UNIVERZA V LJUBLJANI

FAKULTETA ZA DRUŽBENE VEDE

MARTA STOJIĆ

THE ERASED OF SLOVENIA AS A DISCURSIVE PHENOMENON: A PRAGMATIC APPROACH

IZBRISANI V SLOVENIJI KOT DISKURZIVNI FENOMEN: PRISTOP LINGVISTIČNEGA PRAGMATIZMA

MAGISTRSKO DELO

LJUBLJANA
2009

UNIVERZA V LJUBLJANI

FAKULTETA ZA DRUŽBENE VEDE

MARTA STOJIĆ

IZBRISANI V SLOVENIJI KOT DISKURZIVNI FENOMEN: PRISTOP LINGVISTIČNEGA PRAGMATIZMA

MAGISTRSKO DELO

Mentorica: doc. dr. Karmen Šterk
Somentor: doc. dr. Andrej Kurnik

LJUBLJANA
2009

Contents

The Erased of Slovenia as a discursive phenomenon: a pragmatic approach

Abstract: When the discourse about the erased is taken as the originating point of the research (that is, an abstraction made of particularized utterances and communicative events), overtly stated, presupposed and implied notions about the erased in individual utterances and communicative events become designations of (they point to) the phrase in the discourse. Further, extensional properties of expressions in separate utterances give their way to the intensional ones. This implies that sense of expressions prevail over their referents. Thus 'the erased' in the discourse ceases to signify some set of entities in the world, but primarily signifies a set of senses, which concerns interlexical and intralingual relations. Therefore, in the discursive aspect of the phenomenon's appearance, we actually deal with the Saussurean sign, comprised of signifiant ('the erased') and signifié, where the latter is understood as a concept, sense, intension, and not as an (available or unavailable) object, referent, extension, we deal with a notion totally internal to the language-system, with something that doesn't have to be, to paraphrase Barthes.

Key words: the erased, discourse, utterance, meaning, pragmatics

Abstract in Slovenian: Ko se diskurz o izbrisanih vzame kot ishodišče raziskovanja (oz. ena abstrackija narejena iz posameznih izjav in komunikacijskih dogotkov), direktno izrečeni, predpostavljeni in implicirani pogledi o izbrisanih, postanejo designacije (ukazujejo na) frazo v diskurzu. Nadalje, ekstenzionalne karakteristike izrečenega v posamičnimi izjavami vstopaju mesto intenzionalnim. To implicira, da smisel izrečenega prevladuje reference. Tako 'izbrisani' v diskurzu neha označevati nekakšen niz entitet v svetu, temveč primarno označuje niz smislov, kateri se nanaša na medbesedne in vnutar-jezikovne odnose. Na ta način se v diskurzivnem aspektu obstoja tega fenomena pravzaprav ukvarjamo s Saussurjevim znakom, sestavljenim iz označevalca ('izbrisani') in označenca, pri čem je ta drugi razumet kot koncept, smisel, intenzija, in ne kot (dostopen ali nedostopen) objekt, referenca, ekstenzija, ukvarjamo se z idejo totalno notranjo jeziku-sistemu, z nečem, katerega lahko ni, da parafraziram Barthesa.

Ključne besede: izbrisani, diskurz, izjava, pomen, pragmatika

Introduction

Only few Slovenian social researchers have focused on the problem of the erased of Slovenia for the past few years, while this issue has been present almost on regular basis in the political, legal and activist's sphere.[1] Therefore it is not surprising that only two publications, solely dedicated to the erased, have ever been issued (Dedić et al. 2004 and Beznec et al (ed.) 2007). On the other side, there are numerous statements given by politicians to various Slovenian media about the issue, throughout the period of over 16 years. In addition, some members of the European United Left have brought this issue before the European Parliament, thus making it officially recognized. Many legal experts, from private and state legal offices, the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Slovenia and lately from the Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg, have been and are still working hard to grasp the essence of the problem: whether the erasure has ever happened and if so, what are its consequences and future steps to be taken in relation to both the erased themselves and the Slovenian government. The Slovenian and European activists in their everyday activities, including debates, protests and lectures given at different forms of 'nomadic universities' present and revitalize the problem.[2] The phenomenon of the erased is well known among Italian, French and Spanish activists in relation to the issue of marginalization and exclusion of people without citizenship in a country they actually live in. These discrepancies pertaining to the level of interest among the members of different branches (that is, scientists, lawyers, activists) make this phenomenon even more tempting for research. My intention is neither to give an overall description of the phenomenon, nor to provide a final word coming from one "objective", "outside" point

---

[1] Similar opinion is presented in the latest, but also only second book fully dedicated to the erased "Zgodba nekega izbrisa" (for example, see Zorn and Lipovec Čebron 2007, 11). It must be mentioned that the Slovenian Peace Institute implemented the project on the erased in 2007. Some results are published, but there isn't any overall publication yet.

[2] One remark about symbols and typographical conventions should be given: 'single quotation-marks' will be used for phrases, while "double quotation-marks" will be used for meanings, quotations, etc. This may seam too pedantic, however, it is necessary to show the difference among 'the erased' and the erased, a phrase and an entity. *Italics* is used for languages other than English.

of view. On the contrary, my primary concern lays in the manner of conceptualization of the erased by the people who "talk" about them. Being theoretically orientated towards the field of the pragmatic linguistics, I am going to analyze discourse about the erased with an aim to find out how this theoretical framework can contribute to the understanding of the phenomenon.

My working hypothesis is that taking into consideration the erased as a primarily discursive phenomenon, some aspects of its occurrence that would otherwise stay indistinct, might actually be revealed. It will be shown that the existence of the erased as a constellation of the real people occupying some specifiable place and time is inherently related to the creation of a metaphor, i.e. a cognitive device capable of obtaining different meanings dependable on the circumstances of the uttering. The erased, conceived as a metaphor, can further explain the operationalization of the phrase and its meanings and their instrumentalization for various goals, from expressing a political standpoint or even to allure voters, to portraying a personal life misfortune, for example. The pragmatic linguistic approach to this phenomenon may contribute to its thorough examination by assessing circumstances of the uttering and thus resulting in the specification of the contexts within which the metaphorical change of the meaning of the phrase "the erased" occurs. Context can be understood as "a rather undefined mass of factors that play a role in the production and consumption of the utterances" (Mey 1993, 8). In pragmatic linguistics, a context is considered as being dynamic and proactive, constantly developing in continuous interaction of people engaged in language use and not retroactive and static (Mey 1993, 10). Therefore, even though the specification of the contexts is necessary, it can never be complete. However, it may show some trends related to both conceptual and actual changes the phenomenon has undergone throughout 16 years of its existence.

The text shall comprise five major sections:

In the first section, "Assessing the phenomenon of the erased", I will give a short 'encyclopaedic information' (as opposed to presenting 'dictionary meaning') about the erased. While encyclopaedic information is based on encyclopaedic knowledge, that is,

knowledge of the contingent properties of entities, dictionary meaning corresponds to definitional knowledge, that is, knowledge about the essential properties of entities (see Fillmore 1997, 6; Marmaridou 2000, 45). For the reason that this distinction is difficultly if at all applied to experiential utterances, which always happen in a variety social contexts, with this emphasis on encyclopaedic information I am estimating my standpoint that there is no truth about the erased. The description of the phenomena I'll give tends to present empirically justifiable text which will serve as an axis in relation to which I will analyze discourse. This means, that the description will be "underlying truth" in the context of this text and its goal will be to distinguish the erased from other legal and administrative categories of Slovenian population. The question of the problem of description and differentiation will be addressed. The goal of this introductory section is to present the material and the method which will be used in the text. It should be mentioned here that this text will be primarily of the theoretical character. The erased will be taken as an example of discursive "life" of the phenomena which are perceived as real, that is, existing in the world. The material will be analyzed from the different theoretical perspectives (see bellow) having that in common that they deal with the question of uttering, i.e. the actual use of language. Since the material originates from internet forums, I will have to discuss some theories as, for example, those which contrast written to oral communication. I am going to pay special attention to turn-taking and senders and receivers of messages for the reason that some questions which stem from these topics (as 'up-take', that is, acceptance of communication, and participants in the communicative events) are crucial for understanding of how discourse works both on the (concrete) level of utterance and the (abstract) level of discourse.[3] By orientating to pragmatic linguistics the phenomenon of the erased can be illuminated from the standpoint that differs from the more common legal or socio-political one. Then I will introduce the pragmatic theory and its concepts and afterwards analyze the utterances about the erased.[4]

---

[3] It will be assumed that the notions which are explicated in a chapter will be kept in mind in the succeeding chapters. Occasionally, I will notify some chapter (as, for example, "see chapter 1.2.3") in order to ask the prospective reader to pay special attention to it, and at the same time to avoid repeating.

[4] That is articles, comments, internet posts, activist's reports etc. Because of the amount of the material, I will chose and deal only with those which I find paramount. Even though it can seam arbitrarily for a text that tend to be scientific, it will be shown that according to the theoretical framework applied here, the very phenomenon of the erased is also arbitral in some of its respects (see section 4 on Metaphor).

2. Being concerned with the linguistic and cognitive phenomenon, i.e. language, in the second section, "Language", I will say something about the language as such, language as communication, and narrow the topic by the comparison of the works of Ferdinand de Saussure (Saussure 1996) and Charles Sanders Pierce (Pierce 1979; Škiljan 1985). I will examine notions of language and speech, language as system and language in use, which are crucial for understanding of the dual existence of discourse, which is both a process and a product, an abstract system and an operation for the realization of that that system. Moreover, here I will say something about the notion of linguistic sign, which is necessary for the discussion of meaning in a discourse. In order to explicate it, I will say something about first and second articulation, phonemes, substitution and comparison, syntagmatic and paradigmatic axes, as well as of subcategories of linguistic sign (sign, symbol, index, signal). Substitution and comparison are methods for metaphorical abstraction, cognitive device which allows understanding of something abstract in terms of something else what is more concrete. The influence of these notions on the socio-anthropological research (for example, Leach 2002; Lévi-Strauss 1989) will also be noted. It will be shown that different authors attach different markers to these categories. In the following chapters I will delimit them in the way that would be the most suitable for my research.

3. In third section, "Discourse, utterance, meaning" the pragmatic theories about discourse, utterance and meaning will be presented in the separate chapters. Here I will come to the operational definition of the discourse (as comprised of and comprising individual utterances) and connect notions of language-as-system and of language-as-the-product-of -use-of-the-system through structural, referential and pragmatic theories of meaning. This would lead to the explication of the creation of meaning in the discourse mediated by individual utterances. The difference between context-independent sentences and context-dependent utterances will also be estimated. Very useful notions of intension and extension will be explicated and employed to point the following interrelations: between discourse and utterances, language as-system and language-as-the-product-of-use-of-the-system; the notions of the meaning of a sign as comprised from signifié and signifiant or from sense and reference; transformations of referential level (related to non-linguistic objects which exist in the world) in the individual utterances to conceptual

(related to sense/concept, that is linguistic "objects" which exist in the domain of word) in the discourse. In this section some major topics I am going to examine will be introduced and they will be divided into the following chapters:

"Deixis": deictic expressions are put in use in an utterance for "the location and identification of person, objects, events, processes and activities being talked about, or referred to, in relation to the spatiotemporal context created and sustained by the act of utterance and the participation in it, typically, of a single speaker and at least one addressee". (Lyons 1996, 637). Those 'egocentric' discursive tokens are related to expressions like 'I', 'here', 'now' – the person who is uttering, the place and time of the utterance. After presenting the theories about deixis, I will analyze the material in search for deixis, what would lead to the explication of the context in which the utterances appear. Transformations of extensional properties of deixis in individual utterances into intensional in the discourse about the erased will be highlighted.

In the next chapter of this section, "Presupposition", I will deal with this device of the pragmatic linguistics' theory: the presupposition is a proposition whose truth is taken for granted and without which the utterance cannot be easily understood or estimated for the truth value. I will try to examine if and how the presuppositions function in the discourse development and if and how they are used for achieving certain effects in communication by imposing a particular thematic-pragmatic organization of discourse (as propositions within the presuppositions by definition are not a subject to debate). Here will also be risen the question of propositions as cognitive devices and of silent agreement on presuppositions. In that way, by extracting presuppositions from the utterances, it could become possible to asses the world knowledge (background assumptions) that the utterers share and thus feasibly their intentions besides communicative ones. On the other hand, communicative intentions will lead me towards the notion of implicature.

What is said is not the same as that what was meant (see, for example, Šterk 1998, from a different perspective). These discrepancies direct us to the problem of implicature, to that what was implied by saying something. In this chapter of the third section, conveniently named "Implicature", I will present Paul Grice's conversational maxims (cooperative

principle, which is the guiding point of any conversation, the maxim of quantity of presented information, the maxim of the quality of the presented information, that is, the information should not be something the utterer believe to be false, the relation maxim according to which interlocutors should be relevant and the manner maxim, i.e. the appeal to be easily understood) (Grice 1989). Conversational implicatures will be contrasted to conventional ones, notions of which are crucial for making the distinction between conceptual and trope metaphors, the latter being described in a separate section. Implicatures in the individual utterances will be seen as a contribution to intensional properties of the discourse. Connotation of implicatures (and, consequently, metaphors) will be contrasted to the notion of metalanguage.

In the last chapter of this section, "Speech acts" I will say something about "making things with words". The utterances are not always verifiable (they cannot be probed for assigning a truth value), they do not just describe states of affairs and, the most importantly, by uttering (saying something) we also can be doing something (John Austin 1990; John Searle 1991). Here I will present the theories about the locutionary act (the act of saying something), the illocutionary act (the act performed in saying something in conventional circumstances and manner) and the perlocutionary act (the act of producing certain consequential effect upon the audience or the speaker), indirect speech acts (when the utterer says less to the receiver presupposing that the latter would understand the message on the basis of the common knowledge of the background information), etc. Within the speech act theory the notions of deixis, presuppositions and implicature will be connected, since speech acts serve as a place in which these notions can operate. The questions of the utterers, audience, conventionality (social context), interaction that characterizes speech acts, intentionality etc., will also be risen. Thus it would become possible for me to obtain the wider scope of the material I am dealing with. Special prominence will be given to the notion of performativity on the discourse level and on the level of the individual utterances.

4. In the fourth section, "Metaphor", I will present some theories about the metaphor in order to illuminate the discursive phenomenon of the erased. Metaphorical abstraction will be given prominence in this chapter. The term 'the erased' was coined in the 2002,

the year of establishing the Association of the Erased Population of Slovenia and it was widely accepted since. As a transposition of a name, the term, like other metaphors, can be defined in terms of deviation, movement, displacement. Metaphors own their effect to the changed context of the utterance, i.e. by using usual signifiers in unusual contexts different signifié is achieved, or, through unusual selection from paradigmatic-associative chains and usual combination on the syntagmatic axis extraordinary meanings are reached. Thus metaphors transcend and transform denotative aspect. Because the metaphorical change of a word depends of the context of uttering, concepts examined in the previous chapters would help me determine the circumstances of the occurrence of the utterances about the erased. The consequences of these on the discourse about the erased will be noted. The question of conceptual metaphors will be readdressed and the notions of their consistency and coherence examined.

5. In the last section, "Conclusion", I will give the final account on the question of the discursive life of the erased. Theories and notions that had been addressed in the previous sections will be interconnected in the systematic way what will result in the explication of the relatedness of system and use, processes and their products, the erased as some real objects in the world and 'the erased' as a discursive construct.

Due to text's length limitations, I shall enclose the links for the original material in the Sources, whose parts are to be presented in the text.

1. Assessing the phenomenon of the erased

At the very beginning of this text one meets a problem as big and complex as the phenomenon of the erased: how to provide a concise description (that is, one discourse which both consists of and constitutes utterances) which would offer enough information and at the same time would not allow flows into many possible directions this task can bring forward. This means that some boundaries must be imposed. And that is exactly what 'to define' means (Latin *finis* – end). 'To describe' is also to choose and present some properties and leave others as not being pertinent for the aim of presentation, that is, to restrict/bound a phenomenon. The theoretical perspective I employ in this text,

challenges boundaries. Therefore, it seams that I get into a paradoxical situation here: to define/describe something by opening the conceptual borders, or, in other words, to (b)order by crossing (b)orders. This problem does not originate from some theoretical concerns, but from the concrete material collected during fieldwork. Network-like and seemingly chaotic social groupings, flows of utterances, notions about the erased etc. are something that we meet, not stable, definite categories, structures and systems.[5] How to present the erased then? How to grasp all the complex connections and patchworks of the relations they have? How to define, and still stay open, without even tending to give the final word? One conceptual distinction allows me to estimate my point of view for the moment: the one between encyclopedic information and dictionary meaning. While encyclopedic information is based on encyclopedic knowledge, that is, knowledge of the contingent properties of entities, dictionary meaning corresponds to definitional knowledge, that is, knowledge about the essential properties of entities (see Marmaridou 2000, 45; Fillmore 1997, 6). For the reason that this distinction is difficultly if at all applied to experiential utterances, which always happen in a variety social contexts, with the emphasis on encyclopedic information I am narrowing down my standpoint that, at least, there is no truth about the erased. Therefore, the description of the phenomena I'll provide tends to present empirically justifiable text which will serve as an axis in relation to which I will analyze discourses. This means, that the description will be "underlying truth" in the context of this text. Or, it can be called "an open-ended operative definition" of the erased.

1.1. Distinguishing the erased from other legal and administrative categories of people in Slovenia with the outline of the consequences of the erasure for the affected people

A well known question which concerns the use of totems in some religious forms was answered long time ago: they (the totems) are not good for eating, but they are good for thinking. This thought as famous as its originator, anthropologist Lévi-Strauss, was

---

[5] This topic of adequate means for presenting rhisomatic realities is becoming more and more insistent in scientific research nowadays. It is the main subject of the one of the panels for the EASA conference held in Ljubljana in 2008..

highlighted in many succeeding scientific researches. In Leach's interpretation, its presupposed base is: we cannot think in continuum, we must impose borders, we must divide reality if we want to become aware of it, we must give names, we must form categories (Leach 2002, 51-64). From the perspective of the people who employ it, a category can be defined as a set of necessary and sufficient properties (not accidental, contingent ones) that an entity (entities) should have in order to be perceived as a member of a class, to employ a "bio-logical" conceptual metaphor.[6] Categorization precedes any classification. And classification is a prerequisite for putting things in order. This implies that including some properties (i.e. entities which have them) involves exclusion of the others. The consequences of the erasure are usually taken to represent this category as a unique one. By restricting my description to specified contexts of the appearance of the erased phenomenon, that is, legal, administrative and the one based on the consequences of the erasure, the relevance factors (and thus comprehensive effect) are increased. Therefore, for these contexts, the following properties can be considered as essential.

As of 26th February 1992, at least 1% of Slovenian inhabitants was removed from the administrative category of permanent residents into the category of foreigners,[7] and simultaneously erased from the register of people with permanent residence in the Republic of Slovenia, without previously or subsequently being officially and publicly informed about that change (Jalušič 2007, 14). Upon the annulment of their identification documentation (including ID-s, driving licenses, passports etc.), they were consequently, with individual differences from case to case, removed from their working-places, they

---

[6] Lévi-Strauss says that generalizations, and categories as generalizations, are made not on the basis of comparison, but on the basis of opposition (Lévi-Strauss 1989, 32). People who employ categorizations are not aware of those distinctive characteristics, as users of a language are not aware of properties of phonemes, to utilize a renowned linguistic example here. As Geertz suggests, a researcher should understand and describe those "native" categorizations in a way that would make them comprehendible transculturally (Geertz 1998, 18). For further discussion on the topic of actual possibilities of this enterprise, see Šterk, 1998.

[7] The official number of the erased (18 305) can be deduced from the report of the Slovenian Ministry of Internal Affairs of 19th June, 2002 (Ministrstvo za notranje zadeve Republike Slovenije. Tujski in državljanski statusi. Tiskovna konferenca Urada za upravne notranje zadeve. 19.6.2002). This number is was accepted by Slovenian Constitutional Court in 2003 (st. U-I-246/02, 3. April 2003). Prior to this, there was an "auction" about the number of the erased people: 62 816 Slovenian Ministry of Internal affairs announced to Helsinki Monitoring in 2000; 83 000 announced Ministry of Internal affairs in 1996; 130 000 announced Helsinki Monitoring (see Pistotnik 2007, 206).

lost their health insurances, pensions, and other civil, political, social and economic rights (Dedić et al. 2003, 134-135). They are neither immigrants nor natives in classical terms (some of them were born in Slovenia, some possessed at least Slovenian permanent residence for years before the erasure) (Zorn 2007, 17-32); they are neither a single ethnic group (they come from Muslim, Serbian, Montenegrin, Croatian, Roma and Slovenian ethnic groups) nor of the same religious beliefs (Muslims, Orthodox, Catholics, atheists etc.) (Beznec et al. 2007, 8). It took a decade before they were able to recognize similar conditions they were all put in by the state's administrative system (Zorn 2007, 29; Mekina 2007, 157-170). Some of them gathered into two organizations: the Association of the Erased Residents of Slovenia and the Civil Initiative of the Erased Activists (Gregorčič 2007, 93).

From the legal point of view, the erased are "citizens of other states inheritors of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (hereinafter: a foreigner) who had registered permanent residence on the territory of the Republic of Slovenia on 23rd December 1990 and since then have factually lived there without any breaks, i.e. a foreigner who had lived in the Republic of Slovenia on 25th Jun 1991 and since that date have still factually been living there without any breaks", (ZUSDDD Ur. l. RS 61/99, 30th September 1999) But this needs further explanation. Namely, following the plebiscite on sovereignty and independence of Slovenia (23rd December 1990, available on: http://www.ukom.gov.si/10let/), some new laws were introduced: on citizenship (Ur. l. RS – 1/1991, 5th Jun 1991) and foreigners (Ur. l. RS – 1/1991, 5th Jun 1991). At the time the Basic Constitutional Charter on the Independence and Sovereignty of the Republic of Slovenia (Ur. l. RS – 1/1991, 25th Jun 1991) was adopted. People, who didn't have the citizenship of the Socialist Republic of Slovenia but were registered as permanent residents of Slovenia, were supposed to apply for the RS citizenship within the following six months. Those who failed to apply, fell into the category of foreigners and were erased from the register of permanent residents (available on: http://mnz.si/si/upl/gl_novin/izbrisani/ZGODOVINA). In 1999 (Odločba Ustavnega sodišča št. U-I-89/99) and 2003 (Odločba Ustavnega sodišča št. U-I-246/02) the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Slovenia announced that the erasure was unconstitutional and that the government should adopt laws that would retroactively

ensure the erased to regain their rights. However, it has never happened neither in terms of all rights nor in terms of all people affected. Two laws were introduced: in 1999, which allowed the issuance of the permanent residents' permission to approximately 10, 000 erased people, and in 2003, called 'the technical law', when a permanent resident's certificate was issued to some 4, 000 erased people. The implementation of the technical law was hampered by the 2003 veto as well as by the 2004 referendum.[8]

This prevailing legislative "silence" is in the contrast with numerous parliamentary and media discourses about the erased.

1.2. The material

The phenomenon of the erased had been slowly coming into existence even before Slovenia proclaimed its independence in 1991. While Slovenian parliamentarians were debating about the Citizenship Law, some suggestions emerged on possible amendments to its Article 81 (foreigners law), which could have prevented the erasure, nevertheless, they were rejected (Dedić et al. 2003, 43).[9] First doubts that something erasure-like had happened appeared in 1992, when the Ministry of Interior announced that there was considerably smaller proportion of Slovenian citizens compared to the number of permanent residents with the right to vote in 1991 (Mekina 2007, 157). And first examples of the consequences of the erasure (especially in relation to prohibition of the return to Slovenia) were described in 1992. Janez Janša, the current Prime Minister of the Republic of Slovenia, and the Slovenian Defense Minister in 1992, accused weekly "Mladina" of being biased in favor of "Yugoslav aggressors". In addition, the journalists were accused of "having attacked Slovenian democracy" by writing on deportations, deprivation of or preventing from obtaining Slovenian citizenship, pensions and other rights (Mekina 2007, 158). The problem I am coming across at the moment is how to find all discourses related to the erased if I am to search among all phenomena arbitrary labeled as "the problem of national enemies" by some officials (see Mekina 2007, 158). I should find a criterion that genuinely relates to the erased. And science of language offers

---

[8] Thorough chronology of the legal and political aspect of the erasure is given in Pistotnik 2007.
[9] These amendments were about giving permanent or temporary residential status to the people who did not had citizenship of Socialist Republic of Slovenia, but had had registered permanent residence within its borders.

a solution. It is found in analogy with the theory of proper names in some of its respects and naming (wording/designating) in general. As designation will be discussed in more detail in the following sections, here will be addressed one of its basic properties which is that "wording is a process in which humans become aware of their environment, their world, and realize this awareness in the form of language," (Mey 1993, 300). The problems emerging in relation to both of these phenomena pertaining to the erased will be discussed throughout the text.

Lévi-Strauss said that even tough the phenomena exist without their signifiants, thinking about them becomes possible only when they get them (Lévi-Strauss 1998, 54).[10] In other words, we cannot think about something if we do not have linguistic signs ("name" the erased in this case). As Šterk points, "[t]hings are always symbolically mediated (argued), never directly expressed (demonstrated)", (Šterk 2008, 2). The theory of performatives states analogously: by saying something we do something; by naming (giving a proper name for example) we create something (see Austin).[11] The first question I can propose now is the following: can there be drown any analogy between the phrase 'the erased' and a 'proper name' (although in its modified, plural passive verb-originating form)? According to some authors (for example, see Burge 1997, 599), a proper name (Latin: *nomen proprium*, a name that belongs to somebody or something) names persons, institutions and, in general, objects whose reference is clear. It is distinguished from regular nouns which include certain indefiniteness in their naming, due to the lack of an indexical expression (that is, a particular kind of referential expressions where the reference is not just semantic, but includes a reference to a particular contexts in which the semantic is put to work: in other words, they are pragmatically determined) (Mey 1993, 91). In addition, proper names play the role of both a demonstrative and a predicate (one who uses them designates some object in some time) while their demonstrative as well as predicate aspects are not stated, but presupposed. Moreover, a proper name exists only if an object is given a name in an appropriate way and the name designates that object in terms of existential equation

---

[10] For further explication on this point see Šterk 1998, 55 -56.
[11] One example from the Bible: by naming (doing performative act of naming), God creates the world phenomena.

(Burge 1997: 599). According to these properties of proper names, the phrase 'the erased' popularly names one category of Slovenian population in terms of existential equation: the erased (administrative category) is 'the erased' (name/designator) for the specified spatio-temporal circumstances. But the reference is much less clear as it is supposed for proper names due to the fact that this phrase neither exclusively designates that administrative category, nor in the full range in its respective aspects, even though Searle says that "the uniqueness and immense pragmatic convenience of proper names in our language lie precisely in the fact that they enable us to refer publicly to objects without being forced to raise issues and come to agreement on what descriptive characteristics exactly constitute the identity of the object," (Searle 1997: 591). Thus the next question emerges: where to put the line between metaphorical and literal uses of proper names? It can be answered if one more property of proper names is taken into account: that they must be given in a conventional act of naming, which is for some authors the blueprint of performative speech acts (this can be understood as a pleonasm, as speech acts are those forms of expressing through which occurs the change of the world – their performative character is in the property of doing by saying) (see Mey 1993, 166). The erased were given that name in an conventional act of establishing (with full administrative procedure in front of eligible people, by eligible persons, and all of them were expected to behave in some ordered proper manner afterwards) the Association of the Erased Residents of Slovenia (it implies that there were some erased residents recognized who constitute the association) and was acknowledged in public with the support of the press conference ensuing it.[12] It can be said that all felicity conditions were met. But, obviously, here are interwoven different things: process (of the erasure), (the erased) people, administrative category (of the erased residents) and the association (of the erased residents of Slovenia), which probably stem from some background conceptualization ensuring these different references come under the same signifier (derivations of one signifier).[13] Can the analogy between the erased and proper names be drown, if the phrase 'the erased' has

---

[12] In Ptuj, on 26th February, 2002.
[13] In short, the phrase 'the erased' publicly emerged as a name of an association based on metonymical principles, when one aspect of the process of the erasure (namely, the erasure from the register of permanent residents) was taken to represent it as a whole, and was attached as a label and a name to the people who gathered into the association. Afterwards it metonymically spread on other people having undergone the erasure, but obtained different connotations allowing the inclusion of some other categories of the Slovenian population and excluding some people which were eligible to be called the erased.

such a floating reference (and it has never been officially but only publicly accepted in that form)?[14] For the time being, it can be said that if 'the erased' had been used as a proper name the use would have been the metaphorical one. But is a literal use of a proper name possible? Pragmatic theory says no, because the distinction between figural and literal is not a fundamental but a contextual one. Is the phrase 'the erased' a general term/a regular noun then? This question is also difficult to answer. As the phrase contains a lot of indefiniteness in its naming (every person that was erased is not always (self)perceived as the erased; members of the Association of the Erased Residents of Slovenia have not all been erased; the phrase is occasionally used to refer to some specified persons, as, for example, Milan Aksentijević or Aleksandar Todorović in its singular form etc.), [15] because its referring span spreads from process to unique objects, it can be concluded that its logical and linguistic form and the reference that constitute it heavily depend on the context of use. Therefore, the phrase is both a proper name and a general term and none of these at the same time – it is a metaphor and a meta-language, depending whether it is perceived at the discursive or at the utterance level (more on this in the succeeding sections, especially 3 and 4). The difference between a referential and a metaphorical aspect of the process of wording is that the former perceives wording as 'labeling' things in the world and thus fundamentally separates the realm of word from the realm of world, while the latter sees wording as a way of conceptualizing the world and thus fundamentally dialectically unites them (see Mey 1993, 301).

An answer to the question how to choose among all the discourses that can or do relate to the erased for the purpose of this text is the following:[16] as we think about objects only through the means of signs, thinking about/of the erased becomes possible only after they get their signifiant, that is, since 2002 and the appearance of the phrase 'the erased' and

---

[14] Please note that from the legal and administrative point of view the erased are "citizens of other states inheritors of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (hereinafter: a foreigner) who registered permanent residence on the territory of the Republic of Slovenia on 23rd December 1990 and since then have factually lived there without any breaks, i.e. a foreigner who lived in the Republic of Slovenia on 25th Jun 1991 and since that date have still factually been living there without any breaks " but who have not been in the permanent residents' register since 26 February, 1992.

[15] Milan Aksentijević was a general in the Yugoslav People's Army and Slovenian parliamentarian before Slovenia became independent and Aleksandar Todorović was the first president of the Association of the Erased Residents of Slovenia.

[16] The discourses have been constantly appearing since 1992 (see Mekina 2007).

its acceptance in public discourses. This does not imply that people having undergone the erasure did not exist prior to that moment, or that no one has dealt with the problem of the erasure, but since there was no unifying expression covering all individual experiences, ordering of those seemingly unconnected occurrences was hindered (for further elaboration on this point see Searle 1997; Šterk 1998, 84, and fn. 107). Figuratively speaking, the conceptualization floated from a signifiant to a signifiant (from the 'national enemies' and 'aggressors' to the "non-Slovenes" in general, for example) until it was anchored by the erased as a phrase.[17] By being given their name, the erased achieved a specific discursive space, and thus a more effective communication was enabled. As Šterk highlights, only the signifiant does create a signifié, since the latter is the effect of the interplay of the former (Šterk, 1998: 84). With an aim to get an insight into the conceptualizations of the phrase, I am to take into consideration the material dating from the period between 2002 and 2008. In addition, I am to deal solely with the utterances either containing the phrase 'the erased' with its variants (for example, 'so called the erased', 'so called "the erased"', "the erased", "the Erased", etc.)[18] or which are related to them as a kind of responses ("adjacency pairs", that is, "answers" on other texts which are about the erased). I will use the material from the Slovenian internet media, mainly articles and succeeding comments that resemble the form of public forum. I have chosen to consider only the media with the free access, thus confining my material to that from http://www.mladina.si, http://www.vest.si and http://www.dnevnik.si. The one more analogy with proper names can be put in work here: as referring of a proper name is based on certain presupposed characteristics of an object, which can vary from one user to another as well as on some other circumstances of the uttering, this small number of referred sources is in concordance with the theory, which says that there cannot be some absolutely sufficient number of conventional presuppositions and descriptive statements that would make a referring uses of a proper name true: they depend on (extrasentential) context and are all true and sufficient in their own right

---

[17] All those notions remained as references of this phrase until today.

[18] First derivation of the phrase, which is a variation of the verb to erase, appeared in 1994 (see Mekina 1994 and Mekina 2007). Here are double quotation-marks used as in the orthographic form utilized in the original sources.

(Searle 1997: 592; Burge 1997: 600).[19] The same is with the chosen number and origin of discourses that relate to this phrase: they are not that important, and what really matters is what is created by them. Moreover, as discursive phenomena are not subject to empirical confirmation in the sense of natural sciences, pragmatic analyzes does not tend to predict properties of some future occurrences of phenomena. Its goal is comprehension.[20]

1.3. The Method

This text aims at drawing the attention to the discursive creation of the erased as well as to the ways of manipulation with these constructions. The articles will be considered as triggers for succeeding comments. However, the amount of comments decreased after reaching its summit in 2004.[21] The utterances will be examined from various standpoints which have in common that they deal with the actual use of language. Therefore, the linguistic perspective will be adapted in order to make it applicable on this material and it will be compared and modified according to some anthropological theories, especially those which are oriented towards the phenomena of exchange, classification and practice.

The internet as a means of communication has raised some questions both at the methodological and theoretical level. In this section I will give some remarks on some specific problems emerging throughout the research, which concern written versus oral communication and two more specific problems, that is turn-taking and 'senders' and 'receivers" of messages. Since the precondition of any communicative event viewed from a pragmatic standpoint is that there must be some people who communicate,[22] this

---

[19] An amount can be interpreted as relative (*many, several, enough*) or as absolute (*one, three, all, none*). Intuitively, it is not possible to take into consideration all the discourses about the erased, even tough they can "essentially" relate to them, or restricted only to public ones (till they are all gathered in digital form and available through internet). Further, from this it follows that it is not possible to count all the discourses about the erased, too, what would eventually enable quantitative labeling as *the most, the majority,* etc., or even quantitative labeling with further determination of value as *the most valid, the most various* etc. of them. Therefore, I will into consideration *some* of them (on quantificational indefinites see Fodor and Sag 1997).

[20] In Geertzian terms, my goal is to get an insight into a "native" understanding of the phenomenon of the erased, or, in Malinowskian, to find out what are the necessary steps to be taken to "go native" about the discursive use of the erased.

[21] This corresponds to the 'popularity' of the topic: the erased 'appeared' in 2002 and in 2004 there was a referendum when the citizens of Slovenia voted for or against giving back the civic rights to the erased systematically.

[22] "Pragmatics is the science of language seen in relation to its user," (Mey 1993, 5).

clarification will lead towards determination of the participants in communicative events I am going to analyze in order to get some insight into the problem of the erased.

