

Handbook of Pragmatics Highlights

8

Discursive Pragmatics

Edited by Jan Zienkowski,
Jan-Ola Östman
and Jef Verschueren

John Benjamins Publishing Company

Handbook of Pragmatics Highlights (HoPH)

The ten volumes of *Handbook of Pragmatics Highlights* focus on the most salient topics in the field of pragmatics, thus dividing its wide interdisciplinary spectrum in a transparent and manageable way. Each volume starts with an up-to-date overview of its field of interest and brings together some 12–20 entries on its most pertinent aspects.

Since 1995 the *Handbook of Pragmatics (HoP)* and the *HoP Online* (in conjunction with the *Bibliography of Pragmatics Online*) have provided continuously updated state-of-the-art information for students and researchers interested in the science of language in use. Their value as a basic reference tool is now enhanced with the publication of a topically organized series of paperbacks presenting *HoP Highlights*.

Whether your interests are predominantly philosophical, cognitive, grammatical, social, cultural, variational, interactional, or discursive, the *HoP Highlights* volumes make sure you always have the most relevant encyclopedic articles at your fingertips.

For an overview of all books published in this series, please see <http://benjamins.com/catalog/hoph>

Editors

Jef Verschueren
University of Antwerp

Jan-Ola Östman
University of Helsinki

Volume 8

Discursive Pragmatics

Edited by Jan Zienkowski, Jan-Ola Östman and Jef Verschueren

Discursive Pragmatics

Edited by

Jan Zienkowski
University of Antwerp

Jan-Ola Östman
University of Helsinki

Jef Verschueren
University of Antwerp

John Benjamins Publishing Company
Amsterdam / Philadelphia



The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences - Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Discursive pragmatics / edited by Jan Zienkowski, Jan-Ola Östman, Jef Verschueren.
p. cm. (Handbook of Pragmatics Highlights, ISSN 1877-654X ; v. 8)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Discourse analysis. 2. Pragmatics. 3. Semantics. I. Zienkowski, Jan. II. Östman, Jan-Ola. III. Verschueren, Jef.

P302.D569 2011

401'.45--dc22

2011012728

ISBN 978 90 272 0785 2 (Pb ; alk. paper)

ISBN 978 90 272 8915 5 (Eb)

© 2011 - John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

John Benjamins Publishing Co. · P.O. Box 36224 · 1020 ME Amsterdam · The Netherlands
John Benjamins North America · P.O. Box 27519 · Philadelphia PA 19118-0519 · USA

Table of contents

Preface to the series	XIII
Acknowledgements	XV
Discursive pragmatics: A platform for the pragmatic study of discourse <i>Jan Zienkowski</i>	1
Appraisal <i>Peter R.R. White</i>	14
1. Introduction	14
2. Overview	16
2.1 Attitude - the activation of positive or negative positioning	16
2.1.1 Affect	16
2.1.2 Judgement	16
2.1.3 Appreciation	17
2.1.4 Modes of activation - direct and implied	17
2.1.5 Typological criteria	18
2.1.6 The interplay between the attitudinal modes	19
2.2 Intersubjective stance	20
3. Attitudinal assessment - a brief outline	21
3.1 Affect	21
3.2 Judgement	22
3.3 Appreciation	25
4. Engagement: An overview	27
4.1 Dialogic contraction and expansion	28
4.2 Further resources of dialogic expansion	29
4.2.1 Acknowledge	30
4.2.2 Entertain	30
4.3 Further resources of dialogic contraction	30
4.3.1 Pronounce	30
4.3.2 Concur	31
4.3.3 Disclaim (Deny and Counter)	31

- 4.3.4 Disclaim: Deny (negation) 31
- 4.3.5 Disclaim: Counter 32
- 4.4 Engagement resources – summary 33
- 5. Conclusion 33

Cohesion and coherence

37

Wolfram Bublitz

- 1. Introduction 37
- 2. Focus on form: Cohesion 38
- 3. Cohesion as a condition for coherence 40
- 4. Focus on meaning: Connectivity 42
- 5. Semantic connectivity as a condition for coherence 43
- 6. Coherence: A general view 44
- 7. A hermeneutic, context and interpretation based view of coherence 45
- 8. Coherence as a default assumption 47
- 9. Perspectives 47

Critical Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis

50

Ruth Wodak

- 1. Definitions 50
- 2. Historical note 53
- 3. Principles of CL 53
- 4. Trends 55
 - 4.1 Social Semiotics 55
 - 4.2 'Orders of discourse' and Foucauldian poststructuralism 58
 - 4.3 The socio-cognitive model 60
 - 4.4 Discourse-Historical approach 61
 - 4.5 Lexicometry 62
 - 4.6 "Lesarten" approach 64
- 5. Conclusion 65

Énonciation: French pragmatic approach(es)

71

Marjut Johansson & Eija Suomela-Salmi

- 1. Introduction 71
- 2. Historical overview – from the pre-theoretical to the present phase 72
 - 2.1 Origins and the pre-theoretical phase 72
 - 2.2 First phase: Forerunners 74
 - 2.2.1 Charles Bally (1865–1947) 74
 - 2.2.2 Gustave Guillaume (1883–1960) 78
 - 2.3 Second phase: Main theoretical foundation 80
 - 2.3.1 Emile Benveniste (1902–1976) 81

- 2.4 Third phase: Modern developments 85
 - 2.4.1 Antoine Culioli (born in 1924) 85
 - 2.4.2 Oswald Ducrot (born in 1930) 88
 - 2.4.3 Jacqueline Authier-Revuz (born in 1940) 90

