SPEAKING - A FORMAL APPARATUS

Ana Cristina POPESCU
University of Piteşti

Abstract: *The speaking is directly responsible of certain classes of signs. We must distinguish between the entities which have their full and permanent status in language and the ones which only exist in the "individual" network created by the speaking itself and throughout a "here- there" report of the "locator" (the speaker). The written speaking should be distinguished by the spoken one. Great perspectives open to analyze the complex forms of the speech.*

Key words: *language, lexical changes, speaking***.**

All the linguistic descriptions take into consideration the importance of the use of the forms. But the conditions of the use of the forms are not identical with the conditions of the use of the language. There are different worlds and we should insist on this difference which implies another way of seeing, describing and interpreting the same things.

The use of the forms gave birth to a number of models. The diversity of the linguistic structures cannot be reduced to a less number of models.

Speaking is the functioning of the language.

The speech which is produced every time we talk is the word itself. We should be attentive to the specific condition of the speaking-it is the act of producing a speech and not the text which we are talking about.

Speaking supposes the individual conversion of the language into speech. The problem is very delicate because we should distinguish the way in which the sense transforms itself into words and in which way we should distinguish between the two notions and in which terms to describe their interaction.

We should also analyze another perspective- the defining of the speaking. Some of its features are necessary and permanent; some are incident and are related to the chosen idiom.

In speaking, we notice the act itself, the situations in which it realizes itself and it is the instrument of the performance. The individual act through which we use the language introduces the locutor first. Before speaking, the language is only the possibility of the language. After speaking, the language turned into speech which comes from a locutor, and it gives birth to other speeches.

Speaking is defined as an appropriate process. The locutor appropriates the formal apparatus of the language.

The language is used starting from a report with the people. The condition is for the locutor the need to express through speech.

The individual act of appropriating the language introduces the one who speaks in its word. The presence of the locutor in speaking makes every speech instance be an intern reference center. This situation will manifest through a specific game of forms. Their function is to place the locutor into a constant relation with its speaking.

This description is a little abstract and it is applied to a familiar linguistic phenomenon. It is about the appearance of the person index- the "I- you" report which is produced in and through speaking. The "I" term expresses the person who speaks and the "you" term –the person who is present as an ilocutor.

BDD-A5733 © 2009 Universitatea din Piteşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 03:09:52 UTC)

The same happens with the terms “here”- “there”, “this”- “that” which implies a gesture describing the object in the same time in which it is pronounced the instance of the term.

The forms traditionally described like “personal, demonstrative pronouns” appear like a class of “linguistic individuals”. But these “linguistic individuals” are born from speaking and they are produced by this individual event. They are produced again and again when the speaking is realized and every time they appear as new ones.

The verbal “tenses” whose axis form- the present- coincides with the moment of speaking, are part of this necessary apparatus. It is part of the thinking. It is produced from and through speaking. From the moment of speaking the category of the present acts itself and it gives birth to the category of time/tense. The present is the source of the time. It represents this presence of the world which is possible with the help of the speaking act. The formal present only clarifies the inherent present of speaking, which renews at every speech. Starting from this continuum present it appears the feeling of a continuity which is called “time”, the continuity and the temporality creating themselves in the present of the speaking.

Speaking is directly responsible of certain classes of signs. We must distinguish between the entities which have their full and permanent status in language and those which, starting from speaking, exist only in the network of “individuals” which is created by the speaking and through a “here-there” report of the locutor. For example: “the I”, “this”, “the tomorrow” of the grammar description are the metalinguistical nouns of “I’, “this”, “tomorrow” which are produced by the speaking.

In the moment in which the person who speaks is serving by the language to influence the behavior of the alocutor this way, he uses an apparatus of functions. First, the interrogation is a speaking built to release an answer through a linguistic process which is a process of behavior with a double access in the same time. All lexical and syntactical forms of the interrogation – parts, pronouns, sequence and intonation etc- show this aspect of speaking.

We’ll attribute to it terms or forms which we call them terms of challenge: order, callings included in categories such as: the imperative, the vocative, implying a dynamic report from a speaker to another one.

In its syntactic structure and in its intonation, the assertion intends to communicate and it represents the most common manifestation of the presence of the locutor in speaking. It has specific instruments which expresses it, the “yes” “no” words claiming a sentence affirmatively or negatively. The negation is independent from speaking; it has its own form, which is “not”. But the assertive particles “not”-“yes” classify in the forms which represents the speaking.

What characterizes speaking generally, is the underlining the discursive relation with the partner, being it real or imaginary, individual or collective.

This characterizing form settles the figurative frame of the speaking. As a speech form the speaking settles two necessary “figures”: one is the source, the other one is the speaking purpose. This is the structure of the dialogue. Two “figures” in the position of a partner are the protagonists of the speaking.

We should complain about the fact that there might be a dialogue outside speaking or speaking without a dialogue. Both cases must be examined: in reality there is no dialogue, or speaking. None of the two partners enunciates itself: all consists in quoted proverbs and in versus-proverbs versus-quotations. There is no explicit reference to the disputed object. The one from the two rivals who disposes of the biggest proverb

BDD-A5733 © 2009 Universitatea din Pitești
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 03:09:52 UTC)

store or who uses them with the greatest craftsmanship reduces the other one to silence and it is the winner.

