating, because they render the discourse cohesion, thematics and progression, because it underlines the discourse keywords, and rhythmic, because it requires a certain cadence. Rhetorical anaphora gives some argumentative discourse („*România automobilului*” by G.Topîrceanu) or descriptive („*Fulgii*” by I. Barbu), covering parts of speech („*Cuvînt*” by T. Arghezi) or it develops widely („*România policromă*” by I. Minulescu ; „*Love*” L. Blaga), sometimes on the initial anaphora "weaving" the speech to the desired metaphors.

Using a pragmatic analysis of rhetoric anaphora in various literary discourses, I noticed that it doesn't make up discourse cohesion, because of its vector, but also the thematic coherence, due to the isotopic continuity. It also owns an oratory and prosody dimension, which gives it a mnemonic or charming potential, therefore a perlocutionary effect. In this case, it may be associated with the concept of "discursive memory" proposed by J.J. Courtine (1981:9-127), as far as the aim of repetition is to create a "memory effect".

The main function of anadiplosis is the achievement of the linear thematic progression („*Ghimpii*” by L. Blaga, „*Ruga mea e fără cuvinte*” by T. Arghezi). Supported by the refrain and enjambment („*Lumina de ieri*” by L. Blaga), anadiplosis aims to a chain effect and acts as an engine that facilitates the emergence of ideas, as support for related metaphors.

Epanoda confirms the idea according to which "statements should not be treated as monads, but as a chain mesh dialogue" (1988:84 Angenot apud Roventă-Frumușani 2005:70) („*Primăvară*” by L. Blaga).

Chiasmus is an „inversive” figure (A. Rabatel 2008:21-36) the cognitive function of which is subordinated to an informative and argumentative strong function. However, this discursive figure has a focusing potential too

(„*Morgenstimmung*” by T. Arghezi), because it leads the discourse towards the poles it points out.

Among the figures of repetition, one that is the closest to the semantic level is the refrain (the most developed form of parallelism). Being a type of recurrence, the refrain is the element of cohesion and coherence of discourse, with an echo effect. In our opinion, the chorus goes beyond syntax, as it becomes the world's semantic organizer discourse (eg. „*Romanța cheii*” by I. Minulescu).

Despite its conciseness, the enumeration can act the same as accumulation, thereby generating, either a descriptive discourse doubled by an expressive function by introducing the speaker's subjectivity (noun enumeration or adjectival enumeration) or a narrative discourse (verbal enumeration).

CHAPTER IV

DISCOURSIVE VALENCIES OF TROPES

In this chapter, we aimed to demonstrate that tropes are indirect speech acts which contribute to the construction of meaning, being able to ensure the coherence of discourse. Tropes, finding relationships, not entities, between the conventional sense (prediscursive) and the semantic content built (rebuilt) transmitter (discursive), we explain why, in terms of semantic paradoxes appear to us, and reveals the pragmatic level mechanism in action by the literal and metaphorical stating (1982 apud Măgureanu Dragoș 2000:167). For example, the metaphor is an act of discourse that cancels the code rules and sets new rules for functioning as a discursive strategy.

Beginning with Aristotle, a bibliography of over three thousand titles, the metaphor continued „to be the most luminous, more necessary and more frequent

of tropes” (Eco 1984:141). U. Eco shows that by a curious synecdochically the term metaphor indicated any rhetorical figure, in general: to speak of metaphor is to speak about the work of rhetoric in its complexity. To talk about the metaphor is to talk about metonymy, synecdocha, symbol, archetype, myth, ritual, magic, that is, language, sign, significant, effect.

Realizing a pragmatic approach to metaphor, I tried to illustrate its functionality in several literary discourses.

So, we observed that metaphor performs in such a context, discursive valencies, because its ability to generate discursive continuity, having the power to summon and bind speech acts (speech organization through causality and metaphorical density in the voiculesciene sonnets).

Metaphor realizes in ample syntactic constructions, repetitive (enumeration type), the metaphorical juxtaposition of components, some updates are also based on subordination („*Lingoare*” by T. Arghezi). But the simplicity of syntactic reports is associated in these extensions, with the sense initial contact or with the appearance of some real semantic attraction between the terms of the chain metaphor („*Rada*” by T. Arghezi). Irradiating, the metaphor „contaminates” the whole language: the poetry itself can become extended metaphor.

