Stylistic Analysis of Deictic Expressions in President Benigno Aquino III's October 30th Speech

EDWARD JAY MANSARATE QUINTO
Mapua Institute of Technology Manila,
The Philippines
ejmquinto@yahoo.com.ph

ABSTRACT

This paper analyses how the President of the Philippines, Benigno Simeon Aquino III, or simply PNoy, deployed persons, time, location and social relationships in the English translation of his October 30th televised national address and what meaning and effect does such deployment of referring expressions bring about in understanding the nature of the political speech. Using the frameworks of Hanks (2005) and Buhler (1934), this paper examines how, PNoy strategically sets up the deictic field by placing several personal, temporal, spatial and social deictic expressions in what initially is a ground zero. The deployment creates a deictic field in which the Filipino people are situated at deictic centre and the President and his critics are in binary opposition. PNoy's deployment of deictic expressions is very effectively done so that the deictic centre is persuaded to judge the president and his government favourably and the binary opposite in the deictic field, unfavourably. Through a systematic stylistic account of deixis in political speech, this paper argues that not only personal deixis, as previous studies put forth, but also temporal, spatial and social deixis helps political actors to persuade the audience in their favour and ultimately boost leverage in their political discourse and outside.

Keywords: deictic expressions, deictic field, ground zero, language in politics, stylistic analysis

INTRODUCTION

Political speeches by various political actors and in different contexts have been widely investigated in various linguistic fields. The literature on political speeches is rich on studies that draw on traditions from sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis, and semantics and pragmatics. Hence, tools of analysis from these linguistic traditions have been extensively utilised, not to mention the rich resource they have accounted for in understanding the dynamics of language in political speeches.

Although stylistics as a field of linguistic inquiry traces its roots in the examination of language as used in literary pieces, a number of political speeches have already been subjected to stylistic analyses (Adetunji 2006, Suzuki & Kageura 2008, Kaylor 2011, Sheveleva 2012, Abuya 2012, Naz, Alvi & Baseer 2012, Ayeomoni 2012, Oluremi 2013). These stylistic studies on political speeches point to the compatibility of stylistic tools in the systematic explication of meaning and effect even of non-literary texts. This present study comes from within the tradition of non-literary stylistic analysis. Specifically, this paper analyses a political speech made by Benigno S. Aquino III, the President of the Republic of the Philippines.

On October 30th 2013, President Benigno Simeon Aquino III took on primetime television to address the nation and defend the Disbursement Acceleration Fund (DAP) against those who equate it to lawmakers' Priority Assistance Development Fund (PDAF) or more infamously known as Pork Barrel. The 12-minute long speech was transmitted from the Malacañan Palace to major local television networks ABS-CBN, GMA and TV5. PNoy, who in the speech also defended the president's Social Fund, delivered the speech in Filipino. The speech was later translated into English and published in the Official Gazette (Aquino 2013).

This paper analyses the English translation of the President's address retrieved from the Official Gazette. This paper is guided by the following research questions:

1. How does President Benigno S. Aquino III deploy persons, time, space and social relationships in the deictic field of the English translation of his October 30 televised speech?
2. What meaning and effect are shaped and conveyed by the President's use of deictic expressions in the speech?

LITERATURE REVIEW

In order to establish the empirical significance of the present study, it first has to be properly situated in the extant literature through a review of studies that examined various political speeches from within the tradition of stylistic analysis.

Adetunji (2006) analysed the use of personal, spatial and temporal deixis for anchorage in political discourse in two political speeches of Olusegun Obasanjo, the President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria from 1999 to 2007. Obasanjo's use of deixis reflect politicians' way of associating and dissociating from actions taken by them or their officers and conscripting their audience into accepting views and positions on controversial issues.

Suzuki and Kageura's (2008) stylistic study, set in Japan, examined the speech styles used in the Diet addresses of 27 Japanese Prime Ministers. Based on an expansive statistical analysis of online corpora and new text types, the study established that the sociopolitical era in which the Diet addresses took place affected the speech styles of prime ministers. In addition, there were differences in styles between Prime Ministers, reflecting their personal and individual choices.

Kaylor (2011) explored campaign speeches on religion by former US President Kennedy and compared it with an address by the former United States Republican Presidential candidate Mitt Romney considering various issues concerning context, audience and content of the two speeches. The analysis draws implications concerning the differences between the two speeches and an understanding of the confessional political style that guides the intersection of religion and politics at the time of the study.

Some lingo-stylistic peculiarities among other features in US President Barack Obama's speeches were found in Sheveleva (2012). Different types of questions, affirmative sentences, and characteristic of colloquial English, elements of broken syntax, metaphors, inversion and reiteration were some of the peculiarities found, which were aimed at establishing harmonious communication and communicative contacts between the political leaders, on the one hand, and the electorate, on the other hand. Sheveleva (2012) furthers that these peculiarities help the politician seize political power and positions.

The Inaugural Address of Nigerian President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan was the subject of the pragma-stylistic analysis in Abuya (2012). The study focused on speech acts types of locution, illocutionary and perlocutionary in the speech and found that commissives (75%) were the most common speech acts used in the speech, followed by assertive (55%), declaratives (45%), verdictives (15%) and directives (10%). The President's use of commissives acts in his Inaugural Address demonstrates what Abuya (2012) explains as politicians' eagerness to show appreciation after a political victory.

Naz, Alvi and Baseer (2012) used Halliday's Transitivity Model to stylistically investigate the art of linguistic spin in Benazir Bhutto's *Democratization in Pakistan,*

September 25, 2007 speech. The association between Bhutto's linguistic form and function and language manipulation reveals that she could play with words and that her linguistic choices match the need of the speech situation. Also, her use of spatial and temporal circumstances and circumstances of manner give weight and objectivity to her arguments.

Ayeomoni (2012) investigated, from within the traditions of linguistic stylistic approach and Systemic Functional Linguistics, how non-professional politicians and the military use the linguistic resources and devices of grapho-syntax in conveying political ideologies. The study found that punctuation marks (open use of punctuation marks) pervade the language of military political rulers. This, according to Ayeomoni (2012), is in tune with the swift and quick style they employ in carrying out administrative duties. Also In addition, their language is mainly made of simple declarative sentences. This style matches their simple and un-bureaucratic way of governing.