1.3.1. Written *versus* oral communication

Saussure, a famous Swiss linguist, whose work inspired numerous generations of linguists and anthropologists, makes the fundamental distinction between oral and written language, which led towards the Platonic attitude that the former is the only legitimate object of linguistics (Saussure 1996, 46). In such perspective, written language exists only to represent the oral one and it does it inconsistently (Ibid., 50). Saussure saw written systems as kinds of artificial boundaries imposed on language, that inadequately restrict it according to some arbitral norms (Ibid., 51). It could be said that even tough he built his theory of linguistic sign as a union of a concept and an acoustic image (presentation we get through the means of senses) by opposing to the perspective on sign as 'acoustic image' alone that was prevailing in these days, he reiterated his opponents' perspective on written forms: a written form became only a 'written image' of oral sign, and thus impertinent for linguistics. This marginalization of written language had been labeled as "phonocentrism" by later authors and is still appealing for some scientific circles (see Harris 2001, 132). However, analysis of written texts in linguistics and other disciplines has never really ceased. For example, in semiology, writing is dealt with as any other symbolic system (Barthes 1990, 183). Text linguistics is interested in texts, both oral and written (Beaugrande and Dressler 1994, 14-29). The same is with discourse analysis considering written texts as a form of interaction where 'users' (actors) are authors and readers and where reading is an agency of actualizing the written by reconstitution of its meaning (van Dijk 1998, 3). In anthropology, conceptualization of writing went into diverse directions: from identifying it as a sort of technology (which can serve for many goals, from ritual, over education and reproduction of social system, to bare oppression of illiterate majority by literate minority) to a mode of cognition (as any other kind of use of symbolic forms) (see Rapport and Overing 2000, 405-408). In modern anthropology, special emphasis is put on phenomenon of reading, which is understood as an activity where reader imposes his/her interpretative framework upon the text. Some authors speak about 'interpretative communities', a phrase which relates to

readers which share interpretative principles and strategies and thus create certain readings as conventional, normal and obvious, but what does not imply that there is no heteroglossia, possibilities of employing different reading strategies (Ibid., 313). Nevertheless, it is not possible to equate oral and verbal communication for some (at least) technical reasons. Therefore, I will say something about two specific phenomena that seem interesting for this point of research, namely time of uttering in connection with the turn-taking and participants in written communicative events.

1.3.2. Turn-taking

As opposed to simultaneity, characteristic for oral communication, coding time (in this case, time of composing an utterance) on the internet forums, is not always expected to be identical to receiving time (reading) (see Levinson 1995: 77). The span between utterances is usually prolonged. For example, in the article "Popravljanje napak iz preteklosti" ["Ameliorating faults from the past"], *Mladina,* section "Foreigners", of 15th July 2002, the first of 80 comments appears on 18th July 2002 and the last one on 25th July 2002". The span of the whole communicative event is 10 days.[23] All the posts (comments) are both responses to the article and to the preceding posts. In the period 2002-2004 it often happened that a new topic was introduced in the comments, a topic which wasn't present in the article. To take the same communicative event as an example, there are three major topics presented: the former generals of the Yugoslav People's Army and their legal status in Slovenia with the notification of their appeals filed against the Slovenian plaintiffs who accused them of having committed various acts (for example, collaboration with enemies), the erased in terms of their number (20, 000), Milan Kučan's attitude (the former President of the Republic of Slovenia) on the issue ("That problem definitely spoils the image of Slovenia as a democratic and tolerant state") as well as the issue of the legal status of refugees in the Republic of Slovenia (the lack of an adequate law). The whole article is written from the standpoint implying that

---

[23] Similar situation is found in the articles "Borec za pravico. Aleksandar Todorović, predsednik društva izbrisanih", ["Fighter for justice. Aleksandar Todorović, the president of the Association of the Erased"], *Mladina*, section "The erased," 21st July 2003, there was a span of 67 comments from 28th July 2003 until 2nd August 2003, that is, it took 12 days for the whole communicative act, or, in the article "Pol milijona ksenofobov," ["Half a million xenophobes"]. *Mladina*, 10th April, 2004, there was a span of 91 comments from 19th until 25th of April 2004, or 15-day communicative act, etc.

the law practicing in Slovenia is politically motivated (against the people originating from the former Yugoslavia). Some new topics introduced (which have been discussed by more than two commentators) concern "the Slovenian national pride", "the smallness of Slovenia", "Slovenia's wealth", "the Serbian lobby in Slovenia", Ratko Mladić and his citizenship,[24] 1991 Slovenian independence referendum, some Baltic state bank robbers, schools with ethnic minorities languages in Slovenia, etc.[25] Therefore, in terms of conversational analysis, it is possible to talk about 'turn-taking' and 'adjacency pairs', but the mode of communication is distinct from the oral one. Turn-taking represents the shift in the direction of the speaking flow (see Mey 1993, 216). It is achieved with turn-taking mechanisms on the points of speech called 'transition relevant places'. These can be brakes as taking breath, ceasing to speak or declaring the end of conversation contribution (Mey 1993, 217). Turn-taking can happen directly, when the person who is speaking allocates the right to speak to another person, or indirectly, when anyone can take his/hers turn according to his/her interest in conversation. In terms of the internet forum, direct allocating of the person to take turn is accomplished by putting the name of the wanted commentator in front of the post as some kind of a title:

(1)   **perotu**[26]

        [to Pero]

2002-07-18 18:37 by **Neznanec**

{the body of the comment}

(2)   **Neznancu**

---

[24] A military leader accused of committing genocide in Srebrenica (Bosnia and Herzegovina) at the International Criminal Court for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY), in The Hague, Nederland.

[25] It should be mentioned here that because the topics that are spread in the part of the communication act consisted of comments are those which for the readers (commentators) of the article have associative connections in relation to those offered by the article itself, they show the contexts in which the phrase 'the erased' can be found. Explication of contexts of use leads towards the explication of meaning. One of the Grice's maxims of conversation is that is expected to say only things that are relevant. It will be discussed in more detail in the section 3 of this text.

[26] All translations, which are found in parenthesis [ ], are made by the author. I have tried to keep the grammatical and orthographical characteristics of the original.

[to Neznanec]

2002-07-18 21:15 by **Pero**

{the body of the comment}

An indirect turn-taking is achieved when succeeding commentators respond to some topic offered in the post. For example:

(3)   2002-07-18 16:19 by **Bela Roka**

V tej državi očitno vlada ponekod močni srbski lobi.Dol z njim(Aksentijevičem)!Kaj bo nekdo, ki nas je hotel postreliti počel v Sloveniji?!?!? Jaz bi mu jajca odtrgal,če bi ga samo videl na meji.Dol naj gre, v svojo domovino,če je tako ponosen.Raus!!

[In this country obviously rules once powerful Serbian lobby. Down with them (Aksentijevič)! What someone, who wanted to shoot us down, has to do in Slovenia?!?!? I would pull out his nuts,if I only saw him on the border.He should go down, to his homeland,if he is so proud. Raus!!]

(4)   **Sem zaskrbljen**

     [I am worried]

2002-07-18 17:19 by **Valuk**

Pa ne le zaradi tega psa , ki se kani pasti v moji državi, ampak zaradi splošne otopelosti...V Sloveniji več nimamo skrajne desnice, medtem ko je skrajna levica in srbiski lobi zelo močna in to je zaskbljujoče. Nekdaj smo imeli SNS, pa SND...potem pa je gospon Jelinčić SNS spremenil v Srbsko nacionalno stranko..Če prištejemo še helsinški monitor, ki ga vodi gospa Miklavčić in novinarje tipa vasović, ki ne zamudijo niti ene priložnosti, da s ene bi v tujih medijih norčevali iz Slovenije in Slovencev, potem je stvar jasna. Srbski lobi je zelo močan in le vprašanje časa je, kdaj bodo zahtevali še dvojezičnost (ni čudno, kakih 100 tisoč državljanov Slovenije itak ne zna slovensko), pa

šole v svojem jeziku..Aksentijević je le vrh ledene gore. V Sloveniji živi čez 60 tisoč Srbov in podavili bi nas z golimo rokami, če bi le imeli možnost.

[And not only because of that dog , who intends to get fed in my country, but because of the overall dullness...In Slovenia we do not have an extreme right-wing and an extreme left-wing and the Serbian lobby are very strong and that causes worries. We used to have the SNS [Slovenian National Party], and the SND [Slovenian National Right]...afterwards Mr. Jelinčič converted the SNS into the Serbian National Party. If we also take into account Helsinki Monitor, led by Mrs. Miklavčič and journalists of vasović type, who do not hesitate to use every opportunity to make fools of Slovenia and Slovenes in the foreign media, the situation is clear. The Serbian lobby is very powerful and it's only a question of time before somebody would ask for bilingualism, too (it's no wonder, as some 100, 000 Slovenian citizens cannot speak Slovenian), and schools in their own language. Aksentijević is only the top of the iceberg. Over 60, 000 Serbs live in Slovenia and they would strangle us with bare hands if they only had the opportunity.]

In (3) we have new topics on the powerful Serbian lobby and Aksentijević's (being a Serb) intention to kill Slovenes by shooting them up, which are accepted in (4) while the second one is spread to all Serbs in Slovenia (60, 000 of them) with the changed mode of killing – by strangling. In (4) we have new topics that are introduced and accepted in the remaining part of the communicative event (Slovenian vs. Serbian language, languages of the minorities in schools, etc.), but these will be discussed later on in the text.

On internet forums, a turn-taking is achieved with both direct allocation and indirect response to some topic. The difference concerning the achievement and interpretation of the transition relevant places between oral communication and the one present on internet forums, lays in that in the former these are not always clear, thus leaving enough space for creativity of both speakers and future turn-takers, while in the latter they are evident – the end of post is the end of contribution for that stage of communicative event. But this restriction of form does not necessarily result in scarcity of content, to employ this opposition (on this issue, see Mey 1993, 277-281), and inventiveness of participants in communicative events.

In order to have a turn-taking, there must be an up-take, a response, that is, an acceptance of communicative event which is a precondition of its existence (see May 1993, 141; also, on pragmatic acts, Ibid., 257). Two at first glance opposite remarks can be put here: the topics which are frequently up-taken are either those considered to be the most problematic ones and therefore needing further elaboration in the remaining part of the communicative event (everything what could be said on the erased), or the most unproblematic ones, that is, those considered to be the most appropriate for the issue of the erased according to the norms pertaining to the forms and contents of public debating on the issue (what should be said on the erased). The solution is in the conjoining of the two: the topics with the most up-takes are those which are considered to be the most relevant ones for the problem of the erased according to the norms of public debating on the problem, but which are at the same time the most problematic ones (and thus need further elaboration). In other words, the most frequently up-taken topics are those in which the collision of knowledge about the erased and accepted norms and values of the mode of public debating about them is met – where what could be said about the erased is confronted to what should be said about them. To rephrase it again, the most popular topics related to the erased are those without public consensus, and with strong discrepancies in accepting the information generated from different sources which can be considered as valid (trustful). These are politicians, lawyers, international organizations, people who are erased, etc. Therefore, the most frequent topics are at the same time problematic in terms of being accepted by all commentators, but also unproblematic in terms of "lobbies" following some hallmark ideas about the problem of the erased. Consequently, it is possible to find "legalists," "nationalists," "patriots," "racists," "pacifists," "militants," "human rights' advocates," etc. Collision and agitation are very likely to be encountered and are actually realized in the comments on the problem of the erased, on which, as previously mentioned, there is no official consensus even in terms of its existence. For this reason, the posts resemble the situation in a wider society in full range (divisions according to affiliation that spreads, for example, from partial to individual one). In respect to its form, the discussion on internet forums is in this case similar to some kind of round table discussions. Ideally, everyone can speak, if he/she wants, respond to any topic of interest, propose a new one, just show his/her agreement or

disagreement with some of preceding posts etc. It can and it does happen that a response is given a few days after the coding time of a topic (see above). The form of this communicative event is network-like, for its topic aspect (topics can appear and be responded to at every moment of communicative event), but it is also chain-like, for its aspect of development in time (post after post). Analogously, both comments in individual communicative events (loosely defined above as articles and succeeding comments) and discursive creation of the erased in general can be analyzed synchronically, according to topics no matter of the time of their appearance, but also calendrically, according to some absolute time spans and points (dates and times noted in every comment, dates of articles). Both approaches will be employed here: first, synchronic one, will be employed thoroughly in order to notify types of topics that are written as to relate to the erased, which can contribute to the estimation of contexts in which the phrase is found and thus result in specification of its meaning, and the second, calendaric one, will only be mentioned due to he text length limitations, but which could be employed in order to point out the eventual diachronic change of the contexts, and consequently, change of the meaning of the phrase.

1.4. Senders and receivers of messages

The problem of senders and receivers of messages has been elaborated within different theoretical approaches of language and communication studies (see Levinson 1995, 89-94; Jakobson 1996, 153-155; Leach 2002, 21) Here I will combine some of them in order to adjust the perspective to analysis of utterances on internet forums.

Jakobson distinguishes senders (addressers) and receivers (addressees) of messages as two out of six constitutive factors of language (others being message, context, code and channel), former determining as a so called emotive or expressive function of language (feelings, attitudes, overall relation towards what is talked about), and the latter determining its conative function (the use of language to address a hearer in the context situation, grammatically expressed by imperative and honorifics, lacking truth value in Austin's sense) (Jakobson 1996, 153-155). Leach defines a communicative event as any unit of communication which is dyadic in at least two senses: first, there must be two

individuals (which may, but not necessarily, be at the same place at the same time), a 'sender', the generator of the expressive act, and a 'receiver', interpreter of the results of the expressive act; second, the expressive act has two aspects itself, one being an act of transmitting the message, another being the message (coded by sender, decoded by receiver) (Leach 2002, 21). This ideal basic structure (sender-receiver) can be proliferated in order to comprise different participant roles we find in actual communicative events, for which this distinction is too general. Pragmatic theory on person deixis offers the following classification of roles of participants in communicative events:[27] speaker (spokesman), source, recipient, that is, hearers (bystanders, addressed and non-addressed), but also non-participating overhearers (Levinson 1995: 68 and 90). Even though I am dealing with the written material, this categorization can here be employed, with small adaptations of terminology bearing in mind: an "audible" conceptual metaphor should be changed into a "visual" (specifically, 'graphemic') one.

'Speakers' ('spokesman') are to be distinguished from sources of information. In the articles on the erased, 'spokesmen' are the subscribed journalists, but the sources are different persons. For example, in the article "Popravljanje napak iz preteklosti" ("Amelioration of the faults from the past,"), "Mladina," section "Foreigners", of 15th July, 2002, sources are Milan Kučan, the former president of the Republic of Slovenia, Matjaž Hanžek, the Slovenian Human Rights Ombudsman, the reports on the legal proceedings against Milan Aksentijević, etc.; in the article "Borec za pravico. Aleksandar Todorović, predsednik društva izbrisanih", ["Fighter for justice. Aleksandar Todorović, the President of the Association of the Erased"], *Mladina*, section "The erased," of 21st July 2003, sources are Aleksandar Todorović, from the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Slovenia, Franco Juri, a former Slovenian parliamentarian, etc. The same situation is found in the succeeding comments, where the speaker (commentator) is subscribed under a nickname written after the time the post is accepted and sent on the forum by the moderator, but the sources are not always explicitly stated, as in the articles where there is a professional obligation to do so. But it doesn't mean that there are less

---

[27] Pragmatic theory is not interested in roles of participants in communicative acts as a phenomenon *per se*, but to the point how they had been grammaticalized in utterances. However, the application of this thorough classification on the material about the erased with some alternations can benefit to a better comprehension of this phenomenon.

sources engaged. In both cases, explication of sources is often employed in order to achieve some communicative effect:

(5)   2003-07-28 18:00 by **Neznanec**

"Slovenskega državljanstva Aleksandar nima in zanj ne namerava zaprositi, vsaj ne, dokler "Slovenija res ne postane pravna država"." Pa naj ostane državljan pravne države SČG.

[“Aleksandar does not have the Slovenian citizenship and he does not intend to apply for it, at least not until “Slovenia really becomes a state based on the rule of law”.” He should remain the citizen of the law-respecting state of S[erbia and]M[onte]N[egro].]

(6)   2003-07-28 18:03 by **Neznanec**

Država ima nalogo, da "neustavni" zakon spremeni v šestih mesecih. Vendar se tudi štiri mesece po tem še zmeraj ni zgodilo skoraj nič, zato bodo v društvu vztrajali pri javnih protestih in obveščanju medijev. So pa res face. Zakaj ne počakajo pravno določenih šestih mesecev, pa naj pote protestirajo. Zakaj že zdaj delajo paniko. Mogoče bi pa radi iztržili še več.

[The state has the task to amend the “unconstitutional” law in six months. As after four months almost nothing happened, the association is to remain persistent in public protests and informing the media. They are really some dudes. Why don’t they wait legally determined six months to expire and they can protest afterwards. Why are they panicking now. Probably they want to purchase more.]

In (5) and (6) the commentator is producing an utterance with different overall meaning by reproducing the text from the article and adding his “suggestion” (see chapter 3.1.3). In (5) the source is marked by inverted commas, while in (6) that is expected to be inferred by the reader. In (4) the commentator mentions some figures (persons who live in Slovenia but cannot speak Slovenian, and the number of Serbs) which are presented as coming from some unbiased, unquestionable sources. This tacitness over the employed

sources fails into domain of presuppositions. By extracting presuppositions from the utterances, it could become possible to asses the world knowledge (background assumptions) of the utterers on the erased.

Another problem emerges related to the recipients on internet forums: since forums are public, it is very difficult, almost impossible, to make divisions between the addressed or non-addressed ones, unless it is explicitly stated in the title of a comment, as in (1) and (2). But 'overhearers' can be determined as those who do not up-take previously offered topics in the ongoing communicative event, which includes journalist (whose import is finished by the end of the article), succeeding commentators (who ignore the forwarded topic) and all those possible readers who did not become commentators themselves (which are not active participants of the communicative event since they do not import anything into it). They are all to be distinguished from the 'overheard,' a term designating those utterers whose utterances are not responded.

(7)   zalostno

[sad]

2002-07-18 13:34 by **Rok**

Zdi se mi, da bi v Sloveniji lahko vse, kar se tice politike, Nata, Policije... oznacili z besedo "zalostno". Lep pozdrav.

[It seams to me that everything in Slovenia, related to politics, NATO, Police... could be marked with the word "sad". Nice greetings.]

For example, (7) has not been up-taken, however, it is itself an up-take of the preceding article and therefore this 'overheard' is (has been) an active participant of (that stage of) the communicative event whose import has finished with this utterance.

The participant roles of communicative events as found on internet forums on the problem of the erased can be presented with the following table:

active	imports	journalist
		commentator
		overheard
	up-takes	commentator
		overheard
	up-taken	journalist
		commentator
passive	imports	source
	up-taken	
		reader

Table 1. Participants in the communicative events on internet forums

To sum up by turning back to the original division on senders and receivers, senders are source, journalist, commentator and overheard, while receivers are commentator, overheard and readers (if a journalist is excluded as a receiver of the source's message during some temporally preceding communicative event). The actual exchange in communication of this form is much distinct from the one present in oral conversation, which is characterized by alternation. Here we have two participant roles whose protagonists finish their contribution with a single utterance: journalist at the beginning of the communicative event and overheard often in the middle and always at the end of it. We also have commentators, who can never start communicative event, but just join it. We have sources, which are "unwillingly engaged" and readers, which are "willingly restrained." And we have a forum moderator (a person or a machine), without which the communicative event wouldn't exist and an editor of a media house, which both have a privilege to choose between articles and comments, but this surpasses the aim of this text.

Now when the participants are determined, and thus the precondition of the existence of communicative events is met, I will say something about language, a phenomenon per se which participants employ in order to communicate.

2. Language

"[W]hile language is now widely accepted to be central to the definition of what is to be human, there is no consensus on what language actually is," (Cobley 2001, 5; see also Stewart and Vaillette 2001, 19).[28] Here I would present one of the most influential determinations of language, the one which was given by Saussure at the beginning of the XX century and whose reflection is present in the one of the most dominant linguistic theories nowadays, the one known as generative grammar, given by Chomsky. But here I encounter a problem of the translation of French terms into English, a problem that must be resolved before I present the determination itself. Since semantics, as a part of linguistic inquiries, is orientated towards the explication of meaning, I will employ it in order to specify meanings of Saussurean French terms which would help me find the most appropriate English equivalents. For this enterprise, I will follow Lyons's explication of Saussurean terms which is based on eliminating 'system-product ambiguity'.[29] Semantic process of determination of meaning is based on replacing a part of a phrase with another one (something similar that I am doing with the phrase 'the erased' in the articles and comments in this text taken as contexts in which the phrase appears) while the aim is to preserve the initial meaning of the phrase as a whole (in

---

[28] For example, in *The Dictionary of Anthropology*, 'Communication' is determined as a "behavior resulting in the transfer of information among organisms, with the purpose of modifying the behavior of all participants involved in the process. Communication is basic to all life, and essential to living things whose lives are carried out in social environment. Anthropologists have long used complexity of communication abilities and practices as one measure of the differences between human beings and other life forms. Whereas many animals embody some form of information interchange in their primary behavioral repertoires, it has long been thought that only humans are capable of complex form of communication known as language. The exclusiveness of this human ability has been called into question by experiments undertaken in recent years in communication with other animal species, notably chimpanzees and other great apes. However, it is reasonable to maintain that no other species has developed communication to the level of complexity seen in human life," (*The Dictionary of Anthropology* 2005, 73). Under the title 'Language' similar determination is found: "In its nonfigurative sense, "language" refers to the most frequent form of communication among human beings. It is unique for human species (...)," (Ibid, 275).

[29] System-product ambiguity is associated with the categorial ambivalence of the word 'language'. Categorial ambivalence reflects semantically relevant property of countability (count vs. mass noun), which does not have to be grammaticalized, but which is apparent. 'Language' belongs to syntactically distinct subclasses of nouns (count and mass nouns, but also proper and common nouns). Ambiguity appears whether it correlates to a system of words and grammatical rules, or products of the use of a particular system or set of systems. Lyons asks what 'That is English' means: since the process of semantical disambiguation includes replacement of one part of the phrase with another one during which the meaning stays equivalent, he concludes that 'the English language' in this case (as a replacement of 'English') may be used to refer either to a particular text or utterance, or to the language-system of which particular text or utterance is the product (Lyons 1995, 17-18).

comparison with my endeavor, since I do not know the initial meaning and I doubt that something of that kind exists, I tend to notify what all can be referred to by the phrase 'the erased') and find syntactic equivalents (something too linguistic for my anthropological background and therefore underrepresented (if at all) in this text). In order to estimate the object of a linguistic inquiry, Saussure distinguishes between 'langage', 'langue' and 'parole.' These words do not have appropriate equivalents in the English language, since the English word 'language' has a range of meaning which covers both 'langage' and 'langue' and therefore, it is necessary to analyze 'langage' and 'langue' more thoroughly.[30] They differ in terms of grammar and semantics in several respects. 'Langue' in contrast to 'langage' is always used as a count noun; 'langue' denotes what is commonly referred as natural languages (English, French, Slovenian, for example) and language-systems, but also, unlike 'langage', it is not normally used to refer to the artificial languages and paralinguistic as well as non-human communication systems. 'Parole', on the other hand, denotes product or the products (of the use) of a language-system and unlike 'langage' and 'langue', it is restricted to spoken language, that is, to the product of speech (Lyons 1995, 19-20). Lyons points that Saussurean distinction has frequently been misrepresented as distinction between language and speech (Ibid., 20).[31] "The essential distinction, as we have seen, is between a system (comprising a set of grammatical rules and a vocabulary) and the product (of the use) of the system," (Ibid., 22). At this point it becomes possible to translate Saussrean terms:[32] 'langage' will be referred to as 'human ability to speak', 'langue' as 'language-system' and 'parole' as 'product(s) of language-system'. Now, when we have translations, we can get back to the presentation of Saussure's determination of genuine object of linguistics: that is language-system, which should be the norm for all other manifestations of human ability to speak (Saussure 1996, 34). But to start from the beginning: Saussure speaks of linguistics as a part of semiology, science of signs existing in a society (Barthes has the opposite meaning, that is, that semiology is a part of linguistics, but I will elaborate on

---

[30] Saussure says that it is wrong method to start from the name in order to define a thing (Saussure 1996, 38), but it seams to me that it would be otherwise too difficult to present his theory.

[31] For example, in Serbian, 'langage' is translated as 'govor uopšte' (speaking in general), 'langue' as 'jezik' (language) and 'parole' as 'reč' (word).

[32] About impossibilities of translation see Šterk, 1998. But since we are here dealing here with the establishment of a metalanguage, this endeavor is appropriate even tough it is intrinsically doomed to failure.

this later on in the text, when discussing the "nature of linguistic sign") and therefore laws discovered in semiology would be applicable in linguistics. Linguistics is distinguished from other possible semiological disciplines as it deals with the system of linguistic signs existing in a society. And the system of linguistic signs existing in a society is an integral part of the notion of language system, which, for its own sake, is an element of the tripartite structure of a phenomenon called language, others being human ability to speak in general, and various individual products (of use) of language-system. Saussure delimits linguistic inquiry only to the language-system, which is interdependent on its products (of use), by means of which it is realized. Otherwise, language-system is concrete although it exists as a reality located in brain, to paraphrase Saussure. He introduces some additional differences between the language-system and the products (of use) of language-system as: while products (of use) of language-system are individual and contingent, language-system is social and essential. While products (of use) of language-system are heterogeneous and chaotic, language-system is homogenous and systematic (Saussure 1996, 33-42). Moreover, linguistics of products (of use) of language-system is impossible, since at the very moment we understand it as a communicative process, it is a language-system (Barthes 1990, 144). Echoes of this tripartite structure are found in nowadays dominating Chomskyan generative linguistics. Lyons offers neat comparison of notions of 'universal grammar' linguistic 'competence" and 'performance' with Saussurean 'langage,' 'langue' and 'parole'. Universal grammar is specifically human and genetically transmitted language-faculty (analogous to 'langage').[33] By 'competence' Chomsky refers to "language-system which is stored in the brains of individuals who are said to know, or to be competent in, the language in question," (Lyons 1996, 20). Therefore, the competence is always a competence in some specified language. It is acquired by 'native speakers' in childhood with the help of universal grammar and "sufficient number of sufficiently representative sample utterances which can be analyzed [...], as products of the developing language-systems" (Ibid, 21). 'Performance' applies to the use and sometimes to the products of the use of language-systems. Lyons suggests that 'competence' can be identified with 'langue',

---

[33] Compare Saussure, who does not actually talk about genetic transmission, but whose 'langage' has the same effect on two other parts of language as a threefold phenomenon as universal grammar does, namely, it preconditions their existence (Saussure 1996, 34-35).

while 'performance' cannot be identified with 'parole' for the reason that the former is employed to refer both to the use (process) and products of the use (product) of language-system, while 'parole' is employed only to refer to the products of the use (Ibid., 21). He points out that what is essential for these language trichotomies is the system-process-product relation (Ibid, 22). Another analysis is offered by Barthes: 'langue' is understood as a group of rules which are necessary for communication.[34] It has its institutional aspect, whose main characteristic is that it is collectively conventionalized thus making it autonomous from individual use, but it is also a system of values, whose elements can be compared with similar ones and/or substituted with the different ones. On the other hand, 'parole' is an individual realization of 'langue' achieved by rules and accidental combinations of signs (Barthes 1990, 141-142). From Barthes interpretation it is obvious that while 'langue' is a system of rules, 'parole' is the product of individual process of rule employment. Exactly this individual process of rule employment (with the assumption that rules governing this process are not the same as those associated with 'langue' and to which Saussure does not refer with a specific technical term) is studied by pragmatics.[35] Paraphrasing Morris, syntactics deals with the system, pragmatics with the process and semantics with the products of language, (see Damnjanović 1975, 10; this will be addressed in more detail in the next section of this text). This is very important for our further discussion on the meaning of the phrase 'the erased': it is viewed here as a product of the process of uttering and since my aim is to research the creation of the erased as a discursive phenomenon (that is, the process as well as the product), pragmatics with its interest in examination of devices for manipulation of the system in order to construct final (but not finite) products (process of "translation" of the system into products) offers the most appropriate means for achieving it.

The above presented theory is in line with the basic anthropological notions on language: it is perceived as a uniquely human "téhne" of cognition and communication usually comprehended according to conceptual metaphor of exchange, especially the economic one (transfer, transport, sender, receiver, path, source, product, storing, wealth,

---

[34] In some interpretations, those rules are referred as 'grammar' (see Bugarski 1995, 70).
[35] In the remaining part of the text technical terms as langage, langue and parole will be used without single quotation-marks, since they ceased to be bare expressions. The same will happen with other phrases that I am going to introduce.

contribution, etc).[36] More specifically, this perspective on distinction between the system and individual product of use of the system had big influence on Lévi-Strauss's structuralism, according to which the task of an anthropologist is to search among superficial manifestations of culture ("parole") in order to reach objective, systematic and structured ideational reality which is (in) their true base ("langue") (see Lévi-Strauss 1980, 17; Lévi-Strauss 1989, 68).[37]

2.1. Language as communication

Communication is traditionally described as an intentional exchange of meanings that are represented by signs, that is, it is practical use of language.[38] It is realized through communicative events. Specification of the elements of a communicative event is necessary in order to determine subcategories of linguistic sign in general, phenomena whose employment enables language to achieve its status of a major cognitive "téhne." Since pragmatics, as a discipline that is orientated towards the examination of circumstances of uttering (that is, extrasentential context) is going to be discussed in the part 3, here I will just enumerate communicative elements and provide basic descriptions. For this purpose, I will use the Jakobson's classification, mentioned in 1.3.2. Apart from the participants already determined above, in a communicative event we have a 'message' (sequence of signs) which is sent to recipient by sender. That message refers to 'context' (also a sequence of signs, actually or latently grammaticalized/lexicalized,

---

[36] "'Cognition' concerns the knowledge which people employ so as to make sense of the world, and the ways, in which that knowledge is acquired, learnt, organized, stored and retrieved. More loosely, it covers the major modalities of human experience: the ways in which people think, feel and sense, and so make their lives meaningful and more or less ordered," (Rapport an Overing 2000:51).

[37] For example, in his analysis of myths he states that a myth is both a language-system and a product of use of the system: as well as a language-system is determined with its aspect of reversibility of time, the same is with the inner, structural value of myths – they form a permanent structure which applies both to past, present and future; on the other side, as well as a product of use of the system is determined with its aspect of irreversibility of time, the same is phenomenological, static value of myths – they always relate to accomplished past events (Lévi-Strauss 1989, 216-217). Lévi-Strauss's perspective on myths does not end here: myths are also absolute objects beyond usual level of linguistic expressions, different versions are interconnected to form big constitutive units which follow principles of transformations (permutations) which all participate in determination of the meaning of the myth (taken as a complex union of all its versions) and specific structural rules which it follows. Very roughly speaking, those transformations include permutations on syntagmatic and paradigmatic axes according to binary opposition principle (see Ibid., 218-238).

[38] Wider determination of communication includes exchange of any messages, from molecular code in genes till vocal sentences (see Cobley 2001, 5).

which in Jakobson's explication is both the referent and the wider context that determine the referent). In order to enable understanding of the message, there must be mutually accepted 'code,' that is, conventional, implicit or explicit key for coding and decoding messages, or, in other words, mutual agreement on the "nature" of the relation between signifiant and signifié. In other words, a 'code' is an abstract union of signs whose material realization is the 'message.' A 'message' never actualizes whole 'code.' And the last element is a physical channel taken together with the psychological connection between participants, which is called 'contact' (Jakobson 1996, 153-158). After enumerating the elements of a communicative event, I can proceed and direct my attention towards some "more systemic" linguistic phenomena.

2.2. Linguistic sign and related phenomena

In order to estimate the range of pragmatic inquiry as well as some other notions which are important for achieving my task (the examination of the discursive creation of the erased) it is necessary to get back to Saussure's determination of language-system as a system of linguistic signs existing in a society and determine what is a 'linguistic sign' a language-system is made of. Since I am dealing with a phenomenon created by the use of language, I will not take into consideration semiological systems other than linguistic up to the point when the comparison results in better determination. The emphasis will be put solely on those characteristics directly related to my research. In this prevailingly theoretical part, some notions to be discussed have already been used throughout the text, but without further explication. That will be carried out here.

Every sign by definition represents something else than itself, it is something that stands for something else. Therefore, it is necessary to distinguish signs from phenomena signified by them. Signs belong to total social phenomena, which means that they are determinates of human societies. In Peirce's pragmatic philosophy, a sign is a 'representamen' (mental representation) of an 'object,' it designates the object to 'interpretant' in specified 'context' (Peirce 1979). He defines semiosis as a mental action where these three factors of semiosis are interrelated, and since language is understood as a form of semiosis, it is mental action (process) itself. Words stand for things because

users (thinking subjects) conceptualize things in terms of these words what implies that meaning is speaker-dependant (Marmaridou 2000, 17-18). This mentalist understanding of language is altered into more behavioral one in Morris's interpretation, for the reason that user and not his/her mental representations or processing becomes a focus of research (Ibid., 18). He emphases that, side by side with speaker-dependent meaning, there exists equally important interpreter-dependent one. Since language users are both speakers and hearers, their respective roles alternate in course of communicative event. Therefore, the use of language does not only depend on the production of signs whose goal is to fulfill speaker's intentions, but on interpretation of these signs in a way which allows fulfillment of these intentions (compare up-take in 1.3.2.). This implies that signs are not objectively and uniformly perceived or understood, but are only interpreted in different ways and according to social and psychological identity of the language user as it appears in the patterns of behavior in which language is used. This further highlights the importance of social interaction existent in language use (echoed in discourse studies, conversation analysis, philosophy of language orientated towards research of conversational implicature, etc.). Morris gives the following technical terms: 'sign vehicle' is that what is used as a sign, a mediator; 'designatum' is that what sign refers to; 'interpretant' is the effect of a sign on a 'interpreter' (presumably echoed in Austin's effects of speech acts), effect that enables 'interpretator's' perception of a communicated sign; 'interpreter' is the generator of the communication process (Morris 1975,19). Since 'interpretant' and 'interpreter' are mutually constitutive, Morris speaks about three dimensions of semiosis, process in which something acts as a sign: relation of objects to signs is referred to as semantic dimension, relation of signs to interpreters as pragmatic dimension, formal relation of signs among themselves as syntactic dimension (Ibid., 22). As semantic and pragmatic dimensions are the millstone of this text, at this point I will orientate to more structurally, from extrasentential context and users free determinations of sign, mainly Saussurean dyadic definition of a linguistic sign ('signe'): a union of a concept and an acoustic image, first being 'signifié' and a second one 'signifiant.'

