



Universidad de Valladolid

FACULTAD de FILOSOFÍA Y LETRAS

DEPARTAMENTO de FILOLOGÍA INGLESA

Grado en Estudios Ingleses

TRABAJO DE FIN DE GRADO

The Influence of Context, Geographic Position and Language in the Use of Person, Time and Space Deictics: Barack Obama “Yes, We Can” and David Cameron “Farewell Speech”.

Zulema Estévez Gómez

Tutor: Isabel Pizarro

2016/2017

Abstract:

Although deixis has been analysed in political speeches and texts in general, little is known about the influence of language, geographic position, and context when using person, time, and space deictics. The overall idea about deixis is that, in the case of political speeches, it can be used to persuade the audience. This study analyses two different political speeches; different in time, ideology, country, and context, they are Barack Obama's 'Yes We Can' (January 8th, 2008) and David Cameron's 'Farewell Speech outside Downing Street' (July 13th, 2016). The first takes place in an electioneering environment and the second in a farewell context. The analysis of the two speeches identifies that the context influences the use of person and time deictics. Meanwhile, the geographic position and the language do not influence the use of deictics.

Keywords: Political Speech, Deictics, Language, Context, Geographic Position, Discourse Analysis.

Resumen:

Aunque la deixis ha sido ya analizada en discursos políticos y en textos en general; la influencia del lenguaje, la situación geográfica y el contexto sobre el uso de los deícticos de persona, tiempo y lugar son aspectos poco estudiados hasta hoy en día. Se tiene una idea general sobre lo que es la deixis y es que normalmente cuando hablamos de ella recordamos su uso persuasivo en discursos políticos. Este estudio usa dos discursos políticos muy diferentes entre sí, el de Barack Obama 'Yes, We Can' y el de David Cameron 'Farewell Speech outside Downing Street'. El análisis de estos discursos permite identificar que el contexto influye en el uso de los deícticos de persona y tiempo, mientras que el lenguaje y la situación geográfica no influyen en el uso de ninguno de los deícticos.

Palabras clave: Discurso Político, Deícticos, Idioma, Contexto, Posición Geográfica, Análisis del Discurso.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	5
2. Theoretical Framework	7
3. State of the Art	9
4. Materials	10
5. Methodology	12
6. Analysis	17
6.1 Obama (Yes, We Can)	17
6.2 Farewell Speech (Cameron)	19
7. Discussion: Deixis	22
7.1 Person Deixis	22
7.2 Time Deixis	26
7.3 Space Deixis	27
8. Discussion: Context, Language and Geographic position	28
8.1 Context	28
8.2 Language	30
8.3 Geographic Position	30
9. Conclusion	31
10. Bibliography	34
11. Annexes	37
11.1 Obama: Yes, We Can	37
11.2 Cameron: Farewell Speech outside Downing Street	41

TABLES

Table 1: Obama (Person Deixis).	13
Table 2: Cameron (Person Deixis).	14
Table 3: Obama (Time Deixis).	14
Table 4: Cameron (Time Deixis).	15
Table 5: Obama (Space Deixis).	15
Table 6: Cameron (Space Deixis).	16
Table 7: Yes, We Can-Person Deictics: Exclusive Use.	17
Table 8: Yes, We Can-Person Deictics: Inclusive Use.	18
Table 9: Farewell Speech-Person Deictics: Exclusive Use.	20
Table 10: Farewell Speech-Person Deictics: Inclusive Use.	21

1. INTRODUCTION

Deixis has been analysed in different aspects of language. Political speeches have also been analysed for different purposes, Obama's 'Yes, We Can' being one of the most well-known for being studied in terms of deixis. At this point, given that Barack Obama's 'Yes, We Can' speech has had a huge impact in the American society, it is interesting to compare this great speech with another one, David Cameron's 'Farewell Speech outside Downing Street'. This was a speech given at the time of Brexit in the United Kingdom that was also relevant and marked the beginning of something new. Its background along with that of Obama's speech is explained in the 'Materials' section. The aim of this research is to compare these two speeches in terms of deixis, particularly person, time, and space deictics. Their possible differences and similarities are evaluated since one of them was given in the United States of America by a Democrat and the other was given in the United Kingdom by a Conservative, from a different country and different ideology.

At this point, it is crucial to consider some questions. Can a different geographic position influence the use of deictics? Can a different type of the English language mean a different use of deixis? Can different contexts affect the use of deictics? To answer these questions a deep analysis is required, examining to what extent deictics of time, person, and space are presented in the texts: what are their uses, what is the effect or feeling they create in the audience, and which are the differences and similarities, when using deictics, between the two political discourses? Before carrying out the study, the following primary hypotheses can be deducted: in Obama's speech the first person plural 'we' is used in a more persuasive way since it was part of his presidential campaign; meanwhile Cameron's speech is a farewell and it does not have a persuasive aim.

Both Obama's and Cameron's speeches may have differences in terms of the use of deictics, since American English and British English differ in some points. It is also important to note that the analysis of these deictics is an important process when analysing a political discourse. Depending on deictics, a speech can have one meaning or another, or can influence or persuade the audience. Through the comparison and

analysis of these two different political speeches in terms of deixis, a very engaging outcome can be obtained.

Considering all that is explained above, this research adopts the following structure:

- Introduction. This section includes a brief opening about the project, the objectives, the research questions, and the hypotheses.
- Theoretical Framework. This section includes a description of deixis and deictics of person, time, and space.
- State of the Art. This section includes an explanation of some research papers in which the deixis in narratives, business, and political speeches has already been investigated.
- Materials. This section covers the general background of the two political speeches, including the speakers' political life, as well as a brief summary of what the speeches are about.
- Methodology. This section explains how the research is developed showing the linguistics elements analysed, as well as the tools used to obtain the results.
- Analysis. This part is divided in two: 'Obama: Yes, We Can' and 'Cameron: Farewell Speech'. The first includes the frequency of deictics in Obama's speech, and the second includes the frequency in Cameron's. Both contain two tables with the extended context of the pronouns (exclusive and inclusive use) to display their uses simply.
- Discussion: Deixis. This section is divided into three parts: person, time and space. In the three sections, the speeches are compared in terms of the use of deictics, establishing their differences and similarities. This section also includes convincing support for the persuasive 'we' hypothesis.
- Discussion: Context, Language and Geographic Position. In this section the influence of context, language, and geographic position are established in the

use of deictics in Obama's and Cameron's speeches. This section also includes support for the American and British English hypothesis.

- Conclusion. A brief is given of all the results of the analysis of deictics in both speeches as well as the results of the hypotheses.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Deixis comes from the Greek term δειξίς, a noun related to the verb *deicnymi* that means 'show', 'point', 'bring to light', 'aim', 'say', etc (Olza 40); knowing that this term comes from Greek culture, it is obvious that it was analysed during the Greek period and also in the Roman period (Carbonero 12). It is also important to highlight that it refers to the peculiar way language has to record and name all that is before one's very eyes (Rodríguez Guzmán 239); in other words, deixis is used to indicate persons, times, and places that cannot be understood without knowing information about the context. 'Deixis concerns the ways in which language encodes features of the context of utterance' (Levinson 54). For instance, the uses of the pronouns 'I' and 'you' in the sentence 'I will give you a present', are unrecognizable because it is impossible to know who is 'I' and 'you' without knowing the context in which this sentence is said.

Deixis is related to the use of a pronoun since it substitutes other elements in the sentence. According to K. Bühler, personal pronouns can be considered the first deictics since they point out basic communication elements: issuer and receiver (Carbonero 15). Not only pronouns are considered deictics, however; there are also other deictics such as possessives, adjectives, adverbs, or adverbials. As stated above, language can communicate what is around us in different ways, including deictics, words that also come from Greek culture, that refer to those words that require an oral or written indication of what they refer to and whose meaning depend on the context. They also reveal 'how the speaker visualizes the situation at the time of utterance' (Durocher 20).

