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Abstract
This study examines the use of deixis for personal, spatial and temporal anchorage of political discourse. Using two thematically and contextually different speeches of Nigeria's president Olusegun Obasanjo as its database, the paper establishes how politicians can associate with and dissociate from actions taken by them or their officers at different times. I conclude by locating some of the antics of political leaders to conscript their subjects into accepting their views on controversial issues or positions.

1. INTRODUCTION
Language and politics are social stances; the one, a medium used by society for the purposes of communication and cohabitation, the other, loosely, the ideas and activities used for gaining and exercising power in society. As such a linguistic study of political language, that which we intend to do here, conflates the social components of the two stances. It is van Dijk's (2004:8,9) characterization of the field of politics that establishes, most succinctly, politics as discourse:

...this field may briefly-and some what traditionally-be defined by its overall systems (democracy, dictatorship), special social macro actions, such as government, legislation, elections, or decision making, ...micro practices, interactions or discourses, such as parliamentary debates, canvassing or demonstrations, ...special social relations, such as those of institutional power, ...special norms and values (e.g. freedom, equality etc) ...political cognitions, such as political ideologies.

Politics is thus a discursive domain, not just because it situates language in action but also because the action is contextualised.
The use of linguistic parameters for interpreting political language is a fairly recent enterprise. According to Wilson (1990), Geis (1987) is the first complete textbook written by any linguist on political language. Ever since, however, linguists have devoted considerable attention to political discourse: Wilson (1990), from the point of view of linguistic pragmatics, Cap (2002) from an eclectic linguistic angle of vision, and Chilton (2004), from the discourse-analytic perspective, to mention but a few.

Language is used, sometimes, for identification purposes; for delineating positions according to" in "and "out" relations. By this is meant language serves the purpose of including its users and excluding its non-users. But it is not this wide scope of inclusion and exclusion that we would apply here. Inclusion, in this paper, conceptualizes the deictic acts of including the speaker in the political position and activities being presented, and exclusion, at the other end, distances the speaker from such political ideas and activities. Our "inclusion" and "exclusion" are therefore akin to Miller's (2004) bifurcation of "alignment" and "alienation".

Olusegun Obasanjo is the extant president of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. A man who once led Nigeria's federal government (as a military Head of State, between 1976 and 1979) had also been elected as a civilian president, and sworn in on May 29, 1999. His speeches are therefore well thought-out, imbued with political experience, and therefore very useful for the analysis of political language.

Two of Obasanjo's speeches have been selected for explication of the inclusion-exclusion paradigm. The first, the inclusive Text A, is Obasanjo's speech at Harvard University (U.S.A) in the year 2000 titled "Nigeria, Africa, and the World: A New Dawn". In the speech, President Obasanjo presents Africa's fears, problems, and woes, both as self-inflicted and as perpetrated by the colonial masters, first at the continental level and then from the Nigerian perspective, to a greatly non-African audience. Also, Obasanjo speaks as a president of Africa's most populous nation who is competent to hold brief for his fellow African leaders. Text B, the exclusive, is the transcribed speech of Obasanjo's declaration of a "State of Emergency" in Plateau State of Nigeria, in May 2004. In this Text, the Speaker invokes a particular aspect of the (1999) Nigerian Constitution, section 205, to suspend the state's Governor, Deputy Governor, and House of Assembly for six months, and to replace them all with an administrator (invested with the authority to administer the State, meanwhile).

Presidential speeches have been subjected to linguistic inquiries for some time now. This focus is probably due to the institutional voices which these speeches project: presidents are considered the "most eligible" representatives of their countries, whose words therefore bear the semantic load of their nation's ethos and soul.

The literature is replete with investigations of presidential rhetoric, often from not-too-clearly demarcated, heterogeneous perspectives. One way of categorising these works is according to their essential linguistic bases. In this direction, we have had linguistic enquiries of presidential speeches from the pragmatics standpoint (see Adetunji,2005; Ayodabo,2003; Cap,2002; Chilton and Schaffner,1997; Rudd,2004; Yusuf,2003 ),from the discourse-analytic angle of vision (see Miller,2004; Teittinen,2000), and from the stylistics position ( see Adegaju,2005; Oha,1994 ).Presidential speeches may also be delineated into thematic preoccupations. As such we have studies on inaugural address (Adetunji,2005; Cap,2002), address to Party Congress (Chilton and Schaffner,1997), positive projection of government's position for her people's endorsement (Miller,2004; Rudd,2004; Teittinen,2000), situated-
conflict rhetoric (Adegoju, 2005; Oha, 1994), and "negative other presentation" (Ayodabo, 2003; Yusuf, 2003).