Hyperbole is one of the figures can be defined based on the enunciation of a principle of dialogue, on the basis that it is a discursive strategy which requires an adherence point of view that seeks to address („*Povestea lui Harap-Alb*” by Ion Creangă). So, the illocutionary force of the hyperbole is related to its persuasive potential and the tension manifested of this increase argumentative character of the discourse.

The complex image is a crowd of tropes, with co-extensive function, because it consists of a verbal metaphor the meaning of which is „fulfilled” by

comparison. We consider the complex image as a discursive process specific to prose („*Răscoala*”; „*Pădurea spînzuraților*” by L.Rebreanu). This demonstrates once again that the tropes are always in „action” in discourse, and this, in turn, takes its authority and power extracted from them.

CONCLUSIONS

Far from being meaning ornaments to disguise an ontological body given by the significances, tropes and speech figures they are a way of producing and interpreting meaning, with discursive meanings.

Figures of artistic language have an unequal character, and their value is given by the context in which they are used, the way in which they contribute to the expression of message communication: „Figures represent construction discursive activated by syntax entourage and context”. (Bonhomme 2005 : 31)

Tropes have an integrated enunciative character, reaching both the rhetoric and the poetics with their classic subdomains argumentative elocution and literary aesthetics.

Taking into account the language of mathematics, we say that the discourse is not discourse plus figures, but figures are discourse or figures give discourse. Therefore, we believe that tropes and figures can exist in non-discursive texts (Jenny 1999), their function being to make discourse occur.

On the other hand, figures and tropes can be included in those instruments of discourse which ensure consistency and cohesion, moreover, it establishes it as a pragmatic entity. If these instruments, such as pragmatic connectors which give the meaning of discourse and organize it, then the phenomenon can be framed in their subclasses.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adam, Jean-Michel și Herman, Thierry, 2000,
Reformulation, répétition et style périodique dans l'appel du 18 juin 1940 [în] *Semen*, nr.12.
- Adam, Jean-Michel și Bonhomme, Marc, 2005,
Argumentarea publicitară. Retorica elogiului și a persuasiunii, Iași, Ed.Institutul European.
- Adam, Jean-Michel, 2008,
Lingvistica textuală, Iași, Ed.Institutul European.
- Adrados, R., Francisco et alii, 2008,
Dizionario di retorica e stilistica, Torino, UTET Libreria.
- Alexandrescu, Sorin, Nasta Mihail, 1972,
Poetică și stilistică. Orientări moderne (antologie), București, Ed. Univers.
- Alexandrescu, Vlad, 2001,
Pragmatique et théorie de l'énonciation: choix de textes, București, Ed.Universității din București.
- Amossy, Ruth, 2006,
L'argumentation dans le discours, Paris, Armand Colin.

- Andriescu, Alexandru, 1977,
Stil si limbaj, Iași, Ed.Junimea.
- Ardeleanu, S.M., Balățchi R.N., Coroi, I.C., Moroșan, N.L., 2007,
Perspectives discursives: concepts et corpus, Iași, Demiurg.
- Arcand, Richard, 2004,
Les figures de style. Allégorie, ellipse, hyperbole, métaphore, Quebec,
Édition de l'Homme.
- Ardeleanu, Sanda –Maria, 2009,
Discurs et images, Iași, Demiurg.
- Aristotel, 1965,
Poetica, București, Ed.Academiei.
- Armengaud Françoise, 1982,
Eléments pour une approche pragmatique de la pertinence [în]
Philosophica, nr.29, p.3–24.
- Aquien, Michèle, Molinié Georges, 2007,
Dictionnaire de rhétorique et de poétique, Librairie Générale
Française.
- Bacry, Patrick, 1992,
Les figures de style et autre procédés stylistique, Paris, Ed. Belin.
- Bahtin, Mihail, 1982,
Probleme de literatură și estetică, București, Ed. Univers.
- Barthes, Roland, 1970,
L'ancienne rhétorique [în] *Communications*, vol.16, p.172–223.