3. Some basic notions 92

- 3.1 Enunciation and enunciator 92
- 3.2 Situation/Context 93
- 3.3 Subjectivity and deixis 93
- 3.4 Reported speech 94
- 3.5 Modality and modalization 95
- 3.6 Modalities of enunciation (modalités d'énonciation) 96
- 3.7 Utterance modalities (modalités d'énoncé) 97

Figures of Speech

102

Manfred Kienpointner

- 1. Introduction 102
- 2. Ancient rhetoric 102
- 3. Contemporary treatments of FSP 104
 - 3.1 Definition of FSP 104
 - 3.2 Classification of FSP 108
- 4. Across the lines of discipline: The cognitive and communicative role of FSP 111

Genre

119

Anna Solin

- 1. Introduction 119
- 2. Historical precedents 120
- 3. Genre research in language studies 121
 - 3.1 Sydney School 121
 - 3.2 New Rhetoric 123
 - 3.3 English for Specific Purposes 125
- 4. Issues and debates 127
 - 4.1 Genre as class 127
 - 4.2 Stability of genres 129

Humor

135

Salvatore Attardo

- 1. Introduction and definition 135
- 2. Referential and verbal humor 135

3. Semantics 136
 - 3.1 The isotopy-disjunction model 136
 - 3.2 The script-based semantic theory of humor 137
 - 3.3 'Longer' texts 138
4. The cooperative principle and humor 138
 - 4.1 Grice and Gricean analyses 138
 - 4.2 Humor as non-bona-fide communication 138
 - 4.3 Relevance-theoretic approaches to humor 139
 - 4.4 Informativeness approach to jokes 141
 - 4.5 Two-stage processing of humor 142
5. Conversation analysis 143
 - 5.1 Canned jokes in conversation 143
 - 5.1.1 Preface 143
 - 5.1.2 Telling 143
 - 5.1.3 Response 144
 - 5.2 Conversational humor 144
 - 5.2.1 Functional conversational analyses 144
 - 5.2.2 Quantitative conversational analyses 145
6. Sociolinguistics of humor 147
 - 6.1 Gender differences 147
 - 6.2 Ethnicity and humor 148
7. Computational humor 148
8. Cognitive linguistics and humor 149
9. Conclusion 149

Intertextuality

Stef Slembrouck

1. From 'literature' to 'text as a productivity which inserts itself into history' 156
2. Text linguistics on 'textuality' 157
3. Dialogism and heteroglossia in a social-diachronic theory of discourse 158
4. Vološinov, pragmatics and conversation analysis: Sequential implicativeness and the translation of the other's perspective 162
5. Synoptic and participatory views of human activity: Bakhtin, Bourdieu, sociolinguistic legitimacy (and the body) 165
6. Natural histories of discourse: Recontextualization/entextualization and textual ideologies 170

156

Manipulation

Paul Chilton

1. The ancient technique of rhetoric 176
2. The twentieth-century nightmare of 'thought control' 177
3. Manipulation is not inherent in language structure 179
4. So let's look at thought and social action 181
 - 4.1 Drumming it in 181
 - 4.2 Ideas that spread 182
5. What might override the cheat-checker? 184
6. Conclusion: Manipulation and counter-manipulation 186

Narrative

Alexandra Georgakopoulou

1. Narrative as a mode of communication 190
2. Referential properties 192
3. Textual properties 193
 - 3.1 Narrative organization 193
 - 3.2 Narrative evaluation 196
4. Contextual properties 200

Polyphony

Eddy Roulet

1. Preliminaries 208
2. Polyphony in Bakhtin's work 208
3. Polyphony in Ducrot's work 212
4. The description of the polyphonic organization of discourse 215
5. The interrelations between polyphony and other dimensions of discourse structures 218
6. Conclusion 221

Pragmatic markers

Karin Aijmer & Anne-Marie Simon-Vandenberghe

1. The tradition and the present state of research on pragmatic markers 223
2. Defining the field 224
3. The terminology: Pragmatic marker or discourse marker? 226

176

190

208

223

4. Classification 227
5. Pragmatic markers and multifunctionality 228
6. Theoretical approaches to the study of pragmatic markers 229
7. Methodology 231
8. Pragmatic markers in the languages of the world 232
9. The diachronic study of pragmatic markers 234
10. The contrastive study of pragmatic markers 234
11. Pragmatic markers in translation studies 236
12. Pragmatic markers in native versus non-native speaker communication 236
13. Pragmatic markers and sociolinguistic aspects 237
14. Pragmatic markers and the future 238

Public discourse

248

Srikant Sarangi

1. Introduction 248
 - 1.1 Multiple readings of 'publicness' 249
2. The situation-talk dialectic: 'public' as a feature of setting vs. 'public' as a feature of talk 250
 - 2.1 (Socio)linguistic markers of public discourse 250
 - 2.2 Interaction-based approach 251
3. Goffman and the public order 252
4. Habermas and the public sphere 253
5. Transformation of the public sphere: Public discourse as mediated communication 256
 - 5.1 The state's role in the conflation of public and private discourses in contemporary societies 258
 - 5.2 Surveillance and control: Information exchange as a site of struggle 259
6. Pragmatic theories of information exchange and the public sphere: Towards a social pragmatics 260

Text and discourse linguistics

266

Jan-Ola Östman & Tuija Virtanen

1. On terminology 266
2. Historical overview 267
3. Important fields of study 269
 - 3.1 Information structure 269
 - 3.2 Cohesion 270
 - 3.3 Coherence 271

3.4 Grounding 273

3.5 Discourse types and genres 274

4. Other trends 276
5. Applications 279
 - 5.1 Practical applications 280
 - 5.2 Acquisitional and diachronic studies 280
6. Final remarks 281