Contrary, "the monologue" comes from speaking. It must be established like a dialogue variety, a fundamental structure. The monologue is an interior dialogue formulated into an "interior language" between a locutor "I" and a listener "I". Sometimes the locutor "I" speaks alone. The presence of the other "I" is necessary to give sense to the speaking of the locutor "I". Sometimes the listener "I" is present through an objection, a question, a doubt, an insult. The linguistic form this intervention takes differs taking into consideration the idioms, but here we also talk about a "personal" form.

These situations would impose a double description of the linguistic form and of the figurative conditions.

Many other details should be studied in the speaking context. We should notice the lexical changes which the speaking determines, the phraseology which is the frequent mark, maybe necessary, of the "orality" .We should also distinguish the spoken speaking from the written speaking. It moves on two plans: the writer speaks writing and in the interior of the writing makes the individuals to speak to themselves.

Great perspectives open to the analyzing of the complex forms of the speech, starting from here.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

André Martinet, *Elemente de lingvistică generală*, Editura Ştiinţifică, Buc., 1970
Armengaud, Francoise, *La pragmatique,* P.U.F., Paris, 1985
Aurel Codoban, *Semn şi interpretare. O introducere postmodernă în semiologie şi hermeneutică*, Ed. "Dacia", Cluj-Napoca, 2001
Bernard Miège, Gîndirea comunicaţională, Cartea Românească, Buc., 1998
Besançon, Alain, *Les origines intellectuelles du leninism,* Calmann-Levy, Paris, 1976
Daniel Bougnoux, *Introducere în ştiinţele comunicării*, Polirom, Iaşi, 2000
Denis McQuail, *Comunicarea*, Institutul European, Iaşi, 1999
Dragoş, Elena, *Introducere în pragmatică,* Casa Cărţii de Ştiinţă, Cluj, 2000
Eco, Umberto, *Tratat de semiotică generală,* Editura Ştiinţifică şi Pedagogică, Bucureşti, 1982
Garcia-Berrio, Antonio, *A Theory of the Literary Text,* Walter de Gruyter, Berlin New York, 1992
Heinrich F. Plett, *Ştiinţa textului şi analiza de text*, Editura Univers, Bucureşti, 1983
***, *Pentru o teorie a textului*, Editura Univers, Bucureşti, 1980
J.J. van Cuilenburg, O. Scholten, G.W. Noomen, *Ştiinţa comunicării*, Humanitas, Buc., 2000
John Fiske, *Introducere în ştiinţele comunicării*, Polirom, Iaşi, 2003
King, Larry, *Secretele comunicării*, Editura Almatea, Bucureşti, 1999
Lucien Sfez, *Comunicarea*, Institutul European, Iaşi, 2002
Mihai Dinu, *Comunicarea*, Editura ştiinţifică, Bucureşti, 1999
Moeschler, J. Reboul, A., *Dictionaire encyclopedique de pragmatique*, Seuil, Paris, 1994
Murăreţ I. şi A., *Petit traité de Rhétorique*, curs, Bucureşti, 1990
Niki Stanton, *Comunicarea*, Ed. Şt. & T., Bucureşti, 1995
Oswald Ducrot, Jean.Marie Schaeffer, *Noul dicţionar al ştiinţelor limbajului*, Editura Babel, Bucureşti, 1996
Paul Ricoeur, *De la text la acţiune*, Editura Echinox, Cluj, 1999
Plett, Heinrich, *Ştiinţa textului şi analiza de text,* Editura Univers, Bucureşti, 1983
Popescu, Dan, *Arta de a comunica*, Editura Economică, Bucureşti, 1999
Reding, J. F., *Les Fondaments philosophiques de la rhétorique chez les sophistes chinois,* Neuchatel, 1985
Roman Jakobson, "Linguistique et poetique" in *Essais de linguistique générale*, Ed. de Minuit, Paris, 1970
Slama-Cazacu, Tatiana, *Stratageme comunicaţionale şi manipularea,* Polirom, Iaşi, 2000

BDD-A5733 © 2009 Universitatea din Piteşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 03:09:52 UTC)

Stati, Sorin, *Le transfrastique*, PUF, Paris, 1990
Tim O'Sullivan, John Hartley, Danny Saunders, Martin Montgomery, John Fiske, *Concepte fundamentale din ştiinţele comunicării şi studiile culturale*, Iaşi, Polirom, 2001
Todorov, Tzvetan, *Teorii ale simbolului*, Univers, Bucureşti, 1980
Vasile Florescu, *Retorica şi neoretorica. Geneză, evoluţie, perspective*, Bucureşti, Ed. Acad. R.S.R., 1973
Vera F. Birkenbihl, *Antrenamentul comunicării sau arta de a ne înţelege*, Gemma Pres, Bucureşti, 1998
Vlad, Carmen, *Textul aisberg*, Casa Cărţii de Ştiinţă, Cluj, 2000
Zafiu, Rodica, "Figurile textului ironic", in C. Vlad (ed.) *Semiotică şi poetică (3),* Editura Universităţii "Babeş-Bolyai, Cluj, 1987.

BDD-A5733 © 2009 Universitatea din Pitești
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 03:09:52 UTC)