Although, Obasanjo's speeches have been linguistically investigated, (See Yusuf, 2003, Adetunji, 2005) no study that this researcher knows about has yet inquired into the situation of deixis in his rhetoric. As such this study seeks to locate Obasanjo's deployment of indexicals in the two mutually-opposed paradigms of inclusion and exclusion. This, it is hoped, will direct attention to the overt and covert ways in which political leaders project themselves or/and their positions, persuade, coerce, and convince their audience to accept their judgements, and how they can reject and exempt themselves from actions which they consider disagreeable.

2. ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Deixis

Deixis belongs within the domain of pragmatics because it directly concerns the relationship between the structure of language and the contexts in which they are used.

(Levinson, 1983:55)

The quotation above is unambiguous locating deixis as an aspect of meaning in use in context. Also called "indexicals" or "indexical expressions", deictics (deixis' indicative elements) are linguistic pointers which orientate reference in an utterance to "the contextual coordinates of the utterance "(Mey, 2001:54). The situation of deixis therefore presupposes a speaker who provides meaning for an utterance, and expects the audience to interpret the utterance's meaning from the speaker's viewpoint.

Deictics are of three traditional categories; personal, spatial, temporal. According to Trask (1999:68), personal deictic "... allows distinctions among the speaker, the addressee, and everyone else". Odebunmi and Olaniyan (2005 :7) conceptualize this type of deictic, more succinctly:

- It is realised through personal pronouns in several contexts of use. The first person pronoun includes the speaker, the second person includes the addressee, but the third person excludes both the speaker and the addressee.

So such pronouns as I, we, you, he/she, it (referential, not pleonastic) and their variants (e.g. my, mine, your, their, its) are personal deictics. However, the references indicated by this type of indexicals may not be as obviously demarcated as they seem. From a particular angle, Thomas (1995:10) submits:

Even without any remove of time or place, it can be difficult to assign reference correctly to any utterance containing a third person pronoun (he, she, it, they) since these have an almost infinite number of possible referents.

Thus it is from the speaker's perspective or point of view that we would understand best the referents of the personal indexicals which the speaker employs. The speaker
is thus the deictic centre of an utterance. (Mey 2000, 2001; Odebunmi and Olaniyan, 2005), whose "properties" are contextually encoded and variably indicated (Kataoka, 2004).


The speakership, usually achieved by the first-person pronoun "I", is essentially multi-vocal . . . and is a reflection of multiple personae, diverting into (at least) several discursive stances realized as, for example, the animator (utterer), the author (composer), and/or the principal (responsible party) . . . as well as the hearership variably conceived of as, say, addressee, ratified hearer, by-stander, eavesdropper etc. . . .

As such, even "I" whose reference should be easily accessible, really shifts according to both the context of utterance and the speaker's intention. Rees (1983) developed a pronominal scaling which directed attention to the referential capability of political language:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccc}
0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 \\
I & ME & YOU & ONE & YOU & IT & SHE & HE & THEY & THESE & IT \\
\end{array}
\]

(Rees, 1983:16)

Starting from the deictic centre "I" to the distant other, "they", the scale shows the movement from the proximal to the distal in the use of pronominals for political referencing. Maitland (1988), while expanding Rees (1983), the generic conceptualisation of pronominal use, claiming that two individual speakers could, for different reasons, deploy different personal deictics for self-distancing:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccc}
0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 \\
A: & I & WE & YOU & ONE & YOU & HE & SHE & THEY & THESE & IT \\
& THOSE & \\
0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 & 9 & 10 \\
B: & I & WE & YOU & YOU & THEY & THOSE & SHE & HE & IT \\
& (Maitland, 1988:82).
\end{array}
\]

The distinction, between the two scales above, dependent on the speaker's perception of the use of personal indexicals, is captured by Wilson (1990:59):

. . . for example, if the speaker perceives 'those' as more negative than 'it', with 'those' associated with facelessness, and 'it' being treated as a 'neutral' term, then 'those' will be placed further away from 'I'. on the other hand, if ‘it’ is perceived as sub-human, with 'those' being perceived simply as not present, then, in this case, it may be placed further away from the 'I'.