Text linguistics

286

Robert de Beaugrande

1. The rise of text linguistics 286
2. Some central issues 294

Index

297

Discursive pragmatics

A platform for the pragmatic study of discourse

Jan Zienkowski

University of Antwerp

Most introductions to the interdisciplinary fields of discourse analysis and linguistic pragmatics begin by emphasizing that there is no consensus on the meaning of these terms. Neither discourse nor pragmatics are straightforward concepts and it may be correct to suggest that only the most vague and the most general definitions are able to unite the variety of disciplines, researchers, research programmes, heuristics, methodologies, objects of investigation, and terminologies lumped together under these headings. A book title such as 'discursive pragmatics' might therefore be interpreted as an oxymoron consisting of two signifiers whose referents are diverse in both quantitative and qualitative senses of the term. In this sense, the usefulness – i.e. the pragmatic value – of the label discursive pragmatics may be called into question. Yet, I will argue that this notion holds great potential as an instrument for establishing a platform for inter-disciplinary and inter-theoretical cross-fertilization. In this sense, the usefulness of the term resides in its communicative potential for researchers who tend to view their activities as either pragmatic or discursive ways of approaching empirical language use.

Many of the topics, themes, theories and perspectives discussed in this volume would also fit in publications related to rhetoric, cognitive linguistics, semantics, studies on language acquisition, sociolinguistics, communication studies, philosophy, literature, and many other (inter)disciplinary fields. But whatever their focus, all of the contributions collected in this volume contribute in one way or another to the linguistic or discursive turns that have taken place throughout the humanities and social sciences since the second half of the twentieth century. Moreover, they are all products of an increasing pre-occupation with pragmatic concerns related to functional and communicative language use conceived in terms of interactional processes and context generation. This point of convergence has generated an ever-growing number of eclectic studies of real-life discourse(s) described in terms of empirically observable language use. Such discourses may be defined in terms of topic (such as racism, ecology, doctor/patient interaction), genre (such as literature, scientific publications, newspaper articles), or function (such as narrative, manipulative, rhetorical), depending on the researcher's main interests.

In this introduction, I will trace the pragmatic features of the perspectives and approaches to discourse as presented by the various contributors to this book. However, this collective volume is far from exhaustive. I will argue that approaches to discourse such as those presented under the headings of post-structuralist discourse analysis, discursive psychology, or conversation analysis would also belong here. In some cases, there were good reasons to deal with them in one of the other volumes of the *Handbook of Pragmatics Highlights* series. In other cases, they represent gaps to be filled in future updates of the *Handbook*. This introduction does not explore the various potential areas of application of discursive pragmatics.

In their article on *Text and discourse linguistics*, Jan-Ola Östman and Tuija Virtanen point out that "differentiating between discourse analysis, text linguistics, pragmatics, semiotics, and even linguistics has become a field of inquiry in itself". Neither their article nor this volume is intended to present an overview of this meta-field. Recognizing that the term discourse analysis is used in a rather restricted sense by some scholars, they advocate a perspective in which the notion functions as "an umbrella term for all issues that have been dealt with in the linguistic study of text and discourse". With respect to the relationship between pragmatics and discourse studies, they note that a discussion has emerged around the question as to which notion is more general. Even though they prefer to think of pragmatics as the more general term, they emphasize that it is more productive to consider the debate as a matter of perspectives: "Discourse and pragmatics have the same fields of interest, but different aspects in focus. Thus, discourse will typically require larger stretches of text or conversation, whereas for pragmatics this is not necessarily the case".

Such a perspective view is also relevant with respect to other approaches contained in this volume. For instance, *Critical linguistics and critical discourse studies* as discussed by Ruth Wodak can easily be viewed as constituting a perspective as well. Wodak conflates CL and CDA on pragmatic grounds and goes on to characterize "CDA basically as a research program" instead of a theory or a methodology. For her, CDA is first and foremost an approach the specificity of which can be defined in terms of a "concern with power as a central condition in social life that may be indexed in language use". But ultimately, CDA is considered to be an "approach" characterised by interdisciplinary and problem-oriented principles. In the same sense, it is open to a multiplicity of theories, methodologies, and objects of investigation.

Interestingly, in his article on *Text linguistics*, Robert de Beaugrande describes the development of this approach in terms of three historical stages. He points out how text linguistics was initially an attempt to extend grammatical principles to texts and how from the seventies on this approach became increasingly preoccupied with textuality as a structure with both linguistic and social aspects. The most recent stage witnessed an increasing focus on textualization processes in the actual production and reception of texts. He goes on to suggest that these developments allow for a pragmatics which includes "a 'critical' view of communication as an ongoing interaction

whereby the significance of a situation (real or hypothetical) is being negotiated, speaking turns are assigned and relations of power or solidarity are enacted". The convergences with (critical) discourse analysis and pragmatics become even more obvious when he points out that "today, the 'text' is widely defined as an empirical communicative event given through human communication rather than specified by a formal theory".

At first sight, the contributions that go under the headers *Text and discourse linguistics*, *Critical discourse analysis and critical linguistics*, and *Text linguistics* seem to situate themselves at a higher level of abstraction than the contributions that focus on particular aspects of discourse such as the French notion of *Énonciation*, the principles of *Polyphony*, *Intertextuality*, *Cohesion and coherence*, the concepts of *Appraisal*, *Public discourse*, *Pragmatic markers*, *Genre*, *Figures of speech*, or notions such as *Narrative*, *Manipulation*, or *Humor*. However, if one takes a closer look, it becomes clear that these labels do not merely designate an object of investigation for discursive pragmatic approaches to language. Rather, researchers trained in a variety of disciplines deploy them as principles structuring our language use at various levels of abstraction. As such, they also provide perspectives or points of view from which phenomena related to language use can be approached.