Oluremi (2012) examined a speech of Obafemi Awolowo, a Nigerian lawyer, philosopher and statesman who occupies a significant position in Nigerian politics. The analysis was done within the framework of Halliday' s Systemic Functional Grammar and New Rhetoric Approaches, which focus on language forms and evaluate the ideas put forward in speech. The study points to Awolowo's use of English as a strategy of persuasion to gain the support of his audience.

The foregoing reviews highlight just a few political speeches whose meanings and effects have been fleshed out through stylistic analyses. The extant literature suggests that stylistic studies on political speeches are varied not only in terms of their setting but also in terms of the linguistic devices analysed and research aims postulated.

Out of the studies reviewed, only that of Adetunji (2006) focused on deixis as the focus of the stylistic inquiry. Although it is not the only study that analysed the use of deixis in political speeches (other studies which focused on deictic expressions are included in the succeeding section), it can be surmised based on the quick literature review that deixis has been largely left out in the field of stylistics. This gap is identified also because other studies which analysed deictic expressions do not fall under the tradition of stylistic analysis.

Furthermore, no work, at least none that this author is aware of, has focused on the stylistic investigation of deixis in Philippine political speeches. Therefore, this paper intends to enrich the literature by stylistically analysing a political speech for different categories of diexis and challenge other stylisticians to take advantage of and direct some research effort on the rich resource there is in the Philippine political context.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Before discussing the theoretical framework on which the present study is anchored, it will be helpful to first examine some previous studies on deixis in political discourse. A number of studies have turned their focus on the rich research potential there is in deixis (Urban 1986, Maitland & Wilson 1987, Lwaitama 1988, Wilson 1990, Kuo 2001 & 2002, Inigo-Mora 2004).

One of the earliest studies that investigated deixis is that of Urban (1986). In the study, Urban (1986) examined the deployment of the first person pronouns in selected speeches of Casper Weinberger, former United States Defense Secretary. He focused on six forms of 'we', as illustrations of how the speaker tries to persuade his audience into accepting the U.S government's position on the global danger posed by nuclear weapons acquisition by other countries.

Maitland and Wilson (1987) analysed the deployment of personal pronouns in the speeches of three British politicians Foot, Kinnock, and Thatcher. They found obvious similarities between Kinnock and Foot (both members of the labour party) and differences between Foot/Kinnock and Thatcher (a member of the Conservative Party).

In another study of deixis, Lwaitama (1988) explored the use of 'I' and 'we' by Nyerere and Mwinyi (both former Presidents of Tanzania), and identifies differences. Differentiating between scripted and unscripted speeches he posits that Nyerere used more exclusive, while Mwinyi used more inclusive forms in scripted than unscripted speeches. This distinction, he claims, is occasioned by the speakers' Kiswahili-speaking statues (Kiswahili is Mwinyi first language while it is Nyerere's second).

Meanwhile, Wilson's (1990) focus was on the shifting status of 'I' and 'we' utilised by Gerald Ford and Jimmy Carter in the United States presidential debates of 1976. He claims that a politician's shift of reference from 'I' to 'we' and vice versa manifests the necessity to spread the load of responsibility, and the fear of being misinterpreted, by the audience or co-debater.

Kuo (2001) and Kuo (2002) reflect two sides of a coin in Taiwan's political arena, particularly in the televised debates of the 1998 Taipei mayoral elections. Kuo (2001) analysed the candidate's use of direct quotation for both self-promotion and the validation of opponents, whereas Kuo (2002) focused on the deployment of the second person plural pronoun 'ni' (you) by the three mayoral candidates for establishing solidarity with the audience or attacking opponents. Both studies illustrate how deictic expressions are put to referential, impersonal and other sundry uses to set up linguistic interaction in political discourse.

Inigo-Mora (2004) explored the strategic use of the first person plural pronoun 'we' to enact personal identity and deictic five Question Time sessions of House of Commons (British Parliament), held between December 1987 and April 1988. In the study, she locates four distinctive types of 'we', espoused by politician for engendering 'approaching-distancing relationship'.

These previous studies on political discourse examined the use of a specific deictic category, which is personal deixis. None of them turned their focus on other categories of deixis, which are just as rich resource in understanding political speeches as personal deixis is. In this study, investigation is not limited to personal deixis; it includes other categories of deixis, which aid in fleshing out the meaning and effect of the political speech in question. Such an analysis has to be informed by a sound theoretical framework, which serves as a guide in the achievement of the aims of the study. The present study is anchored on the succeeding theoretical framework.

Hanks' (2005) notion of deictic field primarily informs the theoretical framework on which this present analysis is anchored. According to Hanks (2005), the deictic field is a single field composed of, first, the positions of communicative agents relative to the participant frameworks they occupy; second, the positions occupied by objects of reference; and third, the multiple dimensions whereby the former have access to the latter.

This notion of deictic field has much in common with that of Buhler's (1934) but differs from it in that the former is based on practice and foregrounds the embedding of language in social fields. Through this embedding, social relations of power, conflict and value are merged with the deictic field. Therefore, the framework adapted in this paper provides not only the method of analysing deictic expressions but also raises issues and concerns regarding social and political implications brought about by the use of deictic expressions. Buhler's (1934) approach appropriately match the aims of this paper in that, just

like in other stylistic studies of political speeches, this paper aims to establish the social relations that can be surmised from the use of the linguistic device under focus.

Furthermore, the notion of deictic field herein is enriched by concepts drawn from Buhler (1934), particularly those of 'ground zero' and 'deictic centre' or 'origo'.

Ground zero refers to the moment at which the first deictic expression is issued. At the moment before the first expression is issued, the deictic field is smooth and free from any referring expressions and the roles assigned to them. As soon as the speaker issues the first deictic expression, the deictic field begins to be occupied with different context-dependent information through a process called deictic reference.

In understanding the deictic field notion in this paper, it is necessary to clarify how deictic reference is made in the deictic field. Following the approach of Hanks (2005), to perform an act of deictic reference then is to take up a position in the deictic field. Similarly, to be the object of reference is to be thrust into a position. In a political speech, these two acts of taking up and thrusting into a position are both performed by the speaker. Hence, the speaker in a political speech has the power to deploy deictic expressions in the deictic field. This enables the speaker to strategically use deixis in order that he may situate himself, his addressee and other actors involved in a way that judgment by the addressee and others become favourable to him.