As such, it is the speaker's intention and attitude to the topic of discussion and the context of discourse that condition his/her use of indexicals.
Spatial deictics, deictics of place, "do not mean much in isolation, it is only when you know where the speaker is standing or what the speaker is indicating that they become truly meaningful" (Thomas, 1995:9). These indexicals, indicated by demonstratives (e.g. this, those) and place adverbials (e.g. here, there) are used by the speaker to locate their referents either as being near/proximal (here, this) or far/distal (those, there). Many pragmaticians, including Braun (2001), Odebunmi (2001), and Yule (1996) have identified the ambiguous, sometimes indefinite referencing possibility of spatial deictics. Using the example of a message recorded into an answering machine, Yule (1996:12) convincingly submits that technology can allow the speaker to be meaningful in the seemingly incongruous utterance:

1. I am not here now
by means of what he calls, "dramatic performance to a future audience", thus projecting his/her presence in the required location. As such, meaning-making in the use of spatial deictics is both a physical and cognitive exercise.

Temporal indexicals concern the "when" of the utterance. The time of an utterance is reflected by the verb-tense (past present future) and adverbs of time (e.g. then, now). And so, deixis is divisible into three temporal categories of "past" (before the moment of utterance), "present" (at the moment of utterance) and "future" (after the moment of utterance). However, this neat, tristratal demarcation is more complex than it seems. Since it is at the moment of the utterance that we encounter it, temporal deictics are usually balanced against, and interpreted as, "present tensed locutions" (Smith, 1989). Smith (1989, 5-9) applying this principle, has identified historical time, future time and imaginary time. The historical time is the speaker's chronological point of reference, as in

2. It is May 29, 1999, Obasanjo is being sworn in as the president of Nigeria.
The future time refers to the time of the event, as in the tape-recording of the announcement of a future event, on a preceding day:

3. Yes, today is January 1, 2006, you are welcome to this programme.
The imaginary time conflates past and present events, especially through the flashback literary technique, where the past is given a presentness. From the foregoing, deictics are used for referential purposes in salient and relevant contexts. Garcia-Murga (1995:55) says:

. . . . salience and not mutual knowledge or givenness
is the crucial aspect the speaker considers when
he performs a referential act.
The speaker, situated in linguistic and extralinguistic contexts is thus the focal point of deixis. As Odebunmi and Olaniyan (2005:5) elaborate, the "reference of indexicals shifts with utterances, depending on the current user, and their referents are partly determined by extra-linguistic context . . ."

2.2 Deixis In Political Discourse
Studies in political language have investigated politicians' use of deictics for various purposes, ranging from personal to political, from persuasive to manipulative, all essentially dependent on both the context of production and the speaker's intentions.

Kuo (2001, 2002), and Wilson (1990) have explored the use of deixis for indexing political debates. Kuo (2001) and Kuo (2002), two sides of a coin, are situated in the televised debates of the 1998 Taipei mayoral elections: the one, an
analysis of the candidate's use of direct quotation for both self-promotion and the validation of opponents, the other an illustration of the deployment of the second-person plural, pronoun "níi" (you) by the three mayoral candidates for establishing solidarity with the audience or attacking opponents. Both of Kuo's studies reflect how deictics are put to referential, impersonal and other sundary uses for effecting linguistic interaction in political discourse. Wilson (1990) interprets the shifting status of "I" and "we", as deployed by Geraldford and Jimmy Carter, both participants in the United States presidential debates of 1976. He anchors a politician's shift of reference on self-positioning the desire to spread the load of responsibility, and the fear of being misinterpreted, by the audience or co-debater.

Inigo-Mora (2004) studies the strategic use of the first person plural pronoun "we" enacting personal identity and deictic five "Question Time sessions" of House of Commons (British Parliament), held between December, 1987 and April, 1988, she locates four distinctive types of "we" exclusive, generic and parliamentary a variation manipulated by the politician for engendering "approaching-distancing relationship" (p 49).