The three traditional types that are analysed here are the deictics of person, time, and space. None of these could be comprehensible by the hearer without knowing the background of the utterance (Durocher 20).

The first involves ‘the encoding of the role of participants in the speech event’ (Levinson 62). It refers to personal pronouns (singular or plural) in first person when the speaker refers to himself, in second person when the speaker refers to one or more addressees, or in third person when the speaker refers to people who are neither the speaker nor addressee (Levinson 62). When it is used the first person plural, there are two possible uses: the inclusive use, which includes the speaker, addressee, and other people in the same situation; and the exclusive use, which includes the speaker and other persons, but not the addressee.

The second type ‘concerns the encoding of temporal points relative to the time’ in which the speech was carried out (Levinson 62) and it points out adverbs, verb tenses, and adverbials that denote time. When they are adverbs or verb tenses they are called pure deictics, and when they are adverbials they are declared impure deictics.

The third type involves encoding places relative to that in which the utterance takes place (Levinson 62). It includes those words that indicate space, as well as time deixis. These are divided in two: pure deictics, when only a word appears, and impure, when there is more than one word indicating a place.

Having explained the types of deictics, it is important to consider the notion of the deictic centre in order to understand their uses in both speeches. This deictic centre refers ‘to the speaker and hearer’s location in time and place and also to their position in a social hierarchy’ (McIntyre 92); basically it refers to the position from which they interpret the deictic, it is an indicative of our point of view. To clarify the concept of deictic centre, it is useful to use an example. If one considers oneself as the deictic centre and has a mobile phone next to one, one would call it ‘this’ mobile phone because it is near one. But if one had it far away, one would designate it ‘that’ mobile phone. As it is stated in the book written by Poggi et al ‘Multimodal Communication in Political Speech: Shaping Minds and Social Action’, the use of deictics is a technique widely used in political discourses in order to associate with or dissociate from actions which the speaker or his or her collaborators performed in different situations and periods of time (100).

3. STATE OF THE ART

Deixis is a linguistic resource that has already been investigated in different contexts. For this reason, it is important to discuss in advance some of the studies that have already been executed.

The first chosen example is a research paper by Duchan et al, about deixis in narrative, examined from the perspective of cognitive science. The purpose of this investigation was to understand how deixis is used in narrative discourse and how it is experienced by the reader. In this study the author obtained the following result: If we suppose that a reader of a narrative is assumed to create a mental model of the ‘story world’, and to imagine that he or she is located in it, the deictic centre of the reader would therefore be an image of himself or herself in the story world. With this in mind, the reader experiences and understands the story from the deictic centre. This means that the author of the narrative can handle the deictic centre of the reader using different perspectives in the story (448).

Deixis has also been studied in a business environment, for example in the work ‘Deixis Used on Business Brochures Text: A Pragmatics Study’ written by Rotua et al, in which 32 brochures taken from launching products in 2014 were analysed in order to learn which type of deixis is used most in these types of texts. The results were that ‘There are 5 types of deixis used in business brochures text; 16.33% used Person Deixis, 5.71% used Location/spatial Deixis, 5.31% used Temporal Deixis, 63.27% used Discourse Deixis, and 9.39% used Social Deixis’ (171).

There is also another type of investigative works about deixis, those that analyse deixis in political speeches, for instance ‘The Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches’ written by Jessica Håkansson. She uses two political speeches, one by George W. Bush and one by Barack Obama to discover to whom the pronouns ‘I’, ‘you’, ‘we’, and ‘they’ refer. The results were that ‘the pronoun ‘I’ is used when the speaker wants to speak as an individual rather than as a representative of a group’ (10), ‘you’ is used both as generic pronoun as well as a way for the President to speak to the Congress’ (12). The pronoun “we” is employed in order to show ‘a sense of collectivity

and to share responsibility' (14), referring to Congress and the president. Finally, 'they' is used to separate *themselves* from the people that belong to the collective of 'we' (17).

Another example of the study of deixis in political speeches is the book written by Jonathan Charteris-Black, in which he analyses deixis (time, space, person) in President Kennedy's inaugural address. With the results obtained, he states that 'Deixis in all its forms (person, space, time) contributes to underline rhetorical purposes and therefore to the overall coherence of the speech' (Charteris 61). Another example is the study done by Hernández and López, whose purpose was also observe deictics in political communication. The result of this study was that deixis plays an important role in political speeches since deictics introduce the hearer. For this reason, politicians usually introduce these deictics as a discursive strategy since by introducing the hearer in the speech itself, the speaker can call his or her attention and can influence him or her. (171).

With these examples, it can be seen that different aspects of deixis have been investigated. The comparison between Obama's 'Yes, We Can' and Cameron's 'Farewell Speech outside Downing Street' speeches, in terms of their possible differences due to language, context, and geographic position, is a different kind of study.

4. MATERIALS

The two speeches used in this research are Obama's 'Yes, We Can' and Cameron's 'Farewell Speech outside Downing Street'. The backgrounds of both are explained below for a better understanding.

Spoken by the Democrat Barack Obama in the United States on January 8th, 2008, 'Yes, We Can' is a political discourse with 1,238 words that has had much impact in American society. Similarly, 'Farewell Speech outside Downing Street', recited by the British prime minister David Cameron on July 13th, 2016, is another political discourse with 1,070 words that has also had an impact in society since it meant the end of Cameron's term after the victory of Brexit.

Obama is an exceptionally inspiring speaker. Professionally, before becoming the 44th president of the United States, ‘he was a community organizer, civil-rights lawyer, and teacher before pursuing a political career’ (Barack Obama Biography). He was then elected to the Illinois State Senate in 1996, then as a United States senator in 2004. He was elected as the president of the United States in 2008 and re-elected in 2012 against the Republican challenger Mitt Romney (Barack Obama Biography). Focusing on the speech itself, it was recited while he was running for the presidency of the United States. It marked the arrival of the first African-American president and also the end of the Republican George W. Bush presidency, in which some controversial events occurred such as the September 11th attacks, in which thousands of people died. To summarize the content of the speech, the author presents a new vision of a country that is transforming, and discusses a number of problems the United States deals with such as education, taxes, and wars, and how these problems would be solved if he were to win the White House.

The second speech was narrated by Cameron ‘best known for being a revolutionary leader of the Britain's Conservative Party’ (David Cameron Biography). He was elected prime minister of the United Kingdom in 2010. He reported his resignation in 2016 with a speech after people in the United Kingdom voted to leave the European Union (David Cameron Biography). Throughout this speech, ‘Farewell Speech outside Downing Street’, the author evaluates all that had been done during his period as a prime minister, mentioning his achievements and things that were not done so well. He also shows his concern about people’s well-being, thanks people that support and help him in his decisions such as his children and wife, and shows his happiness that the position will be taken by a woman of the same party. It can be said that it is a speech in which he says goodbye to his position and passes it on to the new prime minister, Theresa May. It marked the arrival of a new prime minister in Britain after the referendum in which it was decided if the United Kingdom would continue being part of the European Union. The result of the referendum was ‘yes’ to Brexit (no longer belonging to the European Union).

5. METHODOLOGY

The aim of this research is to analyse the possible differences and similarities between Obama's 'Yes, We Can' speech and Cameron's 'Farewell Speech outside Downing Street' in terms of deixis.

The method I have followed to perform this research is the following.