- Benveniste, Emile, 2000,
Probleme de lingvistică generală, vol.I–II, București, Ed.Teora (ediția în limba română).
- Berendonner, Alain, 1983,
Connecteurs pragmatiques et anaphores, [în] *Cahiers de linguistique française* 5, Université de Genève.
- Bettetini, Gianfranco, 1984,
Cauto elogio della ripetizione [în] **L’immagine al plurale: Serialità e ripetizione nel cinema e nella televisione**, Venezia, Marsilio, p. 923-102
- Biberi, Ion, 1968,
Poezia, mod de existență, București, E.P.L.
- Bidu-Vrânceanu A., Călărașu, C., Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu L., Mancaș M., Pană Dindelegan,G., 1997,
Dicționar general de științe. Științe ale limbii, București, Ed. Științifică.
- Black, M, 1979,
More about methafor [în] *Methaphor and thought*, Cambridge, p.4–19.
- Bonhomme, Marc, 1998,
Les figures clés du discours, Paris, Éd. du Seuil.
- Bonhomme, Marc, 2005,
Pragmatique des figures du discours, Paris, Honoré Champion Éditeur.
- Borcilă, Mircea, 1987,
Probleme actuale ale analizei discursului [în] CL, XXXII, nr.1, p. 63–70.

- Bouacha, Magid, Ali, 1993,
Enonciation, argumentation et discours: le cas de la généralisation, [în]
Semen nr.8.
- Bârliba, Maria Cornelia, 2000,
Filozofie și comunicare, Ed. Bren, București.
- Bremond, Claude, 1970,
Avant-propos [în] *Communications*, vol.16, p.1–2.
- Cadiot, Pierre, 2002,
Métaphore prédicative nominale et motifs lexicaux [în] *Langue française*,
nr.134, p.38–57.
- Charaudeau, Patrick, 1992,
Grammaire du sens et de l'expression, Paris, Hachette.
- Charaudeau, Patrick, Maingueneau, Dominique, 2002,
Dictionnaire d'analyse du discours, Paris, Seuil.
- Charaudeau, Patrick, 2005,
Le discours politique. Les masques du pouvoir, Paris, Vuibert.
- Charolles, M, 1995,
Cohésion, cohérence et pertinence du discours [în] *Travaux de
linguistique*, n.29, p.125–151.
- Chatman, Seymour, 1988,
Story&Discourse. Narrative Structure in Fiction & Film,
Ithaca & London, Cornell University Press.

- Chevalier, Jean, și Gheerbrant, Alain, 1995,
Dicționar de simboluri, București, Ed.Artemis, 3 vol.
- Cicero, 1973,
Opere alese, București, Editura Univers.
- Cohen, Jean, 1970,
Théorie de la figure [în] *Communications*, vol.16, p.3–25.
- Cohen, Jean, 1976,
Poésie et redondance [în] *Poétique*, nr.28, p.413–422.
- Compagnon, A., 1979,
La Seconde main ou le travail de la citation, Paris, Seuil.
- Coșeriu, E., 1994,
Prelegeri și conferințe, Institutul de filologie română A.Philippide, Iași.
- Coșeriu, Eugeniu, 1995,
Introducere în lingvistică, Cluj-Napoca, Ed. Dacia.
- Coșeriu, Eugeniu, 2000,
Lecții de lingvistică generală, Chișinău, Ed. Arc.
- Coteanu, Ion, 1978,
Ipoteze pentru o sintaxă a textului [în] *SCL*, anul XXIX, 2, p.115–124.
- Coteanu, Ion, 1990,
Gramatică. Stilistică. Compoziție, București, Ed. Științifică.
- Coteanu, Ion, 1990,
Stilistică și pragmatică [în] *SCL*, anul XLI, nr.2, p. 89– 99.

- Courtine, J., J., 1981,
Quelques problèmes théoriques et méthodologiques en analyse du discours, à propos du discours communiste adressé aux Chrétiens [în] *Langages*, nr.69, p.9–127.
- Cristea, Teodora, 1983,
Lingvistica discursului și didactica limbilor străine [în] *Limbile moderne în școală*, vol.I, p. 11–18.
- Dessons, Gérard, 2005,
Du discursif, [în] *Langages*, nr. 159, p.19–38.
- Detrie, C., Siblot, P., Verine, P., 2001,
Termes et concepts pour l'analyse du discours. Une approche praxématique, Paris, Honoré Champion Éditeur.
- Dragoș, Elena, 1981,
Structuri narative la Liviu Rebreanu, București, Ed.Științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Dragoș, Elena, 1997,
Ingambamentul - o structură semiotică [în] *Eonul Blaga. Întâiul veac*, culegere de lucrări dedicată Centenarului L.Blaga, îngrijită de M.Borcilă, București, Ed.Albatros.
- Dragoș, Elena, 1998,
Valențe pragmatice ale retoricii și valențe retorice ale pragmaticii [în] *SCL*, XLIX, nr.1–2, p.143 –149.