 Harris points out that 'signifié' is not the same as 'signified' (referent), but a conceptual component of the linguistic sign, as well as 'signifiant' is not a signifier (sign-user or a

material manifestation of a sign), but the mental sound pattern associated with the 'signifié' to form a linguistic sign (Harris 2001, 264-265). As Barthes states, 'signifié' can be comprehended as the level of content of the sign, and 'signifiant' as the level of expression of a sign (Barthes 1990, 161). Only taken together, they form a meaningful unit, a sign. Saussurean dyadic structure of linguistic signs is characterized by 'arbitrariness' (a relation existing between the 'signifié' and the 'signifiant' is not essential (motivated) one, but arbitral (unmotivated or conventional) one) and 'linearity' (a linear temporal span is needed for establishment and realization of a sign).[39] This former property of conventionality, which is by definition contaminated with extrasentential context and users, since context can be understood as signified phenomenon which is not a part of language-system itself (see Škiljan 1998, 15), led into the proliferation of signs in general into more specified categories as symbol, signal, index, etc., which are differently conceptualized by different authors. Before we proceed with the notification of these, something should be said about some basic properties of signs.

2.2.1. First and second articulation, phonemes

Language as a complex sign system is a hierarchical structure which means that units of lower level participate in the units of the higher level (distinctive characteristics of phonemes participate in phonemes, phonemes participate in morphemes, morphemes in words, words in phrases, phrases in sentences, sentences in texts, etc.) thus allowing unlimited amount of final products (texts) from the limited sources (distinctive characteristics of phonemes) (see Bugarski 1995, 12). While first articulation (analysis of a whole into its constitutive elements) is present in all sign systems, second articulation (analysis until the level of fundamental, negative, meaningless basic '*articuli*' whose

---

[39] Saussrean dyadic and linear determination of sign is not the only one: for example, Lacan offers complex formula of signifiant (at least two of them and positioned as a network), gives specific role to the relation of signifié and a signifiant as a complex formula (the former is suppressed with the latter), introduces suppressed subject ($) and object-wish (a) (see Šterk 1998, 83-86). Jakobson speaks about the bundle of signifiants in his analysis of phonemes (Jakobson 1996, 73).

function is only to 'make difference') solely characterizes language (Guiraud 2001, 40-42).[40]

One of the most comprehensive contributions to the topic of phonemes is given by Jakobson. Those "*quanta* of language" are combined in order to make chains of signifiants which are bearers of meaning (Jakobson 1996, 26). A phoneme is the only negative end empty sign whose sole semiotic content is that it is different from all the other phonemes in a system (Ibid, 53). Saussure says that phonemes are above all oppositional, relational and negative units (Saussure 1996, 124). Their only value is that they make difference from other phonemes at the same position in the chain of signifiants, (Jakobson 1996, 58). Phonemes are constituted from indivisible distinctive characteristics which are binary opposed, which means that every member necessarily implies its opposite. Each phoneme is a bundle of these distinctive elements (Ibid, 63). However, this bundle is not a simple mechanical grouping of distinctive elements, but a structure with specific combinatory principles (and thus both Saussurean characterizations of signs, that is arbitrariness and linearity, are questioned at this basic level). [41]

2.2.2. Substitution and comparison

According to Saussure, all elements of a language as a complex hierarchical sign system follow two basic principles for determination of their value: they can be either substituted by different ones, or compared with the similar ones (Saussure 1996, 121). Barthes offers the examples: a signifié can be substituted by a signifiant, a word can be compared with other words (Barthes 1990, 173). This implies that the value of a sign can be expressed only in the system of signs and only as a difference between signs in a system (see Saussure 1996, 121; Šterk 1998, 83). These two principles are put in work on two axis of relations of elements of the sign system, called syntagmatic and pragmatic (systemic, associative) one, and they are present at all its (system's) levels (among distinctive characteristics of phonemes, phrases, signifiants, signifiés, etc.) (see Jakobson 1996, 75).

---

[40] For different opinion see Levi-Strauss 1980, 22.
[41] The theory of phonemes inspired Levi-Strauss to search for indivisible 'atoms of kinship,' for example, basic "bundle" of binary opposed relations between kinsmen (see Lévi-Strauss 1989, 60).

Lévi-Strauss offers a picturesque analogy with the music score: while 'melody' presents a serial of succeeding tones, 'harmony' is achieved when all instruments are playing simultaneously, and sounds are perceived as a combination (Lévi-Strauss 1989, 219-220; Leach 2002, 27). Syntagmatic axis is understood as a successive "chain" of units conjoined in *praesentia* in a sequence and in articulated speech it is presented as linear and irreversible arrangement of units, each of those being valued according to preceding or succeeding ones (Saussure 1996, 128). Units (at least two of them) on a syntagmatic axis are hetero-functional and they determine each other (Barthes 1990, 184).[42] On the other hand, pragmatic (Saussure's associative, Barthes's system) axis presents a simultaneous "network" of units conjoined in *absentia* in a potential mnemonic "field," (Saussure 1996, 129). Units (at least two them) on a paradigmatic axis are at the same time similar and different, for the reason that either their signifiant or signifié must share some equal property and have at least one which is distinct. This shared property is positive (not differential) in actualized paradigmatic axis, but negative (differential) for other latent paradigmatic axes (which are organized according to some other positive property) (Barthes 1990, 185-187). While the units on syntagmatic axis are contrasted, units on paradigmatic axis are opposed (Ibid, 186).[43] These two axes are interconnected and interrelated because functionally equal units are selected from the paradigmatic axis and combined on the syntagmatic one in products of use of the language system (Jakobson 1996, 92). Since every sign is either composed of other signs and/or is combined with other signs (bear in mind that signs exist only in the system),[44] at the same time it is either used as a context for other signs, or is determined by the context of other signs. Selection, on the other hand, implies possibility of substitution (Ibid, 95). This is crucial for determination of meaning, that is, referent and sense of the sign (see Lyons 1996, 77-82). Jakobson speaks of metonymy and metaphor, two ways of conceptualizing, that are to be distinguished according to emphasis on the importance they put either on

---

[42] For example, determining relations can be: 'solidarity,' if one is necessarily implied by the other; 'simple implication,' if one implies the other but not conversely; 'combination,' if none of the units implies the other one (see Barthes 1990, 184).

[43] These oppositions are not only binary, but the comparison can be made between a unit and a system, units among themselves (both positive and negative properties) or between differential values of units (sole negative properties) (Ibid., 188-191).

[44] As Lévi-Strauss points, only a structure enables comparison of elements (Lévi-Strauss 1989). This is very important for the notion of metaphor (see section 4).

context or on selection. He reduces context to property of closeness for the reason that a sign determines, or is determined by, other signs which are present in actualized sequence of the sign system and selection to property of similarity (since the selection is made between units that share something that can be compared). Analogous determination is offered by Leach, who states that while metonymy implies contiguity (closeness), metaphor is actualized according to the declared similarity (Leach 2002, 26).[45] Roughly speaking, pragmatic axis is by some authors comprehended as a characteristic of language-system and syntagmatic one of the products of use of the system.[46] Since neither of them can be conceptualized separately, here I will not follow that determination.

2.3. Subcategories of a linguistic sign

Now when some basic properties of a linguistic sign in general are presented, I can address subcategories organized according to the relations between all factors in a communicative event, both sentential and extrasentential ones. I will combine Barthes 'nomenclature' with Leach's as for the reason that the former one is more formal (in the sense that it does not include the variety of possible contexts of use) and the latter more pragmatic.

Barthes compares six technical terms, namely 'signal', 'index', 'icon', 'symbol', 'sign' (not sign in general)[47] and 'allegory', offered by different authors (Wallon, Hegel, Peirce and Jung) on the basis of their characteristics which result in the distinctive meaning of those terms (we should keep in mind that these subcategories share the property of sign in general, that is, that they are all consist of a signifié and a signifiant, its two interrelated

---

[45] The same logic is found in Fraser's analysis of rules that are put in work in magic: while contiguous magic follows the rule of contiguity, homeopathic magic follows the rule of similarity. Things that had been in contact continue to influence each other after the separation, while the similar produces the similar (consequence resembles its cause) (see Evans-Pritchard 1983, 69).
[46] For example, Saussure explains (partial) classification of syntagmatic relations as an element of language-system and not the product of its use by the fact that syntagmatic arrangement does not represent some totally free combination but a conventional one (Saussure 1996, 128-129).
[47] In order not to confuse sign in general and 'sign' as a subcategory of sign in general, in the remaining of this text I will use 'single quotation-marks' for 'sign' as a subcategory of sign on general, while the sign in general and linguistic sign as type of sign in general will be transcribed as sign, as it has already been the case.

components). These properties are examined according to the presence/absence of the following: 1. implication/non-implication of psychical representation of one of the sign's components; 2. implication/non-implication of analogy between two components; 3. direct and immediate/non-existent connection between two components; 4. exact congruity/ incongruity of the two components; 5. the relation between two components implies/does not imply the existential relationship with the user of a sign. For the reason that terms 'icon' (for which there exist the analogy between two components) and 'allegory' (for which does not exist implication of the existential relation between the sign and the user), are found only in the works of two authors (Peirce and Yung respectively), he concludes that these subcategories of a sign in general are characterized with the following: 'signal' with the absence of psychic representation, direct and intermediate connection between its two components, presence of existential relation between the sign and its user; 'index' with the absence of psychic representation, absence of direct and intermediate connection between its two components, absence of existential relation between the sign and its user; 'symbol' with the presence of psychic representation, implication of analogy between its components, incongruity between its components; 'sign' with presence of psychic representation, non-implication of analogy between its components, congruity between its components (Barthes 1990, 158-160).

Similarly, but with slightly different terminology, Leach determines the relationship between A, "message vehicle", to adjust Morrisian term, and B, 'message'. "Message vehicle" is the entity used for "carrying the message" (Leach 2002, 21), a signifiant, while the 'message' is the signifié. Both signifiant and signifié are part of system of signs organized according to principles of syntagmatic and paradigmatic axis. This implies that they can relate to other signs (parts of signs) and among themselves on the basis of contiguity and/or similarity. But this inner relationship between signifiant and signifié appears in different forms, and in some respects Leach's classification follows Barthes's. It runs in stages (Ibid., 22-25): 1. First distinction is made according to nature *vs.* culture opposition. For 'signal', the relationship is mechanical and automatic (A activates B). Signifié and signifiant are two aspects of one whole. Signals can be comprehended as causal and dynamic (compare Barthes 'signal' above). 'Signals' are not specific only for

humans, but for all other living organisms and their modes of communicating (for example, reproduction of genes). This determination is the same as the one given by Barthes. For 'index', the relationship of signifiant and signifié is such that former points to latter. It can be said that 'indexes' are descriptive. This diverges from Barthes's classification in respect of psychical representation: Leach's index does imply it. 2. 'Indexes' are further divided into two categories on the basis of the nature of association between signifiant and signifié which can be prevailingly metonymical (contiguous) as for 'natural indexes', where the association is natural, although metonymically chosen according to cultural conventions. On the other hand, 'signums' are those indexes in which the association is a "pure" cultural convention (Barthes does not have this distinction) and it appears in two forms which can be either prevailingly metonymical or prevailingly metaphorical. 3. 'Signums' themselves can be divided according to the level of employed conventionality, knowledge of which is necessary in order to understand their meaning. For 'signs', the association between signifiant and signifié is arbitral in such a way that among them exists previously established contiguous relation because they do belong to the same cultural context. Prevailing principle is metonymical (analogous to Barthes congruity). On the other hand, 'symbols' are those 'signums' in which association is arbitral in such a way that signifiant stands for signifié without previously established contiguous relation among them because they belong to different cultural contexts. Prevailing principle is metaphorical (analogous to Barthes incongruity). 4. In subclass of 'symbols', there can be distinguished 'individual symbols', where association between signifiant and signifié is arbitral in a way that it depends solely on the will of an user, from 'standardized symbols', where the association between signifiant and signifié is arbitral, but became habitual. 5. On the other hand, 'standardized symbols' can be divided into 'icons', where signifiant is chosen to stand for signifié in the manner that the former should intentionally resemble the latter (according to Peirce's classification addressed by Barthes, icons are characterized by analogy between signifiant and signifié) and 'conventional, but totally arbitral symbols' (which can be distinguished from 'individual symbols' for the fact that it is not individual, but accepted in a group).

From this classification we can extract the bases on which it was made: nature *vs.* culture, which is valid only for the first distinction ('signal' *vs.* 'index'), level and mode of arbitrariness, level and mode of habitualness and prevalence of either contiguity (metonymic) or resemblance (metaphoric) principle. Moreover, it is obvious that we cannot speak about strictly demarcated categories, but about grades. Further, metonymical and metaphorical principles are not strictly demarcated categories, but interwoven ones, whose simultaneous employment participates in the formation of all signs and thus enables communication (units are ordered according to metonymical principles, but depicted to be ordered according to metaphorical ones, what implies that metonymical units can be perceived as having different but compatible functions while metaphorical ones as having the same function). As Leach points out, distinction between 'signs' and 'symbols' or prevalence of either metonymical or metaphorical principles, is not a fundamental one, but depends on use and availability and conceptual organization of context to be engaged in coding and decoding messages (Ibid., 24). This leads us further to context and use oriented notions of discourse, utterance and meaning.

3. Discourse, utterance, meaning

In this section I will say something about the linguistic and anthropological notions of discourse, utterance and meaning and connect them with the above discussed determinations of language as a system-process-product trichotomy. It will be shown here that determination of the meaning of the phrase 'the erased' in concrete communicative events cannot be achieved without taking into consideration the pragmatic notions of deixis, presupposition, implicature and speech acts, which integrate language-products with the process of language-use in both co-text (surrounding text) and (extrasentential) context. These will be discussed within four separate chapters.

3.1. Discourse, utterance, meaning and pragmatics

That using a language is doing something else than simply saying something was an undisputable standpoint of the Aristotelian rhetoric. And not only a standpoint, but exactly *diferentia specifica* of rhetorically used language perceived as a tool for

producing and reiterating probable things. The aim of this enterprise was a persuasion. Aristotle's first book of *Rhetorics* is divided into three parts: the first one is dedicated to speaker and his influence on conceptualization of arguments according to his conformation to the audience, his own character and abilities and three consolidated types of speech (during court proceedings, when giving advice, and while praising someone); the second one is dedicated to the audience, passions, and acceptance of arguments; the third one is dedicated to message itself, figures and organization of larger parts of speech. Rhetoric was perceived as a kind of degraded logic, conformed to common people, good sense and public opinion. Aristotelian rhetoric was *téhne* of everyday communication, a speculative institution of abilities for producing something that doesn't have to be, to paraphrase Barthes. It was achieved by *pisteis* (*inventio*), creating "evidence", *taxis* (*dispositio*), ordering of evidence in speech, *lexis* (*elocutio*), wording arguments on the sentence level, and *hypokrisis* (*actio*), dramatizing of the speech; the audience was supposed to do *mnéme* (*memoria*), remember and thus obtain sample of stereotypes, transferred mechanically, extracted intertextually (Barthes 1990). This very short *résumé* of the Aristotelian rhetoric shows that studying discourse is not a recent phenomenon, even though it achieved a kind of rebirth in the 20th century. It has been an important field of interdisciplinary research which, as well as pragmatic orientation within linguistics, was induced as a reaction to formal analyses of language perceived as a system (especially generative grammar, for which we have seen that it doesn't deny existence of "performative" aspect of language, but just do not deal with it, since it is focused on language universalities, as well as the Saussurean linguistics, which conceptualizes and focuses on a language-system as a phenomenon detached from both users and use) which all diminished the role of actual language-use, that is, importance of communicative events performed and processed by people in concrete social interactions (compare Morris 1975, 44; Mey 1993, 18-34; Beaugrande and Dressler 1994, 36; Marmaridou 2000, 13-41). Nevertheless, among the "inductors" of discourse studies and pragmatic linguistics are Russian formalists, whose thorough study of narrative, myths, literature, film and other semiotic practices improved devices for discursive study, as well as ethnographers, with their research of culturally shared communicative competence, ethnometodologists with their focus on everyday interaction including conversation,

cognitive psychology, with research oriented towards knowledge acquisition, communication studies, philosophers of everyday language, who posed interesting questions of truth, ontology *vs.* negotiability of meaning, performativity, that is, a perspective on language as an activity, etc. (van Dijk 1998, 25-27), which all in their respective branches understood language not only as an abstract system of signs or tool for making "imaginary" worlds, but as well as an commonly available means for doing something else then simply saying, to paraphrase Austin.

3.1.2. Discourse

The phrase 'discourse' refers mainly to two distinct but mutually connected senses: linguistic, which points to properties of stretches of language above the level of sentence, their syntactic structures, lexical collocations, regularities of text-structure (topics, grammatical characteristics of turn-taking, paragraphs, etc.) and social, which understands stretches of language as a place where socially produced meaning emerges (Kress, 2001:183). In discourse analysis, as a scientific discipline which unites linguistic and social aspect of discourse, prominence is given to elaboration of mutual determining relations which exist between language use, communication of beliefs and interaction in social situations (van Dijk, 1998: 3). In anthropological literature, 'discourse' is broadly described as "ways of speaking which are commonly practiced and specifically situated in a social environment: 'speech in habitual situations of social exchange'," (Rapport and Overing 2000, 117). The orientation towards discourse analysis in anthropology appeared as a reaction on ways of presenting societies in monographs after long-term field-works. Questions of reflexivity, dialogue and power encouraged critical contest of problems of ethnographer's and informant's text-making strategies, positivistic and functionalistic doctrine, objectivity, value-free science, language understood as a device that merely reflects social and natural reality, etc. (Jordan 2005, 120). Every utterance, being spoken or heard, written or read, presents a way of organizing and presenting reality. Taking part in any communicative event, either as a sender or a receiver of the message, or as an unintentional overhearer, is (at least) cognitive agency in which old meanings are negotiated and new ones created. The question of socio-political power ascribed to some institutions and statuses (that is, individuals and groupings who are settled in those

institutions and statuses or, conversely, deprived from them), which influences abilities for producing certain discourses and thus organizes possible meanings is researched both by discourse analysis and pragmatics while in the later the emphasis is put on concrete grammaticalized linguistic means for imposing cognitive networks of interpretation.

Now I will present two understandings of discourse analysis presented by pragmaticians. In the first one, the difference between discourse analysis and more pragmatic orientated studies is emphasized. While talking about conversation, as a place where language is put in use the most actively, obviously, temporarily, where the role of context in understanding is the most apparent, and where presence of actual or potential communicational partners is simply a necessary condition, Mey says that while theorizing in discourse analysis is deductive, 'rule- or grammar-driven', theorizing in more pragmatically oriented research is inductive and 'data-driven', (Mey 1993, 194-195).[48] He points that term 'discourse' serves to indicate not only immediately perceptible context of some communicative events, but also the hidden conditions that govern such situations of language use, which are due to implicit and explicit values, norms, rules and laws, economic, social, political and cultural conditions of life in a society (Ibid., 186-187). Pragmatics is seen to be orientated towards analysis of concrete "play" with these constraints undertaken by individual language users in a communicative event, where the user is the central figure and not the society, which is the focal point of discourse analysis

---

[48] Similarly, while talking about ways of analyzing conversation understood as a "predominant kind of talk in which two or more participants freely alternate in speaking, which generally occurs outside specific institutional settings like religious services, law courts, classrooms and the like", (Levinson 1995, 284), Levinson regards discourse analysis and conversation analysis as two approaches concerned with giving an account of how coherence and sequential organization in discourse is produced and understood. He attaches to discourse analysis extension of techniques successfully applied in linguistics beyond the unit of sentence. The employed procedures are 1) isolation of a set of basic categories or units of discourse and 2) formulation of a set of linked rules stated to cover these categories which serve to delimit coherent discourses (well-formed sequences of categories) from incoherent ones (ill-formed sequences of categories), a distinction made according to intuition (Ibid., 286). Conversation analysis, on the other hand, "is a rigorously empirical approach which avoids premature theory construction", (Ibid, 286). The methods used in conversation analysis are essentially inductive and examination of big number of naturally occurring conversations is done in search for recurring patterns, while in discourse analysis restricted data, usually constructed by analysts, are categorized *a priori* (Ibid., 287). Further, in conversation analysis emphasis is put on the interactional and inferential consequences of the actually made choices between alternative utterances, while in discourse analysis on syntactic description of possible rules that may govern such choices (Ibid., 287).

(Ibid., 193).[49] Another view on discourse and pragmatic studies is offered by Marmaridou, who sees discourse analysis as a level or a preference orientation within the pragmatic one. 'Discourse' is thus an abstraction made according to particularized cases, which leads to an idealization of discourse norms and further to pragmatic universals. Moreover, social situation in which interlocutors conjoin in communicative events becomes a pragmatic abstraction as well as users and language (Marmaridou 2000, 32-33). She points the importance of constant interplay of properties of (some social) discourse and results obtained by pragmatic research of concrete communicative events: neither of them can be explained solely, for the reason that every interaction (what language use is) is a social interaction that follows or brakes some (at least potentially) institutionalized practices. Further, every interlocutor is a person that comes from a social *milieu*, and without appreciation of this, pragmatic notions of, by way of illustration, person deixis, implicature, speech acts (for example, Austin first concentrated on utterances that derive their specific meaning from institution and the institutional act of which they are part), would simply not be neither comprehendible nor explicable. What will an author emphasize in the final account, depends on his/her theoretical preference and scholar background.

Now I should clarify what is to be considered with the phrase 'discourse' in this text. As language in use is perceived as a téhne for making the erased, which (the erased) can be understood as something that doesn't have to be, to paraphrase Barthes's paraphrase of the principal topic of Aristotelian rhetoric, but what is talked about as if it had been

---

[49] In some of its respects, this distinction is analogous to Bakhtinian critique of discursive interpretation of realist ethnography undertaken by anthropologists as George Marcus or James Clifford, who maintained that the author or narrator apparently occupies a position of unchallenged authority (Author-ity), which gives him privileged perspective and makes realist ethnography dominated by a single voice – the one of omniscient and omnipotent author, thus not allowing other possible voices to challenge, converse or subvert his own. For Bakhtin, every text is always plural and deeply embedded in relations of authority and power in a way that even in the most apparently monologic text we find proliferated dialogic processes in which multiple voices compete for expression, and which are not eliminated but restrained and directed by the author (Jordan 2005, 121). Similarly to Bahktin, Mey offers a standpoint on discourse analysis as being too occupied with society while forgetting concrete users and their abilities to play with imposed constraints and thus express themselves, challenge, converse and subvert rules, norms, values, laws existent in the society, which actually happen in communicative events and what results perhaps not in the change of world, but in the change of consciousness about some apparent problems or "state of affairs" (Mey 1993, 282). Furthermore, in linguistic anthropology language ideologies (perception of language and discourse as constructed in the interest of a specific social or cultural group) are always understood as multiple (Kroskrity 2006).

something that is (and mode of their existence is the goal of this research), 'discourse(s)' will be employed to mean any socially processed integrated flow of utterances in which ("space") and by which ("means") the talk about the erased is made possible, or, in other words, both as a use and a product of use of language which organizes permissible meanings of the phrase. Concrete, separate meanings, which participate in discourses and which constitute and are constituted by them, can be achieved by analysis of utterances within the communicative events, which, in their turn, are parts of discourse(s) about the erased. Such understanding of utterances within discourses is analogous to Bourdieu's concept of *habitus* in some of its respects as a structured structure that tends to be a structuring structure (see Bourdieu 1999, 158). This means that utterances are "ordered" within a discourse, in the sense that they are its components and as such, they are organized according to its properties, but since properties of a discourse are neither strict in the sense of rules, nor objective or definite in the sense of borders of conceptualizing, but are only pervasive constraints, like trends or directions ("possible things that doesn't have to be"), there is some space left for individual intervention in separate utterances in the course of changing the discourse as a whole. Therefore, both the discourses and the utterances can be perceived as *habituses*, depending on the range of abstraction, and as any *habitus*, they are products of the reality they are producing.

3.1.3. Utterance

At this point it becomes necessary to say something more about utterances, units which constitute/are constituted by discourses. Difference between 'sentence' and 'utterance' is understood to be of the fundamental importance in pragmatics. While 'sentence' is viewed as an abstract theoretical entity defined within theory of grammar, 'utterance' is the effect of a sentence, its outflow, analogue, or its fragment in an actual context, that what connects a sentence and context in which it was performed (Levinson 1995: 18). Sentences can be merely "pronounced", what says little about their form and meaning. When they are "used", "uttered", their form and meaning get crystallized since infinite range of possible conditions of uttering becomes delimited by the context (Fillmore 1997, 9; (Austin's) speech act theory is based upon this distinction). Understanding of an utterance involves more than knowing meanings of individual uttered words and

grammatical relations which exist between them, it involves production of inferences that are mutually assumed or imposed to be mutually assumed by saying (Levinson 1995, 18-21; theories of presupposition and implicature are based on these assumptions). In addition to meaning of a sentence which is determined both by meaning of words (lexical meaning) and grammatical structure, utterance meaning extends meaning determinants to wider context of use. While sentences are by definition grammatically well-formed (in Chomskyan sense), as well as meaningful (semantically well-formed, in terms of formal semantics) or meaningless (semantically ill-formed), utterances may be either grammatical or ungrammatical (what may be totally irrelevant for the purpose of uttering, or exaggerated, for example, to delimit native or educated speakers from non-native or non-educated ones, that is, to be a sign of something else) and they draw their meaning both from co-text and context (Lyons 1996, 134-136).[50] 'Utterance' can be used to refer either to the process (activity) of uttering when they are usually called 'speech acts' or to the products of that process when they are called 'inscriptions' (Lyons 1996, 235). Empirically, the relation between an utterance and a corresponding sentence can be obscure since product of the utterance of a sentence does not have to be a sentence itself. In a text, Lyons distinguishes between 'system-sentences', which presents theoretical constructs generated by grammatical rules, from 'text-sentences', which are a subclass of utterance-inscriptions and may occur as whole texts or as segments of text. Therefore, within a text-sentence, we can have text-units, which can be either whole sentences or elliptical sentence-fragments (Lyons 1996, 260-261; compare Levinson 1995, 16-20).

In the material I have chosen, utterance, as an inscription, can be a single word, a question-mark, a smiley, or a citation of a law or its parts.[51] And the inscriptions I

---

[50] Definitions of 'grammar' focus on the process of systematization in language. Generally, 'grammar' refers to rules which are employed in the construction of language structures as words (morphology) or sentences (syntax). These rules can be presented as precise systems and regarded as prescriptions or as 'internalized' capacity for language either by the mere fact that it is done by humans as *genus* or for their property of being sufficiently systemic to allow prescriptions to be effective invariably (Cobley 2001, 193). Therefore, 'grammatically well-formed' refers to conformation to those prescriptions, while 'grammatically ill-formed' to combinations that break the rules of a grammar (compare Lyons 1996, 72).

[51] In one comment of the article "Grims's lies" ["Grimsove neresnice"] which appeared on the Slovenian internet portal Vest (http://www.vest.si/2008/02/27/grimsove-neresnice/) of 27th February 2008, a commentator under the nickname Janko posted a plea against a decision of a Higher Court in Ljubljana. The form of the plea is the official one, but since it appeared on the portal, it has no conventional illocutionary or perlocutionary effect (see chapter 3.5 on speech acts). But it induced further up-takes from

analyze can be perceived as products of speech-acts by which the erased are constantly being (re)formed in a way that some meaning is being attached to the notion of the erased. Now I will give one example: in the article ""Izbrisani Mariborčan Čedo Draganič terja od države več kot 291.000 evrov", [The erased Čedo Draganič from Maribor claims over 291, 000 euros from the state"], published in daily *Dnevnik*, of 31st August, 2007, author presents the story of Mr. Draganič's ex-wife who appears as a witness in court and speaks about the life of her ex-husband: as he didn't have any valid documents (she and her ex-husband believe he was erased, what is unquestionable for the journalist, as shown in the title), he couldn't work and buy an apartment, and now he is suing the state demanding the for the financial difficulties he has encountered since 1992, demanding the reimbursement of the costs of medical treatment and compensation for distress. Here is one of the interesting comments:

(8)   **Gost** | 31.08.2007 at 08:36
        Ćedo Draganić

In (8) the name of the potentially erased has been repeated, but instead of 'Č' and 'č', the commentator puts 'Ć' 'ć' which are capital and small letters for a phoneme present in the Croatian, Bosnian, Serbian and Montenegrin writing systems, but not in Slovenian (in other words, it is not recognized for its phonological function in the Slovenian language and does not have a separate grapheme). The name 'Ćedo' does not exist (except as a possible nick-name), only 'Čedo', while 'Draganić' is a common surname in Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia and Montenegro and 'Draganič' can be found in Slovenia, since there is no 'ć' in the official alphabet and is usually (but far from always) exchanged for 'č' in the Slovenian transcription (rules of the Slovenian official transcription-system allow such occurrence in cases when foreign names are originally written in some variety of Latin alphabet). Anyway, the repetition of a name with letter 'ć' is a complete utterance deriving its meaning from a wider context which cannot be acknowledged from the utterance itself. If the inscription had been 'Čedo Draganić', it could have been understood as a speech act where the utterer tries somehow to correct the

---

which it is possible to conclude that it was understood as a kind of expressive and not as a plea. The citations of laws in comments can be explained by Fregean notion of quoted sentences (see chapter 3.1.4).

author of the article, but by putting 'ć' instead of 'č' on both places, the utterer deliberately and forcibly labels the erased Čedo Draganič as a non-Slovene and "transfers" him to "the south", that is, bounds his liable origin to Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia or Montenegro but not to Slovenia. This utterance "says" a lot more than what can be acknowledged from the meaning of individual words that constitute it, which, having been used as a proper name, or for their face-value (literal meaning), are only wrongly spelled deictic words, however, when used in this way, become the bearers of the meaning that can be comprehended only with the help of wider knowledge (of the official writing systems of Slovenian and four other languages). On the other hand, through this act of uttering the erased, they have been defined as non-(original)-Slovenes.

Text-sentences and sentence-fragments are connected within a text in a contextually appropriate way so the text as whole shows properties of cohesion and coherence. [52] Cohesion can be roughly related to the form of connectedness (usually achieved by use of pronouns, ellipsis and particular connecting particles and conjunctions) between text-sentences and sentence-fragments, while coherence can be roughly related to content of text-sentences and sentence-fragments in a way that for any text-unit it is assumed to be relevant to that what has been said in the immediately preceding text-unit. Application of these properties of cohesion and coherence in a text in relation to context is called 'contextualization' (Lyons 1996, 263-265). Context determines utterance-meaning in a way that it delimits propositional content of text-units uttered on different occasions (in different circumstances). Proposition is the notion usually engaged in those philosophical

---

[52] In text-linguistics, 'texts' or written discourses are understood as communicative occurrences which meet seven standards of 'textuality'. These are: 'cohesion', which concerns ways in which the components of a 'surface text' (actual words we encounter) are mutually connected within a sequence; 'coherence', which concerns ways in which the components of the 'textual world' (configuration of 'concepts' and 'relations' which underlie the surface text) are mutually accessible and relevant ('concept' is a configuration of knowledge, that is, cognitive content, which can be recovered or activated with more or less unity and consistency in the mind, while 'relations' are the links between concepts which appear together in a textual world: each link would bear a designation of the concept it connects to); 'causality', which are group of relations that concern the ways in which one situation or event affects conditions for some other one; 'acceptability' which concern the attitude of the text receiver (if he/she finds it cohesive and coherent in a way that it can offer knowledge for provision of co-operation); 'informativity', which concerns the extent to which occurrences of the presented text are expected or unexpected, known or unknown, certain or uncertain; 'situationality', which concerns the factors that make a text relevant to a situation of occurrence; 'intertextuality', which concerns the factors that make utilization of one text dependent upon knowledge of one or more previously encountered texts. "If any of these standards is not considered to have been satisfied, the text will not be communicative", (Beaugrande and Dressler 1994, 3-10).

and theoretical orientations which deal more or less directly with the question of truth (for example, logical positivism, verificationist, truth-conditional theory, etc.). The main principles can be comprised as: sentences are meaningful if (and only if) they have a determinate truth-value, or when it is possible to determine the conditions under which they will be true, or, when they express verifiable or falsifiable propositions. In reaction to verificationism appeared pragmatic orientation which viewed propositions in a different way: sentences as such do not have propositions but are purported (claimed) to express them (compare Lyons 1996, 131-152). But what are propositions? "Propositions differ from sentences and speech acts in that different sentences and speech acts [...] may contain the same proposition, consisting of a reference (an expression identifying any thing, process, event or action) and a predication (what is 'predicated' or said about a thing, process, event or action by means of referring expression). It is propositions, not sentences or speech acts, that are true or false", (Verschueren 2001, 245).[53] Propositions are believed to be cognitive devices usually described in terms of language as constituted from names and predicates.[54] Propositions are used for explanations of some aspects of speech-act theory, as well as presuppositions and implicature, on the basis of propositional content of the utterances. I will get back to this topic in the subsequent chapters.

We have seen that for understanding an utterance one cannot rely neither on the meaning of the separate words that constitute it nor on grammatical relations existing between them as utterances are grammar insensitive (up to the point when grammar ceases to be an organizing principle for ordering words and becomes a meaningful unit itself, a sign, and as every sign represents something else than itself). Now I should say something

---

[53] In standard predicate logic they are comprehended as two-parted composite expressions where first part, name, serves to refer to (sets of) entities in some possible world about which a statement is being made, while the second part, predicate, serves to ascribe properties to single (or sets of) entities and to ascribe relations to ordered groupings of entities (as pairs, triples, etc.), (Lyons 1996, 295).

[54] For example, in experiential pragmatics, propositions are viewed as cognitive models whose structure is characterized by a part-whole schema: the proposition is the whole, while arguments and predicates are the parts. Propositional cognitive models contain entities with some properties, as well as relations which exist between these properties (see Marmaridou 2000, 57). Experiential pragmatics is an orientation within pragmatic linguistics. It supports the subjectivity and socio-cultural relativity of language and therefore can be labeled as realist. It deals with cognitive aspect of language use, mainly reasoning, internalization and cognitive models. Language is seen as a means for structuring reality as a meaningful experience (compare Marmaridou 2000, 42-63).

more about meaning and its properties (Chapter 3.1.4.) as well as how it is understood in pragmatics (Chapters 3.2 to 3.5.).