In order to easily identify and quantify the person deictics in Obama's and Cameron's speeches, I have used Antconc programme, 'a freeware corpus analysis toolkit for concordancing and text analysis' (Anthony). The fact that person deictics are confined to pronouns allows analysis with this tool. Firstly, I analysed Obama's speech by uploading it in TXT format to the Antconc programme because it only works with TXT documents. I then used the wordlist option that determines the frequency of each word; in this case, I have created two wordlists with the pronouns I decided to use: the personal pronouns (object and subject) list and the possessive pronouns list. Secondly, I did the same with Cameron's speech; I uploaded this speech in TXT format to Antconc and I used the wordlist tool with the same two wordlists than in Obama's speech (personal pronouns and possessive pronouns). Finally, in order to compare the results, I created a table to easily display the frequency of deictics in each speech.

To look for the rest of deictics (time and place) I used the speeches themselves, since these types of deictics are formed by adverbs and adverbials; they are an open category and there is no way to find them using a programme. For this reason, firstly, I read Obama's speech carefully trying to identify all adverbs and adverbials that denote time (past, present, future situation) or place (proximity or remoteness from deictic centre), such as 'tonight', 'here', and 'now'. I counted them, one by one, in order to see which deictics are most used. Secondly, I examined Cameron's speech, trying to identify those adverbials, such as 'in our society', 'today', and 'now'. Finally, in order to compare both results, I created another table to demonstrate the frequency of space and time deictics in each speech.

This research is also based on authors, such as Marmaridou and Chilton who have already studied deictics in political speeches, as well as other authors who write about

political speeches analysis. The studies and the results of their investigations have been a great help while carrying out this research, since these studies have been useful for contrasting the different ideas they have about deixis with the idea I have. Their works help to explain the concept of deixis and better understand it. These studies have also been used to argue some ideas in the work, in a way some quotes of their books are used to clarify some ideas helping to the development of this work.

Person Deixis

Table 1. Obama

Personal Pronouns			
Subject Pronouns	Object Pronouns	Possessive Pronouns	Absolute and Relative Frequency
I	me	my	I: 4→0.3% me: 0 my: 0
you	you	your	you: 19→1.5% your: 2→0.1%
he	him	his	he: 0 him: 0 his: 0
she	her	her	she: 1→0.08% her: 1→0.08%
it	it	its	it: 13→1% its: 0
we	us	our	we: 58→4.6% us: 1→0.08% our: 18→1.4%
they	them	their	they: 9→0.7% them: 3→0.2% their: 2→0.1%

Table 2. Cameron

Personal Pronouns			
Subject Pronouns	Object Pronouns	Possessive Pronouns	Absolute and Relative Frequency
I	me	my	I: 30→2.8% me: 8→0.7% my: 8→0.7%
you	you	your	you: 8→0.7% your: 0
he	him	his	he: 0 him: 0 his: 0
she	her	her	she: 0 her: 3→0.2%
it	it	its	it: 13→1.2% its: 1→0.09%
we	us	our	we: 12 →1.1% us: 2→0.1% our: 23→2.1%
they	them	their	they: 1→0.09% them: 2→0.1% their: 3→0.2%

Time Deixis

Table 3. Obama

Adverbs and Adverbials		
Past	Present	Future
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Before. - A few weeks ago. - A year ago. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tonight (3). - At this moment. - Now. - In our time. - Right now. - This time. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the weeks and months to come. - Tomorrow.
Absolute and Relative Frequency		
3→0.2%	8→0.6%	2→0.1%

Table 4. Cameron

Adverbs and Adverbials		
Past	Present	Future
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Before (2). - Six years ago. - In the past. - Eleven years ago. - Over these last six years. - For the last two years. - For the last time. - On that evening in May 2010. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Today (3). - Now (2). - This moment. 	
Absolute and Relative Frequency		
9→0.8%	6→0.5%	

Space Deixis

Table 5. Obama

Adverbs and Adverbials	
Proximity	Remoteness
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Here (3). - In New Hampshire (2). - In America (4). - In this election. - From Iowa or New Hampshire. - In Las Vegas. - In Spartanburg. - In Dillon. - On the streets on L.A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In Des Moines and Davenport. - In Lebanon and Concord. - In Iraq (2). - Overseas. - In Afghanistan.
Absolute and Relative Frequency	
15→1.2%	6→0.4%

Table 6. Cameron

Adverbs and Adverbials	
Proximity	Remoteness
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Here. - In Downing Street. - In our world. - For this great country. - In our country. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On the other side of the world.
Absolute and Relative Frequency	
5→0.4%	1→0.09%

6. ANALYSIS

6.1 Obama: Yes, We Can

The analysis first focusses on Obama's 'Yes, We Can'. The most prominent person deictics used here are the first person plural 'we', 'our', and 'us', which are used 58 times (4,6%), 18 times (1,4%), and once (0,08%), respectively. They are employed throughout the speech with an inclusive and an exclusive use. The pronoun 'we' appears 45 times (3,6%) with an inclusive use and 13 (1%) with an exclusive use. The possessive pronoun 'our' appears 16 times (1,2%) with an inclusive use and 2 (0,1%) with an exclusive use. The pronoun 'us' only appears 1 time (0, 08%) and with only the inclusive use.

Table 7. Yes, We Can-Person Deictics: Exclusive Use

Exclusive Use		
We	Us	Our
We 'd have accomplished what we did here.		Our climb would be steep.
For this campaign, we were far behind.		Our campaign has always.
We always knew our climb.		
Numbers we have never seen.		
We will never use 9/11.		
We began this improbable journey.		
We have been told we cannot do this.		
We 've asked to pause.		
We 've been warned against offering false hope.		
We take the campaign.		
We learn that the struggles.		
Absolute and Relative Frequency		
13 → 1%		2 → 0.1%

Table 8. Yes, We Can-Person Deictics: Inclusive Use

Inclusive Use		
We	Us	Our
Whether we are rich or poor.	A King who took us to the mountaintop.	Health care in our time.
Whether we hail from.		Our new majority. (2)
We are ready to take.		Ship our jobs overseas.
No problem we cannot solve or we cannot fulfil.		Sending our children to school.
We mobilize our voices.		Save our planet.
We can disagree.		Our troops home. (2)
We can bring doctors.		Care for our veterans.
We can tell the drug.		Restore our moral standing.
We will end this war (3).		Obstacles stand in our way.
We can stop talking.		Our new frontier.
We can do this.		Stood in our way.
We can harness the ingenuity.		We are not as divided as our politics suggest.
We can stop sending our children.		Mobilize our voices to challenge.
We bring our troops home.		Our new American majority.
We will finish the job (2).		
We will care for our veterans.		
We will restore our moral.		
We began this improbable journey.		
We know the battle ahead.		
We have faced down impossible odds.		
We 've been told we 're not ready or that we shouldn't try or we can't.		
Yes, we can (12)		
We take the campaign.		
We will remember that there is something happening in America.		
We are not divided.		
We are one people, we are one nation.		
We will begin the next chapter in the American story.		
Absolute and Relative Frequency		
45→ 3.6%	1→0.08%	16→1.2%

Focussing on the first person singular 'I', it can be said that only appears 4 times (0,3%) and mostly at the beginning of the speech.

Regarding second person singular and plural, in the case of the personal pronoun 'you', it appears 19 times (1,5%) and the possessive pronoun 'your' appears twice (0,1%).

The pronouns in the third person plural are 'they', which appears 9 times (0,7%), 'them' 3 times (0,2%) and 'their' twice (0,1%). The only pronouns in the third person singular are 'it', which appears 13 times (1%) and 'she' and 'her' that appears once (0,08%).

Secondly, this analysis focusses on temporal deixis. In this speech the most remarkable adverbs or adverbials (pure, impure deictics) are those that denote a present time: 'tonight' (3), 'at this moment', 'right now', 'this time', 'now', and 'in our time' (8 times; 0,6%). The most used verb tenses are the present ones as well. The adverbs and adverbials that denote a past situation are the second most used, they are 'a few weeks ago', 'a year ago' and 'before' (3 times; 0,2%). The second most used verb tenses are the past ones as well. Future terms are less often used in this speech, represented by 'tomorrow' and 'in the weeks and months to come' (0,1%).

