Preface: Affiliations of (Monologue) Discourse Studies and Organization of the Book

Discourse analysis exhibits a multiplicity of approaches and interactions with numerous and diverse academic areas. Included in these areas are not just disciplines in which models for understanding discourse (and methods for analyzing it) first developed (i. e. linguistics, anthropology, sociology, philosophy; cf. Van Dijk 1985 and Schiffrin 1994), but also disciplines that have applied (and thus often extended) such models and methods to their own particular domains, e. g. communication (cf. Craig and Tracy 1983), social psychology (cf. Potter and Wetherell, among many others), and artificial intelligence (cf. Reichman 1985).

Monologue discourse analysis, a more direct reference point for the present book, has been significantly influenced by the sociological orientation of conversation analysis (cf. Atkinson and Heritage 1984; Button and Lee 1987). First, monologues have been studied in accordance with the main concerns of conversation analysts, that is, as socially-organized orderly affairs within longer, conversation-like units (for instance, opening speeches in political debates), which have provided a source of information about organization, structure and rules in conversation and about the social reality in which they are embedded. They have thus been explored as sites for contextualization of the interlocutors' social identities and relationships. Second, there has been a common concern in both monologue and conversation analysis with **the sequential placement of utterances in unfolding talk**. This has been considered as the key to the understanding of the actions performed, since conversationalists (and text-producers, in general) are themselves oriented to the sequential placement of utterances in order to interpret discourse (cf. Cortazzi 1993). On the whole, important perspectives on discourse have emerged from sociologists interested in systematic analyses of how members of a society build the events they participate in, and **how they constitute social order and organization through discourse**. Sociological models, which will be dealt with extensively in this book, have also informed the analysis of monologues in terms of the speaker's **self-presentation and management of self as a socialized entity** (cf. Schiffrin 1994).

At the same time, the search for meaning and understanding that sociologically-oriented approaches have identified in the moment-by-moment construction of talk is central to the concept of culture in anthropological and ethnographic approaches (cf. Saville-Troike 1982; Schiffrin 1994). As a result, this topic brings together concerns

with social organization, culture and language use in context. All three components can be analyzed as integrated aspects of a **single system of action**.

In view of the above, most studies in (monologue) discourse have started with the assumption that the meaning, structure and use of texts under analysis are socially and culturally variable (cf. Cortazzi 1993). This assumption has yielded significant differences in monologue styles between different contexts of occurrence. First, structural patterns have been noted to be context-sensitive: the amount of descriptive or evaluative content, the play between implicitness and explicitness of (speech) events, and the preferences for specific text-building devices are only some dimensions of contextual and cultural variation. Furthermore, the expectations about the communication purposes are also contextually and culturally variable: the variations hold inevitably between reactions of different audiences to the verisimilitude of the events and the speaker's display skills (cf. Heath 1983).

Though culture provides a broad framework of enquiry into discourse pragmatics, it is only one side of the coin, the other being the local instantiation of discourse in specific contexts (cf. Georgakopoulou and Goutsos 1997). This involves studying how individual speakers with specific agendas, goals and purposes in specific situations draw on their background understandings and knowledge about how to mean and what is meant; how they negotiate and locally adapt this knowledge to micro-level concerns, **their management of self and the creation of alignments with the audience**; finally, how each of their expressions is sequentially relevant to what came before and what comes after. The sociological and anthropological affiliations of discourse analysis call for work on the relationship between language structure, use and socio-cultural ideologies in diverse contexts. The aim is **to establish interpretative links between the forms and functions of discourse and as many settings as possible**. This micro-level research (as we shall see in Part I) is a prerequisite of any informed typology which links linguistic devices, social actions and cultural ethos.

The sociological and anthropological affiliations of discourse analysis tie in with **language and gender studies**, in which texts are investigated for the gender-typical language use and the gender-specific asymmetries (cf. Lakoff 1975; Thorne and Henley 1983; Cameron 1985; Crawford 1995). This usually leads to certain kinds of discourse being classified as 'masculine' or 'feminine' (cf. Lakoff 1975), though there are suggestions that some specific discourses be better called 'ungendered' or 'gender-neutral' (cf. Tannen 1996). The latter terms seem most common in political language studies, where the sex of script-writer(s) cannot be acknowledged by the analyst (as is the case with the texts studied in the present book).