One important information encoded in deictic reference is the deictic centre sometimes referred to as an origo. Al Azzawi (2011) defines a deictic centre as a reference point in relation to which a deictic expression is to be interpreted. Determining the deictic centre in the deictic field is necessary since the evaluation of the meaning of an expression is anchored on the deictic centre.

Typically, the deictic centre is the present time, location, participant role and so forth of the speaker. In deictic reference, establishing the deictic centre is essential for it facilitates the identification of some other time, location and participant roles in the deictic field.

Al Azzawi (2011) posits that deixis is critical for the ability to learn a language which for centuries have been linked to the possibility of comprehensive definition. Despite this, deixis has been a largely left out focus of empirical inquiry. Hence, this paper intends to enrich the literature on deixis by reporting on deictic expressions used by the Philippine President Benigno S. Aquino III during his October 30, 2013 televised national address.

METHOD OF ANALYSIS

One concern in the analysis of data is that the present study delves into a translated speech. Hence, it is necessary to establish the compatibility of deixis in the source language (henceforth SL) and the target language (henceforth, TL). In this study, Filipino is the SL, whereas English, the TL.

Deictic expressions in the SL can be viewed in terms the expressions *ako, ngayon, doon,* and *iyan*. Deictic expressions in the TL can be viewed in the same terms. As Al Azzawi (2011) contends that English deictic expressions include, among others, 'I', 'now', 'there', and 'that'. In the SL, person deixis comes in three categories: first person deixis, second person deixis and third person deixis, e.g. *ako, ikaw* and *siya,* respectively. This property of person deixis in the SL matches that of the TL in that there are also three categories of person deixis in English, e.g. 'I', 'you' and 's/he'. Further, it is also to be noted that in both the SL and the TL, person deixis is generally accomplished using pronouns.

One potential difficulty in the analysis of data is the nature of place or spatial deixis in the SL and TL. Al Azzawi (2011) explains that most languages exhibit a two-way referential

distinction between proximal (near or closer to the speaker) and distal (far from the speaker or closer to the addressee). In the TL, this is exemplified with such pairs as 'here' and 'there' and 'this' and 'that'. In the SL, however, referential distinction of place is three-way: proximal (near the speaker), medial (near the addressee) and distal (far from both), e.g. *dito, diyan* and *doon*, respectively. This difference in place deixis can cause potential difficulties in interpreting the data. However, an initial survey of place deixis in the speech suggests that the President did not make use of such place deictic expressions. Therefore, place deixis was analysed not in terms of the referential distinction but in terms of what Fillmore (1997) claims as an understood place deictic term. This is explicated in detail in the results section of this paper.

This study analyses deictic expressions following a top-down approach. It initially breaks down the broad grammatical category of deixis into smaller categories provided by Fillmore (1997) and then examines the paper based on these categories.

The first three categories of deixis come from what Fillmore (1997) calls the 'major grammaticalised types' of deixis: person, place and time. The fourth and last category is social deixis as informed by Al Azzawi (2011).

The first category is person deixis. Person deixis concerns the grammatical persons involved in verbal language, including those directly involved, not directly involved and those mentioned in the expression. In English, person deixis is generally accomplished through the use of personal pronouns. The analysis begins by carefully inspecting the kinds of personal pronoun used by the President in his speech.

The analysis of person deixis is carried out in two levels: paragraph and full text levels. This two-level analysis provides a mechanism to examine how role assignment – speaker, addressee and others –changes from one paragraph to another and how role assignment is realised overall in the speech. Tracing the roles assigned to persons involved in the speech exposes the positions of each person relative to the deictic centre and how the distance established aids in understanding the meaning and effect of the text.

The second category of deixis analysed in this paper is that of time or temporal deixis. Time deixis concerns itself with the various periods of time involved in and referred to in language. This includes time adverbs like 'now', 'then', 'soon' and so forth. In Buhler's (1934) framework, the temporal ground zero is the moment right before verbal language is used. As soon as the first deictic reference to time is issued, the speaker sets up the deictic field for the different periods of time involved in the speech. In this paper, the speech was also examined for temporal deictic expressions to flesh out the different periods of time involved and the meaning and effect that such reference to different periods of time bring about.

The third category of deixis analysed in this paper is place or spatial deixis. Place deixis is deictic reference to a location relative to the location of a participant in a linguistic event, typically that of the speaker. Similar to person deixis, the locations in the deictic field could be that of the speaker and addressee, or those of persons or objects referred to.

The most salient examples of spatial deictic terms in English are the adverbs *here* and *there* and the demonstratives *this* and *that,* though they are far from the only deictic terms since place deixis can also be expressed in phrases such as the italicised in sentences (1) to (3) below:

    (1)   I love living *in this country.*
    (2)   He was standing *over there.*
    (3)   They stayed *in that corner.*

Al Azzawi (2011) explains that, unless otherwise specified, place deictic terms are generally understood to be relative to the location of the speaker. In this study, place deixis is also analysed to determine where the event takes place, what other locations are referred to and what meaning and effect could be gleaned from the use of spatial deictic expressions.

Another way to flesh out meaning and effect in political speech is from the lens of social deixis as another category of deictic expressions. Social deixis involves the marking of social relationships in linguistic expressions with either direct or indirect reference to the social status or role of participants in the linguistic event (Al Azzawi 2011). Expression of social deixis can be accomplished by several linguistic devices including personal pronouns, clitics and particles, forms of address and the choice of vocabulary. However, in this paper, social deixis is examined only through forms of address and choice of vocabulary.

Having in mind these four categories of deixis, the paper proceeds in analysing how PNoy deploys persons, locations, periods of time and social relationships in the deictic field and what meaning and effect does the President's use of deictic expressions convey.

RESULTS

This section presents and discusses the data analysed in this study. Following the four categories of deictic expressions, data analysis is presented in parts using the same categories. However, prior to the four-part analysis of results, the physical structure of the text and the ground zero are first discussed.

PHYSICAL STRUCTURE

The speech, which serves as the corpus of this stylistic analysis, consists of 19 paragraphs and 1851 words. The speech is provided as an appendix toward the end of this paper. Each paragraph is numbered 1 to 19 to easily navigate through them when a part of the speech is cited in the discussion of results.

GROUND ZERO

The deictic field is called ground zero before the first deictic reference is issued. As earlier mentioned, at this time the field is smooth and free from any deictic elements and their corresponding roles. Therefore, on the eve of October 30, 2013, PNoy establishes the ground zero. Then, he issues the first deictic reference with his first utterance shown in (4) below:

(4)   *My* beloved *countrymen*, good evening.