Finally, it is important to note that the speaker uses space deictics that denote remoteness such as 'in Iraq' (2), 'in Lebanon and Concord', 'in Afghanistan', 'overseas' and 'in Des Moines and Davenport' (6 times; 0,4%). However, the most important and often repeated in the speech are those that denote proximity, such as 'in las Vegas', 'here' (3), 'in New Hampshire', and 'in America' (4), 'in this election', 'from Iowa or New Hampshire' (2), 'in Spartanburg', 'in Dillon' and 'on the streets of L.A' (15 times; 1,2%).

6.2 Cameron: Farewell Speech

Regarding person deictics in Cameron's speech, the most used pronouns are not the first person plural 'we', 'us', and 'our' but the pronoun 'I', which appears 30 times (2,8%). Continuing with first person pronouns in singular, the object form 'me' and the possessive pronoun 'my' appear 8 times each (0,7%).

While not the most prominent in the speech, the first person plural pronouns ‘we’, ‘us’, and ‘our’ appear 12 (1,1%), 2 (0,1%), and 23 times (2,1%) respectively. They have an exclusive and an inclusive use. The pronoun ‘we’ appears once (0,09%) with an inclusive use and 11 times (1%) with an exclusive use, while ‘our’ appears 14 times (1,3%) with an exclusive use and 9 times (0,8%) with an inclusive use. ‘Us’ is only used inclusively.

Table 9. Farewell Speech-Person Deictics: Exclusive Use

Exclusive Use		
We	Us	Our
We have not got every decision right.		Our politics is full of argument.
We have used our stronger economy.		Our country is much stronger.
We have strengthened our nation		Our economy is immeasurably.
Choices and changes we have made.		Our decision to keep our aid.
We will be heading to Buckingham Palace.		Our stronger economy.
We leave for the last time.		Our problems as a country.
Conservative Manifesto on which we were elected.		Our world.
We would confront our problems.		Our aid promises to the poorest.
We could reach better times.		Our health service.
We have strengthened our nation.		Our NHS is a national treasure.
We leave for the last time.		Our nation’s defences.
		in our country.
		Our shipyards to keep our country safe.
Absolute and Relative Frequency		
11→1%		14→1.3%

Table 10. Farewell Speech-Person Deictics: Inclusive Use

Inclusive Use		
We	Us	Our
We must never forget that.	Men and women give for us in the defence of freedom.	Our country's greatest strengths.
	Can be an inspiration to us all.	Our armed forces.
		Our intelligence agencies and our police.
		Our freedom and our way of life.
		Our country who are making our society bigger.
		Serve our country.
Absolute and Relative Frequency		
1→0.09%	2→0.1%	9→0.8%

In the case of second person singular and plural 'you', it appears 8 times in the speech (0,7%).

The third person plural pronouns presented in this speech are 'they', 'them', and 'their', which occur 1, 2, and 3 times respectively (0,09%), (0,1%) and (0,2%). The third person singular appears three times, as the possessive pronoun 'her' (0,2%).

Continuing with time deixis, the most outstanding adverbs or adverbials (pure, impure) are those that denote a past situation; they are 'before' (2), 'six years ago', 'in the past', 'eleven years ago', 'over these last six years', 'for the last two years', 'for the last time', 'on that evening in May 2010' (9 times; 0,8%). Those that denote a present situation are 'today' (3), 'now' (2), and 'this moment' (6 times; 0,5%). Together with present and past verb tenses, both present and past deictics are dispersed through the speech with a very little difference. The deictics that denote a future situation are not used here; they only appear through verbs 'will be', 'will provide', 'will tender' but they are not relevant when analysing the speech because of their limited appearance.

Finally, the most used space deictics, although they are not widely presented throughout this speech, are those that refer to the place in which the speech was given. They appear 5 times in the speech as 'in our country', 'in Downing Street', 'in our

world', 'for this great country', and 'here' (0,4%). Meanwhile those that refer to a place that is far away only appear once 'on the other side of the world' (0,09%).

7. DISCUSSION: DEIXIS

Having rigorously analysed the number of instances and the importance of person, time, and space deictics in the two speeches, the following results can be highlighted.

7.1 Person Deixis

Firstly, taking into account person deictics, particularly first person plural pronouns, it can be stated that in Obama's speech the pronoun 'we' (58 times; 4,6%) is used more than in Cameron's (10 times; 0,9%). This pronoun is employed in Obama's speech with an inclusive use (45 times; 3,6%), while in Cameron's this pronoun is more often employed with an exclusive use (11 times; 1%). The reason why it is more often used inclusively in Obama's speech is because the speech was part of his electoral campaign; 'we' was used to persuade people and make the audience feel part of the speech. This result confirms one of the hypotheses in the 'Introduction', that Obama uses the pronoun 'we' in order to persuade his audience. This idea appears in Chilton's book *'Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice'*, in which he declares that this type of deictic 'can be used to induce interpreters to conceptualise group identity, coalitions, parties, and the like either as insiders or as outsiders' (56). The idea is that with this 'we', the author makes that the hearer feels part of a specific group. The use of this 'we' is a way to identify the people who support him, as well as a way of telling the audience, in this case the electorate, that they are part of the change of the United States, that they are the key to achieving progress, and that he needs them to win the election. Obama refers to a society in which he is included, preserving an atmosphere of unity throughout the entire speech.

Bearing in mind Charteris' words, "'we" is always a significant pronoun in persuasive language [...] and invites hearers to ally themselves with the speaker' (61). The speaker's persuasion of the addressee is clearly presented by the use of this 'we' (61). Remembering what Marmaridou declares about the use of deictics for achieving social goals, it can be stated that the use of this 'we', which he uses to make the

audience part of the speech at all times, may have had an important role with regard to Obama's victory in 2008.

- 1) 'We have to think, act and even vote within the confines of the categories that supposedly define us' (Obama). With this 'we' he encompasses himself, his political party (the Democrats) and American citizens.

In Cameron's speech, 'we' (12 times; 1,1%) and 'our' (23; 2,1%) are mostly used exclusively (11 times; 1%) and (14 times; 1,3%), while 'us' appears 2 times (0,1%) inclusively. Since it is a farewell in which he does not have to convince his audience, it does not have the function of persuading people, but rather saying goodbye and remembering what he has done for his country. As Chilton said, person deictics, in this case 'we', are used 'to induce interpreters to conceptualise group identity, coalitions, parties, and the like either as insider or as outsiders' (56). This sentence is also true in Cameron's speech, but in this case the pronoun 'we' (exclusive use) does not include the audience but Cameron and his political party.

- 2) 'These are the choices and the changes that we have made' (Cameron). Here, 'we' is used exclusively only including Cameron and his party, and excluding the addressee.

Continuing with first person plural pronouns, in the case of 'our' and 'us', it is important to note that they appear 18 times (1,4%) and once (0,08%) and 16 times (1,2%) and once (0,08%) inclusively in Obama's speech. In this case, there is also some differences in the use of these deictics between the two speeches; the deictics are mostly employed with an inclusive use in Obama's speech and with an exclusive use in Cameron's speech. Obama uses these pronouns (inclusive use) to encompass the audience, his party, and himself, while Cameron includes his party and himself (exclusive use).

With regard to the first person singular 'I' in Obama's speech, it is important to mention that it is used less than in Cameron's speech; it only appears 4 times (0,3%) because the author gives more importance to the audience and the 'we' (58 times; 4,6%) than to himself. In any case, the function 'I' has is to show the author as the head of

state, the person who negotiates all the necessary changes and also represents society, but without forgetting that he is part of this society. In other words, with the use of 'I' he wants to show that he will govern by, for, and with people. As Wilson states, this use can be also related to 'going away from designated individuals towards some generic role or conceptual category' (Durocher 35). In this case, instead of naming himself as the president of the United States, he prefers to use the pronoun 'I', perhaps, because of the tension in political discourses between politicians' aims to increase fidelity and support for their actions in their followers and their ambition to evade full responsibility for disliked decisions or courses of action (Durocher 35).