The linguistic or discursive turn in the social sciences and in the humanities in general is not merely a turn towards new objects of investigation that had been previously neglected. Rather, it is a turn which implies a change in perspective – foregrounding and backgrounding both new and old phenomena for empirical research with a linguistically inspired toolbox at hand. This process was often realized by means of a double movement whereby concepts were decontextualized from their normal use and metaphorically applied to new areas of investigation. This is definitely the case with notions such as *Narrative*, *Énonciation*, *Polyphony*, *Intertextuality*, *Cohesion and Coherence*.

Marjut Johansson and Eija Suomela-Salmi explicitly describe French enunciation theory or enunciative linguistics as a set of "several different diversified approaches to pragmatic questions". These questions are not merely linguistic but are relevant to the issue of subject formation as well. In spite of its diversity, it is possible to identify three stages in the development of enunciative pragmatics which culminate in Benveniste's statement that "nothing is in language that has not been before in discourse". This quote bears witness to the struggle of pragmatically oriented authors to emancipate themselves with respect to dominant perspectives on language which tended to focus on the formal rules and structures that supposedly work at a deeper level of semiotic organization than individualized utterances, *parôles*, or *énoncés*. Ultimately, French pragmaticians do not merely study individual *énoncés* and their indexical functions in relation to the *I* or to other aspects of contextual reality. Rather, they arrived at a view of the human subject as a subject split by the discourse it produces. This view was most clearly expressed in Ducrot's work by means of his integration of Bakhtinian dialogism and French enunciation theory. Johansson and Eija point out that Jacqueline

Authier-Revuz voiced similar points of view underscored by an integration of Lacanian psycho-analysis into the theoretical mixture. Interestingly but not surprisingly, some of the concepts central to French linguistic pragmatics proved to be important to the Anglo-American strands as well: this goes for notions such as deixis, context, reported speech and modality.

Enunciation moved from being strictly an empirical object of investigation towards a perspective in which even the subject should be seen as an effect of discourse understood as a set of enunciations. A similar movement may be observed in the interconnected theories of *Polyphony* discussed by Eddy Roulet and *Intertextuality* discussed by Stef Slembrouck. To Bakhtin, the notion of polyphony is just one type of dialogism – an instance of multi-voiced discourse. It does not refer to an actual dialogue between two speakers but rather to the fact that even monological texts incorporate and articulate a multiplicity of voices through various linguistic forms and processes. Whereas Bakhtin illustrates his point first and foremost with forms of reported speech, Ducrot extends the dialogic and polyphonic principles to French linguistics in general. He investigates how polyphony is realized by means of a variety of linguistic forms and pragmatic processes including irony, negation, negative polarity, discourse markers, and presuppositions. Polyphony is therefore one of the metaphors that allow for a perspective on discourse in which the unity of the speaking subject is challenged without falling into the trap of removing all of its agency in the process.

Slembrouck points out that it is possible to consider intertextuality as a matter of those factors which make the utilization of one text dependent upon knowledge of one or more previously encountered texts. In this sense, intertextuality is a phenomenon or a function of discourse which finds itself at the same level of abstraction as cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity and situationality. Intertextuality is then an object of investigation rather than a principle constitutive of a perspective on (discursive) reality. Such is the view of most text linguistic approaches. A broader notion of intertextuality is to be found in the writings of Kristeva and Bakhtin whose works have been rediscovered by one of the main voices in the field of critical discourse analysis – Norman Fairclough. Here intertextuality gains the status of a perspective on language use. As Slembrouck points out, the Bakhtinian/Kristevian notion of intertextuality is broader than the text linguistic one. In addition to the manifest type of intertextuality which is a shared point of interest with text linguistics, Fairclough's notion of intertextuality is a constitutive one. In a Foucaultian argument, Fairclough claims that intertextual analysis draws our attention to: the orders of discourse that consist of configurations of conventionalised practices at the disposal of producers and consumers of texts; to the way texts depend upon society and history; and to the way texts transform social and historical resources. Put differently, intertextuality becomes a metaphor constitutive of a perspective on social relations and historical development in general. As Slembrouck points out, this is the main reason why the notion of

intertextuality can be linked to the concepts of hegemony, polyphony and heteroglossia in critical discourse analysis. However, one may ask in what sense we are dealing with a pragmatic mode of investigation when the notion of intertextuality is taken to such abstract heights. Slembrouck argues that teasing out the various dimensions of intertextuality – both its manifest linguistic forms and its constitutive senses – allows us “to take the dialogic beyond the boundedness of recognized domains of language study”. Slembrouck goes on to draw out the implications of this view on intertextuality and concludes by shedding a rather pragmatic light on the issue. Arguing that recent work on (re)contextualization and (en)contextualization processes in language essentially deals with the same phenomena as the issues discussed in Kristeva's original article on intertextuality, he claims that “(inter)text is a contextually grounded process” whereby “publicly recognized textualities count as by-products of situated practice and cannot be divorced from language ideologies”. Moreover, “intertextuality is about how history is inscribed into situated practice”. The pragmatic dimension of CDA thus resides in its intersubjective stance, in its emphasis on the importance of socio-political and textual context, and in the emphasis on the process-based nature of discourse.