The first deictic references are in the categories of personal and social deixis. These will be discussed further in the data analysis section. As soon as the President issued the first deictic reference in his opening lines, the deictic field begins to be filled with different persons, time, space and social relationships which point to certain meaning and effect in and of the speech.

DATA ANALYSIS

The analysis of deictic expressions in this section comes in four parts corresponding to the four categories of deixis discussed under the method of analysis. Results are presented in the following order: person, time, place and social relationships.

PERSON DEIXIS

Person deixis is probably the most salient deictic category extensively used by PNoy in the English translation of his October 30 speech. The abundant use of personal deictic pronouns in the speech provides a window through which the participants and their roles in the speech and in the socio-political context are surmised.

At first reading, PNoy seems to shift his addressee between a two and three-participant deixis. The speech is then examined closely to see how this shift is realised. An analysis of personal deictic expressions in the paragraph level reveals that such an effect is brought about by the fact that, in the speech, PNoy continually shifted between two and three participant deixis throughout the 19-paragraph speech. Table 1 summarises the paragraph level analysis of personal deixis in the speech.

TABLE 1. Distribution and Percentage of Participant Roles per Paragraph

Participant Roles	Number of Paragraphs	Percentage
Speaker – Addressee (Filipino people)	9	47.5
Speaker – Addressee (Opposition)	1	5
Speaker – Addressee (Filipino people) – Others (Opposition)	9	47.5
Total	19	100

When a paragraph is composed only of first and second person pronouns, PNoy involves only himself as the speaker and his 'bosses' or 'countrymen' as the addressee. In the speech, PNoy made use of nine (9) paragraphs following this kind of participant involvement. His deployment of personal deixis in this way places the addressee at the origo or deictic centre and himself near this deictic centre. An extract from paragraph 2 exemplifies this role assignment of PNoy as the speaker and the Filipino people as his addressee as shown in (5) below.

(5) *I* am asking *you* for a few minutes of *your* time in order to bring clarity to these issues.

His use of first person pronouns to refer to himself and second person pronouns to refer to the Filipino people or his 'bosses' seems to establish a near-each-other relationship. This would not have been realised if, for example, PNoy made use of third person pronouns to refer to the Filipino people since the third person suggests the meaning of farther-apart relationship relative to the speaker. In paragraphs where he used only first and second person deixis, he directly addresses the Filipino people and seems to silence the third person, his critics or the opposition, treating them as outliers whenever he makes use of only two-participant deixis.

There is however one paragraph in which PNoy involves only two participants but his addressee is not the Filipino people but his critics or the opposition of the government. Paragraph 15 is shown in (6) below.

(6)   This is what *I* say to *them*: If *you* think that this will stop *me* from going after *you*, if *you* think that *you* can divert the public's attention, if *you* think *you* can get away with stealing from *our* countrymen: *you* have sorely underestimated *me* and the Filipino people. If there still remains some vestige of kindness in *your* hearts, *I* hope that *you* stop acting in self-interest, and instead act to help *your* fellowmen.

In this paragraph, although the President began by referring to them in the third person 'them', what follows is PNoy's reference to them in second person ten (10) times. The

President seems to bring his critics and the opposition closer to where he placed himself in the deictic field. Specifically, this author suspects that in this paragraph, PNoy temporarily suspends the Filipino people in the deictic centre and moves there from where he originally placed himself in the deictic field. Hence, the President is now at the deictic center and refers to his critics and the opposition using second person deixis, whereas in all other paragraphs he used the third person in his deictic reference of them. In this set-up of the deictic field, PNoy projects himself as a representative of the Filipino people. He silences them but speaks in their behalf using still the first person deixis. This might be PNoy's way of bringing his critics and the opposition closer to himself to show a strong stance and to challenge them. Challenging them would not have sounded potent and confident if he used third person pronouns here because that might register as though he is not brave enough to directly address them, an understandable effect if third person pronouns were used.

Finally, when a paragraph includes third person pronouns such as *they, their,* and *them,* he includes others or third person participants in the deictic field and assigns them a position that is opposite his place. This seems to create a binary opposition between him and the others, whereas the Filipino people still stand at the deictic centre. An excerpt from paragraph 17 as shown in (7) below exemplifies this three-participant deixis.

(7)   Now, *those* who have abused *our* trust want to cast *us* off the course towards the fulfillment of *our* collective aspirations. *I* do not believe that *you* will let this pass. And so long as *you* are with *me*, *I* will continue to stand for *our* principles.

When PNoy deploys personal deixis involving himself (the speaker), the Filipino people (the addressee) and his critics or the opposition (others) in the speech, he sets up the deictic field in a way that he and his critics are standing in binary opposition and the addressee is made to occupy the deictic center. In theory, he and his critics should have the same distance from the deictic center albeit from opposite directions; however his use of first and second person pronouns to refer to himself and the addressee respectively here again brings him, in reality, closer to the Filipino people who are at deictic center. This is strengthened by his use of first person plural pronouns 'our' and 'us', which index a closer relationship or, more likely, shared principles and beliefs between him and the addressee. Here again, the others are treated as outliers because of the use of the semantically deficient third person deixis, which also is farthest from center among the three persons of English pronouns.

The same meanings and effects can be construed from the speech by way of looking at the use of personal deixis in full text level. Table 2 summarises the person-referring expressions PNoy used in the English translation of his speech.

TABLE 2. Distribution and Percentage of Personal Deixis

Personal Deixis	Number of Times Used	Percentage
Speaker – PNoy (I, me, my, we, us, our/s)	99	61
Addressee – Filipino people (you and your/s)	24	15
Addressee – Critics and Opposition (you and your/s)	13	8
Others – Critics and Opposition (they, them, their/s, some, those)	25	16
Total	161	100

Table 2 shows that the first person deixis that refers to the speaker, PNoy himself, is the most extensively used personal deixis in the speech. Because of this abundant use, 99 compared to 25 third person deictic terms referring to his critics and the opposition, PNoy effectively foregrounds himself and backgrounds his critics and opposition in his use of deictic expressions.