- 3) 'I am still fired up and ready to go' or 'I want to congratulate Senator Clinton' (Obama).

The 'I' in Cameron's is widely used, exactly 30 times (2,8%), as well as 'me' and 'my' 8 times each (0,7%), which do not appear in Obama's speech. The reason why it is used more is because it is a speech based on himself, because he is saying goodbye to the prime minister position. One interpretation of the handling of 'I' Durocher's, in which he declares that 'I' may indicate a high degree of speaker involvement with the topic or commitment to authorship (Durocher 34). Cameron may have used this 'I' in order to show his audience that he was and is truly involved with English society.

- 4) 'I'm delighted that for the second time in British history, the new Prime Minister will be a woman' (Cameron).

Taking into account the second person plural 'you', it is notable that it appears more times in Obama's speech (19 times; 1,5%) than in Cameron's speech (8 times; 0,7%). This pronoun has been used differently in the two speeches; in the case of Obama, 'you' refers to American citizens. This use is a way to generalise, as well as, a way to make that the audience feel part of the speech. As Kacandas asserts, the use of 'you' also has an appellative power because it invites people who hear the speech to feel addressed (Straiton 288). Meanwhile, in Cameron's speech it is only used as a way to generalize.

- 5) 'All of you who are here tonight' (Obama).

6) 'You see it so directly that it blows you away' (Cameron).

The third person plural pronouns 'they', 'their', and 'them' are used more in Obama's (9 times; 0,7%), (2 times; 0,1%), and (3 times; 0,2%) than in Cameron's speech (once; 0,09%), (3 times; 0,2%), and (2 times; 0,1%). In both speeches, these pronouns are used to indicate a distance between the speaker and the people referred to as 'they', 'them', 'their'. This contrast with the use of 'we', with which the speaker refers to himself and the addressee, but there is a difference when it is taken into account the context. In the case of Obama, he uses the pronoun 'they' because he does not want to place these people inside the American society; he does not feel identified with them. Wilson mentioned that 'The unnamed opponents also can be linked in a text with named persons or groups, generating a deniable pejorative implicature that associates the two' (Durocher 35). This means, as discussed earlier, that there is no relation between the group to which he refers as 'we' and the group which he indicates as 'they'.

7) 'Tell the drug and insurance industry that, while they get a seat at the table, they don't get to buy every chair, not this time, not now' (Obama).

In the case of Cameron's speech, he does not use the third person plural to exclude someone from a group as Obama does in his speech, but he uses it as a normal way to denote people other than himself.

8) 'They sometimes kick the red boxes full of work' (Cameron). In this example, the third person plural 'they' refers to his family.

The difference between the uses of third person singular is that in Obama's, it appears as 'she' and 'her', and in Cameron's only as 'her'. The pronouns 'she' and 'her' in Obama's refers to Senator Clinton, and as the pronoun 'they', it is use to establish a distance between her and the speaker; although she is not from a different party, she was, in a way, his opponent since both were contending for the nomination for the Democratic candidate in the general election. He also indicates a distance from her by using 'she' and not including her when he uses the pronoun 'we'.

- 9) 'I want to congratulate Senator Clinton on a hard-fought victory here in New Hampshire. She did an outstanding job. Give her a big round of applause' (Obama).

The 'her' in Cameron's refers to Queen Elizabeth; he refers to her as Her Majesty, as this pronoun is used as a formal way to address the Queen.

7.2 Time Deixis

Moving onto temporal deixis, it is important to state that it encompasses three different categories: past, the time previous to the time of the proclamation; present, the time that comprises the moment of the proclamation; and future, the time that follows the proclamation (Wieczorek 91). Thus, temporal deixis is used to specify the time to which the speech refers, and therefore, it is important to know the context of the speech itself. This temporal deixis can also have political significance; this is the case for the two speeches, in which many adverbs, verb tenses, and adverbials that denote time can be found. In Obama's speech, the most frequently used time deictics are those that denote a present time (8 times; 0,6%), while those that denote a past time are less used (3 times; 0,2%). Meanwhile, in Cameron's speech, temporal deictics that denote the present and the past are more or less equally used (present: 6 times; 0,5% and past: 9; 0,8%). Both speeches have in common that time deictics denoting future are used very little. The use of time deictics as a reference to the present, past, or future means that both (Obama and Cameron) require the addressee to assume a specific historical period (Chilton 56). It means that these deictics require, in the case of Obama, to be understood as the period after the government of the Republican George W. Bush; these deictics emphasize the idea that now, after Bush's government, all things that rule America are going to change for the better. In other words, these deictics mark the beginning of a new period, beginning with which everything will be better. In the case of Cameron, these deictics must be interpreted as the moment in which Cameron resigns after a long term because of the victory of the Brexit campaign.

- 10) 'I think of the businesses that were just ideas in someone's head and that today are making a go of it' (Cameron).

Similarly, the use of time deictics as a reference to the past should be understood as the time before the speech was given. In the case of Obama, these deictics refer to the government of George W. Bush, and in the case of Cameron, these deictics refer to the government of Gordon Brown, just before Cameron was elected prime minister. The future time referred to in Obama's speech should be understood as the time in which his government will start, and in Cameron's as a time in which he is no longer prime minister and his colleague Theresa May takes the position.

7.3 Space Deixis

Finally, space deixis, as explained in the 'Introduction', points out adverbs (pure) and adverbials (impure) that denote 'the position in space of specific locations in a speech event' (McIntyre 94), those places that are near the speaker and the addressee or those that are far away. In other words, it denotes places, taking into account the distance from the deictic centre that consists of the speaker and the hearer.

Comparing the two speeches, there is not a notable difference in the use of space deictics between them. In both the most often used are those that refer to the place in which the discourse is carried out, and those that refer to a nearby place; the other space deictics being irrelevant in the development of the speech. However, it is true that in Cameron's speech, space deictics that denote past, present or future are less represented than in Obama's.

In the case of Obama's speech, it situates us in a specific place with the use of the adverb 'here', determined by where the speaker is located. It is important to state that without knowing which is the deictic centre that is to say, where is the speaker situated, it is impossible to know to which place 'here' refers. The use of adverbials such as 'in New Hampshire' and 'in America', help to deduce, given the deictic centre, to what place 'here' refers. Furthermore, with the frequent use of these space deictics, especially with the proximal spatial deictic 'here', the speaker attempts to situate the audience in the same place (New Hampshire); but also with adverbs and adverbials such as 'in Spartanburg', 'in Las Vegas', and 'in Dillon', the speaker situates the audience in the United States. It calls the audience's attention that the speaker does not use 'that', a pronoun indicating distance, though he does use 'that' as a conjunction. This non-use of

the pronoun ‘that’ may be the speaker’s intention to focus the addressee’s attention on the ‘here’ and ‘now’.

11) ‘On a hard-fought victory here in New Hampshire’ (Obama).

12) ‘In Spartanburg are not so different than the plight of the dishwasher in Las Vegas’ (Obama).

In the case of Cameron, he also situates his audience in a specific place through the use of the deictic ‘here in Downing Street’, that is, the place in which the speech is given and in which the speaker is situated. Knowing the name of the street, it can be deduced that the speech was delivered in London. The speaker not only wants to situate the audience in London but in the United Kingdom; so that the audience will think about the country in general since the adverbs and adverbials that refer to it are used most. He achieves this with the use of deictics such as ‘in our country’ or ‘for this great country’. As in Obama’s speech, “that” does not appear as a pronoun indicating distance but as a conjunction.