Like CDA, the study of discourse as performed within the framework of *Appraisal* theory is informed by the principles of SFL (Systemic Functional Linguistics) as proposed by Halliday. It is a decidedly functional perspective on language use in the sense that it holds that “linguistic phenomena can best be explained by reference to the social functions performed by language” and “by reference to the functional demands placed upon language by its users”. In contrast to the approaches to discourse we have encountered thus far, the appraisal framework is rather typological. It categorizes the various functions that a variety of linguistic forms such as adjectives, nouns, adverbs or verbs may perform. Also, it has not engaged with social and political theory to the same extent as critical discourse analysis, even though both perspectives are informed by Bakhtinian insights and SFL principles. On the other hand, appraisal does deal with the social function of texts in the sense that it is concerned with the “systematic analysis of evaluation and stance as they operate in whole texts and in groupings of texts. It is concerned with the social function of these resources, not simply as the means by which individual speakers/writers express their feelings and take stands, but as the means by which they engage with socially-determined value positions and thereby align and disalign themselves with the social subjects who hold these positions”. White argues that the appraisal perspective is pragmatic in the sense that it recognizes that some evaluations are not marked explicitly in a text. In such cases, one has to take recourse to aspects of context in order to understand the evaluative dimension of a text. This view of context is definitely not the most radical one in the landscape of linguistic pragmatics. On the other hand, there is a clear pre-occupation with pragmatic concerns: the functions of actual language use, the role of context and form with respect to the realization of these functions; and an emphasis on evaluation as an ongoing and intersubjective process.

The article on *Public discourse* by Srikant Sarangi is not merely about public texts in the sense of a genre or a set of discursive genres in a reified public sphere. Rather, it is about publicness defined in terms of "social processes of talk and text in the public domain which have institutionally ratified consequences". Moreover, discourse is taken to mean "a stretch of talk or text (including semiotic icons) as well as a form of knowledge and the social processes of production and consumption of such knowledge in the Foucauldian sense". After presenting three dichotomies (private/public; expert/lay knowledge; microcosmic/macroc cosmic) that structure dominant understandings of the notion of publicness, he moves on to consider various sociolinguistic and interaction-based approaches to public discourse. In addition to work in conversation analysis and rhetorics, he explores Goffman's interactional concept of the public order. On the other hand, Sarangi contrasts these approaches with Habermas' philosophical and normative perspective on the public sphere. He describes pragmatics as a concern with "meaning-making against a set of parameters such as power, status, rights and obligations" and claims that as such, "various pragmatic theories of human communication can be reassessed to account for public discourse". To Sarangi, both pragmatic theories and theories of the public sphere are ultimately concerned with information exchange. More specifically, he points out that "information exchange lies at the heart of the three most dominant models of pragmatic inquiry: the cooperative principle and conventional/conversational implicatures, face wants and positive/negative politeness strategies, and principles of relevance and message processing". Sarangi argues that these theories can be extended to theories of the public domain as a domain in which concerns related to information exchange are intertwined with issues related to role-relationships, identity construction, strategic goal imposition and so on. He claims that this would allow for a research programme that "will blend well with the Habermasian characterisation of public discourse as systematically distorted communication, without subscribing to his universal pragmatics model".

Public discourse is often described as a particular genre of discourse. However, discursive pragmatic approaches to discourse have problematized the notion of genre itself. Anna Solin points out that the notion is traditionally associated with "the idea that texts (and other cultural products) can be grouped into types or classes according to formal and/or functional similarities". However, Solin points out that it is also possible to consider genre "not merely as forms, but as social and symbolic action". In her overview of genre studies, she discusses three contemporary approaches to genre research. The first one is the Sydney school which is based on SFL principles. It inherits the SFL preference for functionalist typologies and defines genres as "stage goal-oriented social processes". The specific identity of a genre is defined by recourse to text-internal linguistic criteria. There are strong affinities with text linguistics. At the same time the Sydney approach is both pedagogical and political in the sense that its researchers assumed that it was possible to teach a number of key genres to social groups with less

extensive discursive resources in particular societies (e.g. migrants and working class students). A more thorough familiarity with key genres was supposed to help them in their emancipation processes. The Sydney approach was therefore decidedly pragmatic in its functional emphasis and in its goals with respect to increasing people's language awareness with respect to genre conventions. The New Rhetoric approach is even more pragmatic. Following Bakhtin, genres are perceived as "intertextually related to other genres". Moreover, they are defined as particular types of social action: "a rhetorically sound definition of genre must be centred not on the substance or the form of discourse but on the action it is used to accomplish. At first sight, this does not go against the idea of an SFL goal-oriented attitude to genre. However, within New Rhetoric, social actions always take place within particular communities. Consequently, genres can only be investigated and taught if one ethnographically understands the communal and institutional contexts in which they are deployed. Within this perspective, genre education on the basis of formal linguistic principles only is an absurdity: "if genres are responses to contexts, can they be learned at all out of context?". Drawing on the ethnographic insights of New Rhetoric and on the text linguistics of the Sydney school, English for Specific Purposes is characterized by its pedagogical agenda: "to assist non-native English speakers in mastering academic and professional genres". It defines genres as sets of intersubjective and goal-oriented functions or as communicative actions. As such, we are dealing with a pragmatic perspective.

Throughout her discussion of *Narrative*, Alexandra Georgakopoulou describes how "the reification of narrative has nonetheless increasingly been shied away from, as attention has shifted from narrative as text to narrative as social practice". She describes how studies move towards viewing narrative as "a process of the participants' joint construction, negotiation and contestation of alternative interpretative viewpoints on the events related as well as on the local relevance of the storytelling activity itself". Interestingly, narrative – as a perspective – is also engaging with the principle of subjectivity. Here, it is not so much French pragmatics which serves as a source of inspiration for the exploration of the metaphorical split subject, but Goffman's notion of footing and his corresponding view on the self.