- Dragoș, Elena, 2000,
Introducere în pragmatică, Cluj-Napoca, Ed. Casa Cărții de Știință.
- Ducrot, O și Schaeffer, J. M., 1996,
Noul Dicționar enciclopedic al științelor limbajului, București,
Ed. Babel (ediția în limba română).
- Duda, Gabriela, 1988,
Hiperbolă și discurs poetic, [în] SCL, anul XXXIX, nr.5,
p. 397–403, București
- Duda, Gabriela, 2000,
Analiza textului literar, București, Ed. Humanitas Educațional.
- Du Marsais, C., C. , 1981,
Despre tropi, București, Ed. Univers, (ediția în limba română).
- Eco, Umberto, 1984,
Semiotica e filosofia del linguaggio, Torino.
- Eco, Umberto, 1997,
Șase plimbări prin pădurea narativă, traducere de Ștefania Mincu
Constanța, Ed. Pontica.
- Ene, Cornelia, 1983,
Rhetorical Questions within the theory of Speech Acts [în]
R.R.L.– C.L.T.A. XX , 1, p. 53–54.
- Florescu, Vasile, 1973,
Retorica și neoretorica, București, Ed. Academiei.

- Fontanier, Pierre, 1977,
Figurile limbajului, București, Ed. Univers (ediția în limba română).
- Foucault, Michel, 1969,
L'archeologie de savoir, Paris, Gallimard.
- Fromilhague, Catherine, 1995,
Les figures de style, Paris, Éd.Nathan.
- Funeriu, I., 1980,
Versificația românească, Timișoara, Ed. Facla.
- Genette, Gerard, 1969,
Figures II, Paris, Seuil.
- Genette, Gerard, 1972,
Figures III, Paris, Seuil.
- Genette, Gerard, 1978,
Figuri, București, Ed. Univers (ediția în limba română).
- Genette, Gerard, 1987,
Palimpsestes, Paris, Seuil.
- Genette, Gerard, 1988,
Le statut pragmatique de la fiction narrative, [în] *Poétique*, 78, aprilie.
- Gibbs, W., Raymond, 1994,
The poetic of mind, figurative thought, language and understanding,
Cambridge, England, Cambridge University Press.
- Goodman, N., 1967,
Languages of art, Indianapolis.

- Gréa Philippe, 2002,
Intégration conceptuelle et métaphore filée [în] *Langue française*,
vol.134, p.109–123.
- Greimas, A. et Courtés, J., 1993,
Sémiotique, dictionnaire raisonné de la théorie du langage, Paris,
Hachette Supérieur.
- Grice, H., P., 1979,
Logique et conversation, *Communications*, n.30, p.57–72.
- Grupul μ , 1974,
Retorică generală, București, Ed. Univers (ediția în limba română)
- Harris, Zelig, 1952,
Discourse Analyses [în] *Language*, nr. 2, p. 1–30.
- Ionescu, Cristina, Cerkez, Matei, 1997,
Gramatică și stilistică, București, Ed. All.
- Ionescu, Emil, 2001,
Manual de lingvistică generală, București, Ed. All.
- Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Liliana, 1991,
Narațiune și dialog în proza românească.
Elemente de pragmatică a textului literar, București, Ed. Academiei.
- Iordan, Iorgu, 1975,
Stilistica limbii române, București, Ed. Științifică.
- Irimia, Dumitru, 1999,
Introducere în stilistică, Iași, Ed. Polirom.