13) ‘My only wish is continued success for this great country that I love so very much. (Cameron).

8. DISCUSSION: CONTEXT, LANGUAGE AND GEOGRAPHIC POSITION.

Having analysed the two speeches understanding the use of deictics in each speech, and the differences and similarities between them. The influence of context, language, and geographic position on the use of deictics is explained below.

8.1 Context

To begin with, it is important to state that the context influences the use of deictics in these two speeches. If one considers that each of them was given in different contexts or political times, it can be established that the use of the first person plural deictic ‘we’ is influenced by the circumstances in which the speech was given. For example, as stated above, in Obama’s speech ‘we’ is more often used inclusively. This

is because the speech took place at a time in which Obama wanted to win the election. Meanwhile, Cameron uses this pronoun exclusively because the context has to do with a farewell in which he does not want to include the audience.

The use of the pronouns ‘our’ and ‘us’, are also influenced by the context, although in Obama’s speech the inclusive use was employed more, including the party, the audience, and himself because it was an electoral campaign speech in which it was crucial to include the audience. In Cameron’s speech, these pronouns (exclusive use) are used more but only including the party and himself since the audience has nothing to do with a farewell speech in which the speaker is the protagonist.

As with the pronoun ‘we’, the use of ‘I’ as a deictic is also affected by the context or political circumstances of these two speeches. ‘I’ is used more in the ‘Farewell’ speech, in which the speaker is the most important element, since the political situation is that Cameron promised to resign if the results were in favour of Brexit. On the other hand, ‘Yes, We Can’ is a campaign speech in which the author tries to persuade the audience.

In the case of ‘you’, the different contexts or political situations in which the speeches were given influence the number of times and the ways in which this pronoun appears. In the case of Obama, as stated above, is used to generalise and also to make people feel part of the speech. This is because it is a campaign speech and it is important to make the audience part of it in order to achieve the goals. In the case of Cameron’s speech, ‘you’ is used less since it is a farewell speech in which what is important is him and his party. This is why Obama used the pronoun ‘you’ more than Cameron.

In terms of third person plural and singular, there is no evidence that they were influenced by the context; they are used no more or less depending on their contexts.

Regarding temporal deixis, it can be declared that the context influences the use of these deictics. Since Obama’s is an electoral campaign speech in which he wants to achieve the presidency of the United States, he uses the present tense and adverbs or adverbials that denote present time in order to emphasize the ‘now’ referring to a moment in which things will start to change. In the case of Cameron, the use of past

and present deictics to the same extent is also linked to the context, since this speech is a farewell in which he says goodbye to the government of the United Kingdom. For this reason, he uses the past to refer to things that were done wrong before his term, and the present to emphasize what he has achieved up to the day of the speech, thanks to his mandate.

In the case of space deixis, it can be declared that its use is not influenced by the context. Whether a campaign speech or a farewell, deictics of place are used no more in one than in the other.

8.2 Language

It is widely known that there are some differences between British English and American English. They vary in pronunciation, vocabulary, and spelling. The vocabulary differs from one to another since they use some different nouns and verbs. For instance, Americans use the word ‘truck’ and British people use the word ‘lorry’ to refer to the same means of transport (Beare). The spelling is also different in the use of some prefixes and suffixes. An example is nouns that end with -er in American English that in British English end with -re (such as ‘center’ and ‘centre’), or those that end in -or in American English and -our in British English, such as ‘color’ and ‘colour’ (Beare). Having analysed the speeches deeply and taking into account the possible differences between British and American English, there is no evidence that the use of deictics is affected by the use of British or American English. There are differences between the two speeches but these differences have nothing to do with the use of one language or another.

8.3 Geographic Position

The geographic position is closely linked to the context since both encompass the place in which the speeches were given. Thus, it can be said that the geographic position, in Obama’s speech, New Hampshire, and in Cameron’s, Downing Street in London, does not influence the number of time deictics of person, time, or space appear. It is true, however, that depending on the place in which the speech was given, the pure space deictics ‘here’, ‘this country’, and ‘this nation’, although they can signify anywhere, may refer to one position or another depending on where the speaker is. In

the case of impure space deictics, such as ‘in Downing Street’ and ‘Buckingham Palace’ in Cameron's speech and ‘in Las Vegas’, ‘in New Hampshire’, and ‘in America’ in Obama’s speech, can also signify anywhere, but they do not depend on the place in which the speaker is located at the moment in which the speech is given. For example ‘New Hampshire’ is always New Hampshire; it does not change depending on where a person is.

9. CONCLUSION

To summarize, having carried out the analysis of deictics in general (time, person, and space) in these two speeches, the following can be stated.

Obama used the pronouns ‘we’, ‘our’, and ‘us’ inclusively more, while Cameron employed more these pronouns with an exclusive use. This is because Obama’s is a speech that belongs to his electoral campaign and its aim is to persuade people. Meanwhile, Cameron’s speech is a farewell, whose purpose is to say goodbye and commemorate what he has done for his country. In Obama’s speech, the first person plural pronouns ‘our’ and ‘us’ mostly encompass the audience, his party, and himself, and in Cameron’s speech, his party and himself. The first person singular ‘I’ is used less in Obama’s speech than in Cameron’s because what is important in Obama’s speech is the audience, the ‘we’, meaning himself and the audience as a group. The function of ‘I’ could be to show the speaker as the head of state. Meanwhile, in Cameron’s speech, on the other hand, it has the function of representing himself as the protagonist because he is the person saying goodbye to the prime minister position.

The second person plural ‘you’ is used more in Obama’s speech than in Cameron’s, and in both this pronoun is used differently. Obama uses ‘you’ to refer to American citizens. Meanwhile, Cameron uses it as a way to generalise.

In Obama’s speech, the third person plural ‘they’ is used more than in Cameron’s; Obama uses the pronoun ‘they’ to exclude these people from American society, while Cameron employs it as a normal way to denote people other than himself. The third person singular appears in Obama’s as ‘she’, referring to Senator Clinton. This establishes a distance between the speaker and ‘her’, because she is, in a way, his

opponent. In Cameron's, 'her' refers to the Queen Elizabeth, addressing her formally as 'Her Majesty'.

Temporal deixis is mostly apparent in Obama's speech with time deictics that refer to the present, while in Cameron's the use of present and past are mostly equal. The use of time deictics requires the addressee to assume a specific historical period. Obama's use of the present should be understood as the moment after the government of George Bush. In the case of Cameron, these deictics should be interpreted as the moment in which Cameron resigns from his position. Furthermore, the deictics that denote the past refer to the government of Gordon Brown, before Cameron's government.

Space deixis is used in both speeches to denote the places in which they were carried out, but were used more in Obama's than in Cameron's speech. Obama uses the adverb 'here' to situate the audience in a specific place that is determined by where the speaker is located; without knowing what the deictic centre is (i.e. where the speaker is situated), it is impossible to know where 'here' refers to. The same is true of Cameron's speech; when he uses 'here', it is impossible to know where the speech was given if "Downing Street" is not taken into account. The use of adverbials helps to indicate where the speech was given.

It can be also affirmed that the context influences the use of deictics in these two speeches. The number of times the first person plural deictic 'we' appears depend on the context of each speech. In Obama's speech, it is used inclusively more often because it is a campaign speech in which the collaboration of the audience is crucial to win the election. Meanwhile, Cameron uses it exclusively because the context has to do with a farewell in which he is the protagonist. The pronouns 'our' and 'us' are also influenced by the context for the same reason. Obama's inclusive use includes the party, the audience, and himself, while Cameron's exclusive use includes only the party and himself. The number of times 'I' appears is also influenced by the context. In Obama's it is used less, since his speech gives more importance to the 'we'. In Cameron's, it is used more, since the speech focuses on him.