Lwaitama (1988), Maitland and Wilson (1987) and Urban (1986) have investigated the deictic content of public oratory. Lwaitama (1988), analysing the employment of "I" and "we" by Nyerere and Mwinyi (both former presidents of Tanzania), sights variations, occasioned by context and person. Differentiating between the scripted and unscripted speeches of both politicians, especially as they contain the various forms of "we", he posts that Nyerere used more exclusive, while Mwinyi used more inclusive forms in scripted than unscripted speeches, a distinction, he suggests, is, occasioned by both speakers' Kiswahili-speaking statues (Kiswahili is Mwinyi first language while it is Nyerere's second). Maitland and Wilson (1987) analyse the deployment of personal pronouns in the speeches of three British politicians Foot, Kinnock, and Thatcher for the purposes of "self-referencing, relations of contrast" and "other referencing". They discover obvious simila rites, in the use of these deictics, between Kinnock and Foot (both members of the labour party) and differences between Foot/Kinnock and Thatcher (a member of the Conservative Party). Urban (1986) delves into the deployment of the first person pronouns as variably distributed in selected speeches of Casper Weinberger, (former United States Defense Secretary). Focusing on the plural pronouns, he selects six forms of "we", as illustrations of how the speaker tries to persuade his audience into accepting the U.S government's position on the global danger posed by nuclear weapons acquisition (by other counties).

No work, none that this researcher is aware of has studied the deictic status of Nigerian political discourse. This work thus hopes to fill this gap and thereby direct the focus of pragmatics towards the rich research potentials of Nigerian political language.

Let us now dissect Obasanjo's speeches with the identified indexicals, first as inclusive, then as exclusive, markers, respectively.

3 INCLUSIVE DEIXIS IN TEXT A

Text A is a transcribed text of a presidential speech made at Harvard University in the year 2000. The speaker is Olusegun Obasanjo and his audience includes Nigerians, other Africans, and non-Africans.

The three kinds of personal deictics are put to good use. The first person pronouns, in their singular and plural forms, are used intermittently to convey their traditional singular and plural notions. The subjective "I" is used eight times, its
objective and possessive forms two times each, all referring to the speaker as the guest lecture, and as the leader of the Nigerian government. This is captured in the following extracts:

A1. *I am equally proud to note that a number of eminent academicians, scientists, administrators and businessmen have passed through this great institution.*

A2. *I am glad to share with you my thoughts on today's topic. I consider the theme.*

And the personal responsibility in the opinions the speaker is about to put forward is captured by the phrase "my thoughts" in A2.

The few singular indexicals however give way to the plural forms too soon. The deictics "we" and its variants "our" and "us" are deployed in myriad ways. There is a high incidence of these pronominal deictics ("we" is used fifty times, "our", eighteen times, "us", fourteen times) even though their referents are often not definite. However what is incontrovertible is the speaker-inclusive reference of this plural pronominal.

It is the 'royal 'we' "(Wilson, 1990; Miller 2004), which refers to the executive arm of the Obasanjo-led Nigerian government, that has the highest incidence. This is evidenced by the extracts below:

A3: *We have established a special panel, to investigate human right abuses by past regimes and individuals.*

A4: *In the case of Nigeria, we could choose to severely minimize our involvement, if not totally repudiate our responsibilities to actively participate in sub-regional, regional or even global affairs. We could declare a policy of fortress Nigeria . . . But we reject all these options, and choose instead to remain valid . . . Taking this latter course means, naturally, that we as a government must continue to live precariously . . .*

Also, the speaker feels confident and competent to speak on Nigerians' behalf and express their views. This is illustrated below:

A5: *It is not without reason, therefore that dictatorships such as we have experienced in Nigeria, tend to prefer state-controlled economies . . .*

A6: *Before now, it could be rightly said that we in Nigeria adopted democratic norms primarily because it was the fashionable thing to do . . . Today, we affirm democracy and its values because it is good for us, and not because the world demands it of us.*

Again, the speaker holds brief for Africans, being the president of Africa's most populous nation, he feels suitably qualified to represent the whole continent. This is explicated below:

A7: *Africans are generous of spirit and the extent to which we go to express our gratitude and hospitality could*
easily be mistaken for attempt to bribe . . .