3.1.4. Meaning

Wherever we have a (culturally established) sign, we also have its 'meaning'. Meaning generated in the use of signs may be intentional or non-intentional, where emphasis on intentional variety stresses its production aspect. It can be literal, when the link between the sign and that what the sign stands for is explicit and fully conventional, or figurative (indirect), when further inferencing is required even though there is involved some degree of conventionality (compare chapter 2.3. on subcategories of linguistic sign, which concern types of relations that exist between a signifiant and a signifié and consequently context, use, associations, etc. in connection with the explication of forms that mediate some meaning). We can distinguish propositional from non-propositional meaning, lexical from sentence meaning and sentence meaning from utterance meaning, and further, utterer's meaning (which is used to refer either to communicative intention or to understanding and interpretation in connection to receiver's recognition of sender's intention to communicate something), meaning-nn (non-natural one, when a receiver recognizes sender's intention to communicate), interpersonal, instrumental, social or conative meaning, conventional, contextual, etc. As there is a great variety of 'meanings', similar situation is found among theories that tend to explicate them: in referential (denotational) theory, meaning of an expression is that what it (expression) stands for; mentalist theory relates meaning to the ideas or concepts an expression associates with in the mind of person understanding it; behaviorist theory views meaning as a stimulus evoking an expression or the response evoked by it; the meaning-is-use theory sees meaning as function of the ways in which an expression is used;[55] verificationist theory

---

[55] What is interesting, Saussure uses metaphor of chess while talking about the meaning of a linguistic sign: a single, separate figure out from its specified field on the game board does not represent an element of the game, but in the game, on its specified field, becomes its real and concrete element. It can be substituted by anything (any other figure, any object) for which it is agreed (this implies existence of the collective of potential users) to represent its function or, in other words, to be given (its) adequate meaning for the purpose of concrete use, (Saussure 1996, 116). Even tough this was said in order to point out that there is no linguistic sign out of the system of signs (in which a sign can be compared with similar ones or substituted with different ones) it can also be understood in more pragmatic sense: meaning of a sign is not

sees meaning as determined by verifiability of the propositions contained in the expression; truth-conditional theory defines meaning as the contribution made by an expression to the truth conditions of a sentence (Verschueren 2001, 221; the same theories of meaning are outlined in Lyons 1996, 40). Now I will say something about referential theory of meaning and connect it with the Saussurean notion of a linguistic sign. Some of the above enumerated "types" of meaning will be addressed in the subsequent chapters.

In the referential theory of meaning, which will be presented here according to Lyons, it can be distinguished what expressions ('expression' will be used as a neutral term referring both to lexemes and composite expressions, phrases, sentences and utterances) denote from what they can be used to refer to. This implies that it is possible to distinguish 'denotation' from 'reference'. But expressions have also a third dimension, the one of 'sense'. Now it should be made clear what these terms stand for.

'Denotation' of one expression is considered to be invariant and utterance-independent in a way that it is understood as a part of the meaning which the expression has in the language system, independently of its use on particular occasions of utterance. On the other hand, 'reference' is variable and utterance-dependent because, as Lyons points, " [...] lexemes, as such, do not have reference, but may be used as referring expressions or, more commonly, as components of referring expressions in particular context of utterance", (Lyons 1996, 79). 'Sense' of an expression is defined as a set or network of 'sense-relations' (paradigmatic connections among signs, that is, classes, associations, "types and tokens", perceived as having at least one same and at least one different property, and, therefore, explainable by intension and extension) that exist between it and other expressions of the same language. It is important to say that 'sense' concerns interlexical and intralingual relations (relations between a lexical expression and other lexical expressions in the same language) and, while denotation relates expressions to classes of entities in the world, sense is totally internal to the language-system (Lyons

---

based on some "natural" properties of the sign itself, but on its use (given, attached function) as an element of the system within the system.

1996, 80).[56] Sense and denotation are inversely related to one another in a way that when we have more denotation, we have less sense. For example, denotation of 'the erased' is larger then, and includes, that of 'Aleksandar Todorović', but the sense of 'the erased' is less specific than, and is included in, that of 'Aleksandar Todorović'. Lyons further points that this inverse relation is comparable to the one which concerns 'extension' and 'intension' of a term (or an expression) in traditional logic. 'Extension' of a term is the class of entities that it defines, while 'intension' is the defining property of the class. Lyons treats them as complementary aspects of denotation: an expression denotes (extensionally) a class of entities and (intensionally) its defining property (that is, the property which all members of a class share and by virtue of which they are considered to be members of the class in question) (Ibid., 80-82). For example, 'the erased' denotes not only a class of the erased people, but also the property of being erased. Lyons points that sense and denotation have often been confused as well as denotation and reference. The reason for this can be found in those semantic accounts in which intension is ascribed to sense and extension to reference (as in Petöfi 1989, 90; compare Lyons 1996, 82) or to semantic interpretation of discourses which considers meaning as intensional and referents as extensional assignments to expressions (as in van Dijk 1989, 103 and further). 'Reference', on the other hand, is also a notion that connects language with the world (like denotation): it is a context-dependent aspect of utterance-meaning, a relation that exists between speakers (locutionary agents, interlocutors) and what they are talking about on particular occasions.[57] 'Referential range' of referring expressions is fixed by their sense and denotation, but their actual reference depends upon variety of contextual

---

[56] Notions of sense and denotation can be applied both to lexically simple and lexically composite expressions (containing one or more 'lexemes', vocabulary units of language, constructed according to grammatical rules of a language, that is, morphological and syntactical), where in the latter sense and denotation are determined by the sense and denotation of its component lexemes. On the contrary, reference of a sentence cannot be determined since references are not some immanent part of lexemes, but a lexeme can be used to refer to an object during the process of uttering. Referents, therefore, belong to domain of utterance and not sentence (see Lyons 1996, 294 and further). In the light of truth-value theorizing about language, Frege says similar: changed referents of lexemes constituting a sentence do not result in the change of the sense of the sentence as a whole if the sense of substituted lexemes is the same as it was before substitution. Referents of lexemes do not have influence on a sentence, only their sense has (see Frege 1997: 568).

[57] Sentence meaning is related to utterance meaning "[...] by virtue of the notion of characteristic use, but it differs from it in that the meaning of a sentence is independent of the particular context in which it may be uttered. To determine the meaning of an utterance, on the other hand, we have to take contextual factors into account", (Lyons 1996, 39).

factors (Lyons 1996, 294). Remember that what is peculiar with 'the erased' is that the phrase was used as an anchorage for something what I called a 'floating reference', a 'referential range' that was seeking for its form of expression. Therefore it is possible to say that the erased, both as a real and as a discursive phenomenon are constantly being (re)formed by language use: when referents from different domains (national enemies, non-Slovenes, the deprived, etc.) "find" their most appropriate expression in the phrase and thus supply it with its own referent.[58]

One more analogy can be useful for determination of the meaning of the phrase 'the erased'. Frege, while speaking about quoted words, points that they are, basically, signs of signs, since one's own words first designate words of other speakers, and only latter have their usual reference, what is marked by inverted commas. In reported speech one talks about sense of another person's expression: quoted words do not have their customary reference, but designate their usual sense. Put differently, in reported speech, indirectly used words have indirect reference, which is to be distinguished from customary one as well as customary sense is to be distinguished from indirect sense. Frege concludes that indirect reference of a word is its customary sense (Frege 1997: 565). Is it possible to view the erased as a sign characterized by a composite reference, which actually represents a union of various indirect references comprising the same customary sense?[59] In the remaining part of this chapter I will rephrase this question from different theoretical perspectives. Thus obtained alternations would help me in directing

---

[58] In sociological and anthropological theory of practice, which will be presented (and engaged) here according to Bourdieu, the sign and its elements (being either more language-system related as signifiant and signifié, or language-use related as sense and reference) are understood not as some entities, but as operations whose effects we perceive as entities, that is, in final instance, both as acts of producing and products of these acts (see Bourdieu 1999, 147). In Lacanian linguistics this property is elaborated mostly in relation to signifiant, which is presented not as an entity, but as a battery of relations which induces their constant "moving" and changing (compare Šterk 1998, 86). Further, in structural anthropology, the basic notion 'structure' is a bundle of relations, not a bundle of entities (see Lévi-Straus 1989, 218). This view has big consequences on understanding a sign, for the reason that it stresses its inner dynamic in which relations (operations) are constantly being (per)formed.

[59] Componential analysis allows this situation. Sense can be viewed as a cluster of 'sense-components' whose comprised atomic concepts can be identified by means of lexical decomposition. A lexeme, therefore, presents a compositional function of its sense-components whose value is determined by the value of components as well as by the definitions of operations by means of which they (sense-components) are combined (Lyons 1996, 108-112). In the case of 'the erased', senses of the different signs included in the phrase as its referents can be analyzed into their components and, hypothetically, common properties can be viewed as having the major influence on the choice of signs actualized as referents of the phrase.

my research by extracting theoretical topics which I will put in use in the final section, after I say something about metaphor and 'the erased'.

First alternation stems from text-linguistics: "If 'meaning' is used to designate potential of a language expression (or other sign) for representing and conveying knowledge (i.e., virtual meaning), then we can use 'sense' to designate knowledge that actually is conveyed by expressions occurring in a text. Many expressions have several virtual meanings, but under normal conditions, only one sense", (Beaugrande and Dressler 1994, 82-84). Since text-linguistics uses notions of referential theory of meaning, my question is to be paraphrased as folows: can 'the erased' be seen as a potentially polysemous expression conveying the same sense in its various actual occurrences?

Second alternation stems from the truth-conditional theory dealing with propositions. Sense of sentences as composite expressions can be identified with their propositional content (Lyons 1996, 154). Here a new notion is introduced, the one of 'propositional content'. This notion allows comparison of variously compound propositions. Originally it is expressed as follows: if truth-conditions of two different propositions are the same, we can say that they have the same propositional content (Lyons 1996, 147). Another new notion is that of 'truth-conditions'. It should be mentioned that in the truth-conditional theory there is no consensus on perceiving the truth. In some versions, which I would like to avoid here, the truth is equated with some ontological principle or entity, it is perceived as absolute truth. However, in its more realist and pragmatic branch, as in Montague grammar, truth is relative, and depends on the extension of an expression (keep in mind that intension of an expression is its sense and its extension is its reference in some semantic accounts). The principle can be comprised as: necessarily true (or false) propositions are propositions that are true (or false) in all possible circumstances. Notion of 'all possible circumstances' originates from Leibniz's notion of 'all possible worlds'. To paraphrase it, "we live in the best of all possible worlds", which the God, as omnipotent and omniscient created according to the principles of logic. This would imply that 'all possible circumstances' are all possible circumstances that are logical in a way that they follow principles of standard logic. Relatively true (or false) propositions are thus those propositions which are true (or false) in specific circumstances or, in our

contemporary world, which is extensional world (referential world). Separate possible worlds differ from each other. Intension (sense) of an expression is either its extension (reference) in all possible worlds or, some function (rule, operation) which determines its extension in all possible worlds.[60] Paraphrased principle would be: propositional synonymy (true or false or other determinations of common properties of propositions) is possible if, and only if the propositions have the same sense (intension), that is, extension (or function which delimits their extension) in all possible circumstances (see Lyons 1996: 225-227). Therefore, my question would be: can 'the erased' be seen as an expression used to convey the same propositional content of other variously compound expressions? Or, more the truth-conditional version: Can 'the erased' be seen as an expression used to convey the same truth-conditions of other variously compound expressions?

Third alternation will be achieved by extracting common properties of referential theory of meaning and the Saussurean theory of a linguistic sign. To paraphrase Saussure, a construction of a sign can be presented as a simultaneous articulation of two contingent series, one being undefined field of thoughts and another being equally undefined field of voices. Articulation consists in making arbitral outlines on these fields of thoughts and voices and connecting them into a meaningful sign. In other words, a concept (a signifié, Barthes's level of content) and an acoustic image (a signifiant, Barthes's expressive level) are interrelated into meaningful sign. [61] As Saussure says, in order to achieve a

---

[60] Intension is the propositional content, while extension is truth-value of an expression in particular occasions of utterance. Extension is a reference; the erased don't have fixed reference, that is, their truth-value cannot be determined (compare Lyons 1996, 225)

[61] In standard transformational grammar theory, every sentence has two distinctive levels of syntactic structure, linked by transformational rules. These two levels, generated by rules of different kind are called 'deep structure' and 'surface structure'. Deep structure is more closely connected with sentence-meaning, while surface structure is more closely connected with the way the sentence is pronounced. Grammar, seen as an integrated system, puts a set of phonological representations into correspondence with a set of semantic representations (relates sound to meaning). As sound is external to language system (phonological representations can be thought of as part of the competence) grammar and lexicon (central and essential part of language) are independent of language's phonological system. Grammar (which is non-transformational and comprises categorial rules of syntax) and lexicon are considered to be parts of 'base component', which generates a set of deep structures, which are converted into one or more surface structure by 'transformational component' (Lyons 1996, 211-213). "All the information required by the semantic component is supplied by the base, and therefore present in the deep structure of sentences; all the information required by the phonological component is present in the surface structures that result from the operation of transformational rules", (Ibid., 213). Therefore, transformations do not affect meaning (Ibid.,

separate meaning (and every sign is a meaning-system *per se* that is involved in language as a system of signs), we must articulate field of thoughts, which can be equated with loose potential concept(s), as well as field of voices, which can be equated with available (material) means of expression and without which a sign would not be intelligible as well as communicable.[62] In referential theory of meaning instead of a concept and an acoustic image we have sense, referent and denotation, where reference and denotation connect words to the world, but not in the same direction as does Saussurean signifiant. A meaningful unit is, therefore, perceived from different angle (compare van Dijk, 1989: 103 and further).[63] To employ a motional spatial conceptual metaphor of forward and

---

13). In Katz-Fodor interpretation of transformational grammar, semantic representation is a collection or amalgamation of sense components (which can be formalized by componential analysis). But if that is so, any two sentences containing exactly the same lexemes would have the same semantic representation, what is not the case. The reason for this lies in semantic rules which assign selection restrictions of possible combinations of lexemes (Ibid, 219). On the other hand, in Montague grammar, semantic analysis of sentences is possible on their surface structure. Therefore, by addition of transformational component to the system, distinction between deep and surface structure becomes impertinent (Ibid., 222).

[62] According to Cobley, 'referent' as a term is commonly used to designate the thing in the world, that is, an object, to which a sign refers, where this object can be available like Aleksandar Todorović or unavailable, like 'Aleksandar Todorović' or "Aleksandar Todorović". Cobley compares Peirce's sign triad and Saussure's dyadic sign (see above chapter 2.2) and concludes that while Peirce's sign "[...] includes representamen, interpretant as well as an object which itself can be either immediate or, like referent, dynamic – that is to say, existing in the world but not directly available at the same time and place as sign", (Cobley 2001, 248), Saussure's dyadic sign, on the other hand, comprises a signifiant and also a signifié, where the latter is not an object, but a mental concept. He adds that in some semiological accounts signifié becomes confused or supplemented with referent, an entity neglected by Saussure, who focused on the relation between a mental sound pattern and a concept, not on relations between linguistic signs and referents perceived as real or abstract objects (Ibid, 248). Further, in some semantic accounts, meaning of a lexeme is presented as a function of relation between 'concept' (called also 'intensional dimension' or 'sense') and 'referent' (called also 'extensional dimension' or 'extralinguistic correlate'), (see Petöfi 1989, 90-95).

[63] While talking about interpretation (a process or operation of assignment an expression to an object which results in semantic objects) within semantic discourse analysis (that is, application of a component theory within a larger semiotic theory about meaningful, symbolic behavior on natural-language utterances, that is, discourses, and their component elements, such as words, phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs, and other identifiable discourse units), van Dijk distinguishes between intensional and extensional interpretations. Intensional interpretations of a discourse consist of assignment of a meaning to an expression. Extensional interpretations (which are function of intensional ones, since expressions with a given meaning may refer or denote some object or property with a given meaning in "the world") consist of specification of that what a discourse is about, that is, the individuals, properties, or states of affairs that constitute its various referents in some formal model of a possible world. Discourse semantics is, thus, about meaning and about reference, (van Dijk 1989, 103-105). Meaning and reference in two theories I am trying to combine can be seen as an progress of Saussurean sign towards reference, where intersection is constituted in domains of signifié and sense. Similarly, van Dijk says that every semantic discourse analysis account should take into consideration two aspects of semantic interpretation: 1) Formal, functional (meaning of discourse expressions is a function of the meanings of their component expressions) and structural (where structures of expressions are interpreted as structures of meanings), which assumes that discourse expressions can be analyzed as sequences of sentences as well as that the meaning units assigned to sentences are propositions,

backward, Saussurean signifiant connects concept with user(s), makes it intelligible and communicable, "transferable" and "shared" and can be labeled as connection forward. Reference and denotation connect vague concept of sense with definite objects in the world, but not with user(s) as subjects of communication. This connection can be labeled as backward. In both cases we have a vague conceptual field that crystallizes into separate meaning(s) during the process of delimitation, of attributing some further but more explicit properties: in Saussurean theory through connecting with concrete acoustic image, in referential theory trough connecting with concrete objects we speak about. By crystallization of field of potential signifiés (articulation) and by crystallization of vague sense (ascribing denotation and reference) we get meaning(s).[64] It seams that this fuzzy conceptual aspect of meaning is the common property of both theories, that is, that signifié can be compared with sense. And now I should turn back to my original question: Is it possible to view the erased as a sign characterized by a composite reference, which actually represents a union of various indirect references having the same customary sense? and rephrase it by "moving to different angle": Is speaking about the erased actually speaking about something else for which exists a lack of adequate means of expression, so 'the erased' is used instead, as a signifiant of some other whole signs?

---

which consist of a predicate and a number of arguments that may have various (case) roles. This first aspect of semantic discourse analysis is " to investigate how sequences of sentences of a discourse are related to sequences of underlying propositions and how the meaning of such sequences is a function of the meaning of the constitute sentences and propositions", (Ibid., 105). 2) Second aspect is referential or extensional and the goal of accounts of this aspect is to investigate what sequences of sentences in a discourse can refer to. The objects of reference for meaningful sentences are facts which constitute some possible world. "[M]eaningfulness of a discourse depends on the actual or possible facts (or complexes of facts or episodes) denoted by the discourse, a dependence that may be assessed only on the basis of our knowledge or beliefs about the actual or possible facts in some world or situation," (Ibid., 105-106). In this light the union of Saussurean and referential theory of meaning can be seen as spreading from signifiant, "outer" part of sign which allows communication (and thus is in function for users), through "inner" part of sign, signifié which merges with sense, towards again "outer" reference (which is part of users' world). Thus the circle of sign-making is completed: from user(s), across concepts to objects.

[64] Similarly, Lyons says that as well as sound (acoustic image) is external to the language-system and independent of it (since sound is the physical medium in which language-utterances are realized among others, which are mutually interchangeable), the same is with reference, which is external to language-system and independent of it (since references are also mutually interchangeable having no impact on the meaning of composite expressions if their sense stays the same). But they all participate in meaning, which is internal to language-system (see Lyons, 1996:199 and further). Therefore I find it convenient to speak about acoustic image and reference as a step forward or backward from the conceptual, language-system internal aspect (directions forward and backward being provisional). Connection of formal and pragmatic orientation within linguistics is necessary in order to obtain more thorough account of semiological phenomena.

Fourth alternation is actually a variant of the third one and belongs in the domain of semiology. Barthes speaks about connotation and metalanguage as ways of making a sign as a meaning-system by engagement of some other sign. Every meaning-system has expressive level (conveniently graphically presented here as E), level of content (C) and relation between these two levels (R) which represent its (sign's) meaning. One ERC system can become an element of another ERC system in (at least) two different ways: 1) first ERC system can become expressive level of another ERC system (convenient formula would be {ERC}RC). First system belongs, therefore, to denotative domain, while the second one, which is the extension of the first, belongs to connotative domain and consequently represents a system whose expressive level is a system itself in its own right. 2) Opposite situation is found when the first ERC system becomes level of content of the second ERC system (with convenient formula ER{ERC}). It characterizes all metalanguages, as systems whose level of content is a meaning-system already (compare Barthes 1990, 200-201). Said differently, 'connotation' is such a way of signifying where signifiant is itself a whole sign, while 'metalanguage' is such a way of signifying, where signifié is itself a whole sign. To rephrase my previous question: is 'the erased' (or, the erased or, "the erased") a metalanguage used to speak about something else (with the convenient formula 'the erased'/the erased/"the erased" R {ERC})?

Pragmatic perspective on discourse in relation to individual utterances and communicative events supports justifiability of these analogous variants of the same question. When the discourse about the erased is taken as the originating point of the research (that is, in Marmaridou's terms, an abstraction made of particularized utterances and communicative events), overtly stated, presupposed and implied notions about the erased in individual utterances and communicative events become designations of (they point to) the phrase in the discourse. Further, extensional properties of expressions in separate utterances give their way to the intensional ones. This implies that sense of expressions prevail over their referents. Thus 'the erased' in the discourse ceases to signify some set of entities in the world, but primarily signifies a set of senses, which concerns interlexical and intralingual relations. Therefore, in the discursive aspect of the phenomenon's appearance, we actually deal with the Saussurean sign, comprised of

signifiant ('the erased') and signifié, where the latter is understood as a concept, sense, intension, and not as an (available or unavailable) object, referent, extension, we deal with a notion totally internal to the language-system, with something that doesn't have to be, to paraphrase Barthes, but what is, in terms of the truth-conditional theory, perceived as being valid in all possible circumstances. This would imply that the sense of "the erased" can be undoubtedly defined, what would label "the erased" as a term. However, since the discourse manifests itself through the means of the concrete use, in which the referents are assigned, what makes the sense and the reference of "the erased" valid only in some contemporary circumstances of uttering, the most appropriate notion for labeling "the erased" is metaphor. In Mey's words, a metaphor unites the realm of world with the realm of word, that is, the realm of utterances with the realm of discourse by allowing to the same phrase to obtain almost any meaning according to the context of uttering, that is, freedom of choice and association of intensional properties and their extension on concrete referents both on syntagmatic and paradigmatic axes on any level of sign's formation.

Since the signifiant aspect of the sign is known, it is 'the erased' on the level of discourse, or various anaphorically extracted labels in separate utterances and communicative events, now it is necessary to examine what its conceptual aspect is constituted of. In order to find out what participates in the sense of "the erased" at the discursive level, I must first examine its designations originating in separate utterances, what will be achieved by taking into consideration the pragmatic notions of deixis, presupposition, implicature and speech-acts.

3.2. Deixis

Peirce was the first to introduce the term 'indexical signs' for expressions which determine a referent by an existential relation between sign and referent. Even tough such categorization hadn't been put in use in linguistic pragmatic much, it influenced philosophical research of deixis (Levinson 1995, 57). 'Deixis', from Greek word for "pointing" or "indicating" (also called 'indexical', 'indexical expression' or, 'shifter',

especially after Jakobson)[65] is a term related to the use of linguistic expressions in order to pick out features of the speech situation (Salkie 2001, 178). Thus entities in spatio-temporal, social and discursive context are located. In the Indo-European languages such deictic expressions typically include first and second person pronouns, demonstratives, tense, time and place adverbials, some verbs, and proper names (Marmaridou 2000, 65). Deixis concerns ways in which language encodes or grammaticalizes features of the context of utterance or communicative event and by doing that, it also concerns ways in which the interpretation of utterances depends on the analysis of that context of utterance (Levinson 1995, 54). Deixis belongs both to the domain of semantics (since semantics is taken to include all conventional aspects of meaning) and pragmatics (since it directly concerns the relationship between the structure of languages and the contexts in which they are used), (Levinson 1995, 55). Moreover, it can be seen as "the first point" in analysis in which semantics and pragmatics come together (compare Fillmore 1997). As we have seen, a reference, according to referential theory, is a context-dependent aspect of utterance-meaning (which contrasts sentence meaning for exactly this property of context-dependence), it is a relation between speakers and that what they talk about on particular occasions. Context can be viewed as a set of pragmatic indices, co-ordinates or reference points. Deixis localizes these points in speech. Therefore, deixis is a type of action, not a mere correspondence between words and sets of objects. By picking out referential points, it constructs context that will be activated in the utterance of a communicative event. For this reason it can be said that deixis functions from context to context (compare Levinson 1995, 60 and 276). Context can also be viewed as a set of propositions, describing the beliefs, knowledge, commitments and so on of the participants in a discourse. In terms of Montague grammar (see previous chapter), deixis delimits extension of expressions and thus can be only relatively true (or false). But it determines propositional content and thus makes it comparable and, eventually, negotiable, in course of communicative event. This again leads toward conclusion that deixis is an action of construction of a possible world, precisely, a contemporary one. Therefore, it is also a cognitive means for structuring reality as a meaningful experience, to paraphrase Marmaridou. "The propositional structure of deictic idealized cognitive

---

[65] Jakobson took over the term from Jespersen (see Jakobson 1995, 386).

models consists of an agent, the speaker, drawing the patient's (the addressee's) attention to an entity in terms of its (spatial) relation to the agent", (Marmaridou 2000, 100).[66] In terms of speech-act theory, it is a fundamental performative.[67]

Indexicals can be classified into deictic categories according to their function and the contextual parameter they define. These categories (mostly made in relation to Indo-European languages) are: person deixis (which makes reference to speaker and addressee, that is, participants in communicative event), place deixis (which concerns encoding of spatial locations relative to the location of the participants in the communicative event) and time deixis (which concerns encoding of temporal points and spans relative to the time in which utterance was delivered in course of communicative event) (see Levinson 1995, 62). Marmaridou points that in some accounts of deixis, these categories are perceived as basic: for example, they comprise Bühler's zero point or *origo* of deictic field (Marmaridou 2000, 66). Thus deixis is described by conceptual metaphors of dimensionality as in mathematical co-ordinate system as well as in terms of centre vs. periphery schema. For example, Russell called deictic expressions 'egocentric particulars', for the reason that deixis is organized relative to specific parameters of the communicative event that place the speaker as the centre of deixis (or, deictic co-ordinate system). It has been observed that the centre of deixis can be moved to some other points of deictic co-ordinate system (compare Fillmore 1997, 35 and further). Other deictic categories are: discourse deixis (which includes the matrix of linguistic material within which the utterance has a role, that is, the preceding and following parts of the discourse), social deixis (which concerns social relationships on the part of the participants and other referents in their environment in the communicative event), emphatic deixis (which encodes emotional distance between speakers and aspects of the communicative event), etc., (compare Levinson 1995, 62; Fillmore 1997, 61; Marmaridou 2000, 79).

---

[66] According to theory of experiential pragmatics, human knowledge is organized in idealized cognitive models (for more information on this point see Marmaridou 2000, 50 and further).
[67] Marmaridou points that "[...] deixis may also be described as a speech act which is realized by various grammatical constructions. The use of these constructions construct the speaker as the deictic centre, the source of the act", (Marmaridou 2000, 100). Levinson, following Searle, also points that indexicals are (as other kinds of reference) speech acts, which are "prototypically 'demonstrative'", (Levinson 1995, 60).

Since I am not interested in the individual construction of the context of the separate utterances, but on the discursive determination of 'the erased', I should say something what happens with indexicals in a discourse, as we have seen it doesn't deal with reference, since it is internally related to a language-system. The role of deixis is taken over by presuppositions and implicatures, inferences that can be classified into (pseudo-deictic) discursive categories according to the function and the co-textual parameter they define, and for which deictic expressions are triggers.[68] Since presupposition and implicature in utterances are achieved by combining anaphoric (text-internal, systemic, "grammatical", syntactic) and deictic (text-external, non-systemic, grammar-independent, pragmatic) aspects of expressions, they seam to be the first point of connecting (products)-of-language-use (pragmatic) with language-system (syntax) as well as the deixis is the first point of connecting pragmatic and semantic dimensions of a language. Thus the direct referents pointed by indexicals, become taken over by their sense, that is, their intensional (defining) properties. Let us examine some of the material. In the article "Borec za pravico", ["Freedom fighter"], published in *Mladina* of 21st July, 2003, there is the following sequence of comments:

(9) 2003-07-28 16:03 by **Klepec**

Ne vem kaj oblasti sploh čakajo. Tako kot vse ostale ilegalce, naj tudi "izbrisane" izženejo iz države.

[I do not know what the authorities are still waiting. The "erased" should be thrown out of the country, too, as all the other illegal residents.]

In (9) the commentator speaks to the non-specified audience. The erased are in the third person plural, what makes them detached both from the speaker and intended recipients. Deictic word "what" implies that the commentator expects the authorities to do something what he/she finds in accordance with the situation in the country, and specification of the referent of this word is found by anaphoric usage in the remaining part of the utterance – "throwing out the erased from the country". The presupposition is

---

[68] Otherwise, deixis used in implicatures and presuppositions constitutes the main mechanism of inferring, so called 'triggers'.

that the "question of the erased" should be settled by the authorities, thus specifying the context in which the problem of the erased is placed: it is a political one. The erased are by anaphoric usage equated with "all the other illegal (people)". Deictic word "all" implies that there are more then two categories of people in Slovenia that can be labeled as the illegal. This is further highlighted by the deictic word "too". Thus obtained implicature is that all categories of illegal people should be thrown out of the country. 'Country' is the deixis which points to Slovenia, what is assumed from the context of the discourse about the erased. The erased, as all the other illegal people are presupposed to be already in Slovenia, what is specified by the deictic verb "throw out". The fact that the erased are put in double quotation marks shows that the commentator finds the phrase 'the erased' to have a figural meaning, that is, he/she does not accept it as the name of the erased.

(10) **Lady M**

2003-07-28 16:14 by **Dr. Fig**

Pravljice o "izbrisanih" se nadaljujejo kot doktor roman. Lady Mladina. Obrnite kaseto in se lotite resničnih svinjarij v tej državi.

[The fairy-tales about "the erased" continue like doctor roman. Lady Mladina. Turn the tape and deal with the real bullshit in this country.]

The commentator first directs the comment to the audience and then narrows it down to "Mladina". The erased are in the third person plural, what implies that they are perceived as not likely to be the intended recipients of the comment. Presupposition in (10) is that the stories about the erased are imagined (the phrase "fairy-tales") as well as that they have been going on for a while (the deictic verb "continue"). In the second sentence of the utterance, there is a speech act of giving counsel to/warning Mladina, bearing the implicature that the problem of the erased is not a real problem in Slovenia for which (other real problems) it is presupposed to exist there ("this country" is the deixis for Slovenia, what is inferred from the discourse about the erased as well as from the preceding article and comments). The erased (and stories about them) are negated for

being real three times in this single utterance: first, with double quotation marks, the commentator points out that 'the erased' is used not in its usual, accepted, "real" meaning, but in figural one; second, stories about the erased are imagined ("fairy-tales"); third, they are not a "real" problem in Slovenia.

(11)   **izbrisani**

   [the erased]

2003-07-28 17:12 by **zdomc**

Tovarisi izbrisani ,izbrisal ste se sami ker niste sprejel ponudebo Slovensko drzavljanstvo ,ampak ste ostal zavedni socialisticni jugoslovani. Za jugoslovanske lojaliste ni prostora v Slovenski druzbi.

[Comrades the erased ,you erased yourselves because you failed to accept the offered Slovenian citizenship ,but remained conscious socialist Yugoslavs. There is no place in the Slovenian society for those who remained Yugoslav loyalists.]

In (11) the commentator addresses the erased in the second person plural and names them "comrades" what, together with anaphorically used "conscious socialist Yugoslavs" and "Yugoslav loyalists" places a specific presupposed label to the erased. The Slovenian society is thus labeled as different from the Yugoslav socialist one, or even opposed to it, since the presupposition is that not only were the erased conscious socialist Yugoslavs in the past, but also in the present time (the encoding as well as assumed decoding time), too (trigger is deictic verb "remained"). As in (9) where it is said that the erased should leave Slovenia as all the other illegal people, in (11) this is inferred from the assertion "There is no place in the Slovenian society for those who remained Yugoslav loyalists". Here we also have a presupposition that the erased were offered the Slovenian citizenship (triggered by the deictic verb "accept"). The implicature is that the erased rejected the Slovenian citizenship because they were loyal to Yugoslavia (the discourse deixis "but" triggers this implicature). Further implicatures are that Slovenia is not a socialist country and that a non-socialist country cannot have pro-socialist citizens.

(12) 2003-07-28 17:38 by **Mičo**

Draga mladina točno zaradi tako ¨sivih¨ člankov sem odpovedal naročniško razmerje na vaš tednik - KAKO VAS NI SRAM DA TAKO ENOSTRANSKO PREDSTAVLJATE NEKE NEPREVERJENE ZGODBE kot sem ze enkrat zapisal - izbrisanim se naj status uredi npr. s statusom tujca ampak na vsak način brez državljanstva in brez odškodnin. Po dvajestih letih življenja pri nas leta 1992 niste hoteli prevzeti slovenskega državljanstva zato si ga izbrisani tudi sedaj ne zaslužite. Za določene tsvari imate v življenju res samo eno možnost - ampak IZBRISANI ROKO NA SRCE, ZA VSE STE SI KRIVI SAMI.

[Dear mladina, it is exactly because of such "gray" articles that I cancelled the subscription to your weekly – HOW ARE YOU NOT ASHAMED TO PRESENT SOME UNCHECKED STORIES SO NARROW-MINDEDLY as I have already written once – the status of the erased should be settled for example in the same way as the status of foreigners, but in any case without citizenship and without compensations. After twenty years of living in our place, in 1992 you didn't want to take over the Slovenian citizenship so you the erased do not deserve it now, too. For some things in life you really have only one opportunity - but THE ERASED HONESTLY, YOU ARE GUILTY YOURSELVES FOR EVERYTHING.]

In (12) the commentator first directs the comment to "Mladina", then to the audience and at the end to the erased. The presupposition is that the article the commentator speaks about is "gray", and that the story presented in it is not checked. Mladina used not to publish "gray" articles in the past but now the situation changed and we can conclude that the amount (big) of "gray" articles made the commentator cancel the subscription (discourse deixis "because"). This labels the commentator as a person who dislikes "gray" articles and find them inappropriate for a weekly. The commentator up-takes the possibilities of settling the status of the erased offered in the article and chooses the status of foreigners as being the most appropriate for them, what is directed to all potential readers of the comment. The erased are said to be living in Slovenia ("our place", which is sender-inclusive and recipient-exclusive in this case) and to have rejected to assume the Slovenian citizenship which was presupposed to have been offered to them. The

citizenship is presented as something that a person or a group should deserve (by their deeds) and as something that can be given only once in a lifetime. It is interesting that in directing his/her comment to Mladina, the commentator refers to the story presented in the article as being unchecked, but in the last part the commentator accepts that something is happening (the deictic word "everything") with the erased by ascribing "the guilt" for it to the erased.

From these examples we can see that even though the existence of the erased is at first denied (in all comments), it is eventually accepted (in (9) as something that should be settled by the authorities, or (10) as a problem which is rather imagined than real, in (11) as a group of the Yugoslav patriots, in (12) as a group which doesn't deserve the Slovenian citizenship). Slovenia is presented as a place where the erased either shouldn't be, or which doesn't belong to them (to the erased). The internet media reporting on them is being accused of bad reporting and making up stories (in (10), (11) and (12)). The deictic words outline the following picture: the erased (if there is such a thing as the erased) are illegal (people), Yugoslav patriots, foreigners, who live in Slovenia (which is not their country), they were offered the Slovenian citizenship sometime in the past but they rejected it and now they want it back. The question whether the erased are guilty or not is presupposed in (9), (11) and (12): in (9) their "guilt" is so obvious that they should be thrown out of Slovenia, in (11) the erased are presented as someone who needs an explanation pertaining to who is guilty for their status and the commentator says that they themselves are guilty because they remained loyal to Yugoslavia, as well as in (12) where they simply rejected the offered solutions for their status. We can also infer that the erased have been living in Slovenia (what is not denied) at the encoding time and before that time and that in 1992 they "made a mistake" which made them erased. This "mistake" is "the rejection of the Slovenian citizenship". The comments differ in what should be done with the erased in the future (whether they should be thrown out of the country or be given a status of foreigner, stop speaking about them). The "problem of the erased" is thus defined in terms of the citizenship and the right to stay in Slovenia without having the Slovenian citizenship. The Slovenian citizenship is further on determined as some kind of a reward for being loyal to Slovenia. Apart from the deixis, notions of

presupposition and implicature have been engaged, and now I should make clear what these terms stand for.