The same happens with 'you', the different contexts of each speech influence the number of times and the ways in which this pronoun appears. Obama uses it to

generalise and make that people feel part of the speech because of the electoral campaign, while Cameron uses it less because it is a farewell speech. In terms of the third person plural and singular, there is no evidence that they were influenced by the context; they appear no more or less depending on their contexts.

The context also influences the use of temporal deictics. In the case of Obama, he uses present tenses, adverbs, and adverbials that denote the present in order to emphasize the ‘now’, that is, the time in which the changes he proposes start. This is because it is a campaign speech. In the case of Cameron, the equal use of past and present deictics is also linked to the context, since this speech is a farewell in which Cameron says goodbye to his position explaining his achievements in the past.

In the case of space deixis, it can be said that its use is not influenced by the context. An electoral campaign or farewell speech does not have to use more or less space deictics. In the case of language, though there are many differences between British and American English in pronunciation, vocabulary, and spelling, there is no evidence that this influences the use of deictics in either of the speeches. Similarly, the geographic position, referring to the place in which the speeches were given, does not influence the use of time, person, or space deictics. However, it is true that depending on the place in which the speech is given, the pure space deictics ‘here’ and ‘this country’ can refer to one position or another depending on the location of the speaker. Meanwhile, impure space deictics do not depend upon where the speaker is.

With regard to the hypotheses, it can be said that the pronoun ‘we’ is used persuasively in Obama’s speech because it belongs to his presidential campaign, while Cameron’s speech is a farewell. The second hypothesis in the ‘Introduction’ is incorrect, since there is no difference between the two speeches in terms of language.

10. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anthony, Laurence. "Antconc." *Laurence Anthony's Website*, 2010, <http://www.laurenceanthony.net/software.html>. Accessed 7 March 2016.
- "Barack Obama Biography." *Biography.com*, 2014, <http://www.biography.com/people/barack-obama-12782369>. Accessed 22 September 2016
- Beare, Kenneth. "About Education." *Differences Between American and British English*, 2015, http://esl.about.com/od/toeflieltscambridge/a/dif_ambrit.htm. Accessed 5 October 2016.
- Brisard, Frank. *Grounding: The Epistemic Footing of Deixis and Reference*. Mouton de Gruyter, 2002.
- Bühler, K. *Teoría del Lenguaje*. Revista de Occidente, 1967.
- Carbonero Cano, Pedro. *Deixis Espacial y Temporal en el Sistema Lingüístico*. Raimundo, 1979.
- Charteris-Black, Jonathan. *Analysing Political Speeches: Rhetoric, Discourse and Metaphor*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
- Chilton, Paul. *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. Routledge, 2004.
- Chilton, Paul, and Christina Schäffner. *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2002.
- Cifuentes, José Luis. "La Deixis." *Liceus*, 2006, <http://urbinavolant.com/archivos/1112/Pragma/deixis>. Accessed 27 September 2016.
- "David Cameron Biography." *Biography.com*, 2016, <http://www.biography.com/people/david-cameron-39203>. Accessed 22 September 2016.
- Doherty, Caitlin. "David Cameron's Farewell Speech outside Downing Street." *Independent: Independent Digital News and Media*, 13 Jul. 2016, <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/david-camersons-farewell-speech-outside-downing-street-in-full-a7135241.html>. Accessed 22 September 2016.
- Duchan, Judith F, et al. *Deixis in Narrative: A Cognitive Science Perspective*. Lawrence Erlbaum, 1995.

- Durocher Dunne, Michele. *Democracy in Contemporary Egyptian Political Discourse*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2003.
- Eidenmuller, Michael E. "Top 100 Speeches." *American Rhetoric*, 2008, <http://www.americanrhetoric.com>. Accessed 5 March 2016.
- Håkansson, Jessica. "The Use of Personal Pronouns in Political Speeches: A comparative study of the pronominal choices of two American presidents." *Linnaeus University Website*, 2012, <http://lnu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:531167/FULLTEXT01>. Accessed 20 September 2016.
- Henández Sánchez, Eulalia, and M^a Isabel López " Los Deícticos en la Comunicación Política." *Hesperia*, no. 5, 2002, pp. 155-174, *Dialnet*, <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/autor?codigo=263382>. Accessed 21 September 2016.
- Lenz, Friedrich. *Deictic Conceptualisation of Space, Time and Person*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2003.
- Levinson, Stephen C. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Marmaridou, Sophia. *Pragmatic Meaning and Cognition*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2000.
- McIntyre, Dan. *Point of View in Play: A Cognitive Stylistic Approach to Viewpoint in Drama and other Texts Types*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1975.
- Olza, Jesús. *Deixis: Inquisición ¿Pre-gramatical?, ¿Pre-lógica?, ¿A-lógica?, Sobre el Campo Demostrativo*. Editorial Texto, 2007.
- Perkins, Reverde. D. *Deixis, Grammar, and Culture*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1992.
- Poggi, Isabella, et al. *Multimodal Communication in Political Speech: Shaping Minds and Social Action*. Springer, 2010.
- Rauh, Gisa. *Essays on Deixis*. Narr, 1983.

Rodriguez Guzman, Juan Pedro. *Gramática gráfica al juampedrino modo*. Ediciones Carena, 2005.

Rotua, Elfrida P, et al. “Deixis Used on Business Brochures Texts: A Pragmatics Study.” *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 29 Sep. 2015, p. 171.

Seco, R. *Manual de Gramática Española*. Aguilar, 1971.

Straiton, Andrew. “I have my tricks and trap doors too: Double Deixis, Reader Investment and Self-Identification in Literature and Popular Music.” *The University Of Nottingham Website*, 2008, <http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/english/documents/innervate/08-09/0809straitoncognitivepoetics>. Accessed 25 April 2016.

Wieczorek, Anna Ewa. *Clusivity: A New Approach to Association and Dissociation in Political Discourse*. Cambridge scholars Publishing, 2013.

11. ANNEXES

11.1 Barack Obama: Yes, We Can Change

BARACK OBAMA: Thank you, New Hampshire. I love you back. Thank you. Thank you.

Well, thank you so much. I am still fired up and ready to go.

Thank you. Thank you.

Well, first of all, I want to congratulate Senator Clinton on a hard-fought victory here in New Hampshire. She did an outstanding job. Give her a big round of applause.

You know, a few weeks ago, no one imagined that we'd have accomplished what we did here tonight in New Hampshire. No one could have imagined it.

For most of this campaign, we were far behind. We always knew our climb would be steep. But in record numbers, you came out, and you spoke up for change.

And with your voices and your votes, you made it clear that at this moment, in this election, there is something happening in America.

There is something happening when men and women in Des Moines and Davenport, in Lebanon and Concord, come out in the snows of January to wait in lines that stretch block after block because they believe in what this country can be.

Continue reading the main story

There is something happening. There's something happening when Americans who are young in age and in spirit, who've never participated in politics before, turn out in numbers we have never seen because they know in their hearts that this time must be different.

There's something happening when people vote not just for party that they belong to, but the hopes that they hold in common.

And whether we are rich or poor, black or white, Latino or Asian, whether we hail from Iowa or New Hampshire, Nevada or South Carolina, we are ready to take this country in a fundamentally new direction.

That's what's happening in America right now; change is what's happening in America.

You, all of you who are here tonight, all who put so much heart and soul and work into this campaign, you can be the new majority who can lead this nation out of a long political darkness.

Democrats, independents and Republicans who are tired of the division and distraction that has clouded Washington, who know that we can disagree without being disagreeable, who understand that, if we mobilize our voices to challenge the money and influence that stood in our way and challenge ourselves to reach for something better, there is no problem we cannot solve, there is no destiny that we cannot fulfill. Our new American majority can end the outrage of unaffordable, unavailable health care in our time. We can bring doctors and patients, workers and businesses, Democrats and Republicans together, and we can tell the drug and insurance industry that, while they get a seat at the table, they don't get to buy every chair, not this time, not now.