The shift towards a pragmatic and functional consideration of discourse in terms of (inter)subjective social action and processes, is one of the factors contributing to the success of the linguistic turn across the disciplines. In this sense, I do not think of pragmatics as the study of a limited set of phenomena such as speech acts or the establishment of cohesion or coherence. Rather, linguistic pragmatics is a perspective on and a going concern with language use. Pragmatics-oriented researchers investigate empirical data of language-related actions and processes without losing sight of the various contextual layers that play a role in these actions and processes. Pragmatic interpretations of abstract concepts such as narrative, dialogue or genre thus allow for the empirical analysis of large-scale processes which leave material traces at the

micro-level of language. Put differently, they allow for a de-reification of the things we consider discourse to be.

In his article on *Cohesion and coherence*, Wolfram Bublitz points out that both notions refer to meaning and bear on relations of connectedness which may or may not be linguistically encoded. Whereas cohesion refers to "*inter-sentential semantic relations which link current items with preceding or following ones by lexical and structural means*", coherence is a cognitive category depending on the language user's interpretation. Bublitz provides an overview of research on the relationship between cohesion and coherence and arrives at a pragmatics-oriented perspective. He considers the establishment of coherence as an interactive achievement resulting from negotiations within specific socio-cultural settings. As such, coherence becomes a "*context dependent, user oriented and comprehension based notion*". Moreover, "*it is not texts that cohere but rather people who make texts cohere*". On the other hand, speakers and writers can use linguistic cohesive tools to help create coherence and the associated gestalts. Once again, we are faced with a pragmatic perspective on discourse.

Interestingly, the article of Karin Aijmer and Ann-Marie Simon-Vandenberg points out that *Pragmatic markers* illustrates how pragmatic perspectives do not necessarily originate from macro-discursive concepts such as dialogue, narrative or intertextuality. On the contrary, the notion of pragmatic markers is connected to a whole range of associated concepts among which the notion of indexicality. As Aijmer and Simon-Vandenberg point out, the main function of pragmatic markers is indexical. They point us to features of context we need to take into account in order to connect discourse with relevant aspects of context. Context involves ideational relations between ideas and propositions, relations with respect to how speech acts relate to preceding, following or intended actions, linguistic exchanges or turns, information, and social relations between participants in discourse. Pragmatic markers index elements which are less concrete than more prototypical deictic elements such as pronouns, temporal or spatial expressions. But the pragmatic potential of discourse markers or particles also resides in their reflexivity: "*they comment on the utterance and thus assist in the interpretation of that utterance*". Aijmer and Simon-Vandenberg point out that pragmatic markers perform a meta-linguistic or meta-pragmatic role. Put differently, they assist in the (inter)subjective establishment of coherence. A theorization of meta-pragmatic markers is therefore not restricted to the study of a particular linguistic phenomenon but constitutes a perspective on the overall functioning of discourse. Aijmer and Simon-Vandenberg emphasize that pragmatic markers are diverse. Connectives, modal particles, adverbs, interjections, routines, feedback signals, vocatives, disjuncts, approximators, conjunctions, and reformulations may all perform a multiplicity of (meta)pragmatic functions. Moreover, they may be deployed in linguistic theories and discursive perspectives ranging from speech act theory, conversation analysis, discourse analysis, semantics, socio-linguistics and SFL. The types of texts in

which they are studied also vary greatly. However, regardless of the specific pragmatic perspective in which pragmatic markers are studied, they force the researcher to face questions with respect to pragmatic processes constitutive of (inter)subjectivity and functional context-generation.

Of course, there are many other linguistic phenomena that are investigated in the pragmatic study of discourse. Manfred Kienpointner's article on *Figures of speech* draws our attention to argumentative patterns and linguistic forms deployed in both ancient rhetoric and in the contemporary study of discourse. He argues for a perspective on figures of speech that differs from the ancient deviation view in which the so-called ornamental features of language – e.g. metaphor and metonymy – are considered to be deviations of a supposedly pure form of expression. Kienpointner states that "*FSP are not merely ornamental or aesthetic devices*" but "*inevitably shape our cognition and culture-specific views of reality*". Moreover, they are "*the output of discourse strategies which we use to select units from linguistic paradigms of different levels (phonetics/phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics) to create texts (in the sense of both written and spoken genres of discourse) which are adequate as far as their communicative purpose in some context is concerned*". He goes on to present a typical pragmatic argument against structural typologies by stating that figures of speech "*should be considered as linguistic elements having certain communicative functions like clarification, stimulation of interest, aesthetic and cognitive pleasure, modification of the cognitive perspective, intensification or mitigation of emotions etc.*".

Paul Chilton touches upon the issue of rhetoric as well. He points out that the theoretical question underlying the topic of manipulation amounts to "*does or can language determine the thoughts you have?*". For Chilton, linguistic structures are not "*inherently deceptive or manipulative*". He states that "*linguistic structures are just linguistic structures*" which hold varying degrees of potential for manipulation by human users with goal-directed intentions. Throughout his article, Chilton explores some conditions which would allow for a manipulation of the ideas of language users: exposure of a population to a repeated message; the wide-spread dispersal of a linguistically encoded notion; and/or the malfunctioning or potential over-riding of the human consistency-checking device. Throughout his argumentation, Chilton argues for a perspective on manipulation that we may call pragmatic. He writes that producers and consumers of discourse can only be partly aware of what they are doing when they engage in discourse. In this sense, all communication is manipulative to some degree and not just "*some particular kind of communication that we call manipulative*". Consequently the issue of responsibility appears. In this context, Chilton points out that "*the human mind has the capacity or the potential to inspect or introspect*". Moreover, this "*capacity to reflect on their unconscious cognitions, communicative behavior and physical action*" can be trained and encouraged by a variety of factors. One of these is education and it is here that Chilton attributes a role to the enlightening potential of

critical approaches to discourse such as CDA. Increasing the awareness of speakers and writers with respect to the various functions of discourse is probably not specific to CDA. Rather it is characteristic of discursive pragmatics in general.