3.3. Presupposition

'Presupposition' refers to "propositions whose truth is taken for granted in an utterance and without which the utterance cannot be assigned a truth-value", (Marmaridou 2000, 117). It is important to notice that truth-value of presuppositions is not bivalent, but trivalent, that is, they can be true, false or neither-true-nor-false (compare Levinson 1995, 176). Moreover, their actual truth-value is not important, since they are used as if they had been true, a fact, and they remain taken as being true regardless of whether the entire sentence is true or false (compare Mey 1993, 13 and 200-206; Lyons 1996, 190 and 299). As Mey points, "even truths are not truths unless they are framed in a context where a truth is expected" (Mey 1993, 201). And presuppositions are those "frames" activated in the context where a truth is expected. Therefore, when truth-value is not taken into consideration as being the immanent property of presuppositions, but imposed on them, it can be said that they are assumptions underlying a statement, which remain in force even though the statement itself is denied (Mey 1993, 28).[69] Presuppositions entail world-knowledge of speaker by a single sentence fragment (Beaugrande and Dressler 1994: 211). Levinson points that in ordinary language notion of presupposition is used to describe any kind of background assumption against which an action, theory, expression or utterance (foreground assumption) makes sense or is rational, while in the technical terms, it is restricted to certain pragmatic inferences or assumptions that seam to be built into linguistic expressions and which can be isolated by engagement of specific linguistic tests which other kinds of inferences "cannot pass" (Levinson 1995, 168). The goal of these tests is to show whether an inference remains the same (constant, or that it 'survives') when the sentence or utterance is put in negative or interrogative form, that is, in changed linguistic context and, on the other hand, whether it is defeasible (canceled or violated) in certain kinds of both linguistic and extra-linguistic contexts, by virtue of

---

[69] Exactly the different attitudes towards pertinence of truth in relation to presuppositions is used as a demarcation property between 'semantic' (based on truth-value theories) and 'pragmatic' (based on truth-emerges-in-use theories or truth-is-shared-world-knowledge-of-interlocutors theories) presuppositions.

contrary beliefs (conflicting truth-values) which are triggered by factive verbs and some other deictic categories as tense and adverbials (see Levinson 1995, 178-194; Marmaridou 2000, 125). "Evidently, a presupposition may be triggered by a linguistic expression, but survives only if our knowledge of the world allows it", (Marmaridou 2000, 126). This problem of defeasibility merges with the projection problem, that is, the problem of behavior of presuppositions in complex sentences, where sometimes they are suspended and sometimes not, depending on the context of use and specific triggers that activate these contexts. Presuppositions thus existentially depend both on co-text and context, which presents an engaged combination of referents, signified by indexicals (compare Ibid., 127-141).

Presuppositions are crucial for discourse (and any sequence's) coherence, which is achieved when concepts and their relations (names and predicates, in terms of propositional theory) engaged in presuppositions are preserved in a way that they are mutually accessible and relevant (compare Mey 1993: 238; Beaugrande and Dressler 1994: 4). Since mutual accessibility belong to the domain of anaphor (internal to language-system, syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations between signs) and relevance to the domain of implicature (external to language-system, conventions of interpretation of the utterances, that is, actualized selection and combination of linguistic signs), presuppositions can be seen as their intersection. This property of presuppositions (of connecting language-system with language-use in the discourse) is analogous with transformation of referents into senses which happens when a presupposition survives. Here it will be examined at two levels, at the level of individual utterance and at the level of a discourse.

Presupposition as underlying proposition of an utterance is constituted from a name and a predicate or, in other words, of a reference (an expression identifying any thing, process, event or action) and a predication (what is 'predicated' or said about a thing, process, event or action by means of referring expression) but which can be distinguished from other propositions for its property of staying implicit and staying in force whatever is happening with the utterance whose constitutive part is the presupposition in question. So, are the referents in presuppositions direct or indirect ones, or are the presuppositions

complex referents, since they undoubtedly point to the context, and especially that kind of context which is taken to be true and without appreciation of which (or, better, accepting it without any debate) any utterance would stay incomprehensible? In order to answer this question, the position of presupposition in an utterance must be examined. If we view the presupposition as an expression that is a part of an utterance as any sentence (sentence-fragment) is, the answer would be that presuppositions are direct referents. But presuppositions are not expressions, for the reason that they are not locutions "that simply have a sense and reference" to employ Austin's terms. In the light of speech-act theory, which would be discussed in the later chapter in this section in more detail, the presupposition would be a speech-act of constructing the only world in which the expression in question can be comprehensible. Can we thus speak of presuppositions as "having" any reference at all? Aren't they referents *par excellence*? They are frames in which context is activated, a place where a definition of the context is expected, a place where 'contemporary world' is read as 'all possible worlds'. But they also signify something and exactly this is their existential condition: when that what is signified is questioned, the presuppositions are foregrounded and consequently cancelled in the course of communicative act, so they cease to be presuppositions. According to this view, presuppositions are pure referents, "anti-quoted" speech, a context present in a language, a kind of passage which allows a break-trough of referents in the language. When they transform from direct referents to indirect ones (signs of referents), they cease to exist.

The practical advantage of the presupposed notions over asserted ones is in that, since former are not at issue of debate, the debate is transposed to asserted notions. Thus the receiver takes over "the state of the world" offered by the sender not even being aware of that and further makes his own implicatures, presuppositions and assertions on this basis (Marmaridou 2000, 142-143). We have seen in the material that some presuppositions are subject of the fierce debate between interlocutors (see chapter 1.3.2. and Sources for the material). But what happens with those which stay hidden (implicit) in the discourse about the erased (constituted by and of individual utterances, but being an abstraction and not actual (product of) language-use, but a sublimating sign of utterances)? In order to answer this question I should recall Beaugrande's determination of meaning and sense:

"If 'meaning' is used to designate potential of a language expression (or other sign) for representing and conveying knowledge (i.e., virtual meaning), then we can use 'sense' to designate knowledge that actually is conveyed by expressions occurring in a text. Many expressions have several virtual meanings, but under normal conditions, only one sense", (Beaugrande and Dressler 1994, 82-84). When a presupposition is taken over and over again without being cancelled, but being present in various utterances, being the condition of assertions to have any sense, this implies that their signification of the context became fixed and in that way use-independent (compare Lyons 1996, 79). Presuppositions thus cease to be related to referents, but to denotations. 'Denotation' as a term rests on a theory in which words are the names of phenomena in the world, where that relation is fixed and not perceived as culturally established, but natural or metonymical in Leach's terms (see Kress 2001, 178). Moreover, while denotation is perceived to be metonymical, it is actually metaphorical, purely conventional, habitual.[70] Thus 'denotation' falls into domain of sign, both linguistic sign in general and its subcategory of the same name (see chapter 2.3.). Denotation of a word is not an entity, an aspect of meaning, but an operation, a kind of sublimating sign (which is itself an operation of connecting a signifiant with a signifié as well as the product of that operation) of all possible extensionally signified entities that share some intensional properties according to conventional use of that word. Denotation serves for identifying intensional adequacy of extensionally chosen entities in conventional use of that word. Thus it mediates between sense and reference of a word (and that is why when we have more denotation, we have less sense, or, put differently, when we have more conventionally extensionally chosen entities, we have less specific intensional properties). In Saussurean linguistics 'denotation' is used to refer to basic meaningful system where we have one signifiant and one usual/conventional signifié (whose proliferations on both levels lead either to connotation or meta-language) (see Barthes 1990, 200). Now to turn back to presuppositions: as they are predominantly referential in the individual utterances, that is, specific, contextually determined, they are

---

[70] In anthropological literature this property of presenting conventions as natural states of affairs is well explored in domains of gender, politics (different deprived groups and categories of population), social stratification, what, in my opinion, owns its inspiration in Durkheim's and Mauss's study of classification (Durkheim and Mauss 1963).

predominantly related to sense in the discourse (which, as language-use independent, does not allow reference), so real referents (extensions) are perceived according to their defining properties (intension) what is "examined for adequacy" through denotational operation. Thus presupposition moves from the domain of entities in the world to the domain of word, where it becomes a sign of a sign in Frege's terms.[71]

Let us examine some of the material. In the article "Pol miliona ksenofobov" ["Half a million of xenophobes"] of 19th April, 2004, published under the column "Rezultati referenduma" ["The results of the referendum"], in the weekly *Mladina*, the author, Jani Sever, cites several foreign magazines commenting the referendum organized by the Slovenian opposition, when voters were asked whether they supported the implementation of the technical law according to which the erased should get the permanent residence certificate or not.[72] Here I will examine the effect presuppositions could have on the discursive determination of the erased, especially concerning their relation to Slovenes, foreigners and minorities.[73]

 (13) "*Slovenija je v nedeljo na referendumu glasovala o tem, ali naj obnovi temeljne človekove pravice več deset tisočim Neslovencem ...*"

---

[71] Similar point can be made if extension and intension solely are taken into consideration: they cannot be set apart since 'extension' of a term is the class of entities that it defines, while 'intension' is the defining property of the class. What will be taken to represent a defining property of a class depends on various conditions (see chapter 1.3.2). Lyons treats them as complementary aspects of denotation: an expression denotes (extensionally) a class of entities and (intensionally) its defining property (that is, the property which all members of a class share and by virtue of which they are considered to be members of the class in question) (Lyons 1996, 80-82). In truth-conditional theory of meaning intension (sense) of an expression is either its extension (reference) in all possible worlds or, some function (rule, operation) which determines its extension in all possible worlds. Now to turn back to presuppositions: they are prevailingly extensional in separate utterances, but prevailingly intensional in the discourse (like in the Leach's distinction of signs and symbols, it is not possible to speak about strict demarcations, but only about grades). Further, discourse as internal to language-system does not allow referents, so their extensional properties are comprised into intensional ones. Moreover, according to Fregean theory of quoted speech, presuppositions in the discourse cease to point to direct referents, but to indirect ones, since they become signs of signs and not signs of entities.

[72] Mateja Hrastar in the article "The erased and all the others" within the 2004 report (the column "Slovenia in 2004") published in the weekly *Mladina*, of 27th December, 2004, writes: "31.3% of eligible voters cast their ballots at the April referendum on the technical law on the erased, 94 % of them voted against the implementation of the technical law. And this was not enough for the opposition – they demanded the referendum on the constitutional law on the erased, too. Throughout six months, the opposition organized five suggestions for the referendum, but they were all waived, while the politicians became increasingly perplexed in judico-political jargon. Anyway, the question of the erased remained unresolved with the change of the government that ensued." (translation by M.S.).

[73] The complete texts of the articles can be found by following links enclosed in Sources.

Independent

[At the referendum held on Sunday Slovenia voted whether the basic human rights should be restored to several tens of thousands of Non-Slovenes...]

In (13) we have a deictic (also called 'factive', changing state of the world) verb "restore", which points out that several tens of thousands of Non-Slovenes once had basic human rights, however, they were deprived of them in the past. This presupposition of the utterance, activated by the trigger "restore" assumes the role of time deixis in the co-text of discourse. Further on, Slovenia becomes not an absolute place deixis, but a person determinant, the agent of the act which is talked about, what is signified by the third person singular. "On Sunday" informs us about the day when the referendum was held, however, it does not provide the exact date. This implies that the speaker expects the recipients would get the message in the week directly following the one when the Sunday referendum was held.[74] Both Slovenia and Non-Slovenes are in the third person, what implies that the speaker as well as the recipients are detached from both the event the speaker talks about and its participants (conversational implicature: "Be perspicuous"). Now we reach two possibilities of comprehending the utterance according to our understanding of the discourse to which they belong. If we, the readers, are not familiar with the topic of the erased, we can read the utterance as if Slovenia voted for restoring the human rights to all Non-Slovenes (presupposed they reside within its borders), for whom we are told that there are several tens of thousands of them. On the other hand, if we, the readers, are expected to be familiar with the topic of the erased, and read the utterance as a part of the discourse about the erased, we can comprehend the utterance as if Slovenia voted for restoring the human rights to the erased as a specific category of

---

[74] Such deictic markers will not be dealt with, since the separate utterances with their utterers do not interest me *per se*, but their effect on creation of the discursive spaces for "the erased". Time determinants will be dealt as, for example, in the statement of Janez Janša throughout the debates on referendum, for whom the technical law is labeled as "making the process of Slovenian independence worthless" since it is against the restoring of the human rights which were illegally taken away from the erased, but "for political and ideological alliance of friends or partisans from the period when Slovenia was becoming independent or, in other words, from the period when there were many who opposed the Slovenian independence." (translated by M.S., a quotation of an article published in the daily "Večer", of 29 October, 2003 in Pistotnik 2007, 217). Besides that, this time determinant in the co-text of discourse puts the origin of "the problem of the erased" into the period of Slovenia's separation from Yugoslavia, labeling them simultaneously as (presumably active) opponents to Slovenia's independence.

people who live within its borders. This would imply that some intensional properties of the erased had been imposed to us, the readers, through their extensional identification with the Non-Slovenes as well as with foreign citizens (by means of anaphoric usage according to which we conclude that the Non-Slovenes and foreign citizens refer to the same category).

(14) "*Slovenci so proti vključevanju tujih državljanov. Z veliko večino so volilci na spornem referendumu v nedeljo zavrnili določitev o povrnitvi manjšinskih pravic.*"

Frankfurter Allgemaine Zeitung

[The Slovenes are against the inclusion of foreign citizens. At the controversial referendum held on Sunday the majority of voters rejected the decision on restoring the minority's rights.]

In (14), Frankfurter Allgemaine Zeitung identifies the Slovenes as the voters who participated in the referendum, by anaphoric, that is, non-deictic use of the proper name of a nationality as well as that the referendum was about the inclusion of foreign citizens (in Slovenia). By equating the Slovenes and the voters, the readers may conclude that the majority of Slovenes cast their ballot at the referendum. Further anaphoric usage may be noticed in the part of the utterance equating the foreign citizens and the minority. The underlying presupposition is that the minority is deprived of its rights in Slovenia. If "we are expected to know" that this referendum was on the erased, we may conclude that foreign citizens and the deprived minority refers to them. This shows how the discourse influences the reading of separate utterances. We may also conclude that non-foreign citizens in Slovenia are the Slovenes by anaphoric usage (here we have an example of mixing categories of ethnicity and citizenship, for which it is impossible to tell if it is intentional or not). On the other hand, if we are not familiar with that the fact that this referendum was on the erased, we may conclude that the Slovenes are against the inclusion of any foreign citizens as well as that persons belonging to minorities have the status of foreign citizens (again we have an example of mixing categories of ethnicity and citizenship). The deictic verb "rejected" presupposes that the decision on restoring the

minority's rights was made sometime in the past. The deictic verb "restore" presupposes that the minority used to have some rights in the past. As in (11), a sender and recipients are detached from both the Slovenes or eligible voters and the foreign citizens or minorities (persons who are not eligible voters and do not have access to any minority's rights).

(15) "*Čeprav referendum ni bil pravno zavezujoč, analitiki verjamejo, da je bil test pred jesenskimi parlamentarnimi volitvami, ki kaže na porast nacionalističnih čustev v mali alpski državi z dvema milijonoma prebivalcev.*"

New York Times

[Even tough the referendum wasn't legally binding, the analysts believe that it was a test prior the autumn parliamentarian elections, which marks the rise of nationalistic feeling in this small Alpine country with a population of two million.]

In (15), the discourse deixis "even tough", usually implies that the consequence of some action, state of affairs etc., was unexpected. Thus formed implicature (that the referendum is somehow connected with the parliamentarian elections, based on the maxim: "be relevant") connects the erased with the ongoing political situation in Slovenia, estimating one of their possible discursive spaces (namely, politics, and more precisely, to presupposition that in the autumn the parliamentarian elections are to be held, activated by the trigger "prior", thus puting the erased in the context of the contemporary political events in Slovenia). This may be valid only in case we are aware that the referendum was on the erased, however, the rest of the utterance implies this wasn't the case. The adjective "small" shows that according to the New York Times' journalist's criteria, here taken as the absolute ones, Slovenia belongs to the small Alpine countries (implying that there are some larger Alpine countries) while "Alpine" delimits Slovenia from some other possible spatial labels such as, for example, the Balkans, the Mediterranean region, Central Europe, etc. "Alpine" fixes the space occupied by Slovenia based on some absolute geographical measures. From this engagement of absolute criteria, we may conclude that the speaker talks about Slovenia as a country the intended

readers are not expected to be familiar with. However, this utterance is quoted in the article whose readers are familiar with the topic. Moreover, the deictic verb "rise" triggers the presupposition that nationalistic feeling in the small Alpine country with a population of two million was once at some lower level in the (recent?) past. The number of up-takes of the fragment "rise of nationalistic feeling" in the comments succeeding the article, shows that this notion was taken to be the most controversial one thus inducing the debate (see Sources).

(16) Ksenofobija je zmagala. Janša ni dobil zaušnice. Oziroma natančneje - bila je šibka. Tako zelo, da je videti, kot da je še opazil ni. Udeležba na referendumu o izbrisanih je bila sicer skromna za plebiscitarne sanje pobudnikov. A kljub vsemu sorazmerno visoka. Še posebej ob vseh izrekanjih o bojkotu, ki pa so bili resda izrečeni šele v tako rekoč zadnjem trenutku.

[Xenophobia won. Janša didn't get a slap. Or, more correctly – it was a light one. So light it seamed he didn't even notice it. The turnout at the referendum on the erased was pretty modest compared to the plebiscite dreams of the inducers. And in spite of everything, proportionally high. Especially because of all proclamations of the boycott, which had actually been announced , so to say, almost at the last minute.]

In (16) the deictic verb "won" presupposes that xenophilia struggled with xenophobia in Slovenia to some extent in the past. We are expected to be familiar with Janša's role in the referendum on the erased (according to the conversational maxim of quantity: say exactly as needed, no more, no less). Now, as we know that utterances preceding the one in the article labeled the referendum as being xenophobic, we may conclude that Janša is somehow the representative of xenophobia in Slovenia. 'Janša' is by anaphoric usage and implication (the maxim: "Be relevant") imposed as the inducer of the referendum, the person responsible for it. And we are imposed to the conclusion that he should have been punished for that role. Thus, we get the insight into the speaker's attitude towards the referendum and Janša's role in it. In one sequence we can see the cancellation of the presupposition whether Janša was punished or not for his role in the referendum. The presupposition that inducers expected higher turnout on the referendum (the discourse

indexical 'however') is also imposed on us. 'In spite of everything' anaphorically refers to 'all proclamations of the boycott' and presupposition that there were a lot of proclamations of the boycott (the deictic word 'all'). Thus constituted implicature is that proclamations of boycott could hamper the referendum, at least by diminishing the voters' turnout. This discourse deixis ("in spite of everything") implies that the consequence was unexpected. By implementation of another discourse deixis "because" and presupposition that proclamations came too late, the speaker cancels the implicature (which serves as a presupposition in this fragment) that proclamations of boycott could hamper the referendum thus forming another implicature that if the proclamations hadn't arrived too late, the voters' turnout at the referendum would have been substantially smaller. Therefore, the proclamations of boycotting xenophobia failed. Since we know that the referendum was on the erased (for or against the restoration of their rights), we may conclude that the people who voted against the technical law are xenophobes. This means that the speaker labels the decision on the implementation of the technical law on the erased as xenophobia struggling with xenophilia, thus labeling the erased as foreigners, strangers placing them out of the Slovenian society. This property of determination of the erased (as being fundamentally "foreign") is found more directly asserted in the majority of utterances.[75]

---

[75] One commentator of the article "Borec za pravico" ["Freedom fighter"] published in *Mladina*, of 21st July, 2003 says: "What about the erased, what about them: They are simply bullshiters, who didn't choose our country up to 26 February, while it was possible hoping that Slovenia wouldn't become independent. It is very likely that very high percentage of them voted against Slovenia's secession from Srboslavia. They are today complaining saying that they were somehow deprived. A-ha, you cooked your own stew, my dears, our country gave you the opportunity and now you complain that you don't have anything. You know, Yugo-politics was mocking the whole world (alias Slobo) for many years and there would not be none of us any more after 50 years of fucking in the head. All these inhumane and heartbreaking stories are of the secondary importance, because you are GUILTY YOURSELVES because you DIDN'T (primarily) get citizenship at the right moment. Even today the majority of you cannot speak Slovenian, what can you know about the Slovenian history then. And you tell me, "erasedies": WHY 170, 000 former residents DID manage to resolve their status. A?? Were you Serbs high in the clouds and counted on the big victory of the YPA [the Yugoslav People's Army]. Your time has passed and Slo[venia] isn't your country because YOU HAVEN'T CHOSEN it at the right time. Now when you figured out that in Europe things are going better then on the Balkans you are crying and shouting. Sorry, these are false tears! And one more thing: Now Slovenia should PAY THE COMPENSATION TO YOU because YOU REJECTED our country when it was necessary and possible to make choice. Pig dreams about corn. We, the Slovenes, built strong spine for 50 years of shit and we don't fall on your Balkan tricks any more!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!" (translated by M.S., typographic as in original except square parenthesis) In this comment the erased are first referred to in the third person plural, what implies that the speaker does not perceive them as the possible recipients of the utterance. Later he/she refers to them in the second person plural. Anyway, the speaker does not include the

From these examples we have seen how the erased are defined through the anaphoric usage of the presupposed and implied notions which become indirect referents of the phrase. Thus, they are discursively constructed as being "a problem stemming from Slovenian xenophobia", "nationalism", they are "foreign citizens", "minority", "Non-Slovenes", deprived from minority's and election rights, while staying detached both from Slovenes as well from the authors of the utterances and their expected readers. They can also be perceived as objects and discursive space of political struggle that is ongoing in Slovenia, and not as its agents.[76]

In the discourse on the erased, presuppositions within its utterances can be seen as Beaugrande's actually conveyed knowledge, or the sense of "the erased", that what is unquestioned but also unstated, what participates in the signifié that the phrase is signifiant of. A special property of the presuppositions is that they serve as a starting point (a precondition) for any manifestations of the "potential for presenting and conveying knowledge", that is, for the process of further construction of implicatures, (secondary) presuppositions as well as foreground assertions, which appear in the diverse forms and also give their contribution to the signifié in the discourse. In the last section of this text the mutual relation of deixis, presupposition, implicature and speech act will be discussed. In order to introduce a new topic of the research, here I will notify one of the relations of presuppositions and implicatures. They are interdependent in a way that a presupposed notion induces the implied one but not *vice versa* (Mey 1993, 206). I would like to add, that this is the case when a single utterance is taken into consideration. An anaphoric usage hypothetically may result in the creation of some further presupposition based on the previously constructed implicature. But what are implicatures? They are some kind of inference as well as presuppositions are. However, they do differ considerably. To employ a conceptual metaphor of space, while presuppositions are

erased in the category he/she is self-perceived to belong to (they/you *vs*. 'us', 'our', 'we') and anaphorically (by presuppositions and implicatures) defines the erased as being the enemies of his own group (against the Slovenian independence, always making problems to the Slovenes, not respecting Slovenes and their laws, language and history, wanting to take advantage of Slovenia, etc.) which "invaded" its geographical borders (the Balkans and Srboslavia as the countries of origin of the erased vs. Slovenia as the target of the erased).

[76] See the example in the above footnote (Ft. 80) where the erased are perceived as the agents of political instability in Slovenia. One generalization can be made: the erased are either perceived as victims or the initiators of the political conflicts in Slovenia, but are necessarily connected with the political situation.

inscribed in the utterance, but have to be inferred from its surface (level), implicatures are constructed "out of" the utterance, they are in the "outer space" between utterances. Let's examine this notion more thoroughly.

3.4. Implicature

'Implicature' is a term derived from the word 'to imply' which etymologically means to fold (cover, hide) something into something else. 'Implicature' is something which is left implicit in the utterances (see Mey 1993, 99). But this differs from presupposition since implicatures "[...] lie outside the organization of language, in some general principles for co-operative interaction, and yet these principles have a pervasive effect upon the structure of language", (Levinson 1995, 97). Implicatures must be derived not from uninterpreted surface structures but from some semantic representation of a particular reading (Ibid., 124).[77] The basic question concerning implicatures is how is that possible that an information in communication can be conveyed even though no words in asserted speech propositionally or semantically point to it. It seams that words obtain some extra

---

[77] In anthropology, 'reading' is a process brought by the reader bringing an interpretative framework (a cognitive schema, world-view) to bear upon the text. Thus the reader constructs a meaning of the text in question what points that there is no fixed relationships between the forms recognized in a text and response they elicit (Rapport and Overing 2000, 313). Consequently, members of the same 'interpretative communities' share certain structures of interpretation which make particular readings conventional, normal and obvious, but existence of different interpretative communities in a society leads to 'heteroglossia' and 'competing readings' (Ibid., 313-314). In pragmatics, the emphasis put on the cultural relativity and social diversity in the analysis of implicature distinguishes societal pragmatics tradition from the cognitive one, which assumes implicatures to be universal phenomena, and hence not a subject of cultural or social diversity (Marmaridou 2000, 237). For the reason that conversational implicatures arise in the course of talk exchange, they can be viewed as part of the phenomenon of exchange, systematically studied in anthropology as a total social phenomenon (pervading all social institutions) especially after Mauss's "The gift" according to which the manifestations of the exchange can be different in various societies, but they are regulated by some principles which tend to be universal. As in conversational analysis, where in order to have a conversation there must be an up-take, in anthropological analysis of exchange, there must be a reception of offered item to have an exchange (see Mauss 1998). Mauss related this constant urge of sending and receiving to mana, for which he was accused to be 'mystified' by the beliefs existing in the societies he analyzed (that is, for not decentering himself from the object of study, thus allowing "native" classification and interpretation to became his own). Levi-Straus viewed mana as an expression of a need for totality (see Lévi-Strauss 1998, 57). In psychoanalytic linguistic anthropology, mana is understood as controversial zero point, as both precondition and impossibility of creating any system, totality, wholeness (see Šterk 1998, 57). All this standpoints contribute to the understanding of language as processual, as liable to constant change according to the dynamics of context in which it is put in work and not as static and finite or, in other words, as a denial of justifiability and possibility of stable bounded concepts, but as permanently open metaphorizing, bridging the gaps between word and world, filling in the 'losses of communication', to the understanding that language is its use, ultimate performative (compare Ricoeur 1994, 74, 77 and 106-107).

layer of meaning in conversational contexts. Grice, a philosopher who dealt with this question, made a distinction between 'natural meaning' (when user of a sign has no intentions to convey some meaningful information) and 'non-natural meaning', or 'meaning-nn', which is characterized by speaker's intention either to cause some effect in recipient or by speaker's intention that the recipient would recognize speaker's initial intention (that the recipient would recognize it and so on) (Grice 1989, 99).[78] "[W]hen an utterance is used, the recognition of speaker's intention as being intended constitutes the utterance's meaning-nn, which may be distinct from the propositional meaning of the same utterance", (Marmaridou 2000, 227). Of all the inferences that may be associated with an utterance, those which are intended are implicatures (Ibid.).

Grice considered implicatures arising in the course of talk interchange, where interlocutors must be following some sources located outside the language, some conversational principles which would allow 'bridging the gap' ('bridging the gap' is Levinson's term for function of implicature) between 'what is said' ('what is said' is Grice's technical term for truth-conditional content of an expression) and what is communicated. He assumed that in any information exchange the interlocutors must recognize each other's intention to communicate, accept that intention and engage in cooperative interaction and in order to make all this possible, interlocutors must share some encyclopaedic knowledge (or think that they do, or be imposed to think that they do). This property of 'conversational implicature', implicature that arises in the course of conversation and is governed by some principles that regulate conduct of conversation, he called 'Cooperative Principle'. More precisely, he defined it as following: "Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged", (Grice 1989, 26). He proceeded in distinguishing four categories of special applications of this principle and more specific subcategories. These are: 1) the category of Quantity maxims with submaxims a) "Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange)" and b) "Do not make your contribution more informative than is required"; 2) the category of Quality maxim, which says "Try to make your

---

[78] According to Ricoeur, Husserl points in his "Logical Investigations" that "language is intentional par excellence; it aims beyond itself", (Ricoeur 1994, 74 and fn. 17).

contribution the one which is true" with submaxims a) "Do not say what you believe to be false" and b) "Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence"; 3) the category of Relation maxim which says "Be relevant"[79]; and, 4) the category of Manner maxim, which says "Be perspicuous" with submaxims a) "Avoid obscurity in expression", b) "Avoid ambiguity", c) "Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity)" and d) "Be orderly" (Ibid., 26-28). These maxims are 'observed' by interlocutors in order to converse in efficient, rational and cooperative way and when conversation does not follow them, addressee reasons how the cooperative principle applies to the case in point (compare Marmaridou 2000, 229). They are called 'standard implicatures'. But a participant in a talk exchange may fail to fulfill a maxim in various ways. They can be also 'violated unostentatiously'[80], which is recognized by the addressee as that something is wrong with the speaker's utterance, except in the unostentatious violation of Quality maxim, where the speaker simply lies. Further, a participant may 'opt out', that is, choose not to continue conversation and restrain from Cooperative principle. Maxims can come into 'clash', when stronger maxim overrules the weaker one, or they can be 'ostentatiously floated or exploited', that is, deliberately violated in order to generate implicatures (tautologies, irony, metaphor, euphemism or meiosis and hyperbole) (see Grice 1989, 30-35).

This evading of fulfilling maxims gives rise to 'generalized' (which arise without any particular context or special scenario being necessary) or 'particularized conversational implicatures' (which do require specific contexts) (Ibid., 37; see also Levinson 1995, 126). Another kind of these non-truth-conditional inferences is 'conventional implicature' which is not derived from superordinate pragmatic principles like the enumerated maxims, but are simply attached by convention to particular expressions (Levinson 1995,

---

[79] This maxim is given prominence in the relevance theory (compare Carston and Uchida (eds.) 1998). Wilson and Sperber say: "[E]very utterance starts out as a request for the hearer's attention. As a result, it creates an expectation of relevance. It is around this expectation of relevance that our criterion for evaluating possible interpretations is built", (Wilson and Sperber 1998, 8).
[80] Russell distinguished 'object-words' from 'dictionary words'. While 'object words' are (logically) words which have meaning in isolation and (psychologically) words which can be learned without having as a necessary precondition knowing other words, 'dictionary words' are composite and may be learned in terms of object-words. Object-words are learned by demonstration, 'ostension', by showing the learner a sufficient number of entities that fall within extension of each object word. 'Ostensive definition' (definition by ostension) involves pointing at one or more entities denoted by the word in question and saying "That is an X" (Russell 1940, 62-63).

127). In contrast to conversational implicatures, conventional ones have more or less determinate content and are specific for a society. Indexicals and conventional implicatures have a lot of similar properties. In some accounts it is said that conventional implicatures are indexicals, while in another that indexicals have conventional implicatures as their focal point (Ibid., 128). Both conversational and conventional implicatures evade truth-conditionality since different implicatures can have the same truth-conditions and, accordingly, asserted propositional content. Furthermore, the same implicature can arise in different co-texts and contexts (Mey 1993, 103).

Since conversational implicatures arise in the course of conversation, which is habitual, they are differently achieved in different societies and conversational situations. For the reason that I am not interested in the process of conducting talk exchange in the digital "society" of journalists and commentators as manifested on internet forums I took as the material for this research, but in how the theory of implicature can give me an insight into the discursive meaning of "the erased", I will assume that the Gricean general maxims would be enough for achieving my goal. Implicatures, which originate in the individual utterances and communicative events, and thus are extensional, will be considered as the provisions to intensional determination of the phrase 'the erased' within the discourse on the erased. Namely, implicatures are a kind of "pathways" for receiver's making of *ad hoc* assumptions about the context in order to determine interpretative range in which asserted speech would have sense (in every day's meaning of that word). This means that implicature contributes to a reduction in the polysemy (see section 4) of the asserted words (compare Crupi 2006, 266). And these assumptions are negotiated in the course of the talk exchange. Let us examine some of the examples from the article "Pravno nepismeni politiki proti izbrisanim" ["Politicians ignorant in the questions of law against the erased"] published in *Mladina* of 8th December, 2003 (see Sources for the complete material) where the author, Matevž Krivic, a former member of the Constitutional Court of Slovenia and represents the erased gathered in the Association of the Erased Residents of Slovenia, talks about the "systemic law" on the erased and the referendum initiatives when the voters would say if they are for or against its implementation and about the "technical law" introduced as some kind of preliminary implementation of the decision

made by the Constitutional Court of Slovenia in 2003 according to which so called additional decisions are to be issued to some of the erased (with the data on the locations where the erased lived in Slovenia since 1992 up to the date of the issuance of these decisions). He points out that both parties in power (being for "systemic" and "technical" law) and oppositional parties (being against these laws and advocating the referendum) in the Slovenian Parliament are ignorant of the legal matters and that these debates just prolong finding the solution of the problem of the erased. By far the commentators of this article do not up-take direct assertions offered by Matevž Krivic from the legal point of view, but concentrate on the reasons of the erasure, that is, on the questions referring to who is to be blamed for the erasure, whether to blame the erased or the politicians, and if the politicians are to be blamed, from which party. Very important topic was also the amount of the compensation the erased are likely to receive if the "systemic law" enters into force. If the legal(ist) jargon is to be used, it is only to serve as a tool for firming arguments. Now I will give some examples:

(17) 2003-12-15 12:09 by **Neznanec**

Zdaj se manjka samo še to, da bi Mateuš Krivić razglasil družine Goebels, Himmler in Goering za izbrisane reveže, ki se jim godi krivica. Veseli naj bodo, da je Slovenija tako strpna država, da po letu 1991 pri nas ni bilo procesa kot je bil tisti v Nuernbergu po drugi svetovni vojni.

[The only thing we need now is Mateuš Krivić claiming the Goebels, Himmler and Goering families having been the poor erased people who were deprived. They should be grateful because Slovenia is such a tolerant state and that after 1991 here we had no processes as this which was held in Nürnberg after the Second World War.]

The utterance (17) taken as whole, implies (the maxim of relevance) that the erased can be equated with some people from Fascist-ruled Germany, that is, that the erasure is justified as the erased people are considered as being some kind of Nazis. The first part of the utterance belongs to the linguistic trope of irony, flouting the maxim of quality, as the outcome of the reasoning process operating on the propositional content (see

Marmaridou, 2000:225). In the second part of the utterance the implicature is that the erased deserve to be brought before the court similar to *Nürnberg*, what further contributes to the assumption that they are to be blamed (if the range of associations is expanded, their guilt stems from committing something similar to genocide or crime against humanity). The commentator writes the name of the journalist as Mateuš Krivić, what is similar to the example (8) (see above, section 3.1.3.).

(18) **Janičar**

[Janizary]

2003-12-17 02:18 by **Grega**

Pa kaj bi rad ta Krivic dosegel? Kdo ga plačuje, da se tako grebe za "pravice" nekaj tisoč najbolj problematičnih jugosov? Pa kaj bi rada Mladina, da kot lajna ponavlja neke pravljice o silnih krivicah? Jaz bi tudi lahko imel poleg slovenskega še ameriško državljanstvo, če bi se mojim tastarim dalo malo potrudit, pa se jim ni in ga nimam. Shit happens, a zdej naj grem pa Buša tožit?