There is, finally, no doubt that one of the most influential emerging affiliations of (monologue) discourse analysis is **corpus linguistics**, which analyzes large-scale corpora consisting of vast quantities of text (e. g. 100 million words) by electronic means such as computer concordancing (cf. Sinclair 1991; Aijmer and Altenberg 1991; Svartvik 1992; Baker et al. 1993). The emphasis of this paradigm on actual and authentic instances of language use, whole texts and cross-generic considerations (cf. Stubbs 1993) occupies a prominent position in pragmatics and discourse analysis. Text annotation is becoming increasingly sophisticated and can provide useful information which will serve as a test bed for discourse theory. In addition, great care is being taken to provide contextual information (e.g. setting, time, participant details) about individual texts in the corpora. The corpus approach has some significant advantages for discourse analysts: **it enables them to test out their hypotheses in an explicit way, putting their analyses onto a firmer empirical footing**. It also allows them to

quantify the presence of linguistic forms and patterns of forms across different text-types. Furthermore, machine-readable corpus approaches force the analyst to label every single part of a text in a systematic and consistent way, as examples inconvenient to the model cannot be simply disregarded (cf. Short et al. 1996). On the whole, cross-fertilization of notions between the two disciplines of corpus linguistics and discourse analysis is bound to yield noteworthy results in the future.

***

All the foregoing indicates that it is virtually impossible for any book on pragmatics, discourse or text organization to cover all the different theoretical and analytic perspectives currently in operation in discourse analysis. Discourse analysis is not a strictly unified discipline with one or few dominant theories and methods of research. This proliferation of approaches is definitely a sign of the area's richness, the impressive result of multi-faceted research which has developed a wide range of analytic procedures and tools, and provided clear insights into discourse construction. The nature of the subject of discourse is such that '**the goal of a homogeneous discipline with a unified theory, an agreed-upon method and comparable types of data, is not only hopeless but pointless**' (cf. Van Dijk 1990: 74). At the same time, interdisciplinary study is indispensable. Quite simply, it is almost impossible to separate discourse from its uses in the world and in social interactions; as a result, **linguistic tools alone are not sufficient for its comprehensive study**.

The recognition of the need for **analytic pluralism** is not incompatible with the need for a more constructive dialogue between different approaches. This need is now becoming apparent in view of an increasing compartmentalization of the field which makes planning for further development difficult (cf. Duszak 1995). The foreseeable danger is that discourse analysis will come to mean loosely any work from diverse analytic perspectives with no common metalanguage, method or technical apparatus. In a similar vein, the various analyses of texts will remain fragmentary and unsystematic, taking too much for granted in terms of theory and method. There is a clear need for a more inclusive strategy, a theoretical and methodological compactness which will tie the loose ends together and lead to integrated accounts of discourse. As Beaugrande (1990) notes, a balance must be struck between what is anectodal and what is significant in order for discourse analysis to attain the ideal stage of an empirical science.

The plea for comprehensive theories of discourse has been put formally on the agenda for further development of the field by various sources. In a Special Issue of *Text* (1990) on the programmatics of discourse analysis for the 1990s, it was emphasized that what is needed now is a **synopsis of the aspects of analysis**: 'one of the urgent tasks is to clear up the existing confusion and to propose an integrated theory of discourse which will make explicit the links between different levels, or dimensions of analysis' (cf. Van Dijk 1990: 146). One of the prerequisites for integrated accounts is to explore the common concepts that provide the basis of interaction between different approaches. Discourse analysis gets a high mileage out of a small selection of concepts, namely **structure, function and context**. All approaches

to discourse share these general concerns and make assumptions about the relationship between structure and function, and text and context. Yet these fundamental concepts need to be explained more clearly and the different methodological and theoretical proposals need to be brought together.

Focus on the identification of units and relationships between them can be combined with focus on actions and purposes and the interpretation of social and cultural meanings. According to Schiffrin (1994: 361), combining both types of analyses and developing an inclusive attendant methodology may help to balance the weaknesses of one mode of analysis with the strengths of the other. **Structurally-based approaches are up against various criterial problems in the identification of units, while functionally-based approaches are clouded by uncertainty and subjectivity regarding the identification of functions** (cf. Georgakopoulou and Goutsos 1997). The increase of dialogue between the two could help overcome these weaknesses.

The relationship between text and context is another central concern of discourse approaches which can benefit from a more inclusive strategy. Different approaches emphasize different aspects of context in their analyses; they also diverge in relation to how much of the context needs to be taken into account for text analysis (cf. Georgakopoulou and Goutsos 1997). There is much scope for formulating a clearer understanding of the notion of context and a more inclusive view of its relationship with text.