- Jaubert, Anna, 1988,
L'énonciation réflexive en première ligne, dessin de l'acte de parole [în]
Langue française, nr.79, p.64–81.
- Jaubert, Anna, 1990,
La lecture pragmatique, Ed.Hachette Supérieur.
- Jenny, Laurent, 1999,
Rostirea singulară, București, Ed. Univers.
- Kerbrat– Orecchioni, Catherine, 1980,
L'énonciation. De la subjectivité dans le langage, Paris,
Librairie Armand Colin.
- Kerbrat – Orecchioni, Catherine, 1994,
Rhétorique et pragmatique: les figures revisitées, [în] *Langue Française* nr.101, p.57–71.
- Kerbrat – Orecchioni, Catherine, 1995,
Le trilogue, Sous la direction de C.Kerbrat-Orecchioni et Christian Plantin. Publié avec le concours de CNRS et du Programme Pluriel en Sciences Humaines Rhone-Alpes. Publication de l'URA 1347, Groupe de Recherche sur Le Interactions Conversationnelles CNRS, Université Lyon 2.
- Lakoff, G, et Johnson, M, 1985,
Les Métaphores dans la vie quotidienne, Paris, Minuit.
- Lala Marie – Christine, 2000,
La processus de la répétition et le réel de la langue, [în] *Semen* nr.12.

- Landheer, Ronald, 1994,
Présentation [în] *Langue française* nr.101, p.3–12.
- Magheru, Paul, 1991,
Noțiuni de stil și compoziție, București, Ed. Coresi.
- Maingueneau, Dominique, 1976,
Initiation aux méthodes de l'analyse de discours. Problèmes et perspectives, Paris, Classiques Hâchettes, Libra.
- Maingueneau, Dominique, 1984,
Genèses du discours, Editeur 2, Galerie des prices, 1000 Bruxelles.
- Maingueneau, Dominique, 1987,
Nouvelle tendances en analyse du discours, Paris, Hâchette.
- Maingueneau, Dominique, 1990,
La lecture comme énonciation [în] **Pragmatique pour le discours littéraire**, Paris, Bordas, p.27–52.
- Maingueneau, Dominique, 1991,
L'Analyse du discours. Introduction aux lectures de l'archive, Paris, Hachette.
- Maingueneau, Dominique, 2000,
Linguistique et littérature: le tournant discursif [în] *Prospettive della francesistica nel nuovo assetto della didattica universitaria*, Società Univeritaria per gli Studi di Lingua et Letteratura Francese, Internazionale di Napoli, Pozzuoli.

- Maingueneau, Dominique, 2007a,
Pragmatică pentru discursul literar: enunțarea literară, Iași,
Ed. Institutul European (ediția în limba română).
- Maingueneau, Dominique, 2007b,
Analiza textelor de comunicare, Iași, Ed. Institutul European.
- Maingueneau, Dominique, 2007c,
Discursul literar: paratopie și scenă de enunțare, Iași, Ed. Institutul
European.
- Mancaș, Mihaela, 1988,
Coerența textului și figura retorică [in] SCL, anul XXXIX,
nr 4, p. 297–305.
- Mancaș, Mihaela, 1990,
Text și figură în postumele lui L. Blaga, [în] SCL, anul XLI, nr 3,
p. 223–242.
- Mancaș, Mihaela, 1991,
Limbajul artistic românesc în secolul XX, București, ED. Științifică.
- Manolescu, Nicolae, 2002,
Despre poezie, București, Ed. Aula.
- Marandin, J . M. , 1979,
**Problemes d' analyse du discours. Essais de description du discours
français sur la Chine** [în] *Langages*, 55, p.17–88.

- Marcus, Solomon, 1970,
Poetica matematică, București, Ed.Academiei.
- Marga, Delia, 2003,
Introducere în analiza discursului, Cluj-Napoca, Ed.Fundației pentru Studii Europene.
- Marian, Rodica, 1988,
Conector sintactic, figură și personaj în Luceafărul [în] SCL, anul XXXIX, n.4., p.317–322.
- Marque – Pucheu, Christiane, 2000,
Les figures entre langue et discours [în] *Langue Française*, n.129, p. 3–21.
- Mavrodin, Irina, 1982,
Poietică și poetică, București, Ed. Univers.
- Mihăilă, Ecaterina, 1995,
Textul poetic, București, Ed. Eminescu.
- Milaș, Constantin, 1988,
Introducere în stilistica oralității, București, Ed. Științifică și enciclopedică.
- Moeschler, J și Reboul, Anne, 1996,
Dicționar enciclopedic de pragmatică, Cluj-Napoca, Ed. Echinox (ed. în lb. română).
- Moeschler, J, Auchlin, A, 2005,
Introducere în lingvistica contemporană, Cluj-Napoca, Ed.Echinox.