[What does that Krivic want to achieve? Who pays him to solicit for the "rights" of several thousand most problematic Yugos? What does Mladina want when cassette-like repeating some fairytales of the alleged big injustices? I would like myself to have the USA citizenship apart from the Slovenian, if only my parents had tried better, but they didn't and I don't have it. Shit happens, and should I now sue Bush?]

In (18) we have the following implicatures: the struggle for the rights of the erased is not justified since the very rights of the erased are something considered as being imagined (put under inverted commas and triggered by the word "fairytales"). Very interesting presupposition (triggered by person deixis "who") is that Krivic is paid by someone to solicit for the rights of the erased. This implies, together with the implicature that the rights of the erased are not real, that presupposed "several thousand of the most problematic Yugos" have some sponsors (either inside or outside Slovenia) who are willing to bring their lawsuit before the court, and as the erased are labeled as "Yugos",

these sponsors are probably pro-Yugoslavian oriented, that is, against Slovenia as an independent state (the maxim of quantity: Do not say more then it is needed). Furthermore, the struggle of the erased for regaining their rights is labeled as not being based in reality, since the commentator gives the example of him not having the USA citizenship because his parents didn't try harder, thus implying that the erased want something what "normally" doesn't (in terms of administrative and legal procedure) belong to them, but what they might have got if only they had tried harder (thus Slovenia is presented not only as directly asserted tolerant state, but also as a state where persons not qualifying for being its citizens may become that). Moreover, the problems of the erased are reduced to the questton of citizenship (Slovenian).

(19) **pa so znane cifre ???**

[Do we know exact figures???]

2003-12-19 09:05 by **mrki**

"Zahteva po odvzemu državljanstva velja tudi za predsednika koroškega območnega odbora DIPS Mladena Balabana, ki med drugim od države zaradi proceduralnih napak pri pridobivanju državljanstva zahteva 227 milijonov tolarjev odškodnine, velja pa tudi za ostale izbrisane, ki do slovenskega državljanstva po mnenju podpisnikov zaradi preteklih dejanj niso upravičeni.-------------------- ----------- No folk zdej boste kmal zvedli še za ostale kok stanejo "njihove" človekove pravice. Pol pa veselo cekinčke zbirat. Upam da bo LDS in ZLSD začela akcijo vsesplošnega zbiranja denarja - npr. dodatni tolar ali dva pri bencinu , pa cestnini, pa pošti, pa telefonu itd - namen za poplačilo izbrisanim. Se že veselim lepe prihodnosti.

["The president of the regional DIPS council in Koroska, Mladen Balaban, also submitted the claim for obtaining the citizenship, and he ,among other things, demands 227 million tolar compensation for injury caused by procedural mistakes made during his attempts to obtain the Slovenian citizenship, and the other erased also qualify for receiving it, but who, according to the subscribed, are not eligible for applying for it (citizenship, remark by M. S.) due to their previous acts.-------------------- ----------- Well,

people, you will know soon how much are "their" human rights worth, of the other erased. Then you go collecting coins. I hope that the LDS and the ZLSD are soon to begin collecting money – i.e. additional tolar or two for gasoline, for toll, for post, for phone and so on – in order to collect compensation to be paid to the erased. I am looking forward to the beautiful future.]

In (19) we have a quoted sentence (for which I will assume that the commentator focuses on its sense) where it is written that the erased can ask for receiving some compensation as well as that the erased are persons whose citizenship is being questioned, according to the sources of this information.[81] This comment is a good example of how the commentator makes implicatures based on the quoted sentence: he assumes that what is valid for Mladen Balaban is valid for all the erased. His first implicature is that all the lawsuit filed by the erased before the courts claiming they have been deprived of the human rights is only to get some money (to paraphrase it, the erased are thought to use plea for human rights as an speech act with the perlocutionary force engaged in achieving the different goal – obtaining money). The commentator further concludes that if the Mladen Balaban claims amount of 227 million tolars, it is likely it would be the same for all other erased persons. Moreover, the right wing politicians use the same argument (among others), that is, a lot of new taxes which would be introduced if the erasure was law sanctioned. Based on the implicature in the last part of the utterance, which is an irony, we may conclude that the commentator is frightened at such a prospect.

(20) **odpisani**

[cancelled]

2003-12-16 11:30 by **radirka**

[eraser]

---

[81] Here I will not deal with the inferences made by the source of the information, even though they are very interesting. For example, the citizenship is presented as something that a person must deserve (be eligible for it) and the erased do not deserve it (due to their former activities).

Vsi državljani so imeli zakonito možnost urediti status leta 1991 in 1992. Državljani bivših bratskih republik, ki so bivali v RS so imeli tri možnosti. Prav je bila možnost pridobitve Slovenskega državljanstva. To možnost je velika večina izrabila in živi v naši državi enakovredno. Druga možnost oziroma zakonska dolžnost je bila, da se tuj državljan na upravni enoti prijavi ter pridobi dovoljenje za stalno ali začasno bivanje. No tu je pa nastopil problem. Določen de populacije izbrisanih je bil nacionalno preponosen da bi ratal Slovenc, hkrati pa ni doumel ali ni želel kapirati , da je Slo nova država. In v državi je treba zakon spoštovat.Tretja možnost je bila, da oseba ne prevzame državljanstva in se tudi ne želi prijaviti v Slo. Te osebe so v veliki večini zapustile državo ter iskale boljše življenske pogoje v ex jugi. Nekateri pa zavestno niso storili ničesar ter še zmeraj nezakonito in brez pravne podlage prebivajo v Slo.Zaključek: vsak državljan je imel možnost izkoristiti pravne možnosti.Če jih takrat niso hoteli iz različnih razlogov (nacionalizma, ponosa, oportunizma) se naj sedaj soočijo s svojimi grehi. Nepravilno in skrajno nepravično pa je, da se določeni posamezniki in politične ustanove tako aktivno angažirajo za popravek v tako imenovani problematiki "izbrisanih". S tem delajo krivico vsem tistim, ki so pravočasno uredili svoj status. Kajti oni ne bodo upravičeni do nikakršnih odškodnin, ker so ravnali pravilno. Tisti, ki pa niso izrabili zakonsko dovoljnih možnosti pa bodo za to ngrajeni!?? Lepo vas prosim. Banalen primer je vozniško dovoljenje. Če vam poteče plačate kazen. Nihče vas predhodno ne opozori, vabi ter vas nagovarja, da si dajte podaljšati vozniško dovoljenje.O tem vas seznani policist, ko ugotovi, da vam je poteklo. Napiše vam plačilni nalog in amen. In tu ni nikakršnega Krivica in političnih strank, ki bi se zavzele za vas, saj ste vendar izpit opravili in ga imeli že toliko let!!? Ni resnično, da Slo tujina opozarja zaradi ksenofobije. Res pa je, da določeni politiki in novinarji pišejo svojim znancem v tujino ali v tujih časopisih pišejo o ksenofobiji v Slo. Potem pa sami sebe citirajo ali omenjajo "opozorila" iz tujine.Tako nam po mojem mnenju izbrisani sploh ne bi smeli delati nikakršnih miselnih in političnih problemov. Zgodba se je vrtela pred dobrim desetletjem. In takrat današnji izbrisani v tej zgodbi niso želeli nastopati. Torej bi morali danes biti:ODPISANI.

[All the citizens were given a legal opportunity to resolve their status in 1991 and 1992. The citizens of the former fraternal republics, who lived in RS had three possibilities. The

first one was to assume the Slovenian citizenship. The majority of them used that opportunity and they live in our country having the access to all their rights. Second possibility, that is to say, a legally binding obligation, envisaged that a foreign citizen was obliged to register in a municipal unit thus and thus be issued with the permission for permanent or temporary residence. However, a problem appeared. A certain proportion of the erased population was nationally too proud to become a Slovene, and at the same time they didn't realize or didn't want to realize that Slovenia became a separate country. And the law must be respected. Third possibility included that a person didn't assume the citizenship and moreover didn't want to be registered in Slo. A big proportion of those persons left the country in a search for better living conditions in the former Yuga. Some of them knowingly did nothing and even now they illegally reside in Slo. Conclusion: every citizen was given an opportunity to use legal possibilities. If they didn't want to use the opportunity then for the different reasons (nationalism, pride, opportunism), they are confronting us with their sins. It is extremely wrong that some individuals and some political institutions are so actively engaged in resolving the so called problem of "the erased". By doing this, they are unfair to those who correctly resolved their status on time, an thus they do not qualify for receiving any compensation. Those who didn't use offered legally sufficient possibilities are going to be awarded for that!?? Please. There is an example of a driving license. If it expires, you must pay a fee. Without any previous warning, since no one will invite you or persuade you to prolong your driver's license. You are informed on that matter by the policeman when he finds out that it has expired. He writes you a fee and amen. There is no Krivic and political parties who would intercede for you, for the reason that you have passed your exam and you had it [license] for a lot of years!!? It is not true that Slo is warned by other states for its xenophobia. But it is true that some politicians and journalists are writing to their acquaintances abroad or write in foreign magazines about xenophobia in Slo. Then they quote themselves or mention "warnings" from abroad. Because of this the erased shouldn't make any cognitive or political problems in my opinion. The story was played more than a decade ago. And todays erased didn't want to take part in it then. And because of that, today they should be: CANCELLED.]

I will extract only a few implicatures from the utterance (20). Since the utterance is thorough, the majority of the former implicatures become directly asserted. The attempts of the erased to resolve their status are illegal (since it was possible to do it legally in 1991 and 1992, according to the commentator) and based on that the problem of the erased is questioned in terms of being justified. The erased are those citizens of the former fraternal republics who didn't want to become Slovenes because of their pride, nationalism, opportunism and stubbornness, even though they had been offered that opportunity. The sin of the erased is twofold: first, they didn't want the Slovenian citizenship, and, second, they didn't leave Slovenia, what the commentator finds immoral. The compensation the erased are expecting is not justified. The erased are thus not real, existing (problem) but seen as artificially created by the "fifth columnists", that is, those who write about xenophobia in Slovenia in order to obtain some personal benefit. Similar point is made in the following comment:

(21) **krivic**

[to Krivic]

2003-12-17 10:31 by **mrki**

Kje ste bili leta 94???? Ste pridno greli stolček ustavnega sodnika, vlekli plačo in naredili nič. Ali pač !! Pripravili teren , da danes lahko zastopate "izbrisane" in boste v odškodninskih zahtevah pokasirali "ŽIVLJENSKO" vsotico denarja. Koliko je to % od iztoženega denarja 40% , 50% , 60% ali več???

[Where were you in 94???? You were diligently sitting in the chair of the judge of the constitutional court, receiving salaries and doing nothing. But!! You prepared the field so that you can represent "the erased" today and you will earn money FOR THE LIFE from the lawsuits for compensation. How much % of the claimed money your share will account for, 40%, 50%, 60% or more???]

In (21) the erased are labeled as something that is questioned (by inverted commas) and the court proceedings initiated by them as some kind of Krivic's malversation. The

implicature is that Krivic took part in the creation of the erased as a judge of the Constitutional Court with an aim to earn some money in the future lawsuits. A conspiracy theory is well presented in the utterances on the erased. But while commentators, who consider the attempts of the erased to restore their civil rights back as unjustified, perceive the erased as the conspirators the same as their supporters, including, among others, their lawyers and journalists who write about them, while the erased and their supporters perceive the Slovenian parliamentarians and the staff in the municipality units in Slovenia as the conspirators (see, for example, the publication *The Story of One Erasure* (Beznec et al. 2007)). The main difference is about the territorial origin of conspirators: while in the first example they are not from Slovenia (being either foreigners, or fifth columnists, funded by foreigners, or people immoral to the extent they cannot be seen as the representatives of Slovenia), in the second example they are from Slovenia and are perceived as "want-to-be-hard-core-Slovenes". Nevertheless, the erased are simply not perceived as the Slovenes (either "hard or soft"), as totally "native", "domestic", "Slovenian", and they are, at the discursive level, constantly being kept away from the rest of the Slovenian factual residents. It is this that seams to be the most general implicature arising within different utterances on the erased. Being discursive, it ceases to be related to referents, that is, to particularized extensions (remember that the same implicature can arise from different propositional contents). It can only be related to intensions, which serve as "pseudo extensions", reified concepts. In other words, 'the erased' in the discourse is a metalanguage, a sign of signs, a sign of quoted speech. The cognitive process of understanding one domain of experience in terms of another (for example, talking about patriotism, "Slovenianness", deprivation, xenophobia, morality, etc., by engaging in the communicative exchange which nominally concerns the erased) is in some accounts called 'metaphorical concept' (see Lakoff and Johnson 2003, 5). Now I will say something more about conventional conceptual metaphors, a notion which originates from the experiential and cognitive researches within linguistics. Nonconventional and trope metaphors will be discussed in the following chapter.

3.4.1. Metaphorical concept

As Marmaridou points, a conceptual metaphor (other name for metaphorical concept) involves two experiential domains of which the one is understood in the terms of the other. Furthermore, "usually an abstract domain, the target, is understood in terms of a concrete one, the source domain, which cognitively structures the target domain while preserving its conceptual topology", (Marmaridou 2000, 101).[82] Lakoff and Johnson stress that this allows transposition of the conceptual organization of one domain to another (see Lakoff and Johnson 2003, 14). Conceptual metaphors are different then trope metaphors, but they share some general properties. Metaphorizing is a procedure of abstraction through which the expression used as metaphor looses its reference to an individual object and takes on a general value by giving prominence to one of its possible attributes and thus it hides its other possible aspects (Ricoeur 1994, 107).[83] Theory of metaphorical concepts is experiential in its basis: metaphors allow us to understand abstract concepts in terms of something more concrete, of something that stems from our physical experience (Lakoff and Johnson 2003, 61).[84] For the reason that the manner of talking (in terms of) influences the manner of doing (as if it had been), this necessarily results in systematization of experiences (Lakoff and Johnson 2003, 19). Conventional conceptual metaphors can be categorized in structural, orientational and ontological ones. 'Structural metaphors' (where one concept is metaphorically structured in terms of another) not only orient concepts, refer to them or enable their quantification, but also allow use of one highly structured and clearly delineated concept to structure another

---

[82]In terms of cognitive science, metaphor allows conventional mental imagery from sensorimotor domains of experience to be used for domains of subjective experience and abstract reasoning. It is possible to distinguish between primary metaphors (neural connections learned by co-activation, which extend across parts of the brain between areas dedicated to sensorimotor experience and areas dedicated to subjective experience and thus represent a cross-domain mappings, a process during which inferences and sometimes even lexical expressions are preserved) and complex metaphors (made up of primary ones by conceptual blending, that is, by co-activation of distinct conceptual domains, where blending can be conventional or not) (Marmaridou 2000, 50).

[83] See Lakoff and Johnson 2003, 97 for more thorough examination of the consequences of metaphorizing.

[84] According to Sweetser, different domains are perceived as sharing a limited amount of common structure which allows metaphorical mapping between the relevant aspects of domains. This mapping further structures understanding of more abstract domains in terms of more directly experientially based ones. Therefore, it is not possible to it is not possible that every aspect of the source domain will be (can be) mapped onto some aspect of the target domain (Sweetser 1995, 59).

(Lakoff and Johnson 2003, 61).[85] Furthermore, there are 'orientational metaphors' which give a spatial orientation to a concept (social distance, for example). 'Ontological metaphors' allow identification of experiences as entities or substances (which occupy some space), making them easy to refer to, to categorize, group and quantify. Moreover, reification of concepts can easily lead to their personification (see Lakoff and Johnson 2003, 14-34).[86] Conventional conceptual metaphors present a society and a language specific manner in which some concepts are structured in terms of another. However, it seams that some of their properties are universal (for example, transposition of space relations like up-down, close-away, left-right, etc. on social relations or religious beliefs).[87] Being habitual, they are not questioned and they are widely accepted as a manner of talking about concepts. On the other hand, nonconventional conceptual metaphors are very similar to trope metaphors, but different for their property of systematicity. Namely, conceptual metaphors, that is, those used for understanding some concepts, are coherent, or, as Lakoff and Johnson say, they "fit together". They also can be (but does not have to be) consistent, that is, form a single image (Lakoff and Johnson 2003, 44). These two properties (coherence and consistence) show that conceptual metaphors are textual: they are an abstraction made according to individual metaphorized expressions in separate sentences, thus they can be seen as habituses which structure and are structured by individual appearances.

In the discourse about the erased, the phrase 'the erased' is explicated in individual utterances in terms of foreigners, citizenship, ex Yugoslavia, nationality, loyalty, minorities, xenophobia, etc. This shows that some new concept (the erased) is understood in terms of some more concrete and already known (or at least already "thought about") concepts. As every discourse tends to be systematical, the conceptual metaphors in the discourse about the erased show properties of coherence but also of consistence. When utterances are thoroughly analyzed, it is possible to conclude that discursive coherence is

---

[85] Indexicals are, for example, mutually interchangeable: social deixis can be exchanged for spatial, temporal for spatial and *vice versa* (compare Fillmore 1997, 74; Lakoff and Johnson 2003, 14; Marmaridou 2000, 102).
[86] This basic space-time-object/person configuration of conceptual metaphors is analogous to Bühler's *origo* of deictic field ("I", person, "here", place, "now", time).
[87] In ethnological and anthropological literature there were a lot of researches of space relations in religious and magical practices, for example, right and left in Serbian Mythological Dictionary, Kulišić at al. 1970.

achieved by talking of foreigners for which attitudes can be more or less xenophobic, that is, their presence can be perceived as more or less appreciated in Slovenia. This means that there exist two poles in the discourse about the erased, the one where they are presented as victims of Slovenian (nationalist) policy, and the other one, where Slovenia is presented as victim of the erased (that is, foreigners). Other concepts which are engaged in the explication of the erased (loyalty, citizenship, ex Yugoslavia, etc.) are coherent with the sublimating concept of foreigners. Consistence is usually achieved when the utterer attaches strong affectional mark to his/her utterance, for example, when the erased are presented as not loyal to Slovenia and, consequently, as immoral, and consequently, as criminals. The examples from the second pole are quite similar: the erased are victims of Slovenian policy, Slovenian policy is immoral, the Slovenian policy is criminal. These structural conceptual metaphors also obtain orientational aspect, which allows determination of the erased as an entity (again, they are foreigners, that is, living in Slovenia but not originating from it, their origin is placed somewhere in the south, east, and as foreigners, they are distinct from Slovenes). Orientational metaphors give rise to ontological metaphors (if the erased are determined as foreigners living in Slovenia, they do exist) so the erased are personified into a kind of group or into a real constellation of people which intentionally undertake some steps against Slovenian policy (what can be approved or disapproved by the utterer). This means that even though there does not exist consensus on the question if the erased do or do not exist, they are talked about as if they do. On the other hand, I can propose a question if the utterances about the erased are intended to explicate (give a contribution to the understanding of) the phenomenon or as an "excuse" to talk about something else. This is a fundamental question and will be resolved later in the text.

As any other metaphor, conventional conceptual metaphors are implicatures. More specifically, they are conventional implicatures which are not derived from superordinate pragmatic principles like the maxims of conversational implicatures, but are simply attached by convention to particular notions (Levinson 1995, 127). In contrast to conversational implicatures, conventional ones have more or less determinate content and are specific for a society, even though, since one concept cannot be handled by a single

metaphor, related metaphors can overlap. Nevertheless, except being only a kind of inferencing, conventional conceptual metaphors structure the very manner of perceiving (since they tend to systematically transpose metaphorically abstracted properties of one conceptual domain to another), and en-acting (communicating in the manner "as if it had been"). But conventional conceptual metaphors are not just implicatures, for the reason that they share some of the properties of presuppositions. Namely, similarly to presuppositions, their validity, that is, relatedness to concepts (adequacy), is taken for granted. Furthermore, they are assumptions underlying a statement, which remain in force even though the statement itself is denied. They are simply conventional and thus not questioned. They entail world-knowledge of speaker by a single sentence fragment. They are restricted to some inferences or assumptions that seam to be built into linguistic expressions. They are defeasible in certain kind of extralinguistic contexts by virtue of contrary beliefs (conflicting truth-values). But, they are not pragmatic, that is, they are not structured or anyhow influenced by the context in which they are uttered. This may seam to be in contradiction with the previous sentence, but here is the explanation: conflicting truth-values (truth-value in the sense "taken to be truth") in the case of conventional conceptual metaphors are simply the consequence of engagement of different metaphors (that is, giving prominence to different properties of the concept in question), not negotiation and creation in the course of the communicative event. Therefore, they belong to the domain of sentence, of language-system and they show its paradigmatic dimension, that is, habitual associative connections. They are implicatures arising from the language-system, not from the utterances, from the-products-of-language-use. They are petrified syntagms (common combinations of paradigmatically depicted properties). This means that conventional conceptual metaphors characterize the level of discourse (understood as an abstraction made from particular utterances) and not the level of utterances (even though they appear in individual sentences, but their coherence and thus systematicity exists only on the discursive level).

For the reason that the manner of talking (in terms of) influences the manner of doing (as if it had been), metaphorically constructed classification of concept's relations necessarily results in systematization of experiences (Lakoff and Johnson 2003, 19). But

this cognitive aspect of "doing by saying" is not the only one. Actually, it is possible to do more concrete (less cognitive) things with words, what is studied within speech act and performative theory.

3.5. Speech acts

(22) **Gost** | 31.08.2007 at 09:43

VSE IZBRISANE NA VLAK PA ZA DACHAU!! NA DIREKTNO LINIJO!!

[ALL THE ERASED ON TRAIN AND THEN TOWARDS DACHAU!! ON DIRECT LINE!!]

This is an utterance made by the commentator of the article "Izbrisani Mariborčan Čedo Draganič terja od države več kot 291.000 evrov" ["The erased Čedo Draganič from Maribor claims over 291, 000 euros from the state"], from daily *Dnevnik*, of 31st August, 2007 (see chapter 3.1.2). It is in the imperative form, what can be inferred from exclamation mark(s). Exclamation marks are also used in writing or printing to express surprise, strong emotion, determination, etc., (Webster's New World Dictionary). What is the commentator telling? Is he/she describing the state of affairs? Can his/her utterance be determined for the truth-value?[88] This kind of utterances was examined by John Austin, a philosopher who opposed the verificationist theory according to which every statement, which is supposed to describe some state of affairs, can be verified (tested for truth or falsity) or otherwise it was considered to be meaningless. In that view, a lot of utterances were left out from examination, since their effect was not based on their truth-value (Levinson 1995, 227).[89] "It has come to be commonly held that many utterances that look like statements are neither not intended at all, or only intended in part, to record or impart straightforward information about the facts: for example, 'ethical propositions' are perhaps intended, solely or partly, to evince emotion or to prescribe conduct or to influence it in special ways", (Austin 1990, 14-15). He further argues that even believing that statements describe some state of affairs is 'descriptive fallacy' (ibid.). He notes that

---

[88] From our world knowledge we could infer that this commentator uses allegory on fascist behavior with the Jews (Dachau, known as concentration and extermination camp during the Second World War).

[89] Marmaridou notices parallelism between verificationist and Austin's theory: sentence *vs.* utterance, constatives *vs.* performatives, truth conditions *vs.* felicity conditions (Marmaridou 2000, 112).

some ordinary language declarative sentences are not apparently used with any intention of making true or false statements. On the contrary, they are used not to say things (describe state of affairs), but to do things (actively influence on the state of affairs). He names this kind of sentences and realized utterances 'performatives' and contrasts them to 'constatives' (statements, descriptives). This property of utterances to do socially sanctioned acts only with saying, points to possibilities of linguistic transformations of reality. That transformation consists of imposing obligations either to the utterer or to the audience. Ducrot calls this 'juridical power'. (Šumić-Riha 1988, 9-10). Performatives cannot be examined for truth or falsity, but anyway they can go wrong. In order to be successful, they must fulfill 'felicity conditions': existence of the conventional procedure with the conventional effect, circumstances and persons must be appropriate (as specified in the procedure), the procedure must be executed correctly and completely, persons who participated in the procedure must conduct in the proper manner afterwards (Austin 1990, 23-53). As Marmaridou points, the examples he used to delimit the category of performative utterances were part of institutionalized procedures and thus having a strong component of social convention.[90] Searle defines the pertinent object of the theory of speech acts: the special level on which something is understood as an utterance by the very means of the act of uttering, which is connected with the circumstances of uttering, particularly social rules and conventions (Mišćević 1991, 18). Austin attempted to extract those expressions which could be classified as explicit performatives, with peculiar syntactic and pragmatic properties (first person indicative active sentences in the present tense which can occur with the adverb "hereby" – "trough this means"),[91] but he shifted towards the general theory of illocutionary acts of which various performatives and constatives are just special sub-cases (compare Levinson 1995: 231). Austin distinguishes

---

[90] In the case of the erased it is possible to find a lot of examples of explicit performatives from the court proceedings ("We invite you (to come on that trial)", "We ask you (to redefine the plea)", "We inform you (that the trial is postponed)", etc.). For example, the court sentence is done by a judge saying "We sentence you" in the court, at the specified time of the trial, in front of eligible persons, to the accused, and after it, the accused is expected to behave in the appropriate manner (go to jail, pay, etc.) and he ceases to be accused, but becomes sentenced (and here is the one of the actualized changes in the state of affairs).

[91] He classified them in verdictives, exercitives, commissives, behahitives and expositives (Austin 1990, 126 and further). On the other hand, Searle classifies illocutionary acts in assertives (telling how things are), directives (getting people to do things), commissives (committing oneself to do things), expressives (expressing feelings and attitudes) and declarations (bringing about changes in the world) (Marmaridou 2000, 182).

between three types of linguistic acts. First type are 'locutionary acts', acts of saying something, comprised of 'phonetic act' (producing some sounds), phatic act (uttering sounds of certain types, that is, belonging to a certain vocabulary and conforming to a certain grammar) and 'rhetic act' (using sounds in combinations which do have some more or less definite sense and reference).[92] In other words, locutionary act is the utterance of a sentence with determinate sense and reference. Second type comprise 'illocutionary acts', acts performed in saying something by means of some kind of conventional force associated with it explicitly or implicitly. In Austin terms, to perform a locutionary act is also to perform an illocutionary act (he uses 'illocution' as the name of the act and 'illocutionary force' as the name for the function the act serves). In other words, illocutionary act is making a statement, offer, baptizing, with uttering a sentence by virtue of the conventional force associated with it or with the explicit performative paraphrase. Third type of linguistic acts are 'perlocutionary acts', acts of producing certain consequential effect upon the feelings, thoughts or actions of the audience, or of the speaker, or of other persons, possibly done with the design, intention, or purpose of producing it (he uses 'perlocution' as the name of the act). In other words, perlocutionary act is bringing about of effects on the audience by means of uttering the sentence or acts performed by saying something (Austin 1990: 85 and further). Ducrot determines illocutionary act as linguistic *par excellence*, while perlocutionary as connected to language impertinently (Šumić-Riha 1988:10).

Austin saw the language as an action which produces non-linguistic consequences in the world. It must be emphasized that this theory is not restricted to oral medium of language production. This is the reason why speech acts are named as 'language' or 'linguistic acts' in some accounts (compare Mey 1993, 111 and fn. 56; Marmaridou 2000, 173). Furthermore, as every production, speech acts presuppose existence of human agents whose intentions are relevant and indispensable to the correct understanding and description of their utterances. While the 'illocutionary force' is bound up with the very form the utterance may have (it names function of the illocutionary act as, for example, statement, question, wish, etc.), perlocutionary effects are not, since they are dependent

---

[92] As Marmaridou points, these sub-acts of locutionary act correspond to the phonological, morpho-syntactic and semantic levels of linguistic analysis (Marmaridou 2000, 174).

on the particular circumstances of the utterance (compare Mey 1993, 112 and Levinson 1995, 236). Searle further elaborated the notion of speech acts. He presented the general form of speech act as F(p), where 'p' stands for a proposition (that is, a reference and predication) and 'F' for illocutionary force of the utterance. He tried to describe speech acts in terms of constitutive rules based on necessary and sufficient conditions for the felicitous performance of an act of a certain type. Further, he distinguished between direct and indirect speech acts, where the latter have double illocutionary force comprised by the primary illocutionary act and a secondary act by means of which the primary force is indirectly obtained (Verschueren 2001, 267-268). In pragmatic linguistics, perlocutionary act is seen as a crucial aspect of understanding of what people use their illocutionary acts for. Furthermore, it had been shown that illocutionary and perlocutionary acts can be successfully performed without the use of explicit performatives. "[W]hat people do with sentences seams quite unrestricted by the surface form (i.e. sentence-type) of the sentences uttered" (Levinson 1995, 265). Searle concludes that it is the context which determines whether an expression may be considered as a speech act, not the verbal formula which is employed (Searle 1991, 79).[93] This means that pragmatic conditions governing the use of language are the ones which prevailingly determine performative type of the utterance (Mey 1993, 121). Moreover, Searle neutralizes the distinction between descriptives and performatives: all performative speech acts are a kind of declarations since they mold the world by speaking (Sweetser 1995, 66). On the other hand, it is possible to ask if molding the world by speaking presents the ultimate performative (see previous chapter 3.4.1. on metaphorical concepts). In more cognitive accounts, speech acts are seen as metaphorically treated as exchange or transfer of objects from one interlocutor to another, where objects are linguistic forms, and these linguistic forms are containers of meaning. Understanding of logic and thought processes is modeled on the basis of understanding social and physical world. Simultaneously, linguistic expressions are modeled as descriptions (models of the world), as actions (acts produced in the world that is being described) as well as epistemic or logical entities (premises or conclusions in the world of reasoning). Content

---

[93] While discussing conjunctions, Sweetser concludes that the choice of "correct" interpretation depends not on form, but on pragmatically motivated choice between viewing the conjoined clauses as representing content units, logical entities, or speech acts (Sweetser 1995: 78).

domain (real-world) is used as the basis of metaphorical understanding of epistemic premises and conclusions as well as of speech acts. This would imply that there exist an interaction between semantic, pragmatic and syntactic structure (compare Sweetser 1995: 21 and 146).

One of the prominent critiques of traditional speech act theory is the following: "Even though speech act theory, by its name and pretensions, should be a theory of action, it is in reality a philosophical theory of, or about, propositions", (Mey 1993: 123). Putting it differently, it focuses on action and not on interaction, on action as emanating from the individual (Fairclough 1989: 9). This lead towards the more thorough analysis of human agency in speech acts (Duranti 2006). Mey introduces a new term, the one of 'pragmatic act'. It is characterized by three conditions: 1) the circumstances of its performance must be adequate in order to have an effect in the end; 2) no speech act needs to be involved for the reason that the context determines pragmatic acts; 3) there must be an up-take (even when the up-take is a cancellation of communication, because it is cancelled by another pragmatic act) (Mey 1993, 257). It is defined as the exercise of societal empowerment through language (Marmaridou 2000, 37). Levinson suggests notion of 'indirect force', which is not directly stated but inferred (Levinson 1995, 264). Furthermore, Marmaridou asks if implicitness is associated with pragmatic parameters of the communicative event that are not made systematically explicit by any linguistic or other means, how it is compatible with conventional means of expression or conventional communicative procedures (Marmaridou 2000, 178). Moreover, notion of pragmatic acts transcends even the one of indirect speech acts: "[W]hile speech acts, when uttered in contexts, are pragmatic acts, pragmatic acts need not be speech acts (not even indirect ones)" (Mey 1993, 262). The reason of this lays in the manner of interpretation of utterance exchange, since it relays on the context of goals of interaction, not just communicative ones. Since goals of interaction are not only linguistic, talking for the reason of talking, a kind of linguistic *l'art pour l'art* -ism,[94] it follows that constraints of pragmatic acts come from meta-pragmatic level, from conventions existing in a society. Thus we come back to the emphasis of Austinian theory of speech acts: conventionality.

---

[94] Malinowski recognized forms of communication whose function is the establishment of phatic communion (see Malinowski 1969: 315).

But here we deal with two kinds of conventionality: in Austinian theory it is extensional, inductive, present on the level of utterance, on the level of world, and understood as given, while in Mey's theory, it is intensional, deductive, present on the level of discourse, on the level of word, and understood as created (employed) by inferring. Conventions in both views apply to background knowledge according to which assertions are being made and inferences understood. This implies that background knowledge must be (thought or imposed to be thought of as, what is done, for example, by engagement of presuppositions) shared by interlocutors. Ducrot offers the solution of this dilemma: the 'shared knowledge' as accepted state of affairs (and consequential obligations of interlocutors imposed by illocutions) remains within the frames of discursive universe created by illocution. Namely, a performative act is a performative only when it is disguised as constative and relates to reality which it itself created as if it had been existing autonomously. Furthermore, constatives while creating the reality are disguised in descriptions of that reality (Šumić-Riha 1988, 11-12 and 23-24). Thus we reach the domain of rhetoric, universe where words are used to create probable worlds and not to merely represent actual ones. From this I can make a conclusion that performatives (doing) exist on the level of utterance while constatives can exist only of the level of discourse. But here is not the end of the problem. Namely, discourse as a sublimating construct (result of the performance) does the final performance: it reifies into a formation which tends to be coherent, into a system (though open-ended, liable to changes), which would further influence the manner of performativity of the individual utterances by imposing intensional properties in the frame of which the utterances are created. This means that speech acts serve as a context in which deixis, presuppositions and implicatures are actualized. On the level of discourse these become not related to referents, but secondary referents, that is, signs of referents. They cease to be extensional, but their prominent properties begin to participate in intension trough the process of metaphorizing.