A8: In any case, the struggle, of Africans for democratic empowerment has been consistent through the ages.
We feel confident that our young democracies . . . - we
are determined to move on from transition
to real transformation.

The other instances of the use of plural deictics are cases of ambiguity: situations when an indexical refers to more than one referent. Texts A9 and A10, are each capable of referring to both the government of Nigeria and the people called Nigerians.

A9: We have in Nigeria singled out corruption as the
greatest bane of our society.

A10: But why should the rest of the world be concerned
with our peculiar predicament?

Not dissimilarly, cases of multiple-indexing make the situation more complex. Let us consider the following extracts:

A11: On this, we may recall the old negritude admonition
of Leopold Sedar Senghor . . .

A12: As we all know, colonialism established its
stranglehold on a continent . . .

It is almost impossible for us to place our fingers on the intended referents represented by "we" in A11 and A12. These various forms of multiple-indexing fall under the scope of Miller's (2004) "dialogic contraction."

There are only three examples of the use of the second person pronominal deictic "you", all referring to the Harvard audience. This situation is represented below.

A13: I am glad for this opportunity to share with you . . .

The third person plural pronoun is also an ubiquitous deictic in the Text Realised as "they", them, and "their", these deictics are used to denote Africans, most commonly, in the Text (eleven out of twenty-eight). Let us see the variety in the following examples;

A14: African nationalists who led their nations into independence. . .

A15: The evil regimes were quick to learn that by proclaiming
ideological allegiance to either of the super-power
blocks, they would be guaranteed external military . . .

A16: While African democracies cannot afford to shut themselves out of
globalization, they must adopt strategies that give them leverage as
sovereign players.

While "their" in A14 refers unambiguously to African nationalists, "they" in A15 is a "dysphemistic" (Yusuf, 2003) replaceive of "evil regimes". And the deictic set "themselves," "they," and "them" in A15 stand for African democratic governments.

Although we have identified personal deictics as distinct units, there are instances when we encounter cross-deictic referencing, even within a single sentence;

A16: I will be speaking from my position as one of the
typical ordinary Africans who are genuinely anxious about the African condition today, because we are deeply concerned about the African condition today . . .

A17: This is the modest message I bring to you today. Let us all together work to build . . .

While in A16, "I" dissolves quickly into "we" to show the eagerness of the speaker to move from the position of authority to that of "common-man", the "I - you- we" continuum in A17 is an effort by the speaker to persuade the audience to cross-over to his ideological position.

The situation with temporal deictics also offers valid points for understanding these indexicals in political discourse. The speech is rendered basically in the present tense but for the occasional historical excursions and projections into the future, which privilege past tense verbs and modal auxiliaries, respectively. These two uncommon indexings are presented below, respectively too.

A18: African nationalists who led their nations into independence have confessed . . . Leadership of the nation-state felt like the captaincy of a ship . . . to achieve real nationhood, these African leaders needed . . .

A19: Our new democracies will need to design intervention programs . . . the right of youths to proper education, health care and employment will have to be . . .

Temporal adverbials are also used in this Text to situate the speech in its proper historical context. For a speech delivered in 2000, the end of twentieth, and the beginning of the twenty-first century, references cannot but be made to this significant point in history. The temporal indexing we encounter here refers backwards, forwards, and to the present severally with such adverbials as in the closing days of the 20th Century, in recent years, in the mid-seventies, Before now, at the end of the 20th century, in the outgoing century, now (used three times), today (used five times), in the new millenium.

The spatial deictics we encounter are few. They are basically "this" and its plural form, "these". "This" occurring eleven times refers variously to the topic of discussion, "recent development," democracy", "value". "These", mentioned five times replace "values", "governments", and "reasons".

Thus far, we have been able to locate deixis in Text A. Though, the indexicals have been used to different levels of intensity, they all situate the speaker in a collaborative communication with the audience. The speaker's positioning regarding the context and form of the discourse, is thus self-inclusive and audience-inclusive. As such the macro-textual interpretation of deictic use in Text A is "inclusion".

4 Deixis as Exclusive in Text B

The deictic situation in Text B is unlike what obtains in Text A the textual forms and contents of the two speeches are different. Text B is rendered by an angry President, who lacks a live audience and whose voice is probably of a military tenor (he was once a military Head of State, any way).