The last article in this reader deals with *Humor* and is written by Salvatore Attardo. He explores various approaches that exhibit this phenomenon. He points out that linguistics did not contribute much to research on humor until the eighties. Attardo starts out with some semantic theories such as the isotopy-disjunction model, the script-based semantic theory of humor, and the genertal theory of verbal humor. He then moves towards a discussion of approaches who exhibit a more pragmatic point of view. These include Gricean approaches to humor as it relates to conversational maxims and principles of relevance, but also humor as it relates to informativeness and to the way it is processed in psycholinguistic terms. Conversation analysis and sociolinguistics are also incorporated in this overview. As such, Attardo concludes that "*the field of humor research is definitely taking a pragmatic perspective*".

At the beginning of this overview, I emphasised that the articles collected in this volume on discursive pragmatics do not constitute an exhaustive collection of the themes, issues, terminologies and perspectives which take pragmatic insights as a point of departure and/or as a topic of investigation. For instance, this is the case with respect to an approach such as discursive psychology where discourse is considered to consist of "*text and talk as parts of social practices*" and where the relationship between cognition and the use of discourse as conceptualised in cognitive psychology is called into question. From a discursive psychological point of view both knowledge, reality and cognition are discursively constructed through situated language use. In this sense, we are dealing with a discursive pragmatic perspective within the domain of qualitative psychology (Potter 1996). Also, a whole set of socio-linguistic, anthropological and ethnographical approaches that are implicitly and explicitly pragmatics-oriented have not been discussed within the context of this book (but see other volumes of this series, in particular: Jaspers et al. 2010; Senft et al. 2009).

There are also strong pragmatic tendencies in approaches that are not usually considered to be pragmatic at all. This is especially the case with respect to Foucaultian and other post-structuralist approaches to discourse. One might argue that these approaches are first and foremost philosophical or macro-sociological at best. One might also claim that they are not so much dealing with a linguistics-based discourse analysis as with a perspective on self, subjectivity and social processes which deploy linguistic categories in a metaphorical way in order to account for the phenomena under investigation. In this sense, one might even argue that we are basically dealing with non-empirical and non-pragmatic modes of investigation. Nevertheless, there are strong parallels to be drawn. For instance, Foucault's archaeological approach to discourse explicitly focuses on the basic units of discourse in terms of enunciative functions (Foucault 1969:119–20). The unity of discourse and its delineation in terms of

genre, narrative, subject, and so on is therefore always a functional enterprise that needs to be performed in relation to contextual correlates. Moreover, it is precisely because of this concern with function that Foucault refuses to reduce his archaeologies – defined as descriptions of statements – to the linguistic features that may characterize specific statements (Foucault 1969:97–98). In this sense, his proposal to add a level of discursive description to those levels of analysis provided by linguistics constitutes a decidedly pragmatic agenda. Moreover, there is an inter-subjective dimension to his work as well. Foucault explicitly stated that he was interested in how it was possible for individuals to produce so many contradictory statements and to occupy such varying positions at a particular point in time (Foucault 1969:221). His theory of discourse is therefore one of a historically over-determined process. Linguistic pragmatic perspectives which focus on the inter-subjective and processual aspects of establishing cohesion, coherence, narrative, dialogue, enunciation, manipulation, genres, public discourse, and so on might be able to help answer these questions.

Today, the approach to discourse that is best known in socio-political theory and philosophy was formulated by Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe. Their discourse theory is a theory of articulations in the sense of a set of connections between semiotic elements that can be identified at various levels of discursive organization (Critchley & Marchart 2004; Howarth 2005; Laclau & Mouffe 1985). These elements include statements, subject positions (Laclau & Mouffe 1985:115), subjectivities (Laclau & Zac 1994), empty signifiers (Laclau 1994), nodal points (Laclau & Mouffe 1985:110–13), and other notions that can be traced back to French linguistic sources of inspiration (Laclau & Mouffe 1985:106, 12), Foucaultian theory and Lacanian psycho-analysis (Glynos & Stavrakakis 2004; Stavrakakis 1999). At first sight, their terminology is inspired by structuralist tendencies. However, their general line of argumentation is typically pragmatic. Even though they hold on to a structuralist notion of the sign based on de Saussure's distinction between the signifier and the signified, their general line of argumentation is decidedly pragmatic. They are interested in the ways in which political meanings are partially and inter-subjectively fixed. They claim that meanings can only be temporarily fixed to a certain degree within specific contexts because of the sliding values of signifiers and signifieds. Moreover, these contexts are themselves results of a series of articulations of not necessarily linguistic elements. To name a context is to alter the significance of a context (Butler & Laclau 2004). Linguistic pragmaticians will not contest such statement. However, there is a problem with respect to the linguistic aspect of their theory.