Now I can propose a question if speech acts, as doing by saying, can be examined on two levels, on the utterance and on the discursive one, what consequences this can have on the topic of my research - the erased. For the moment I will turn back to the utterance

(22). The illocutionary force of this comment is not an order, even though the manner of its presentation would point to it, for the reason that it does not fulfill felicity conditions for such a determination (the circumstances of uttering are not adequate for making an order, since neither the commentator nor potential up-takers is liable). Moreover, the context of internet forums *a priori* denies/diminishes/neutralizes liability of participants for having any institutionalized roles from which it would be possible to draw juridical power in order to effect the state of affairs in the world, at least directly. Thus any speech act on the utterance level (even where explicit performative expressions are used) in internet forums can be questioned for fulfilling conditions for "speech act-ness" other then assertives and expressives (to employ Searle's classification), that is, for expressing standpoints, attitudes, saying "how things are". On the other hand, up-taking shows that speech acts are being somehow performed. Now I can ask a question what change in the state of affairs is made? What is performed besides individual speech acts? Namely, on the level of discourse, which is an interplay of individual utterances in which performatives take place and which sublimes them in the disguise of constatives, the erased are being created. They are presented as something that exists independently of the discourse in which they are formed, in which they make sense, they are reified (remember that there exist no consensus on that what is the erased or to what the phrase 'the erased' refer or if the phenomena connected with the erasure exist at all, that is, if the erasure had ever happened), since the signifié, which is the sign itself, overtakes the role of actual referents. In that way, every public utterance (the kind I am dealing with) about the erased presents the establishment of a possible world (that is, context) in which the erased do or do not exist (properties of which are determined through elaboration of pragmatic notions of deixis, presupposition and implicature). And the discourse comprised by these utterances tends to be the establishment of all the possible (logically, that is, systemically organized) worlds. The next, more specific question I would like to propose is: What happens with 'the erased'? Discourse can be seen as a precondition of illocution, since discourse does not do "saying", it is not pragmatic, for the reason that it is context independent, that is to say, only secondarily context dependent, through the mediation of the individual utterances which comprise it. But it gives the intension which serves as a frame in which the utterances can be performed. Nevertheless, discourse,

similarly to the individual utterances, can also be seen as perlocutionary, as a linguistic means for achievement of non-linguistic goals: intension, since it is always too general, allows metaphorical prominence of any aspect of the concept in question and its reverse implementation and actualization in the utterance and its further use as a speech act out of the primary context (in our example, the one of internet forums). Since I am dealing here with the discursive creation/description/determination of the erased, speech acts of the individual utterances can be viewed only as signs which serve as signifiants (or their parts) of the phrase 'the erased'. The final result of this interplay is the perception of the probable, that is, rhetorical, discursive appearance of the erased as something that exists in the physical world. This reification of the erased into coherent, logically understandable and provable entity allows their further instrumentality in the manner of perlocutions, for the reason that when once the erased are created, they can be used. On the other hand, indefiniteness of the signifié, lack of the primary referents to which this sense/concept can be anchored, expends the range of their possible use (from expressing political standpoint to expressing individual misfortune). In order to explain this more thoroughly, I will say something about metaphors and metaphorical abstraction.

4. Metaphor

Metaphors were topic of the Ancient rhetoric, téhne of persuasion. As Aristotle says, metaphor consists in giving the thing a name that belongs to something else (alien), where transference (*epiphora*, movement, displacement) goes either from genus to species, or from species to species, or on grounds of analogy (Ricoeur 1994, 13 - 43). This would imply that there exists an order (genus, species, classification) which is destroyed by the engagement of metaphor. Thus a metaphor cannot be the change of a single word, but of a whole system. It threatens classification itself. On the other hand, metaphor just transposes, displaces elements of the known system by employment of metonymical (genus *vs*. species, part *vs*. whole) means or analogy. Deconstruction exist only in the intermediate state, between description and redescription, the old system of classification and the new one. In that way it challenges the oppositions between proper and figurative, order and transgression. This would imply that metaphor is not only some final product but also the process (not a noun but a verb, not a subject but a predication).

Transposition implies substitution. Substitution as well as analogy is based on resemblance, but metaphor is not a simile, it is not a comparison between two things, two words, metaphor does not say "this is like that" but "this is that". Thus the resemblance employed in metaphor remains on the implicit level.[95] This again presupposes existence of at least two different things which can be compared and interchanged, that is, the existence of a system, classification (ibid.). But one of the preconditions might be "that certain ideas lack signs" (signifiants) and simply must be expressed by means of something else, some other signs (Ibid., 62). Since a sign is defined only according to its place in the system of signs, this would imply that any sign has no meaning *per se*, but only extrinsically, trough its use, "place" of actualization. In that way any word cannot have a proper meaning but constancy of meaning is achieved trough constancy of contexts (arrangements of other signs within a sign system) and this is denotation, presuppositions of the ordinary designations. 'Collocational range' of an expression is the set of contexts in which it can occur (and these are its 'collocations') and collocations of an expression are part of its meaning (Lyons 1996, 62). Metaphors draw on extraordinariness of contexts and are made through implementation of a linguistic unit from an absent context into actualized one. Thus metaphorizing implies co-presence of at least two contexts chosen on the grounds of analogy (relationships) and similarity (things or ideas) (Ricoeur 1994, 66-86). Substitution implies synonymy (remember that one of semantic means for determining meaning of an expression is substitution, and what defines synonymy is precisely the possibility of substituting expressions in given contexts without altering its overall meaning), which concerns identity and not mere similarity of meaning (Lyons 1996, 60). But metaphors are due to polysemy of expressions. The meaning of an expression in modified Saussurean terms is the unity of the name and the sense. Sense is vague, that is, not ordered, indefinite and imprecise and always demands making of further discriminations based on the actual context (see above, chapter 3.1.3). Namely, polysemy, vague character of meaning, the indeterminacy of semantic boundaries and cumulative character of meaning present the intrinsic property of expressions what allows changes of meaning. It is different from homonymy: while

---

[95] In that way metaphor is similar to enthymeme, shortened syllogism characteristic for rhetoric, where it is left to the audience to enjoy the process of concluding (Barthes 1990, 68).

polysemy is a property of single lexemes and is achieved by means of metaphorical extension, homonymy concerns relations between two or more distinct lexemes (Lyons 1996, 58). Polysemy is reduced by the context and the process of metaphorical interpretation. In communicative events conversational maxims (which give rise to implicatures and metaphor as a type of implicature) serve to enable addressee to calculate intended meaning of the utterance as a function of its literal meaning and of the context in which it is uttered in order to reach relevant metaphorical interpretation. Denotative meaning is perceived as contextually irrelevant or improbable (Ibid., 283-284). In that way metaphor can bee seen as a result of the combination of properties of synonymy and polysemy. Namely, metaphors can be explicated trough comparison with logical concepts on the basis of linguistic signification. The function of 'concept' is to distinguish, to delimit, by assigning an order, a structure, to the object of reference, to illuminate the relations between elements of a sign. The prime function of the concept is to recognize the individual nature of the object, its completeness, not to constitute general attributes. On the other hand, metaphorical abstraction consists in forgetting the order, the structure, completeness, in taking only several attributes of the metaphorized expression, performing an operation by which the expression loses its reference to the individual object and takes on a general value. Metaphorical term does not become the name of a category, but the name of the main property, the prominent attribute. Thus it can apply to all objects that possess the general property which is expressed. It could be said that a metaphor transforms a property into a sense (Ricoeur 1994, 106-107). Furthermore, metaphor acts as classification since it names an object with the help of the most typical representative of one of its attributes and thus intersects classifications based on structure and the one based on isolated features (Ibid, 108). Understanding of a metaphor concerns trying to make sense of something what does not make sense on a literal, face-value, interpretation of the expression which it contains (Lyons 1996, 136). Analogously, in semiology, a linguistic sign is formed by the process of picking out some elements from the paradigmatic, associative axis and their combination on the syntagmatic axis (see above chapter 2.2.2). Jakobson speaks of metonymy and metaphor, two ways of conceptualizing that are to be distinguished according to emphasis either on the importance they put on context or selection. He reduces context to property of closeness

for the reason that a sign determines, or is determined by, other signs which are present in actualized sequence of the sign system and selection to property of similarity (since the selection is made between units that share something that can be compared). Analogous determination is offered by Leach, who states that while metonymy implies contiguity (closeness), metaphor is actualized according to declared similarity (Leach 2002, 26). When picked properties on the signifié level are habitual, metonymical, pertinent for the co-text in which we operate, we speak about concepts. When picked properties are not habitual, and their associative relation is difficult to perceive, we speak about metaphors. Metaphor thus consists in picking unusual properties from the associative chain and their usual combination on the syntagmatic axes. What will be taken to represent a defining property of a class depends on various conditions.

The erased are talked about in terms of something else. However, the distinction between utterance and discursive level of the talk about the erased must be made. On the utterance level, nationalism, loyalty, ex Yugoslavia, etc., are metaphors through which the erased are perceived. Those metaphors, as every other metaphor, use connotation, that is, they are complete signs which serve as signifiants of the erased, which is a signifié, the actual "goal" of this talks. On the other hand, on the discursive level, the phrase 'the erased', since it obtains intensional determinants, serves as a metalanguage to speak about nationalism, loyalty, etc., so speaking about nationalism, loyalty, etc., becomes the goal and 'the erased' the means for its fulfillment. This means that the process of discursive creation (creation of a discourse) consists of constant interplay and exchange of connotation and metalanguage. This dual existence of the erased, as the result of metaphorical connotation on the level of utterance, and the imposing of 'the erased' as metalanguage on the level of discourse shows that actual referents are so indirect (transformed to signs which serve as signifiant and again to signs which serve as signifié) and thus basically irrelevant, what further allows instrumentality of the erased through mediation of 'the erased'. The byproducts of this "loss of actual referents" in the discourse makes possible their re-invention in the individual utterances by means of which speech acts can be performed and result in the change of the state of affairs both illocutionary and perlocutionary. Here I will just give a short notification of one change of the state of affairs concerning the erased, mediated through the discourse about the

erased: failure of the efforts of introduction of the systemic law according to which the status of the erased could be resolved in 2004. It (the law) was obstructed by discursive creation of the erased as enemies of Slovenia, which could have endangered Slovenes and their (national) state.[96] I attempted to find the opposite example, when the discourse about the erased resulted in some overall changes in favor of the erased, but I failed. This would imply that even though the erased are talked about in some circles mentioned in the Introduction (activists, European United Left, etc.), the members of these circles are not recognized for their juridical power on the legislative level in Slovenia. However, it is possible to notice some changes in the manner of the talk about the erased, which could result in alterations of their status in the future and that is stronger appearance of politically correct speech.[97] Since this appeared after the right-wing parties won the elections in 2004 (and the right-wing parties were those who accelerated xenophobic

---

[96] See, for example, the following articles, all from weekly *Mladina* in which the referendum is presented as a kind of political manipulation of the electoral body undertaken by parliamentarians both from the government and opposition. Furthermore, the erased got a special column in the weekly Mladina, "the erased": "Pravi problem sta Pahor in Bohinc. Rop še uzbuja upanje – bo to potrdil z dejanji?" ["Real problem are Pahor and Bohinc. There is still some hope with Rop - will he prove that with his acts?"], author Matevž Krivic, of 5th January 2004, http://www.mladina.si/tednik/200401/clanek/slo--izbrisani-matevz_krivic/; "Neustavni referendum. Ustavno sodišče zavrnilo Janšev predloge" ["Non-constitutional referendum. The Constitutional Court rejected Janša's initiatives"], author Jure Trampuš, of 1st March 2004, http://www.mladina.si/tednik/200409/clanek/slo--izbrisani-jure_trampus/; "Lažni patriotizem. Vsi, ki nasprotujejo popravi krivic izbrisanim, s tem spodkopujejo temelje, na katerih stoji svobodna slovenska družba" ["Fault patriotism. All who are against restoring of rights of the erased, derange the bases on which modern Slovenian society stands"], author Igor Mekina, of 22nd March 2004, http://www.mladina.si/tednik/200412/clanek/slo--izbrisani-igor_mekina/; "Ne referendumu! Udeležba na referendumu bo glas proti Sloveniji kot pravni državi." ["Say 'No' to referendum! Participation on the referendum will be a vote against Slovenia as a state with the rule of law"], author Igor Mekina, of 29th March 2004, http://www.mladina.si/tednik/200413/clanek/slo--izbrisani-igor_mekina/, etc. In these articles there is a strong propaganda against the referendum, what can be seen as a reaction on the propaganda for it. In the majority of cases the authors of these articles are being accused for not being loyal to Slovenia by the commentators.

[97] Even though, in the comments of some articles from 2007 and 2008 the erased are still presented as persons who speculate with the citizenship and permission for permanent residence in order to obtain some financial benefits, as, for example, in the article "Kakšna bo sodba?" ["What would the judgment look like?"], which appeared on the internet portal Vest of 17th October 2007, http://vest.si.2007/10/17/kaksna-bo-sodba/ or in the article "Teden izbrisanih" ["The week of the erased"], internet portal Vest of 26th February 2008, http://vest.si.2008/02/26/teden-izbrisanih/ . Very interesting is the reaction on the series of articles dedicated to Dragomir Petronjić, who was erased, deported from Slovenia to Croatia though he was a Serb, his bones were found in some mass cemetery in Bosnia and Herzegovina and his identity determined by DNA analysis. There are some comments in which commentators ask the editorial to cease with the publications of such stories, since they are "boring", "passé", "not true", but there is also an amount of comments in which Slovenia is accused for improper conduct against non-Slovenes (see, for example, the article "Napotitev v smrt" ["Sent to death"] from daily Dnevnik of 16th October 2007, by the author Igor Mekina, http://dnevnik.si/kolumne_komntarji/kolumne). However, the situation in recent years is quite similar to the situation from 2002 to 2004.

discourse about the erased), this shows instrumental character of the erased. By being silent or politically correct on the question of the erased, the government builds we-are-not-that-right image but by doing nothing in course of amelioration of their status it also keeps but-we-are-still-right image. This, of course is not done only with the help of the erased, but from this we can see how metaphorical abstraction (taking some properties and giving them prominence) and discursive creation of the erased are used for non-linguistic means.

Metaphor, as a process immanently open to the influences of concrete context of appearance, allows grasping the phenomena characterized by permanent change, indefiniteness, "lacking in closure", it unites otherwise demarcated categories and thus transcends the ordinary divisions. By picking similarities instead of discrepancies, it ruins the very foundations of signs, which tend to be differential. As a cognitive device it points to freedom of choice and association of intensional properties and their extension on concrete referents both on syntagmatic and paradigmatic axes on any level of sign's formation thus allowing it to obtain different meanings dependable on the circumstances of use, on context. In pragmatic linguistics a context is considered to be dynamic and proactive, constantly developing in continuous interaction of people and not retroactive and static (Mey 1993, 10). Because of this, although the specification of contexts is necessary, it can never be complete and, consequently, the process of metaphorized abstraction. To conclude, when trying to describe or define a phenomenon, we use words, we do wording. "Wording is a process in which humans become aware of their environment, their world, and realize this awareness in the form of language," (Mey 1993, 300). The difference between referential and metaphorical aspect on process of wording is that the former perceives wording as 'labeling' things in the world and thus fundamentally separates the realm of word from the realm of world, while the latter sees wording as a way of conceptualizing the world and thus fundamentally dialectically unites them (see May 1993, 301).

Conclusions

In text an attempt has been made to analyze discourse about the erased within the framework of pragmatism. In particular, it had been argued that pragmatic linguistic approach to the phenomenon can account for its discursive aspect as well as its engagement in actual communicative events.

At the beginning of this text it was said that the distinction between the erased as some real people and 'the erased' as a phrase found in numerous public communicative events which served as the basis for this research must be made, since it appeared that although the erased and 'the erased' share some common properties, the equation mark could not be put. In order to delimit the erased, I have given one open-ended operative definition of the erased which took into consideration administrative and legal context of appearance of the phenomenon, as well as the one which concerned the consequences of the erasure. When it became possible to distinguish the erased from other administrative categories in Slovenia, I turned towards the phrase 'the erased' as appearing in public communicative events. I tried to determine how they were interrelated, so I proposed a question if 'the erased' was a proper name of the phenomenon. It appeared that it was not, since a proper name by definition applied to phrases whose reference was clear, what was not the case with 'the erased'. Since a proper name should denote something univocally, I employed the distinction between literal and figural use of words, the distinction which originate in studies of poetics and rhetoric. As figural use applies to metaphors, I labeled the phrase as a metaphor of something, something which was to be determined later in the text.

The material I took as the basis for the research (internet forums) opened some interesting theoretical and methodological topics. The major one concerned the relation between oral and written communication. I followed such a determination which distinguished between these two modes of predominantly verbal communication, and pointed differences through the elaboration of the topic of turn-taking and senders and receivers of messages. That allowed me to decide upon participant roles in the communicative events.

As participants in the communicative events employed language in order to communicate, I found it necessary to examine the notions of language. Through the comparison of works of Saussure and Chomsky, I accepted the determination of language as a tripartite, that is, consisting of language system, human ability to speak in general, and various individual products of use of language-system.[98] Since human ability to speak in general was not pertinent for my research, I focused on language-as-system *vs*. products-of-the-use-of-language-system dichotomy. This dichotomy was transformed into trichotomy in Morris's determination of linguistic inquiry, namely, that syntactics deals with the system, pragmatics with the process and semantics with the products of language. On the basis of this I delimited the theoretical focus of my research. Since I dealt both with utterances in communicative events, as well as with the discourse (which is constituted of and constitutes individual utterances), all three aspects of the linguistic inquiry seamed pertinent (syntactics was understood in terms of structural and semiological perspective). Then I examined the notion of language as a means of communication and thus reached the topic of the linguistic signs (units which enable communication). Saussurean distinction between signifiant and signifié aspect of a linguistic sign (and modes on their inter and intra-relatedness in terms of synatgmatic and paradigmatic axes) was given prominence. This allowed me to determine 'the erased' as a signifiant of something as well as to resolve how this relation could be actualized.

In order to find out what was 'the erased' signifiant of, I examined the notions of meaning, utterance and discourse. I presented the referential theory of meaning according to which meaning is comprised from sense and reference. In order to connect this theory with Saussurean notion of linguistic sign, I had to focus on the notion of sense, which appeared to be their common property. The resultant of this was the estimation of meaning as threefold, comprised from signifiant, signifié/sense and reference. I determined signifiant aspect as language-internal and reference aspect as language-external with signifié/sense as a mediator. This allowed me to connect notions of utterance and of discourse and further to examine what happens with the phrase 'the

---

[98] The difference between Chomsky and Saussure lies in the properties of the third member of this tripartite organization of language. Namely, while Saussure speaks of products of language system, Chomsky speaks of use of the language system.

erased' in its transformation from something which belongs to the domain of world to something which belongs to the domain of word. In the individual utterances referents were reached through examinations of deixis, presuppositions, implicatures and speech acts. The phrase was seen as a concept which the utterers talked in terms of some other phenomena (nationalism, loyalty, citizenship, etc.), which I labeled as metaphorical concepts and which thus were signifiants of the phrase, but complex ones, since they were themselves complete signs. These complete signs allowed me to find referential range of the phrase as had been shown in the individual utterances. Then I examined what happened when the level of individual utterances was sublimated by the level of discourse. I achieved this task by employment of concepts of intension and extension. 'Extension' of an expression is the class of entities that it defines, while 'intension' is the defining property of the class. Extensions are related to referents and intensions to senses. Frege's theory of quoted speech (where extensions give their way to intensions) made possible to transform referents to senses and thus to move from the domain of world characteristic for utterances to the domain of word characteristic for discourse. This means that contexts of uttering, which influenced determinations of the referential, that is, extensional, range of the phrase 'the erased', became intensional in the discourse. This established 'the erased' as a signifiant whose signifié was a sign itself, and the discourse about the erased as completely interlingual and intralexical. Thus I connected those three dimensions of the linguistic inquiry (syntactics, pragmatics and semantics), which were mentioned above.

Theory of speech acts was examined at two levels, at the level of utterance and at the level of discourse, where, similarly to deixis, presuppositions, and implicatures, extensional properties transformed to intensional, but then I tried to find out if the discourse was itself a speech act. Ducrot's determination of performativity of a discourse, according to which discourse performs (creates) discursive universe but presents it as physically existing (where performatives are read as if they were constatives) allowed me to conclude that through the discourse 'the erased' as well as the erased are being created as something that preceded the talks about it. Here I will also mention the determination of the discourse in relation to the individual utterances as analogous to Bourdieu's

concept of *habitus*, as a structured structure which tends to be structuring structure, or "translated", the discourse structures the utterances, but is at the same time structured by them. This means that performatives in the utterances are read as constatives in the discourse (not only in the discourse, but also in the individual utterances, however, in the discourse this is necessary). In order to find out how this interrelatedness of the individual utterances and the sublimating discourse is settled (how structured structure becomes structuring structure and *vice versa*), I examined the notion of metaphorical abstraction and the distinction between concepts and metaphors. As Aristotle says, metaphor consists in giving the thing a name that belongs to something else (alien), where transference goes either from genus to species, or from species to species, or on grounds of analogy. This would imply that there exists an order (genus, species, classification) which is destroyed by the engagement of metaphor. Thus a metaphor cannot be the change of a single word, but of a whole system. It threatens classification itself. On the other hand, metaphor just transposes, displaces elements of the known system by employment of metonymical (genus *vs.* species, part *vs.* whole) means or analogy. Deconstruction exist only in the intermediate state, between description and redescription, the old system of classification and the new one. In that way it challenges the oppositions between proper and figurative, order and transgression. This would imply that metaphor is not only some final product but also the process (not a noun but a verb, not a subject but a predication). Analogously, in the relation of the discourse and individual utterances, intensions within the discourse as the function (operation or rule, which is never strict since it is conventional) estimate the range of potential extensions. On the other hand, metaphorical abstraction is relatively free in depicting properties it would metaphorize, so it can happen that the intensional function is violated and added to the discourse in that transformed, non-conventional form. This defines discourse as liable to changes.

The phenomenon of the erased belongs to the domain of rhetoric, domain of the probable, where things only can but do not have to be, to the domain of imposed linguistic worlds – to the domain of discourse. Every discourse is compound from words, which are linguistic facts, but is a discourse itself a linguistic fact? And what are words? Names for

things? Tamed senses? The hallmark idea of pragmatics, theoretical perspective that has been employed here, is that words are "things" to be used, to be manipulated with, as any other means for achievement of some practical goals.[99] Therefore, words, and all phenomena related to them (as signs, classifications, discursively structured thoughts expressed in utterances), are perlocutionary *par excellence*. The consequence of this is that there exist no thing as denotation, no thing as dictionary meaning, no thing as sign "with determinate sense and reference", no truth, no "all possible worlds". Everything is just a matter of currently valid conventions. But the temptation lies exactly in this, in making a paradoxical effort to determine something that is indeterminable by definition (to do something similar to rhetoricians who attempted to codify speech). This endeavor can be figuratively described as "taming senses" (which are loose by definition), which was probed here either from the referential aspect (by assigning a referent to a sense) or from the signifiant aspect (assigning a signifiant to a sense). As the phrase 'the erased' is used both as a metaphor (something else "was talked" in-terms-of 'the erased'), and as a meta-language (it "was talked" in-terms-of something else) all these "collocations" participate in the meaning of the phrase. Therefore, it seams that it is not distinction between similar things, but conjoining of different things what makes a meaning. The distinguishing between similar things is only the result of this operation. Actually, adding makes distinctions through ascribing properties to something. And properties are differential only positively (there is something which lacks to something else). It might seam that this is only the question of the standpoint, that is, if the start is made on the existing property of a sign which is found not to exist on some other sign or if we have an empty place (potential sign) to be filled in by some properties. The pragmatic theory follows this second alternative: a property is read there where it is expected. But what makes an expectation? Context and intentions, especially meaning-nn, that is, recognition of things ("available or unavailable", to paraphrase Cobley) as signs (means for communication), as meaningful conglomerates. The consequences of this on the phrase 'the erased' are manifold: if 'the erased' is metaphorically (connotatively) spoken in terms of some other phenomena, 'the erased' is the signifié. This means that 'the erased'

---

[99] In terms of economic anthropology, words are money (exchangeable for all other goods), that is, a universal means for exchange.

represents the sense of these phenomena. Since sense is intensional, that is, its properties cannot be enumerated (for the reason that then it would become extensional), it presents a rule or an operation which allows attaching of extensions (the other phenomena which are used for speaking-in-terms-of, and which are thus signifiants). As meaning is only expected, that is, ascribed, and meaning presents the relation between signifiant and signifié, the relevance between 'the erased' and the phenomena it is spoken-in-terms-of is only a posteriori, that is, convenient, "made because it was expected". This would mean 'the erased' could be spoken-in-terms-of some other phenomena then those it actually is spoken, but trough the actualized process of metaphorical abstraction the range becomes delimited. Since metaphorical abstraction leads towards the establishment of an order (after it ruins the previously established one), it appears that the relation between 'the erased' and the phenomena it is spoken-in-terms-of is governed by some superordinate principle, superordinate discourse. And this superordinate principle is the context in which this relation is set up, in which "it makes sense". The inductive procedure, that is, analysis of the individual utterances related to the phrase, shows that 'the erased' is read as connected with the phenomena which concern the period when the actual erasure happened and that is the period when Slovenia became independent state. This delimits the range in which metaphorical abstraction can take place (namely, to the questions of citizenship, nationality, loyalty, patriotism, etc.). In other words, the discourse superordinate to the discourse about the erased is the one of "Slovenianness", of what is to be Slovenian (understood either as an ethnicity or a matter of citizenship or a matter of eligibility to live in Slovenia).[100] Within (place) this superordinate discourse, the discourse about the erased was formed, since it was expected. And conversely, it is omnipresent, questioned and re-established in the individual utterances about the erased. The discourse about the erased is its perlocutionary (and illocutionary) effect. From this it

---

[100] There are some attempts to put the discourse about the erased within some other discourses, as, for example, about Serbian Diaspora on a research project on The Ethnographic Institute in Belgrade since 2007, or about migrations on the projects of some European social centers (with intended perlocutionary effect to connect the problem of the erased with the ongoing European problems of migrants), or about human rights violations on the projects of Helsinki Monitor and Amnesty international, but these discourses seam not having enough juridical power to overtake the role of the superordinate discourse. Furthermore, it is questionable if these discourses when applied to a phenomenon originating in Slovenia can avoid dissolving in the discourse of Slovenianness, since they all share some common tracks as ethnicity, residence rights, human rights.

follows that 'the erased' cannot have some autonomous meaning (what is, nevertheless, impossible, since meaning is achieved only through engagement of context in which a sign apperas), but what does not restrain users from perceiving it as reified, what allows further manipulation which is in correspondence with the inherently constant (more or less intensive) changes of the superordinate discourse. And here lays the discursive creation of the erased.

References:

Austin, John L. 1990 (1962). *Kako napravimo kaj z besedami*. Ljubljana: Studia Humanitatis ŠKUC-FF.

Barfield, Thomas (ed.). 2005 (1997). *The Dictionary of Anthropology*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Barthes, Ronald. 1990 (1964). *Retorika starih. Elementi semiologije*. Ljubljana: Studia Humanitatis ŠKUC-FF.

Beaugrande Robert-Alain de and Wolfgang Ulrich Dressler. 1994 (1981). *Introduction to Text Lingustics*. London & New York: Longman.

Beznec, Barbara, Marta Gregorčič, Tatjana Greif, Nikolai Jeffs, Mirt Komel, Andrej Kurnik, Katarina Majerhold, Mitja Velikonja, Boris Vezjak and Jelka Zorn (eds.). 2007. *Zgodba nekega izbrisa*. Časopis za kritiko znanosti, letnik XXXV, No. 228. Ljubljana: Študentska založba.

Beznec, Barbara. 2007. Zgodba nekega boja. In *Zgodba nekega izbrisa*. Časopis za kritiko znanosti, letnik XXXV, No. 228, 7-9. Ljubljana: Študentska založba.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1999. *Nacrt za jednu teoriju prakse*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva. Societas.

Bugarski, Ranko. 1995. *Uvod u opštu lingvistiku*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva.

Burge, Tyler. 1997 (1973). Reference and Proper Names. In *Readings in the Philosophy of Language*, ed. Peter Ludlow, 593-608. Cambridge & London: The MIT Press.

Carston, Robyn and Seiji Uchida (eds.). 1998. *Relevance Theory. Applications and Implications*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Cobley, Paul. 2001. Referent. In *Routledge Companion to Semiotics and Linguistics*, ed. Paul Cobley, 248-249. London & New York: Routledge.

Cobley, Paul. 2001. Langue. In *Routledge Companion to Semiotics and Linguistics*, ed. Paul Cobley, 215. London & New York: Routledge.

Cobley, Paul. 2001. Introduction. In *Routledge Companion to Semiotics and Linguistics*, ed. Paul Cobley, 3-13. London & New York: Routledge.

Cobley, Paul. 2001. Grammar. In *Routledge Companion to Semiotics and Linguistics*, ed. Paul Cobley, 193. London & New York: Routledge.

Crupi, Charlene. 2006. Structuring cues of conjunctive yet, but and still. A monosemic approach. In *Advances in Functional Linguistics. Columbia School beyond its origins*, eds. Joseph Davis, Radmila J. Gorup and Nancy Stern, 263-281. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Damnjanović, Milan. 1975. Predgovor. In *Osnove teorije o znacima*, Charles Morris.

Dijk, Teun A. van. 1989 (1985). Introduction: Levels and Dymensions of Discourse Analysis. In *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Vol. 2: Dimensions of Discourse, ed. Teun A. van Dijk, 1-12. London: Academic Press.

Dijk, Teun A. van. 1989 (1985). Semantic Discourse Analysis. In *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Vol. 2: Dimensions of Discourse, ed. Teun A. van Dijk, 103-135. London: Academic Press.

Dijk, Teun A. van. 1998 (1997). The Study of Discourse. In *Discourse as Structure and Process. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, Vol. 1, ed. Teun A. van Dijk, 1-34. London: SAGE Publications.

Dedić, Jasminka, Vlasta Jalušič and Jelka Zorn. 2003. *Izbrisani. Organizirana nedolžnost in politike izključevanja.* Ljubljana: Mirovni inštitut. Politike.

Duranti, Alessandro. 2006 (2004). Agency in Language. In *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology,* ed. Alessandro Duranti, 451-473 . Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Durkheim, Emile and Marcel Mauss. 1963 (1896). *Primitive classification*. London: Cohen and West.

Evans-Pritchard, E.E. 1983. *Socijalna antropologija*. Beograd: Biblioteka XX vek, Prosveta.

Fairclough, Norman. 1989. *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

Fillmore, Charles J. 1997. *Lectures on Deixis*. Stanford: CSLY Publications.

Fodor, Janet Dean and Ivan A. Sag. 1997 (1982). Referential and Quantificational Indefinites. In *Readings in the Philosophy of Language*, ed. Peter Ludlow, 475-521. Cambridge& London: The MIT Press.

Frege, Gottlob. 1997 (1948). On Sense and Reference. In *Readings in the Philosophy of Language*, ed. Peter Ludlow, 563-583. Cambridge & London: The MIT Press.

Geertz, Cliford. 1998. *Tumačenje kultura (1)*. Beograd: Biblioteka XX vek.

Gregorčič, Marta. 2007. Fantomska neodgovornost ali fašizem v preoblekah. In *Zgodba nekega izbrisa*. Časopis za kritiko znanosti, letnik XXXV, No. 228, 81-97. Ljubljana: Študentska založba.

Grice, Paul. 1989. *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge & London: Harvard University Press.

Guiraud, Pierre. 2001. *Semiologija*. Beograd: Plato, XX vek.

Harris, Roy. 2001. Linguistics After Saussure. In *Routledge Companion to Semiotics and Linguistics*, ed. Paul Cobley, 118-133. London & New York: Routledge.

Harris, Roy. 2001. Signified. In *Routledge Companion to Semiotics and Linguistics*, ed. Paul Cobley, 264. London & New York: Routledge.

Harris, Roy. 2001. Signifier. In *Routledge Companion to Semiotics and Linguistics*, ed. Paul Cobley, 265. London & New York: Routledge.

Jakobson, Roman. 1996 (1989). *Lingvistični in drugi spisi*. Ljubljana: Studia Humanitatis ŠKUC-FF.

Jakobson, Roman. 1995 (1990). *On Language*. In Waugh, Linda and Monique Monville-Burston (eds.). Cambridge & London: Harvard University Press.

Jalušič, Vlasta. 2003. Organizirana nedolžnost. In *Izbrisani. Organizirana nedolžnost in politike izključevanja*, Dedić, Jasminka, Vlasta Jalušič and Jelka Zorn (eds.), 7-22. . Ljubljana: Mirovni inštitut. Politike.

Jordan, Glenn. 2005 (1997). Discourse Theory. In *The Dictionary of Anthropology*, Thomas Barefield (ed.), 120-122. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Kress, Gunther. 2001. Discourse. In *Routledge Companion to Semiotics and Linguistics*, ed. Paul Cobley, 183. London & New York: Routledge.

Kress, Gunther. 2001. Denotation. In *Routledge Companion to Semiotics and Linguistics*, ed. Paul Cobley, 178. London & New York: Routledge.

Kroskrity, Paul V. 2006 (2004). Language Ideologies. In *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*, ed. Alessandro Duranti, 496-513. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Kulišić, Špiro, Petar Ž. Petrović and Nikola Pantelić. 1970. *Srpski mitološki rečnik.* Beograd: Nolit.

Leach, Edmund. 2002. *Kultura i komunikacija*. Beograd. Biblioteka XX vek, Prosveta.

Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Levinson, Stephen C. 1995 (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, John. 1996 (1995). *Linguistic Semantics. An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levi-Strauss, Claude. 1989 (1958). *Strukturalna antropologija 1*. Zagreb: Stvarnost.

Levi-Strauss, Claude. 1998 (1950). Uvod u delo Marsela Mosa. In *Sociologija i antropologija 1*, Marcel Mauss, 11-58. Beograd: Biblioteka XX vek.

Levi-Strauss, Claude. 1980. *Mitologike 1. Presno i pečeno*. Beograd: Prosveta. Beogradski izdavačko-grafički zavod.

Malinowski, Bronislav. 1969 (1923). The Problem of Meaning in Primitive Languages. In *The Meaning of Meaning. The Study of The Influence of Language upon Thought and of The Science of Symbolism*, eds. C. K. Ogden and I. A. Richards, 296-336. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Marmaridou, Sophia S. A. 2000. *Pragmatic Meaning and Cognition*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Mauss, Marcel. 1998 (1982). *Sociologija i antropologija 2*. Beograd: Biblioteka XX vek.

Mekina, Igor. 2007. Izbris izbrisa. In *Zgodba nekega izbrisa*. Časopis za kritiko znanosti, year XXXV, No. 228, 157-170. Ljubljana: Študentska založba.

Mey, Jakob L. 1993. *Pragmatics. An introduction*. Oxford & Cambridge. Blackwell Publishers.

Miščević, Nenad. 1983. *John Langshaw Austin. Jezik kot dejavnost*. Ljubljana: DDU Univerzum. Analecta.

Miščević, Nenad. 1991. Predgovor. In *Govorni činovi*, John Searle. Beograd: Nolit.

Morgan, Marcylienna. 2006 (2004). Speech Community. In *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology,* ed. Alessandro Duranti, 3-22. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Morris, Charles. 1975. *Osnove teorije o znacima*. Beograd: Beogradski izdavačko-grafički zavod.

Petöfi, János S. 1989 (1985). Lexicon. In *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Vol. 2: Dimensions of Discourse, ed. Teun A. van Dijk, 87-101. London: Academic Press.

Pierce, Charles Sanders. 1979. *Pragmatizam.* Beograd: Grafos.

Pistotnik, Sara. 2007. Kronologija izbrisa 1990-2007. In *Zgodba nekega izbrisa*. Časopis za kritiko znanosti, letnik XXXV, No. 228, 204-236. Ljubljana: Študentska založba.

Rapport, Nigel and Joanna Overing. 2000. *Social and Cultural Anthropology. The Key Concepts.* London and New York: Routledge.

Ricoeur, Paul. 1994 (1978). *The Rule of Metaphor. Multidisciplinary studies of the cration of meaning in language.* London. Routledge.

Russell, Bertrand. 1940. *An Inquiry Into Meaning and Truth*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Salkie, Raphael. 2001. Deixis. In *Routledge Companion to Semiotics and Linguistics*, ed. Paul Cobley, 178. London & New York: Routledge.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1996. *Kurs opšte lingvistike*. Novi Sad: Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića Sremski Karlovci. Theoria.