The most recurrent deictic is the first person singular pronoun "I " This is
understandable as the speaker is here giving personal opinions about the breakdown of law and order in a particular Nigerian State. As such, the fifteen instances of "I" are used by the speaker to indicate the extent to which he had advised and promoted repair work, before the present debacle. This is illustrated below:

**B1:** As I have advised all governors in their capacity as chief security officer of their States.

**B2:** I have had several meetings with political, religions and traditional rulers and leaders of thought. . . .

**B3:** I have done everything to bring lasting peace to Plateau State.

Beyond this description of personal efforts, the speaker's use of "I" confers sole responsibility and "almost oracular" (Chilton and Schaffner, 1997: 216) legitimation on the speaker's action. The authoritarian use of "I" is hinted at in Text B4 and comes to a climax in B5.

**B4:** I have painfully come to the point that I have to resort to the last constitutional option.

**B5:** I hereby declare a State of Emergency in Plateau State.

The first person singular subjective and possessive pronouns, variants of "I", "me" and "my" also refer undoubtedly to the speaker, in the two capacities of a person and a president.

Let us cite two obvious instances of this use of "my"

**B6:** Considering my constitutional responsibility as president of the Federal Republic of Nigeria . . .

**B7:** In my personal and official capacities . . .

The second person masculine singular pronoun "he", and its other forms "himself," "his", and "him" also take the centre stage in Text B. "He", occurring thirteen times, stands for the governor of Plateau State (whose face is saved by the speaker's decision not to mention his name specifically) but for one occasion. The "he" is adjudged guilty, by the "oracular" speaker, and so receives verbal bashing, severally, in the Text:

**B8:** At every point, the governor of Plateau State either made himself unavailable on the ground to take appropriate action to stem the tide of violence or when he was available he was simply incompetent to take action

**B9:** When crises broken out in his State, the governor made no effort to return home immediately, he was away for about two weeks.

The all-inclusive "we" has been deployed by the speaker to bring on to his side, the audience, in his ideological and power positioning. "We", and its variants, "our", "ours" and "us", therefore represent, what Adegoju (2005:140) defines as, "the coalescence of the voice of the person with the voice of the people". Let us see two cases:

**B10:** We have all made personal and collective sacrifice not just to enthrone peace . . . but also to consolidate our democracy...
... failure to put in place the necessary checks is what we are witnessing today in Plateau State ...

The third person plural pronoun, "they" and its allied forms, "them," "themselves" are used in Text B to refer to two major sets of people: the residents of Plateau State and other Governors. While the first field of reference is empathetically acknowledged by the speaker, the second receives only a neutral (or almost an implied Plateau-Governor's-irresponsible conspiratorial) mention. Examples B12 and B13 differentiate these positions:

B12: ... hundreds have been killed with much more wounded or displaced from their homes on account of their ethnic or religious identification.

B13: As I have advised all governors in their capacities as Chief Security officers of their States, they are held responsible for breaches of security in their respective States.

The speaker in Text B also appeals to universal legitimization and wisdom. This is explicated by the use of indefinite pronouns, such as "anybody", "anyone", "nobody", no one", "any people". In each instance in which these deictics are used, the speaker tries to justify his position as commonsensical:

B14: Nobody seems to be able to be neutral or impartial as you must either be tainted or drawn to one side ...

B15: Anyone who kills or instigates the killing of another human being except on established judicial judgment is a murderer ...

The deployment of personal deictics in Text B may be constructed into this simple schema:

Figure 1: Schema of the use of personal deictics in Text B

By this diagram is meant the speaker his audience are on the same deictic pedestal. While "I" stands for the "speaker", "we" represents both the speaker and the audience. The all-inclusive "we" has three outward relationships: supportive of the Nigerians who are suffering in Plateau State (them 1), neutral towards the other Governors, (them2) and against the Plateau Governor (him). Whenever a Governor behaves like the Plateau Governor (i.e the rectangle of "them2" touches that of "him") the "we" disapprove of his behaviour. But if the rectangle of them2 touches that of "them1", (i.e if a Governor hearkens to his responsibilities), "we" approve of him.