- Molinié, Georges, 1994,
Problématique de la répétition
[în] *Langue française*, n.101, p.102–111.
- Morel, M, A, 1982,
Pour une typologie des figures de rhétorique: points de vue d’hier et d’aujourd’hui [în] *DRLAV*, nr.26.
- Morier, Henri, 1981,
Dictionnaire de poétique e de rhétorique, Paris, P.U.F.
- Morris, Charles, 2003,
Fundamentele teoriei semnelor, Cluj-Napoca, Ed.Fundației pentru Studii Europene.
- Munteanu, Ștefan, 1972,
Stil și expresivitate poetică, Ed. Științifică.
- Munteanu, Ștefan, 1995,
Introducere în stilistica operei literare, Timișoara, Ed. de Vest.
- Nasta, Mihail, 2008,
Les anaphores dans l’espace du poème [în] *RRL*, LIII, nr.3, p.261–279.
- Neț, Mariana, 1988,
Figura – funcție a textului poetic [în] *SCL*, anul XXXIX, nr.2,
p. 125–132.
- Neț, Mariana, 1988,
Figură și univers de discurs [în] *SCL*, anul XXXIX, nr. 5, p. 389–395.

- Neț, Mariana, 1988,
Figură și prozodie [în] SCL, XLIII, nr. 1, p. 55–59.
- Neț, Mariana, 1988,
Figura–rezultat al strategiei discursive [în] SCL,
anul XXXIX , nr. 3, p. 199–212.
- Neț, Mariana, 1990,
Figuri enunțiative și limbaj poetic [în] SCL, anul XLI , nr.3,
p. 193–199.
- Oancea, Ileana, 1988,
Istoria stilisticii românești, București, Ed. Științifică și
Enciclopedică.
- Ohmann, Richard, 1981,
Actele de vorbire și definiția literaturii [în] *Poetica Americană*.
Orientări moderne. Studii critice, antologie, note și bibliografie de
M. Borcilă și Richard McLain, Cluj - Napoca.
- Parpală, Emilia, 1984,
Poetica lui T. Arghezi. Modele semiotice și tipuri de text, București,
Ed. Minerva.
- Parpală – Afana, Emilia, 1998,
Introducere în stilistică, Pitești, Ed. Paralela 45.

- Perelman Ch. și Olbrechts-Tyteca L., 1988,
Traité de l'argumentation, Bruxelles, Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles.
- Pescheux, Marion, 2008,
Le feuillet de l'anaphorisation de «facette» en «degrés» [în] *Texto!*,
Revue électronique sous la direction de François Rastier, Publié par
l'Institut Ferdinand de Saussure, juillet, vol. XVIII, nr. 3.
- Pezzini, Isabella, 1994,
Le passioni del lettore, Bompiani, Milano.
- Plett, Heinrich F., 1983,
Știința textului și analiza de text, București, Ed. Univers.
- Pop, Liana, 1987,
Valences discursives [în] *RRL*, XXIX, 32, nr. 4, p. 377–394.
- Quintilian, 1974,
Arta oratorică, 3 vol., București, Editura Minerva.
- Randall, M, 1985,
Context and convention [în] *Poetics*, vol. 14, oct., p. 415–433.
- Rabatel, A, 2008,
Points de vue en confrontation dans les antimetaboles Plus et Moins [în]
Langue française, n. 160, p. 21–36.
- Rastier, François, 1989,
Sens et textualité, Paris, Hachette.

- Rastier, François, 1994,
Tropes et sémantique linguistique [în] *Langue française*, nr. 101, p.80–101.
- Rastier, François, 2001,
Indécidable hypallage [în] *Langue Française*, nr. 129.
- Richards, I. A., 1936,
The philosophy of rethoric, Oxford.
- Ricoeur, Paul, 1984,
Metafora vie, București, Ed. Univers.
- Reboul, Anne și Moeschler, Jacques, 1998,
Pragmatique du discours [în] **De l'interprétation de l'énoncé à l'interprétation du discours**, Paris, Seuil.
- Reboul, Anne & Moeschler, Jacques, 2001,
Pragmatica azi, Cluj-Napoca, Ed. Echinox.
- Reboul, Anne, 1991,
Comparaisons littérales, comparaisons non- littérales et métaphores,
Tranel 17, p. 75–96.
- Riffaterre, M, 1969,
La métaphore filée dans la poésie surréaliste [în] *Langue française*, n.3,
p.46–60.
- Robrieux, Jean, Jacques, 1993
Éléments de rhétorique et d'argumentation, Paris, Dunod.