Searle, John R. 1997 (1958). Proper Names. In *Readings in the Philosophy of Language*, ed. Peter Ludlow, 585-592. Cambridge & London: The MIT Press.

Searle, John. 1991 (1970). *Govorni činovi*. Beograd: Nolit.

Sweetser, Eve. 1995 (1990). *From Etymology to Pragmatics. Metaphorical and cultural aspects of semantic structure.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Škiljan, Dubravko. 1985. *U pozadini znaka. Esej iz semiologije značenja.* Zagreb: Školska knjiga, Savremena misao.

Šterk, Karmen. 1998. *O težavah z mano. Antropologija, lingvistika, psihoanaliza.* Ljubljana. Študentska organizacija univerze, Študentska založba.

Šterk, Karmen. 2008. Ontology is to Epistemology what Paranoia is to Science: Confessions of a Resigned Anthropologist. Not published yet.

Šumić-Riha, Jelica. 1988. *Realno v performativu.* Ljubljana: Delavska enotnost. Analecta.

Thomas, Stewart W. Jr. and Nathan Vaillette. 2001. *Language Files. Materials for an Introduction to Language and Linguistics.* Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.

Verschueren, Jef. 2001. Propositions. In *Routledge Companion to Semiotics and Linguistics,* ed. Paul Cobley, 245. London & New York: Routledge.

Verschueren, Jef. 2001. Meaning. In *Routledge Companion to Semiotics and Linguistics*, ed. Paul Cobley, 221. London & New York: Routledge.

Verschueren, Jef. 2001. Speech Act. In *Routledge Companion to Semiotics and Linguistics*, ed. Paul Cobley, 267-268. London & New York: Routledge.

Wilson, Deirdre and Dan Sperber. 1998. Pragmatics and time. In. *Relevance Theory. Applications and Implications* eds. Robyn Carston and Seiji Uchida, 1-22. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Zorn, Jelka. 2007. "Mi, etno-državljani etno-demokracije", - nastajanje slovenskega državljanstva. In *Zgodba nekega izbrisa*. Časopis za kritiko znanosti, letnik XXXV, No. 228, 17-33. Ljubljana: Študentska založba.

Zorn, Jelka and Uršula Lipovec Čebron. 2007. Zakaj se ukvarjati z izbrisom? In *Zgodba nekega izbrisa*. Časopis za kritiko znanosti, letnik XXXV, No. 228, 11-14. Ljubljana: Študentska založba.

Sources:

Basic Constitutional Act of Autonomy and Independence of RS. Ur. l. RS – 1/1991 (25th June 1991).

Hrastar, Mateja. 2004. "Izbrisani in vsi ostali" ["The erased and all the others"]. *Mladina*, (27th December).

http://mnz.si/si/upl/gl_novin/izbrisani/ZGODOVINA

http://www.dnevnik.si

http://www.mladina.si

http://www.vest.si

Klipšteter, Tomaž. 2007. "Izbrisani Mariborčan Čedo Draganič terja od države več kot 291.000 evrov" ["The erased Čedo Draganič from Maribor claims over 291, 000 euros from the state"], *Dnevnik.* (31st August). Available on: (27th September 2008).

Krivic, Matevž. 2003. "Pravno nepismeni politiki proti izbrisanim"["Politicians ignorant in the questions of law against the erased"]. *Mladina.* (8th December). Available on:

http://www.mladina.si/tednik/200349/clanek/slo--izbrisani-matevz_krivic/ (12th March 2008).

Lovrec, Vesna. 2007. "Kakšna bo sodba?" ["What would the judgment be?"]. *Vest.si.* (17th October). Available on: http://vest.si.2007/10/17/kaksna-bo-sodba/ (27th September 2008).

Odločba Ustavnega sodišča št. U-I-89/99 (10th June 1999).

Odločba Ustavnega sodišča št. U-I-246/02 (3rd April 2003).

Plebiscite on sovereignty and independence of Slovenia (23rd December 1990). Available on: http://www.ukom.gov.si/10let/ (12th March 2008).

Maček, Urh. 2008. "Teden izbrisanih" ["The week of the erased"]. *Vest.si.* (26th February). Available on: http://vest.si.2008/02/26/teden-izbrisanih/ (27th September 2008).

Mekina, Igor. 1994. "Izgnani, delozirani, izbrisani". *Mladina.* (22nd November)

Mekina, Igor. 2003. "Borec za pravico. Aleksandar Todorović, predsednik društva izbrisanih", ["Fighter for justice. Aleksandar Todorović, the president of the Association of the Erased"]. *Mladina.* (21st July). Available on: http://www.mladina.si/tednik/200329/clanek/izbris-3/ (12th March 2008).

Mekina, Igor. 2004. "Lažni patriotizem. Vsi, ki nasprotujejo popravi krivic izbrisanim, s tem spodkopujejo temelje, na katerih stoji svobodna slovenska družba" ["Fault nationalism. All who are against restoring of rights of the erased derange the bases on which modern Slovenian society stands"]. *Mladina.* (22nd March). Available trough: http://www.mladina.si/tednik/200412/clanek/slo--izbrisani-igor_mekina/ (12th March 2008).

Mekina, Igor. 2004. "Ne referendumu! Udeležba na referendumu bo glas proti Sloveniji kot pravni državi" ["Say 'No' to referendum! Participation on the referendum will be a vote against Slovenia as a state based on the rule of law"]. *Mladina*. (29th March). Available on: http://www.mladina.si/tednik/200413/clanek/slo--izbrisani-igor_mekina/ (12th March 2008).

Mekina, Igor. 2007. "Napotitev v smrt" ["Sent to death"]. *Dnevnik.* (16th October). Available through: http://dnevnik.si/kolumne_komntarji/kolumne (27th September 2008).

Sever, Jani. 2004. "Pol milijona ksenofobov" ["Half a million xenophobes"]. *Mladina*. (10th April). Available on: http://www.mladina.si/tednik/200415/clanek/uvo-uvodnik--jani_sever/ (12th March 2008).

Trampuš, Jure. 2002. "Popravljanje napak iz preteklosti" ["Ameliorating faults from the past"]. *Mladina*. (15th July). Available on: http://www.mladina.si/tednik/200228/clanek/aksentijevic/ (12th March 2008).

Trampuš, Jure. 2004. "Neustavni referendum. Ustavno sodišče zavrnilo Janševe predloge" ["Non-constitutional referendum. The Constitutional Court rejected Janša's initiatives"]. *Mladina.* (1st March). Available on: http://www.mladina.si/tednik/200409/clanek/slo--izbrisani-jure_trampus/ (12th March 2008).

Unknown author. 2008. "Grimsove neresnice" ["Grims's lies"]. *Vest.si* (27th February). Available on: http://www.vest.si/2008/02/27/grimsove-neresnice/ (27th September 2008).

Zakon o državljanstvu RS. Ur. l. RS – 1/1991 (5th June 1991).

Zakon o tujcih. Ur. l. RS – 1/1991 (5th June 1991).

Zakon o urejanju statusa državljanov drugih držav naslednic nekdanje SFRJ v RS (ZUSDDD). Ur. l. RS 61/99 (30th September 1999).

Povzetek magistrske naloge v slovenščini

Opomba: Za osnovo slovenskega povzetka sem vzela Zaključek (*Conclusions*) iz osnovnega teksta. Predstavitev poteka po poglavljih.

V tem tekstu je narejen poskus analize diskurza o izbrisanih iz perspektive pragmatizma. V osnovi sem izhajala iz tega, da pristop pragmatične lingvistike omogoča uvid tako v diskurzivni (sistemski) aspekt fenomena, kot tudi v njegovo uporabo v aktualiziranih komunikacijskih dogodkov (posamični aspekt).

Na samem začetku originalnega teksta je zapisano, da se mora narediti razlika med izbrisanimi kot stvarnimi ljudmi in 'izbrisani' kot fraze. Ortografska pravila, ki jih uporabljam (po Lyons 1996), kažejo, da se enojni narekovaji ('') uporabljajo za izraze, dvojni narekovaji ("") pa za (prenesene) pomene, citate in podobno (recimo, lahko imamo izbrisane, 'izbrisane' in "izbrisane"; prvi so izbrisani ljudje, 'izbrisani' fraza, ki jo v večini teksta analiziram, nekaj kot označevalec z nedoločenim označencem, "izbrisani" pa tisto, kar se nanaša na pomen lingvističnega znaka, torej, odnos med označevalcem in označencem ali smislom in referenco, odvisno od lingvistične perspektive, ki jo uporabljam. Tako se 'izbrisani' (kot fraza) pojavlja v številnih javnih (ne samo uradnih) komunikacijskih dogodkih, ki so uporabljeni kot osnova za to raziskavo. Izbrisani in 'izbrisani' delijo nekatere skupne značilnosti, nikakor pa niso dve enaki niti kompatibilni "stvari", niti ni 'izbrisani' enostavno označevalec izbrisanih, če za trenutek izhajamo iz tradicionalne semiologije in lingvistike. Kompleksnost tega odnosa se kaže v poskusu določitve izbrisanih kot nekakšnega realno obstoječega fenomena. Ta je mogoča le, če nanjo (določitev) gledamo kot na odprto operativno definicijo. Zato sem se vprašala ali je 'izbrisani' (osebno) ime nekega realnega fenomena (recimo kakšne skupine ljudi). Na ta način bi šla prav v smeri, ki jo je Saussure kritiziral, torej, da parafraziram, prek besede bi poskusila priti do stvari. Namreč, uradnih podatkov o izbrisanih je zelo malo, uradne osebe in institucije pa o njih dajejo kontradiktorne

informacije (ki gredo celo do tega ali izbrisani sploh so, torej problematizirajo samo eksistenco tega fenomena). Da bi vsaj nekako izbrisane ločila od ostalih administrativnih kategorij, ki obstajajo v Sloveniji, sem se odločila, da vzamem naslednje aspekte pojavljanja tega fenomena, in sicer - administrativni in pravni kontekst ter kontekst, ki se nanaša na posledice izbrisa. Zato sem uporabila maloštevilno znanstveno literaturo o tej problematiki, kot tudi različne zakonske akte in novinarske članke. Ta trije konteksti so se mi zdeli najbolj izpostavljeni in zaradi tega pertinentni za začetek moje raziskave, ki naj bi se ukvarjala z diskurzivnimi opredelitvami izbrisanih (po teh je vsak podatek validen in vsak doprinese k ustvarjanju diskurza, posebno, če ti prihajajo od ljudi, ki imajo juridično moč, v tem primeru od uradnih oseb ali institucij). Ko sem takšno operativno (dokaj uradno) definicijo izbrisanih poskusila aplicirati na ostale javne komunikacijske dogodke, in sicer tiste v internetnih forumih, se je pokazalo, da tudi ta odprta definicija izbrisanih ne drži, in da se kot pertinentne izpostavljajo popolnoma drugačne karakteristike. Ker naj bi se ime kot filozofski koncept (najbolj pogosto preučevan znotraj filozofije jezika), nanašalo na izraze, katerih referenca je jasna (Burge 1997), ali na izraze, ki nekaj univokalno denotirajo, je edino, kar sem lahko sklepala, da 'izbrisani' ni osebno ime (neke administrativne kategorije, ki naj bi se nanašala na kakšno skupino ljudi ali osebno ime česar koli drugega). Pojem denotacije me je pripeljal do vprašanja, če 'izbrisani' že ne denotira (*denote*) nečesa, ali je mogoče ta izraz figurativno uporabljen, torej, ali je 'izbrisani' metafora (definicija po: Ricoeur 1994). To pa bi pomenilo, da spet gredoč od besede k stvari, pridem od "izbrisanih" do nekakšnih potencialnih in zamolčenih izbrisanih, ali do nečesa drugega, čez detajlno analizo individualnih izjav na osnovah pragmatične lingvistike, ki je s svojo sistematičnostjo v opredelitvi konteksta in koteksta izjavljanja pripomore k opredelitvi pomena besed (razumljenega ali kot rezultat medsebojnega odnosa označevalca in označenca, ali smisla in reference, ali triade označevalca-označenca/smisla-reference v zadnji instanci primerjave in združevanja semioloških in pragmatičnih opredelitev koncepta pomena, ki so nujne, ko gremo v katerikoli smeri od diskurza do individualnih izjav).

Tudi sam predmet, ki sem ga vzela kot osnovo za svoje raziskovanje (in to so internetni forumi), je odprl nekatere zanimive teoretske in metodološke teme. Najbolj pereča se

nanaša na razmerje med ustno in pisno komunikacijo. Sprejela sem determinacijo, ki razlikuje ti dve obliki predominantno verbalne komunikacije, in poudarila razlike skozi preučevanje jemanja-besede (*turn-taking*) ter pošiljatelja in sprejemnika sporočil (Levinson 1995). To mi je naprej omogočilo opredelitev udeležencev v kominikacijskih dogotkih na osnovi njihovih vlog (in njihove potencialne juridične moči, torej moči, da z besedami naredijo nekaj bolj konkretnega, kot da bi samo nekaj povedali, če parafraziram Austina).

Ker so udeleženci v komunikacijskih dogodkih uporabljali jezik, da bi komunicirali, sem menila, da je nujno analizirati ideje o jeziku. Na osnovi Lyonsove komparacije Saussirjevih in Chomskyjevih idej o jeziku (Lyons 1996), sem sprejela opredelitev jezika kot tridelnega, in sicer, konstituiranega iz jezika-sistema, človeške sposobnosti govora na splošno in različnih posamičnih proizvodov uporabe jezika-sistema (razlika med Chomskym in Saussurjem je v značilnostih tretjega člena te tridelne organizacije jezika: ko Saussure govori o proizvodih jezika-sistema, Chomsky govori o uporabi jezika-sistema). Ker splošna človeška sposobnost govora ni bila pertinentna za mojo raziskavo, sem se osredotočila na dihotomijo jezik-kot-sistem (*language-system*) *vs.* proizvodi-uporabe-jezika-kot-sistema (*the-products-of-(use-of)-language-system*). Ta dihotomija v Morrisovi opredelitvi lingvističnega početja, sestavljenega iz sintakse, ki se ukvarja s sistemom, pragmatike, ki se ukvarja s procesom uporabe, in semantiko, ki se ukvarja s proizvodi jezika, preraste v trihotomijo. Na tej osnovi sem prišla do omejitve fokusa moje raziskave. Ker sem se ukvarjala z izjavami v komunikacijskih dogodkih kot tudi z diskurzom (ki konstituira in je konstituiran z izjavami), sem vzela vse tri aspekte lingvističnega raziskovanja za pertinentne (s tem, da sem sintakso razumela v strukturalni in semiološki perspektivi). Potem sem, po opredelitvi jezika kot sredstva komunikacije, prišla do teme lingvističnega znaka, enote, ki omogoča komunikacijo. Poudarek je na Saussurjevem razlikovanju med označevalnim in označenim aspektom lingvističnega znaka (in načinov vzpostavljanja njihovih inter in intra razmerij v smislu sintagmatskih in paradigmatskih osi) (Saussure 1996). To mi je omogočilo, da "izbrisani" določim kot označevalca nečesa, kot tudi, da odredim, kako se lahko ta odnos realizira (aktualizira).

Da bi ugotovila označevalec česa je 'izbrisani', sem preučila koncepte pomena, izjave in diskurza. Predstavila sem referencialno teorijo pomena, po kateri je pomen sestavljen iz smisla in reference. Da bi to teorijo povezala s Saussrjevim konceptom lingvističnega znaka, sem se osredotočila na koncept smisla, ki se pri nekaterih avtorjih opredeli kot njihova skupna značilnost (van Dijk 1989a). Rezultat tega je bila določitev pomena kot trojnega, sestavljenega iz označevalca, označenca/smisla in reference. Označevalni aspekt sem opredelila kot jeziku notranji in referencialni aspekt kot jeziku zunanji, pri čemer je označenec/smisel figuriral kot mediator. To mi je naprej omogočilo povezavo konceptov izjave in diskurza, kot tudi, da ugotovim, kaj se dogaja s frazo 'izbrisani' v njeni transformaciji od nečesa kar pripada domeni sveta (fizičnega sveta, realnosti) do nečesa, kar pripada domeni besede (nečemu, česar lahko ni, če parafraziram Barthesa). V posameznih izjavah sem do referenc prišla skozi analizo indeksikalov, presupozicij in govornih dejanj. Samo frazo sem vzela kot concept, o katerem izjavljalci govorijo v terminih nekaterih drugih fenomenih (nacionalizma, lojalnosti, državljanstva, in tako naprej). To sem opredelila kot metaforične koncepte, ki so tako postali označevalci fraze, in še več, kompleksne fraze, ker so sami po sebi že bili popolni znaki (Lakoff in Johnson 1980). Ti popolni znaki so mi omogočili, da odkrijem referencialni obseg fraze, tako kakor je bila prikazana v posameznih izjavah. Potem sem raziskovala, kaj se zgodi, ko nivo individualnih izjav postane sublimiran v nivo diskurza. To sem lahko naredila šele z vpeljavo konceptov intenzije in ekstenzije. 'Ekstenzija' enega izraza je klasa entitet, ki jih ta izraz definira, 'intenzija' pa je definirajoča značilnost klase. Kot se ekstenzije nanašajo na reference, tako se intenzije nanašajo na smisle. Fregeova teorija citiranega govora (v katerem ekstenzije umikajo mesto intenzijami) omogoča transformacijo referenc v smisle in tako prehod iz domene sveta, karakteristične za izjave, v domeno besed, karakteristične za diskurz (Frege 1997). To pa pomeni, da je kontekst izjavljanja, ki vpliva na določitve referencialnega, torej ekstenzionalnega obsega fraze 'izbrisani', postal tudi sam intenzionalen v diskurzu. 'Izbrisani' se tako vzpostavlja kot označevalec, kateremu je označenec tudi sam znak, diskurz o izbrisanih pa se lahko opredeli kot popolnoma interjezikovni (*interlingval*) in intrabesedni (*intralexical*). Na ta način sem povezala omenjene tri dimenzije lingvističnega raziskovanja (sintakso, pragmatiko in semantiko).

Teorija govornih dejanj je preučevana na dveh nivojih, na nivoju izjave in na nivoju diksurza, kjer se, podobno kot se zgodi z indeksikalom, presupozicijami in implikaturami, ekstenzionalne značilnosti transformirajo v intenzionalne. Potem sem poskusila preveriti, če je lahko diskurz tudi sam govorno dejanje. Ducrotova opredelitev performativnosti diskurza, po kateri diskurz performira (izvaja, ali bolj enostavno ustvarja) diskurzivni univerzum, pri čem ga predstavlja kot fizično obstoječega (ko se performativi berejo (*read*) kot da bi bili konstativi), mi je omogočila, da sklepam, da se skozi diskurz 'izbrisani' kot tudi izbrisani vzpostavljajo (naredijo) kot nekaj, kar je obstajalo že pred govorom o tem (Šumić-Riha 1988). Tukaj bom še omenila, da je opredelitev diskurza v razmerju do posameznih izjav analogna Bourdieuvem konceptu *habitusa*, kot strukturirane strukture, ki poskusi biti strukturirajoča struktura, ali "prevedeno", diskurz struktuira izjave, a je istočasno tudi sam struktuiran z izjavami (Bourdieu 1999). To pa pomeni, da se performativi iz posamičnih izjav berejo kot konstativi v diskurzu (to se dogaja tudi na nivoju posameznih izjav, v diskurzu je pa nujno). Da bi ugotovila, kako je rešena medsebojna odvisnost individualnih izjav in sublimirajočega diskurza (torej, kako strukturirana struktura postane strukturirajoča in obratno), sem preučevala nocijo metaforične abstrakcije in razliko med koncepti in metaforami. Kot pravi Aristotel, metafora je dajanje imena eni stvari, ime pa pripada neki drugi (tuji stvari), pri čemer gre prenos ali od rodu k vrsti, ali od vrste k vrsti, ali na osnovi analogije. To bi impliciralo, da obstaja en red (rod, vrsta, klasifikacija), ki pa je uničen z uporabo metafore. Tako metafora ne more biti sprememba samo ene besede, ampak celega sistema. Ogroža klasifikacijo samo. Po drugi strani metafora samo prenaša, premešča elemente znanega sistema skozi uporabo metonimijskih (rod *vs*. vrsta, del *vs*. celota) sredstev ali analogije. Dekonstrukcija tako obstaja samo v tem medialnem stanju, med deskripcijo in redeskripcijo, med starim sistemom klasifikacije in novim. Na ta način izziva opozicijo med dobesednim in figurativnim, med redom in transgresijo. To pa implicira, da metafora ni samo en končni proizvod, temveč tudi proces (ni samostalnik (*noun*), temveč glagol (*verb*), ni subjekt, temveč predikacija) (Ricoeur 1994). Analogno temu, v povezavi z razmerjem med diskurzom in posameznimi izjavami, intenzije znotraj diskurza kot funkcija (operacija ali pravilo, ki nikoli ni striktno, ker je konvencionalno) opredelijo razpon potencialnih ekstenzij. Po drugi strain je metaforična abstrakcija

relativno svobodna pri izbiri značilnosti, ki jih bo metaforizirala, kar privede do tega, da je intenzionalna funkcija narušena in dodana diskurzu v tej transformirani, nekonvencionalni obliki. To pa opredeli diskurz kot imanentno podvržen spremembam.

Fenomen izbrisanih pripada domeni retorike, domeni verjetnega (*probable*), kje stvari lahko so, ampak lahko tudi niso, domeni vsiljenih (*imposed*) lingvističnih svetov – domeni diskurza. Vsak diskurz je sestavljen iz besed, ki so lingvistična dejstva, zato se lahko vprašam, če je tudi diskurz sam lingvistično dejstvo. In kaj so besede? Imena stvari? Ukročeni smisli? Glavna ideja pragmatike, teoretske perspektive uporabljene tukaj, je, da so besede "stvari" za uporabo, za manipulacijo, podobno kot druga sredstva za dosego nekaterih praktičnih ciljev (v besedah ekonomske antropologije, so besede denar, torej, lahko se zamenjajo za vse druge stvari, eno univerzalno sredstvo menjave) (Mey 1993). To pa pomeni, da so besede in vsi fenomeni, povezani z njimi (kot so znaki, klasifikacije, diskurzivno struktuirane misli, izražene z izjavami), perlokucijski *par excellence*. Je posledica tega, da ne obstaja nekaj takšnega kot naj bi bila denotacija, nekaj takšnega kot naj bi bil pomen iz slovarja, nekaj takšnega, kot naj bi bil znak "z določenim smislom in referenco", kot naj bi bila resnica, kot naj bi bili "vsi možni svetovi". Vse je stvar trenutno prevladujočih konvencij. Izziv leži prav v tem, v paradoksalnem naporu, da se opredeli nekaj, kar se izmika vsekakršni opredelitvi (nekaj podobno početju antičnih retorikov, ki so poskusili kodificirati govor) (Barthes 1990). To početje se lahko figurativno izkaže kot "ukrotitev pomena" (ki je begajoč in nejasen po definiciji), kar je bilo v tem tekstu poskušano z referencialnega aspekta (pripisovanjem reference smislu) in z aspekta označevalca (pripisovanjem označevalca smislu). Kot se fraza 'izbrisani' pojavlja kot metafora (o nečem drugem se govori v terminih 'izbrisanih') ali kot metajezik (o 'izbrisanih' se govori v terminih nečesa drugega), tako tudi vse te "kolokacije" participirajo v pomenu tega izraza. Zato se zdi, da niso razlike med podobnimi stvarmi, temveč združitev različnih stvari, tisto, kar naredi pomen. Razlikovanje med različnimi stvari je samo izzid te operacije. Pravzaprav, dodavanje dela razliko skozi pripisovanje lastnosti nečemu. In tako so lastnosti diferencialne samo pozitivno (obstaja nekaj, kar manjka nečemu drugemu). Lahko se zdi, da je to samo vprašanje stališča, torej, ali se začne na že obstoječi lastnosti znaka, za katero ugotovimo,

da ne obstaja na/v nekem drugem znaku, ali se začne na praznem mestu (potencialnem znaku), ki ga je treba izpolniti z nekaterimi lastnostimi. Pragmatična teorija se drži druge alternative: lastnost se bere tam, kje jo pričakujemo (Mey 1993). Kaj pa naredi pričakovanje? Kontekst in namere, posebej pomen-nn (*meaning-nn*), torej, prepoznavanje stvari ("dostopnih ali nedostopnih", če parafraziram Cobleya), kot da so znaki (sredstva komunikacije), pomenski konglomerati (Grice 1989). Posledice tega na frazo 'izbrisani' so raznovrstne: če je 'izbrisani' metaforično (konotativno) govoreno-v-terminih (*spoken-in-terms-of*) nekakšnih drugih fenomenov, je 'izbrisani' označenec. To pa pomeni, da 'izbrisani' predstavlja smisel teh fenomenov. Ker je smisel intenzionalni, oziroma se njegove lastnosti ne morejo določiti, ker bi takrat postal ekstenzionalen (spomnimo se, da intenzija ni skupek lasnosti, temveč operacija: če bi bila skupek lastnosti, bi bila ekstenzija neke druge intenzije), 'izbrisani' predstavlja pravilo ali operacijo, ki omogoči pripisovanje ekstenzij (drugih fenomenov, ki so vzeti za govorjenje-v-terminih in so tako označevalci). Ker je pomen samo pričakovan, torej pripisan, predstavlja pa relacijo med označevalcem in označencem, je relevanca med 'izbrisani' in fenomeni v-terminih-katerih-se-'izbrisani'-govori (*'the erased' is spoken-in-terms-of some other phenomena*), samo *a posteriori*, torej, priložnostna, "vzpostavljena, ker je bila pričakovana". To bi pomenilo, da se 'izbrisani' lahko govori-v-terminih kakšnih drugih fenomenov od tistih, v terminih katerih se pravzaprav govori. Vendar je ta razpon omejen skozi aktualizacijo procesa metaforične abstrakcije. Zaradi tega, ker metaforična abstrakcija pelje k vzpostavljanju enega reda (potem, ko uniči predhodno vzpostavljenega), se zdi, da je razmerje med 'izbrisani' in fenomeni v-terminih-katerih-se-'izbrisani'-govori vodena z nekakšnim nadrejenim principom, nadrejenim diskurzom (originatorjem klasifikacije, ki je zato, da se uporabi, uniči, in ponovno re-formira). In ta nadrejeni diskurz je kontekst v katerem se ta odnos vzpostavi, v katerem "zadobi smisel". Induktivna procedura, torej analiza posameznih izjav, ki se nanašajo na frazo, kaže, da je 'izbrisani' bran (*read*) kot povezan s fenomeni iz obdobja, v katerem se izbris zgodil, in to je obdobje, ko je Slovenija postala samostalna država. To pa omejuje obseg, v katerem se metaforična abstrakcija lahko zgodi (in sicer, to so vprašanja državljanstva, nacionalnosti, lojalnosti, patriotizma in tako naprej). Z drugimi besedami, diskurz nadrejen diskurzu o izbrisanih, je tisti, ki se nanaša na "slovenstvo", na to, kaj je biti slovenski (razumljeno kot etniciteta

ali kot vprašanje državljanstva ali kot vprašanje tega, kdo lahko živi v Sloveniji). (Ena digresija, ki bo poslužila kot primer: smo priča nekaterim poskusom, da bi diskurz o izbrisanih spravili pod kakšen drug diskurz, kot denimo diskurz o srbski diaspori v enem izmed raziskovalnih projektov Etnografskega inštituta v Beogradu, ki se je začel leta 2007, ali diskurz o migracijah v okvirju projektov nekaterih evropskih socialnih centrov (z nameravanim perlokucijskim efektom, da se problem izbrisanih poveže s tekočimi problemi migrantov v Evropi), pa tudi s kršitvami človeških pravic v projektih Helsinškega monitorja ali Amnesty Internationala. Zdi se, da ti diskurzi nimajo dovolj juridične moči, da bi prevzeli vlogo nadrejenega diskurza. Še več, lahko se vprašamo, če se ti diskurzi, ko se aplicirajo na problem, ki izhaja iz Slovenije, lahko izognejo temu, da se vtopijo v diskurz o slovenstvu, saj vsi delijo nekatere skupne značilnosti, kot so etniciteta, pravica do prebivanja na nekem območju, človeške pravice). Znotraj (razumljeno kot prostorska razsežnost) tega nadrejenega diskurza, je diskurz o izbrisanih formiran, ker je pričakovan. In obratno, je vseprisoten, problematiziran in ponovno vzpostavljen v posameznih izjavah o izbrisanih. Tako je diskurz o izbrisanih samo njegov perlokucijski (in ilokucijski) efekt. Iz tega sledi, da 'izbrisani' ne more imeti nek samostojen pomen (kar je, da se tako izrazim, nemogoče, ker se pomen dosega samo skozi aktualizacijo konteksta v katerem se znak pojavlja, in, še več, samo, če obstaja nekakšen sistem znakov), kar pa ni ovira, da tisti, ki ta znak (ali del znaka, odvisno od mesta v diskurzivnemu sistemu) uporabljajo, ta znak percipirajo kot reificiran, opredmeten, fizično obstoječ, realen in ne samo aktualen (Lakoff in Johnson 1980). To naprej omogoča manipulacijo (različne opredelitve izbrisanih, odvisno od namena govorjenja o tistih), kar je v skladu z inherentnim konstantnim (več ali manj intenzivnim) spremembami nadrejenega diskurza. Prav v tem leži diskurzivno ustvarjanje izbrisanih, v tej možnosti instrumentalizicije "ukrotitve pomena" 'izbrisanih', odvisno od trenutnih značilnosti diskurza v katerem se ta uporablja.

Na kratko, izbrisani so in lahko tudi niso, vendar se percipirajo (česar se začnemo zavedati šele, ko se o njih začnemo pogovarjati) kot obstoječi zaradi delovanja diskurza, ki jih opredmeti. Individualne izjave o izbrisanih (in tudi individualno obstoječe osebe, ki se identificirajo - same sebe ali so tako identificirane od drugih - kot nekašni izbrisani,

karkoli naj bi to uradno ali neuradno bilo, če bi sploh bilo, ker se premikamo po retoričnem vesolju) zadobijejo smisel (postanejo ekstenzionalne) šele, ko se preučujejo kot del diskurza, ki je njihov kotekst in jim določi nadaljno operacijo intenzije, katera jim naprej omogoči pripisovanje ekstenzij. Intenzije pojem 'izbrisani' sam po sebi nima in tako nima niti avtonomnega pomena. Tako se 'izbrisani' pojavlja ali kot prazen lingvistični znak, ki se izpolni z različnimi fenomeni (katerih postane nekaj kot drugostepena intenzija)**,** ali način, da se o različnih fenomenih pogovarja (katerih postane nekaj kot dvojno posredovana ekstenzija). V skladu s tem, sta v primeru 'izbrisanih' označevalec in označenec samo stvar pogleda, ker smisel 'izbrisanih' nastane šele kot efekt nadrejenega diskurza, in potem je samo sekundaren, nekakšna izvedena funkcija nadrejenega diskurza.

Za potrditev uspešnosti svojega poskusa, da od besede pridem k stvari, da ponovno parafraziram Saussurja, lahko za trenutek sprejmem stališče, da je 'izbrisani' ime enega realno obstoječega fenomena, in sicer nekaterih izbrisanih ljudi. Če je 'izbrisani' sekundarna intenzija, izbrisani pa (ena od) sekundarna/ih ekstenzij/a nadrejenega diskurza o slovenstvu, in če rezultati v tem tekstu narejene analize kažejo, da so izbrisani percipirani kot nekaj tujega, drugo, neslovensko, potem bi sami izbrisani bili tujci, drugi in ne-Slovenci. Po drugi strani, raziskave narejene z ljudmi, ki se samoidentificirajo kot izbrisani, kažejo dokaj različne rezultate (tudi sama sam z izbrisanimi od leta 2005 izvajala intervjuje in opazovanje z udeležbo). V kratkem, izbrisani se samopercipirajo kot del slovenske družbe (nekateri tudi kot členi slovenske etnične skupnosti), čeprav dokaj marginalizirani in deprivirani. Lahko vprašam, ali so rezultati moje magistrske naloge napačni, saj sem prišla do tako različnih izhodišč. Stvari pa kažejo drugače. Izbrisani se samopercipirajo kot marginalizirani v slovenski družbi. Tudi diskurz o slovenstvu (in iz njega izhajajoči diskurz o izbrisanih) izbrisane ustvarja kot marginalizirane s stališča slovenske družbe. Izbrisani nimajo juridične moči, da bi ustvarili drugačen diskurz, kar pa ne pomeni, da se v diskurzu o izbrisanih "ne sliši njihov glas" (tukaj se držim Bakhtinovega stališča, da tudi v najbolj avtoritarnih tekstih, in na dikurz se lahko gleda kot na tekst, vendar ne homologno, temveč analogno, različni glasovi tekmujejo za svoj izraz), vendar je "omejen in orkestriran" od nadrejenega diskurza. Še več, izbrisani, ker

so nastali kot perlokucijski efekt diskurza o slovenstvu (in to kot njegov nekakšen *alter ego*), so potem v njega nujno vpeti.

Po drugi strani, ljudje, ki se samopercipirajo kot izbrisani, niso edino na kaj bi se 'izbrisani' nanašalo. To pa pomeni, da nekateri aspekti diskurza o izbrisanih postanejo iniciatori novih ekstenzij ob posredništvu procedure metaforične abstrakcije. Te nove ekstenzije lahko ostanejo znotraj nadrejenega diskurza o slovenstvu ali "gredo ven". Če takšne ekstenzije diskurza o izbrisanih postanejo del drugih močnih diskurzov, se povratno 'izbrisani' (in vse na kar bi se to lahko nanašalo) lahko re-definira in re-formira na drugačnih osnovah. Za zdaj pa ostaja vpeto v diskurz slovenstva.

Splošni zaključek moje raziskave je, da besede nimajo same po sebi določenega pomena in, da je pomen odvisen od uporabe. To pa potrjuje Saussurjevo stališče, da je lingvistični znak arbitraren. Tudi če je arbitraren, ni svoboden. In ne samo zaradi tega, ker ne more obstajati sam zase, ampak samo kot del sistema, niti samo zaradi tega, ker uporaba znakov ni svobodna zadeva sama zase. Vsak lingvistični znak, takoj ko je aktualiziran, postane vpleten v kompleksne mreže diskurzov. Nekateri lingvistični znaki se po teh mrežah lahko "premikajo", drugi pa so popolnoma odvisni od nadrejenega diskurza, ki jih je ustvaril. "Izbrisani" obstaja kot navaden pridevnik. In ta navaden pridevnik ima svoboden premik. 'Izbrisani', kot nekaj, kar je del diskurza o slovenstvu, pa zelo težko postane ekstenzija ali intenzija nekega drugega diskurza. Vsaj do takrat, ko se ta nadrejeni diskurz ne spremeni dovolj (in odpre meje, da spusti 'izbrisane' ven, tudi če je narejen tako, da izbrisanim ne dovoli niti priti notri).