Although the second person deictic expressions referring to the Filipino people were just as few as the third person deictic expressions referring to others in the linguistic event, 24 compared to 25 times used, the number did not place the Filipino people in the background. One reason could be that since they have been placed at the deictic center, their position in the written discourse privileges them to be foregrounded along with PNoy himself. What strengthens the realization of this is again PNoy's (the foregrounded) use of first person plural pronouns, which are inclusive of the Filipino people. An example of this instance is taken from paragraph 17 in (8) below:

(8)   Now, *those* who have abused *our* trust want to cast *us* off the course towards the
         fulfillment of *our* collective aspirations.

This near-each-other relationship between PNoy and the Filipino people realised through the use of first and second person pronouns respectively and strengthened by the use of first person plural nouns to refer to both brought the latter closer to the foreground if not in the same foreground as where he himself is.

TIME DEIXIS

Another salient deictic category, which sheds light to the text's meaning and effect, is that of time or temporal deixis. In his speech, PNoy made use of both temporal adverbs and time expressions in order to dichotomise two different periods of time. Table 3 summarises the use of temporal deictic expressions in the translation.

TABLE 3. Distribution and Percentage of Time Deixis

Time Deixis	Number of Times Referred to	Percentage
Soon – Aquino Administration	1	7
Now – Aquino Administration	11	73
Then – Pre-Aquino Administration	3	20
Total	15	100

Throughout the 19-paragraph speech, PNoy made use of temporal deictic expressions 15 times. Of these instances, he referred most often to the 'now', which represents the time of his administration, using 11 deictic expressions pertaining to it. The temporal deictic expressions *for the past three years and five months, in the fourth quarter of 2011, today, in the wake of Typhoon Sendong, now* and *tonight* used in the translated version of the speech all refer to the administration of PNoy. The only time-referring expression that pertain to a future time is *in the coming days* and could still essentially be considered as referring to the administration of PNoy. Meanwhile, three deictic expressions referring to a period of time before the present administration were used namely, *once, in the past,* and *not too long ago.*

Given the distribution of temporal deictic expressions in the English translation of the speech, the origo or temporal deictic centre seems to be that of the Aquino administration and that, throughout the speech, PNoy's reference to his administration and the time before his thrusts his critics in a position opposite his in the deictic field, therefore in binary opposition as well. His more often reference to the temporal deictic centre, the time of his administration, effectively dichotomises time as composed of two mutually exclusive periods, in which one is foregrounded (now and soon) and another is placed at the background (then).

Therefore, PNoy once more strategically sets up the deictic field in order for the person deictic centre, the Filipino people, to hold favourable judgment toward him and his government.

PLACE DEIXIS

Among the four categories of deixis analysed in this paper, the analysis of place or spatial deixis produced the most limited result. For one, there is no clear deictic reference of any place where the communicative event takes place. Since there is no explicit mention in the translation of the spatial deixis where the event or some other events took place, it can be safe to follow Fillmore's (1997) claim that the place deictic term is understood to be relative to the location of the speaker. While this eases out the difficulty of fleshing out the 'space' in PNoy's speech, another question that arises from this is, "What is the place?" It is necessary then to examine the speech to find lexical clues as to the spatial setting of the communicative event.

While it is convenient to just assume that the communicative event takes place in the physical space of the President, in this case the Malacañan Palace where the speech was delivered, an examination of the English translation does not point to any stylistic evidence of the spatial deictic centre to be the Malacañan Palace. Another possible 'default' location where the communicative event takes place could refer to a non-physical space; particularly it could be that the understood location relative to the speaker is his abstract and symbolic location, one which he calls 'straight path'. This argument is supported by the data since, three times in his speech, PNoy referred to the abstract spatial deixis 'straight path'. The following excerpts (9), (10) and (11) contain the phrase 'straight path' which might be suggestive of what Fillmore (1997) considers the understood location relative to the speaker.

(9)   And now, can we not expect a fair and just investigation, because the Ombudsman
        we appointed walks alongside us *along the straight path?*
(10)   I repeat: The issue here is theft. I did not steal. Those who have been accused of
        stealing are the ones who are sowing confusion; they want to dismantle all that we
        have worked so hard to achieve *on the straight path.*
(11)   This is why I am thankful today, because I know that we will continue our march *on
        the straight path.*

The possibility that the 'straight path' is what is referred to as the default location of the speaker makes more sense than if it were to be argued that the default location is the Malacañan Palace. This is because the Aquino administration's catchphrase 'straight path' jives with what PNoy also establishes in personal and temporal deictic categories. The straight path being the spatial deictic centre could attract the addressees to favour him in the political discourse he delivers because the addressees could surely identify themselves more with the 'straight path', which symbolises what the people long for: good governance and clean and honest leadership. This might not be the effect if, say, the spatial deictic centre is argued to be the Malacañan Palace, since only few addressees might be able to identify themselves with Malacañan Palace, which has long been a symbol of power and, at one point, greed and corruption and not the collective aspirations of the Filipino people.

Although the spatial deictic category accrued the most limited result, PNoy's strategic use of spatial deictic reference again aided in the setting up of a deictic field where the Filipino people judges him and the government favourably and the third-person participants otherwise.

SOCIAL DEIXIS

The last category of deixis, which contributes in fleshing out the meaning and effect of the translated speech, is that of social deixis. As said earlier, social deictic expressions concern the social information that refers to characteristics of referents especially persons. An examination of forms of address and choice of vocabulary in the text leads to PNoy's use of

24 social deictic expressions referring to him as the speaker, the Filipino people as the addressee and his critics as the others in the deictic field. Table 4 summarises the social deixis used in the speech.