The development of multiple analyses of discourse which would explore how the different levels and entities correspond with each other might be still a desideratum, though in recent years various steps have been taken in this direction. A prominent instance of analysis at different yet interdependent levels concerns the notion of **form-function anisomorphism**. This is intertwined with approaches to discourse as a **set of systems of structure, function and action**, which, although interlocked, can be analytically teased apart for identifying constraints at different levels (cf. Schiffrin 1987; Schiffrin 1994).

Text organization can also be shown to rely on the orchestration of diverse interacting strategies. Connectivity was conventionally seen as consisting of two separate activities: the linear ordering of connections along a horizontal axis and the projection of this horizontal axis on an implicitly vertical axis (cf. Karmiloff-Smith 1985; Berman and Slobin 1994). The former orientation works at the local level of adjacent clauses and their boundaries to the right and to the left. The latter is concerned with signalling higher-level relations of saliency, that is, how units are grounded in each other and how they are to be understood with respect to the overarching global theme of discourse. The current tendency is to combine the two foci in more comprehensive accounts of various discourse forms (cf. e.g. Bamberg and Marchman 1991). **The combination of the linear and non-linear succession of parts of the text accounts for a text's coherence as a whole**. The relative importance of parts is also defined in relation to this global coherence.

Lastly, a similar combination of approaches underlies current cognitive views of discourse. Theories of discourse comprehension have placed emphasis either on the idea that the pre-existing schema-based knowledge guides comprehension from the top down (in a deductive manner), or on the idea that comprehension is guided in a bottom-up, inductive fashion by the text itself and its explicit information (cf. Corbett 1982; Kintsch and Mross 1985). **Currently, there seems to be a consensus that both top-down and bottom-up processes are involved in comprehension** (cf. Beaugrande 1990; McKoon and Ratcliff 1992; Whitney et al. 1995). Similarly, while

many research programs used to focus on only one half of the communication process, either the production or the comprehension of discourse, currently the tendency is to focus **on both**.

<div align="center">***</div>

Out of the foregoing concerns and tendencies, **especially need for the cognitive pluralism in analysis**, grows the idea of the present book, which is a study of both critical and methodological orientation. The book consists of two parts (Part I and Part II), largely autonomous in content and subject matter, yet complementary in the sense of illustrating the bottom-up and top-down tracks respectively, as well as consistent and compact in the sense of demonstrating continual interplay between concepts from diverse scientific disciplines (sociology, psychology, formal linguistics and pragmatics). Altogether, the book should be regarded as a voice in the ongoing debate on how many of the paralinguistic and cross-disciplinary variables should be integrated in discourse analysis, and more specifically, which particular concerns and limitations should be taken into account when constructing an analytic model drawn on the consensus between the bottom-up and top-down approaches to analysis.

Both Part I and Part II, preceded with individual introductions, offer analyses of **political discourse in the monologue format**. They are two self-contained studies consistently operating within a hierarchical system of multiple, cross-disciplinary variables. In both Part I and Part II these variables are grouped and classed for common pragmatic features which define the global function of the analyzed discourse. The difference is, however, that Part I, working from the bottom-up perspective, makes no initial assumptions or presuppositions about this function, while Part II does make such presuppositions, by pre-defining the global category and subsequently finding its top-down constituents. Another difference lies in the status of the introductions to both parts. The introduction to Part I is "autonomous" - in the sense that it only refers to the subsequent material in Part I. By contrast, the introduction to Part II is as much explanatory with regard to the subsequent analysis, as it is evaluative with regard to the preceding analysis in Part I. Hence, it indicates the first point at which the previously critical character of the study finds its methodological counterpart. The truly methodological argument, however, is undertaken in the Afterword, a section balancing and comparing the strengths and weaknesses of the bottom-up and top-down approaches. This last part is not meant to be forcibly integrative, it only brings up a selection of problems to be reckoned with while possibly prescribing such integrated approach to analysis. The acknowledgement of these problems by the reader/analyst constitutes the primary goal of the book. The secondary objective is, of course, the acknowledgement of (hopefully) interesting critical findings about the material on which the analysis is performed. This concerns the **language of the US inaugurals** (in Part I), as well as **the rhetoric of the NATO press releases** of the recent time (in Part II).