The temporal deictics we come across in Text B are basically of the temporal adverbial type. Such lexemes as "today", "since 2001", "in this year alone", "six-month period", "with immediate effect", today" "11th of May, " function variously but essentially to put the Plateau State Governor in bad light and explicate why the speaker disapproves of him and his ways. The tense of Text B, just as is found in most political discourse is present, whether in its progressive or perfective forms. But references to the past, as a justification for the present is couched in past tense verbs. Let us see this verbal variation.
B16: What has because clear is that the constituted authority in Plateau State is incapable of maintaining law an order . . .

B17: . . . I took it upon my self to visit . . .
B18: . . . it was not until Tuesday, the 11th of May that . . .
B19: It was not until Tuesday, the 11th of May that at my prompting, he informed me that he was calling a security committee meeting

Also, instances of reference to a future courses of action are captured by the modal verbs. As example utterances B 20 and B 21 explicate, these modal auxiliaries are used by the speaker to project into the future of the action he has just taken (in the declaration of the state of Emergency).

B20: It is hoped that the administrator will not need new laws . . .
B21: It is my hope and prayer that this six-month period will be used

The only spatial deictic of interest; is the proximal "this". Used severally to describe "situation", "violence" (the unfortunate situation warranting the Presidential hammer), "declaration", "decision" the pronouncement being made), and "period", "six-month period" (the expected duration of the action being taken), this "subjective deictic" (Mey, 2000:184) places the speaker in the thick of the action as a prime mover of the situation in Text B.

5 FINDINGS & CONCLUSION

Thus far, we have been investigating the functions of deixis in political discourse, from the perspective of two of Obasanjo's speeches. Findings reveal that two speeches, even by the same speaker are scarcely similar.

In Text A, the deictic centre is nearer the plural "we" than the usual, singular "I". This reflects the all-embracing content and context of the speech, which is given away by the rapport-inviting opening sequence, "Distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen". As such "we", the commonest personal deictic in the speech, has been deliberately employed by the speaker to convince and probably manipulate the audience to reason like him and help him in sharing the load of responsibility. In Text B, the deictic "I" preponderates, essentially because the speaker speaks from a personal point of view, verbalising a particular conviction whose general (the populace, its "royal" arm) acceptability we may not be sure of. His occasional use of "we" is sheerly an appeal to "ideological common sense" (Fairclough, 1989:88), a subtle conscription suggested by the speech's opening salutation "Fellow Nigerians "(a formulaic introduction made popular by Nigerian military coup announcers for public acceptance (Adegbija, 1995:Adetunji, 2005))

The temporal sequence of the deictic configuration in Texts A and B are similar, We encounter a plethora of adverbial time markers which situate the actions, positions, and situations being described in their proper time frames. The tenses are cast in present and past modes while modal auxiliaries are used to exemplify future references. In Text B, the speaker gives the history of the action he is about to take, especially the Governor's "irresponsible" acts and the speaker's rebuffed initiatives, makes his declaration (after a long moment of suspense) and hopes for the future.

Spatializers are in little quantity in the speeches studied. This is probably due to the fact that political discourse is basically interactive and dialogic. Spatial indexicals are most frequently used however for self-exclusive purposes, as
represented by the singular ("he", "she") and the plural ("they", "them", "themselves")

By and large, we have been able to establish politics as a discursive domain,
an altercation between the governor and the governed, the leader and the led.
Sometimes, this discourse is a friendly collaboration as in Text A. At other times it is
a remonstration, a "verbal flogging, as shown by Text B. But in both cases, the
communication is not ambiguous, thanks to the functional use of personal, temporal,
and spatial indexicals.

In sum, there is an essential difference between the situations of deixis in
Texts A and B. While the speaker in Text A seeks an acceptance from and a
collaboration with the audience, the speaker rejects the ways of and vilifies the
referred "he", in Text B. Text A is thus speaker-inclusive, a macro-text of "inclusion".
And because the speaker in Text B finds fault with the person he describes, by means
of what scholars have variously conceptualized as "discrediting facts" (Adegbija,
1995), "delegitimization (Chilton and Schaffner, 1997), "negative other presentation"
(van Dijk, 1997), and "dysphemisms"(Yusuf, 2003), Text B presents a self-exclusive
speaker. Text B is, as such, a macro-text of "exclusion".
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