TABLE 4. Distribution and Percentage of Social Deixis

Social Deixis	Number of Times Referred to	Percentage
Speaker	8	33
Addressee	11	46
Others	5	21
Total	24	100

Among the three persons in the deictic field, the President referred to the addressee most often. His social deictic reference to the Filipino people 11 times throughout the text using terms such as *bosses, beloved countrymen* and *fellowmen* effectively thrusts the addressees in an important place in the deictic field, the place being the deictic centre. This choice of form of address and vocabulary to refer to the Filipino people, in turn, transforms the speaker who is supposed to be occupying the highest political position in the land into a servant leader serving the *bosses* and his *beloved countrymen.* Moreover, it is to be noted that although PNoy made use of social deictic expressions referring to himself eight times, none of these referred to him as a President not even as an individual person. The eight instances of social deictic reference to the speaker himself were all references to the government which he presides, using words like *government, clean and honest government* and *good governance.* This strategy of PNoy of assigning social deictic expression to himself and the people this way very effectively admonishes the addressees to identify them with him since they are being addressed as *bosses* of a *good governance.* The effect could be that the Filipino people hearing this would be drawn closer to a clean and honest government and good governance where they are *bosses* and are *beloved.*

Social deictic reference to the others, his critics and the opposition was made five (5) times throughout the speech using words with semantically negative value such as *corrupt, old politician* and *thieves.* The effect of this is for the addressees to be naturally repelled, since the *bosses* of a clean and honest government would not like *corrupt* officials, *old politicians* and *thieves.*

Through the use of social deictic expressions, PNoy also easily dichotomises the deictic field between two types of relationship: first, between *bosses* and *beloved countrymen* and a *clean and honest government* and, second, *bosses* and *beloved countrymen* and *corrupt officials, old politicians* and *thieves.* The first social relationship is one that is mutually beneficial, whereas the second one social relationship establishes a negative, unhealthy relationship between the participants. Hence, PNoy once more succeeds in treating his critics and opposition outliers in the social deictic field.

DISCUSSION

The results of the present study point are consistent with what previous studies deixis found, especially concerning use of personal deictic expressions (Adetunji 2006, Urban 1986, Wilson 1990, Inigo-Mora 2004).

The President's use of personal pronouns both on the paragraph and full text levels seems to aid in solidifying his position on the issues that his government faces when the

speech was issued and, in the words of Adetunji (2006), conscripting the audience to accept his views and position in the political discourse.

PNoy's strategic use of two and three-participant deixis in the speech puts him in a more advantaged light, realising what a political speech should serve as purpose after all. Further, his switching back and forth from two to three-participant personal deixis seems to push his critics or the opposition farther from him and the Filipino people in the deictic centre. This strategy allows him to treat the opposition as outliers in the deictic field and consequently in the government's quest toward a clean and honest governance.

As found in Wilson (1990), his shift from 'I' to 'we' deixis throughout the speech might also be an attempt to ensure that the audience are persuaded in his speech and reduce the chances of being misinterpreted. Consistent with Urban (1986), Aquino's use of 'we' in the speech serves to persuade the Filipino people to believe that his government is clean and honest and eager to go after those who misused government funds in the past. The use of 'we' can also be seen as an attempt to enact personal identity as espoused in Inigo-Mora (2004). In his case, PNoy's use of 'we' serves to establish an identity that is close to the Filipinos' collective ideologies and aspirations, in order to achieve what Adetunji (2006) calls anchorage in political discourse, which is important not only in the remaining years of Aquino's presidency but also in the years beyond that.

In terms of the analysis of temporal deictic expressions, the President's reference to two different periods of time might be another way for him to send the message that his time is different from the time of his critics or that before his administration. A consequent effect then is for the person deictic centre, the Filipino people, to judge the message from the lens of temporal deixis favourably toward the government, hence strengthen the leverage in political discourse initially achieved in the level of personal deixis.

Unlike the temporal deixis, PNoy does not compare two different places in his deployment of spatial deixis. One reason could be that his non-mention was meant to silence and bring down the place of those who criticise or oppose his administration, treating them again as outliers in the communicative event. His non-mention of their place down plays their voice in the political discourse, thereby producing the impression that their spatial location is different and unimportant in the discourse. Therefore, in the spatial deictic field, the others are again treated as outliers.

Finally, in terms of social deixis as a separate category, the President also effectively uses expressions which would aid in the achievement of advantageous position in political discourse. Specifically, his division of the deictic field between two types of relationship: first, between *bosses* and *beloved countrymen* and a *clean and honest government* and, second, *bosses* and *beloved countrymen* and *corrupt officials, old politicians* and *thieves*, helps him persuade the Filipino people in his favour and ultimately gain political leverage.

Besides consistent findings with previous studies on the category of personal deixis, the present study also provides a case in which other categories of deixis further strengthens what is initially fleshed out by personal deictic expressions. Through this, the paper enriches what stylisticians already understand and can further surmise as to the nature of political discourse by way of analysing deixis in political speeches more extensively.

CONCLUSION

The present study explores President Benigno Aquino III's use of deictic expressions in the English translation of his October 30, 2013 speech through stylistic analysis. Specifically, the paper aimed to examine how PNoy deployed persons, time, place and social relationships in

his speech and what does his style of using personal, temporal, spatial and social deictic expressions convey as to the meaning and effect of the speech.

Guided by a framework anchored on Hank's (2005) notion of deictic field and Buhler's (1934) notions of ground zero and deictic centre or origo, the paper found that PNoy extensively and strategically made use of referring expressions in order to set up the deictic field in a way that he and his critics stand in binary opposition and the Filipino people at deictic centre.

Personal deictic expressions were most extensively used to establish and shift back and forth to two and three-person deixis. This was attributed to PNoy's strategy of bringing him and his government close to the deictic centre and his critics and the opposition far from it as seen in his use of personal pronouns in English.

Temporal deictic expressions were also utilised to dichotomise the deictic field into two mutually exclusive periods of time: one referring to the 'now' and 'soon' and another referent to the 'then.' The former represents the Aquino administration and is foregrounded, whereas the latter represents the pre-Aquino administration and is placed the background. This is realised using adverbs of time and other time expressions in the text

Meanwhile, in terms of spatial deictic expressions, PNoy's use was most limited. The paper however argues that even that is purposeful. Since PNoy was most silent in the use of place referring expressions, stylistic evidence point to reference to the 'straight path' as the spatial deictic centre and no other reference to any other spatial location. In this way, PNoy effectively places his critics and the opposition far from centre in the deictic field.

Finally, social deictic expressions used by the president also effectively foregrounds the Filipino people referred to through forms of address and vocabulary as 'bosses' and 'beloved countrymen', while his government was referred to as one that is 'clean', 'honest' and 'good.' The others in the social deictic field were referred to using expressions with negative semantic value.

PNoy's extensive and strategic use of personal, temporal and spatial and social deictic expressions very effectively sets up the deictic field so that, in terms of the persons, time, place and social relationships involved and referred to, the Filipino people would judge the President and his government favourably and the critics and the opposition unfavourably realising what the president meant to underscore in issuing the categorical statement, *The Disbursement Allocation Program is not pork barrel*. Through this, PNoy was able to dichotomise not only two different government programs but also two different kinds of persons (or politicians), two different periods of time, two different places and two different relationships with the Filipino people and himself and the government in a more advantaged and privileged light.