It is important to realise that the model of the sign as set out in the discourse theories of Laclau, Mouffe and successors such as Howarth, Glynos and Stavrakakis, is not always compatible with the model of the sign as it is found in pragmatic linguistic approaches to discourse. Most importantly, the Essex variant of post-structuralist discourse theory does not deal with the notions of indexicality and

deixis (Levinson 1998; Sidnell 2009), i.e. with those signifiers whose functional interpretation is dependent on the non-linguistic aspects of extra-linguistic reality. This neglect can be explained by the fact that according to Laclau and Mouffe nothing can be thought outside of discourse. Since these authors do not distinguish between linguistic and non-linguistic discourse in their texts, this has led to a methodological stalemate. Torfing points out that the post-structuralist anti-positivist stance has led many discourse theorists to throw "*the methodological baby out with the epistemological bath water*" (Torfing 2005: 27). As a result, "*there is an urgent need for critical, explicit and context-bound discussion of what we do in discourse analysis, why we do it, and what the consequences are*" (Torfing 2005: 28). The type of discourse analysis he refers to is the type of discourse analysis as performed in the post-structuralist line of thought.

Today, a response to the methodological deficit of post-structuralist discourse theory has started to emerge. Especially authors dealing with CDA (Fairclough & Chouliaraki 1999) have started to engage with Foucaultian and Essex-based approaches to discourse (Glynos & Howarth 2007; Howarth 2005; Howarth & Torfing 2005). Nevertheless, I would like to argue that an explicit recognition of pragmatics-oriented perspectives would add even more depth to this discussion. As the articles in this volume demonstrate, the pragmatic focus on language use does not need to lead to a neglect of the non-linguistic semiotic elements that allow us to articulate ourselves to others and to the world in general. In this sense, the increasing interest in studies on the multimodal aspects of discourse as considered from the point of view of interactional (Kress & van Leeuwen 2001), systemic functionalist (O'Halloran 2004) and pragmatically oriented approaches to language use holds great promise. As Scollon and Levine argue, "*language in use, whether this is in the form of spoken language or text, is always and inevitably constructed across multiple modes of communication, including speech and gesture not just in spoken language but through such "contextual" phenomena as the use of the physical spaces in which we carry out our discursive actions or the design, papers, and typography of the documents within which our texts are presented*" (Scollon & Levine 2004: 1–2).

All of the articles collected in this volume present some recent tendencies. Some even suggest future trends. I would like to conclude by suggesting a direction for future reflection that starts from a platform that we may choose to call discursive pragmatics. It is a route that allows the linguistic approaches presented in this volume to engage with the theories and approaches to discourse located at the macro-level of analysis. It is a road across the methodological deficit characterizing some of the dominant approaches to discourse outside of the field of linguistics. The various perspectives that may be grouped together under the heading of discursive pragmatics are characterized by an internal evolution towards an investigation of language use in terms of contextualized performances and in terms of the interactional functional processes involved. The specific terminologies deployed within each of the perspectives discussed within

the context of this book vary greatly. The continuing success of this discursive pragmatic turn will depend on its ability to demonstrate its own pragmatic value in a variety of empirical studies across disciplines. Success is guaranteed if one considers the varying areas of application that are touched upon in the individual contributions to this volume.

References

- Butler, J. & E. Laclau (2004). Appendix I: the uses of equality. In S. Critchley & O. Marchart (eds.): 329–44.
- Critchley, S. & O. Marchart (eds.) (2004). *Laclau: a critical reader*. Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. & L. Chouliaraki (1999). *Discourse in late modernity*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1969). *The archaeology of knowledge*. (2007 edition) Routledge.
- Glynos, J. & Y. Stavrakakis (2004). Encounters of the real kind: sussing out the limits of Laclau's embrace of Lacan. In S. Critchley & O. Marchart (eds.): 201–16.
- Glynos, J. & D. Howarth (2007). *Logics of critical explanation in social and political theory*. Routledge.
- Howarth, D. (2005). Applying discourse theory: the method of articulation. In D. Howarth & J. Torfing (eds.): 316–49.
- Howarth, D. & J. Torfing (eds.) (2005). *Discourse theory in European politics: identity, policy and governance*. Palgrave/Macmillan.
- Jaspers, J., J.-O. Östman & J. Verschueren (eds.) (2010). *Society and language use* (Handbook of Pragmatics Highlights, 7). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kress, G. & Th. van Leeuwen (2001). *Multimodal discourse: the modes and media of contemporary communication*. Edward Arnold.
- Laclau, E. (1994). Why do empty signifiers matter to politics? In E. Laclau (ed.), *Emancipation(s)*: 36–46. Verso.
- Laclau, E. & Ch. Mouffe (1985). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: towards a radical democratic politics*. Verso.
- Laclau, E. & L. Zac (1994). 'Minding the gap: the subject of politics', in Ernesto Laclau (ed.), *The making of political identities*: 11–39. Verso.
- Levinson, S. (1998). Deixis. In Jacob Mey (ed.), *Concise encyclopedia of pragmatics*: 200–205. Elsevier.
- O'Halloran, K.L. (2004). *Multimodal discourse analysis: systemic functional perspectives*. Continuum.
- Potter, J. (1996). *Representing reality*. Sage Publications.
- Scollon, R. & Ph. Levine (2004). Multimodal discourse analysis as the confluence of discourse and technology. In Ph. Levine & R. Scollon (eds.), *Discourse and technology: multimodal discourse analysis*: 1–6. Georgetown University Press.
- Senft, G., J.-O. Östman & J. Verschueren (eds.) (2009). *Culture and language use* (Handbook of pragmatics highlights, 2). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Sidnell, J. (2009). Deixis. In J. Verschueren & J.-O. Östman (eds.), *Key notions for pragmatics*: 114–38. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Stavrakakis, Y. (1999). *Lacan and the political*. Routledge.
- Torfing, J. (2005). Discourse theory: achievements, arguments, and challenges. In D. Howarth & J. Torfing (eds.): 1–32.