Our new majority can end the tax breaks for corporations that ship our jobs overseas and put a middle-class tax cut in the pockets of working Americans who deserve it.

We can stop sending our children to schools with corridors of shame and start putting them on a pathway to success.

We can stop talking about how great teachers are and start rewarding them for their greatness by giving them more pay and more support. We can do this with our new majority.

We can harness the ingenuity of farmers and scientists, citizens and entrepreneurs to free this nation from the tyranny of oil and save our planet from a point of no return.

We will end this war in Iraq and bring our troops home.

We will end this war in Iraq. We will bring our troops home. We will finish the job -- we will finish the job against Al Qaida in Afghanistan. We will care for our veterans. We will restore our moral standing in the world.

And we will never use 9/11 as a way to scare up votes, because it is not a tactic to win an election. It is a challenge that should unite America and the world against the common threats of the 21st century: terrorism and nuclear weapons, climate change and poverty, genocide and disease.

All of the candidates in this race share these goals. All of the candidates in this race have good ideas and all are patriots who serve this country honorably.

But the reason our campaign has always been different, the reason we began this improbable journey almost a year ago is because it's not just about what I will do as president. It is also about what you, the people who love this country, the citizens of the United States of America, can do to change it.

That's what this election is all about.

That's why tonight belongs to you. It belongs to the organizers, and the volunteers, and the staff who believed in this journey and rallied so many others to join the cause.

We know the battle ahead will be long. But always remember that, no matter what obstacles stand in our way, nothing can stand in the way of the power of millions of voices calling for change.

We have been told we cannot do this by a chorus of cynics. And they will only grow louder and more dissonant in the weeks and months to come.

We've been asked to pause for a reality check. We've been warned against offering the people of this nation false hope. But in the unlikely story that is America, there has never been anything false about hope.

For when we have faced down impossible odds, when we've been told we're not ready or that we shouldn't try or that we can't, generations of Americans have responded with a simple creed that sums up the spirit of a people: Yes, we can. Yes, we can. Yes, we can.

It was a creed written into the founding documents that declared the destiny of a nation: Yes, we can.

It was whispered by slaves and abolitionists as they blazed a trail towards freedom through the darkest of nights: Yes, we can.

It was sung by immigrants as they struck out from distant shores and pioneers who pushed westward against an unforgiving wilderness: Yes, we can.

It was the call of workers who organized, women who reached for the ballot, a president who chose the moon as our new frontier, and a king who took us to the mountaintop and pointed the way to the promised land: Yes, we can, to justice and equality.

Yes, we can, to opportunity and prosperity. Yes, we can heal this nation. Yes, we can repair this world. Yes, we can.

And so, tomorrow, as we take the campaign south and west, as we learn that the struggles of the textile workers in Spartanburg are not so different than the plight of the dishwasher in Las Vegas, that the hopes of the little girl who goes to the crumbling school in Dillon are the same as the dreams of the boy who learns on the streets of L.A., we will remember that there is something happening in America, that we are not as divided as our politics suggest, that we are one people, we are one nation.

And, together, we will begin the next great chapter in the American story, with three words that will ring from coast to coast, from sea to shining sea: Yes, we can.

Thank you, New Hampshire. Thank you. Thank you.

12. Cameron: Farewell Speech outside Downing Street

David Cameron has given his final speech as Prime Minister, before he headed to Buckingham Palace to resign before the Queen. Here is what he said:

"When I first stood here in Downing Street, on that evening in May 2010, I said that we would confront our problems as a country, and lead people through difficult decisions, so that together we could reach better times.

"It's not been an easy journey, and of course we've not got every decision right, but I do believe that today our country is much stronger.

"Above all, it was about turning round the economy, and with a deficit cut by two thirds, two and a half million more people in work and one million more businesses, there can be no doubt that our economy is immeasurably stronger.

"Politicians like to talk about policies, but in the end, it is about people's lives. I think of the people doing jobs who were previously unemployed. I think of the businesses that were just ideas in someone's head and that today are making a go of it, and are providing people's livelihoods.

"I think of the hard-working families, paying lower taxes and getting higher wages because of the first ever National Living Wage.

"I think of the children who were languishing in the care system and have now been adopted by loving families.

"I think of the parents who are now able to send their children to Good and Outstanding schools including free schools, that simply didn't exist before.

"I think of over two hundred thousand young people who've taken part in National Citizen's Service, the fastest growing youth programme of its kind in the world, something that, again, wasn't there six years ago.

"I think of the couples who have been able to get married who weren't allowed to in the past, and I think of the people on the other side of the world who wouldn't have had clean drinking water, the chance to go to school, or even be alive were it not for our decision to keep our aid promises to the poorest countries and the poorest peoples in our world.

"And we've used our stronger economy to invest in our health service. When I walked in there, there were over eighteen thousand people waiting over a year for their operation, today it's just 800. Too many, still too long, but our NHS is a national treasure and one whose staff perform miracles – as I've seen – everyday.

"And we've strengthened our nation's defences, with submarines, destroyers and frigates and soon aircraft carriers rolling out of our shipyards to keep our country safe in a dangerous world.

"These are the choices and the changes that we've made, and I want to thank everyone who's given so much support to me personally over these years. The incredible team at Number 10, the civil servants whose professionalism and impartiality is one of our country's greatest strengths, and my political advisors, some of whom have been with me since the day that I stood for my party's leadership eleven years ago.

"I want to thank my children, Nancy, Elwyn and Florence, for whom Downing Street has been a lovely home over these last six years. They sometimes kick the red boxes full of work, Florence you once climbed into one before a foreign trip and said "take me with you." Well, no more boxes.

"And above all, I want to thank Samantha, the love of my life. You have kept me vaguely sane, and as well as being an amazing wife, mother and business

woman, you have done something every week in that building behind me to celebrate the best of voluntary service in our country.

"We will shortly be heading to Buckingham Palace to see Her Majesty the Queen where I'll tender my resignation as Prime Minister, and I will advise her Majesty to invite Theresa May to form a new Administration.

"I'm delighted that for the second time in British history, the new Prime Minister will be a woman, and once again, a Conservative. I believe Theresa will provide strong and stable leadership in fulfilling the Conservative manifesto on which we were elected and I wish her well in negotiating the best possible terms for Britain's exit from the European Union.

"Let me finish by saying this. The spirit of service is one of this country's most remarkable qualities. I've seen that service day in, day out, in the incredible work of our Armed Forces, our Intelligence agencies and our police. It is something I always knew, but as Prime Minister, you see it so directly that it blows you away. And, of course, writing those heartbreaking letters to the families who've lost loved ones, is a poignant reminder of the profound scale of what these men and women give for us in the defence of our freedoms and our way of life. We must never forget that.

"In a different way I've seen the same spirit of service in the amazing contributions of countless volunteers in communities up and down our country. We're making our society bigger and stronger, and I'm proud that every day for the last two years I've used the office of Prime Minister, in a non-political way, to recognise and thank almost six hundred of them, as points of light whose service can be an inspiration to us all.

"For me, politics has always been about public service in the national interest. It is simple to say, but often hard to do. But one of the things that sustains you in this job is the sense that, yes, our politics is full of argument and debate, and it can get quite heated, but no matter how difficult the decisions are, there's a great

sense of British fair play. A quiet but prevailing sense that most people wish their Prime Minister well and want them to stick at it, and get on with the job.

"So I want to take this moment to say thank you, to all those who have written letters and emails offering me that support, people who I'll never get to meet, and never get to thank personally.

"It has been the greatest honour of my life, to serve our country as Prime Minister over these last six years and to serve as leader of my party for almost eleven years, and as we leave for the last time, my only wish is continued success for this great country that I love so very much.

Thank you."