The study reports on how tools of stylistic analysis could be utilised to examine language use in political speeches. Extending notions that previous stylistic studies on deixis have established, the present study provides a case in which not only on the category of personal deixis, but also on other categories, temporal, spatial and social deixis, researchers may be able to examine the different social and political relations that exist between the speaker, the audience and other addresses in a political speech. Through a systematic stylistic account of deixis in political speech, this paper argues that not only personal deixis, as other studies advanced, but also temporal, spatial and social deixis helps political actors to persuade the audience in their favour and ultimately boost leverage in the political discourse and outside. The Philippine political arena wherein deixis is enmeshed is a fertile ground of rich research potential. Stylisticians and other researchers should use tools available at their disposal to better understand the nature and dynamics of political discourse.

REFERENCES

Abuya, E.J. (2012). A pragma-stylistic analysis of President Goodluck Ebele Jonathan's inaugural address. *English Language Teaching 5*(11), 8-15.

Adetunji, A. (2006). Inclusion and exclusion in political discourse: Deixis in Olusegun Obasanjo's speeches. *Journal of Language and Linguistics* 5(2), 177-191.

Al Azzawi, Q.U.D. (2011). Establishing the effect of deixis in translation. *Journal of Babylon University Vol 19* (4), 585-605.

Aquino III, B.S. (2013, Oct. 30). *Televised address of President Benigno S. Aquino III, October, 30, 2013 (English).* Retrieved from http://www.gov.ph/2013/10/30/televised-address-of-president-benigno-s-aquino-iii-october-30-2013-english/

Ayeomoni, O.M. (2012). Grapho-syntactic analysis of selected political speeches of some Nigerian Heads of state. *Matatu - Journal for African Culture and Society 21,* 319-339.

Buhler, K. (1934). *Sprachtheorie: Die darstellungsfunktion der Sprache.* Jena: Fischer.

Fillmore, C.J. (1997). *Lectures on deixis.* Stanford CA: CSLL.

Hanks, W.F. (2005). Explorations in the deictic field. *Current Anthropology Vol 46* (2), 191-220.

Inigo-Mora, I. (2004). On the use of the personal pronoun we in communities. *Journal of Language and Politics 3*(1), 27-52.

Kaylor, B.T. (2011). No Jack Kennedy: Mitt Romney's "Faith in America" speech and the changing religious-political environment. *Communication Studies 62*(5), 491-507.

Kuo, S. (2002). From solidarity to antagonism: The uses of the second- person singular pronoun in Chinese political discourse. Text 22(1), 29-55.

Kuo, S. (2001). Reported speech in Chinese political discourse. *Discourse and Society 3*(2), 8181-2002.

Lwaitama, A.F. (1988). Variations in the use of personal pronouns in the public oratory of J.K Nyerere and A.H Mwinyi. *Belfast Working Papers in Language and Linguistics 1*, 1-23.

Maitland, K. & Wilson, J. (1987). Pronominal selection and ideological conflict. *Journal of Pragmatics 11*(4), 495-512.

Naz, S., Alvi, S.D. & Baseer, A. (2012). Political Language of Benazir Bhutto : A Transitivity Analysis of Her Speech 'Democratization in Pakistan.' *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business 4*(8), 125-141.

Oluremi, A.O.C. (2012). A stylo-rhetorical analysis of Obafemi Awolowo's "It is not life that matters." *International Journal of Asian Social Sciences 3*(1), 216-228.

Sheveleva, A. (2012). Lingo-rhetorical and socio-pragmatic peculiarities in political speeches by Barack Obama. *Intercultural Communication Studies 21*(3), 53-62.

Suzuki T. & Kageura, K. (2010). Stylistic analysis of Japanese Prime Ministers' Diet addresses. In T. Tokunaga & A. Ortega (Eds.) *LKR 2008.* Paper presented at the Third International Conference on Large-Scale Knowledge Resources, Tokyo, 3-5 March (pp. 318-325). Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.

Urban, G. (1986). Rhetoric of a war chief. *Working Papers and Proceedings of the Center for Psychological Studies* No. 5 (pp. 1-27) Chicago: Center for Psychosocial Studies.

Wilson, J. (1990). *Politically speaking: The pragmatic analysis of political language.* Oxford: Blackwell.

APPENDIX

Televised Address of President Benigno S. Aquino III, October 30, 2013 (English)

Paragraph	Speech
1	My beloved countrymen, good evening.
2	Over the past few months, a few topics have come to be the focus of public discourse. With the cacophony of discordant voices coming from many different sides, perhaps the subject of the Pork Barrel and DAP [Disbursement Acceleration Program] has begun to leave you confused. I am asking you for a few minutes of your time in order to bring clarity to these issues.
3	You are all witnesses to the conflict taking place. On the one hand, there is you and your government, to whom you gave the mandate for change—a government that has implemented reform for the past three years and five months, pursuing the corrupt and working to alleviate poverty. On the other side, you have the corrupt officials allegedly involved in the Pork Barrel Scam.

4   Might I remind those who have forgotten: The real issue here is stealing. This is the topic they have constantly tried to avoid ever since their wrongdoing was exposed. I can't help but shake my head, since the first thing I expected was for them to at least deny the accusations. After all, is that not the natural reaction of anyone who is accused of anything? And yet, in the midst of all their extended counter-accusations hurled against me, not once have I heard them say: "I did not steal."

5   One would have hoped that out of respect for those who believed in and voted for them, these officials would have fulfilled their sworn duties. At the very least one would have expected them to explain how it happened that the beneficiaries of the NGOs [nongovernment organizations] they chose to fund was just a list of board passers seemingly culled from newspapers. But how can we take their excuses seriously, when after repeated instances of their giving money to the same NGOs, they had not once bothered to check if the funds they allocated actually reached the intended beneficiaries? This state of affairs is indeed difficult, even impossible, to explain away.

6   And since it is exceedingly difficult to explain, it seems they have taken the advice of an old politician from their camp: If you can't explain it, muddle it; if you can't deodorise it, make everyone else stink; if you can't look good, make everyone look bad. You have heard what they are saying: that we are all the same.