- Roulet, Eddy et alli, 2001,
Une modèle et un instrument d'analyse de l'organisation de discours,
Bern, Berlin, Bruxelles.
- Roventă - Frumușani, Daniela, 2005,
Analiza discursului. Ipoteze și ipostaze, București, Ed.Tritonic.
- Rumelhart, D.E., 1979,
Some problems with the notion of literal meanings [în]
Metaphor and thought, Ortoni, Cambridge University Press.
- Runcanu-Măgureanu, Anca, 1987,
Aspecte semantice ale constituirii textului [în]
Semantică și semiotică, București, Ed. Științifică și
Enciclopedică.
- Saint- Pierre Madeleine, 1991,
Illocutoire et modalisation: les marqueurs d'intensité en français [în]
Revue québécoise de linguistique, vol.20, nr.2, p.223–236.
- Salbayre, Sébastien, Vincent -Arnaud, Nathalie, 2006,
L'analyse stylistique. Textes littéraires de langue anglaise, Presses
Universitaires du Mirail, Université de Toulouse-Le Mirail.
- Sălăvăstru, Constantin, 2001,
Critica raționalității discursive, București, Ed.Polirom.
- Searle, John, 1972,
Les actes de langage, Paris, Hermann.

- Searle, John, 1975,
A Clasification of illocutionary acts [în] *Language in Society*, 5,
p. 1-25, Cambridge University Press.
- Segre, Cesare, 1986,
Discurs [în] *Istorie –Cultură-Critică*, București, Ed.Univers,
p. 316–358 (ediția în limba română).
- Sorea, Daniela, 2007,
Pragmatics: some cognitive perspectives, București, Ed.Universității.
- Sperber, D., & Wilson, D.,1989,
La pertinence, Paris, Minuit.
- Spiridon, Monica, 1984,
Despre „aparența” și „realitatea” literaturii, București, Ed.Univers.
- Starobinski, J., 1971,
Les mots sur les mots.Les anagrammes de Ferdinand de Saussure,
Gallimard, Paris.
- **Studii de limbă și stil**, 1973,
Timișoara, Ed.Facla.
- **Studii de poetică și stilistică**, 1966,
București, EPL.
- **Studii de stilistică, poetică și semiotică**, 1980,
Cluj-Napoca.
- Suhamy, Henry, 2004,
Les figures de style, Paris, Press Universitaires de France.

- Șera, Nicolae, 2002,
Les figures du discours eliadesque [în] *Lingua*, nr.1, iunie.
- Șerbănescu, Andra, 1992,
Nivelurile pragmatice ale textului literar [în] *SCL*, XLIII, nr. 5,
p. 479–482, București.
- Șerbănescu, Andra, 2002,
Întrebarea - teorie și practică, Iași, Ed. Polirom.
- Tamine, J, 1979,
Métaphore et syntaxe, [în] *Langages*, n.54, p.65–81.
- Tămâianu, Emma, 2001,
Fundamentele tipologiei textuale, Cluj-Napoca, Ed. Clusium.
- Todorov, Tzvetan, 1978,
Les genres du discours, Paris, Éd. du Seuil.

Todorov, Tzvetan, 1983,
Teorii ale simbolului, București, Ed. Univers (ediția în limba română).
- Tomașevski, Boris, 1973,
Teoria literaturii. Poetica, București, Ed. Univers.
- Verine, Bertrand, 2008,
La parole hyperbolique en interaction: une figuralité entre soi-même et même [în] *Langue française*, n.160, p.117–132.
- Vianu, Tudor, 1968,
Studii de stilistică, București, Ed. Didactică și Pedagogică.

- Vianu, Tudor, 1965,
Despre stil și artă literară, București, Ed. Tineretului.
- Vlad, Carmen, 1982,
Semiotica criticii literare, București, Ed. Științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Vlad, Carmen, 1994,
Sensul, dimensiune esențială a textului, Cluj-Napoca, Ed.Dacia.
- Wellek, René, și Warren, Austin, 1967,
Teoria literaturii, București, Ed. Pentru Literatură Universală.
- Zafiu, Rodica, 1988,
Figuri ale discursivității [în] SCL, anul XXXIX, nr. 4,
p. 307–316.