7   My response: We are not the same. I have never stolen. I am not a thief. I am the one who goes after thieves. We appointed people of unquestionable integrity who are fulfilling their sworn duties. Did we not appoint the Commission on Audit leadership that reviewed the documents leading to the discovery of PDAF [Priority Development Assistance Fund] abuse? And now, can we not expect a fair and just investigation, because the Ombudsman we appointed walks alongside us along the straight path?

8   Let me make it clear: The Disbursement Allocation Program is not pork barrel. Of the DAP releases in 2011 and 2012, only nine percent was disbursed for projects suggested by legislators. The DAP is not theft. Theft is illegal. Spending through DAP is clearly allowed by the Constitution and by other laws. DAP is only a name for a process in which government can spend both savings and new and additional revenues. Where did these funds come from? They came from our efforts to stop the connivance of some in bidding for contracts, in padding costs, overpricing, and kickbacks. They came from the proper spending of our budget. They came from good governance now seen in our GOCCs [government-owned and -controlled corporations]; just one example of this is the MWSS [Metropolitan Waterworks and Sewerage System], an agency once buried in debt, and which now remits dividends to the national government annually. Savings, above-target collections, and new revenues are the results of good governance. And because of DAP, these funds were allocated to projects that were within the proposed budget and that had a clear benefit to the country.

9   How does this mechanism work? Simple. There are some agencies that, for a variety of reasons, are unable to implement their projects right away; on the other hand, there are those that are very efficient in implementing their projects. When projects are stalled, naturally, we will not spend for them. We did not allow these funds to remain dormant. We looked for programs under implementing agencies that had proven themselves to be fast and efficient, and we channeled our savings into these programs—together with the additional revenue of the government. The benefits of these projects reached our countrymen faster and earlier, and we were able to spend the money allocated yearly in our National Budget more prudently and efficiently.

10   You can decide for yourselves: Is this wrong? When has it ever been wrong to look for a constitutional way to serve our countrymen more effectively? DAP funded Project NOAH [Nationwide Operational Assessment of Hazards], which gives accurate and timely warnings during calamities. Also because of DAP, under the Training-for-Work Scholarship Program of TESDA [Technical Education and Skills Development Authority], almost 150,000 Filipinos were able to study, and no less than 90,000 of them are currently employed. DAP also benefited our Air Force and the police. Through DAP, we were able to construct infrastructure in Mindanao and other parts of the country; restore the benefits of DepEd [Department of Education] employees by paying their GSIS [Government Service Insurance System] premiums, which had long been unpaid by the government; and fund many other programs and projects that have a real, tangible benefit to Filipinos.

11   DAP also played an important role in our economic resurgence. According to the World Bank, DAP contributed 1.3 percentage points to our GDP [gross domestic product] growth in the fourth quarter of 2011. Let us compare: isn't it true that, when they were still in power, we were called the "Sick Man of Asia"? Today, we can choose from a number of new labels: "Asia's Fastest Growing Economy," "Rising Tiger," "Brightest Spark." And let's include the investment grade status we received from the three most reputable credit ratings agencies in the world. This economic growth—and its positive effects, which have redounded to our countrymen, especially those in the margins of society—this is the product of principled spending, and not of stealing. Money once pocketed by the corrupt is now being used to help our people, particularly the poor.

12   Let me also take this chance to explain the President's Social Fund [PSF]. There are times when we will need funds that can be disbursed quickly to meet sudden needs. For example: we needed funds to provide assistance to the families of soldiers and policemen who fell in the line of duty while responding to the threat posed by the MNLF [Moro National Liberation Front]-Misuari Faction in Zamboanga. There were also those who fell in the course of rescue and relief operations in the wake of Typhoon Sendong. The PSF funded these; without it, without calamity or contingency funds, they would have continued to suffer.

13   Because these funds were abused in the past, people are saying that perhaps we will abuse them today—even if no one has accused us of stealing or of using them in the wrong manner. Some propose to remove them completely. Would this be just? If only it were that simple—but what would we then do in case of natural disasters? Even if we were lucky and Congress was in session, it would take at least four months of debate before Congress can approve the funding we need. If you are in Zamboanga, with a child crying from hunger, and government tells you that it cannot help you just yet, it would need to haggle with Congress first—how would you feel? We have the money, and we have the mechanisms that will ensure this money goes where it's needed most. Would it be right to deprive our countrymen of the care they direly need?

14   I repeat: The issue here is theft. I did not steal. Those who have been accused of stealing are the ones who are sowing confusion; they want to dismantle all that we have worked so hard to achieve on the straight path. We were stolen from, we were deceived—and now we are the ones being asked to explain? I have pursued truth and justice, and have been dismantling the systems that breed the abuse of power—and yet I am the one now being called the "Pork Barrel King"?

15   This is what I say to them: If you think that this will stop me from going after you, if you think that you can divert the public's attention, if you think you can get away with stealing from our countrymen: you have sorely underestimated me and the Filipino people. If there still remains some vestige of kindness in your hearts, I hope that you stop acting in self-interest, and instead act to help your fellowmen.

16   When my father returned home on the twenty-first of August 1983, he had a speech prepared. The Filipino people never got to hear it, because he was murdered right on the tarmac. In that speech, he quoted Archibald MacLeish: "How shall freedom be defended? By truth when it is attacked by lies." Now that falsehood and deception are threatening the Filipino's right to a clean and honest government, the truth stands as our most powerful weapon. Tonight, I laid out the truth of what has been happening in our nation. I hope that in the coming days you will talk about this within your families, organizations, and communities, and that you can arrive at an understanding and a resolve that aligns with the truth.

17   My Bosses, we have fought so many battles. And I am grateful that no matter how foul the slander and the sabotage, you never let go, you never gave up. Together we proved that there are no tyrants if there are no slaves. Now, those who have abused our trust want to cast us off the course towards the fulfillment of our collective aspirations. I do not believe that you will let this pass. And so long as you are with me, I will continue to stand for our principles.

18   I have no doubt that, whether or not I am in office, you, our Bosses whose minds and hearts are in the right place, will continue and will finish the fight. This knowledge is the source of my strength and my courage. After all, is it not true that, not too long ago, the system in place was one where the Filipino people had grown tired of dreaming, of fighting back, of doing their part? Today, there are so many of us who are collectively forging the positive and meaningful reforms that are taking place in society. I have every confidence that you will more actively choose to be on the side of what is right, what is truthful, and what is just. This is why I am thankful today, because I know that we will continue our march on the straight path.

19   Thank you very much.