Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis

Article · August 2017

Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis

Prof. Dr. Fareed Hameed Al-Hindawi

University of Babylon

College of Education- Human Sciences

Dept. of English

Mariam D. Saffah

University of Babylon

College of Education- Human Sciences

Dept. of English

Abstract

   It is said that pragmatics and discourse analysis are closely interrelated and that there is a considerable overlap between them to the extent that they can be regarded as sister disciplines. The current study aims at investigating the relationship between them highlighting their similarities and detecting their differences. In order to fulfill the objectives of the study, a number of procedures will be followed: (1) Surveying the relevant literature about the two fields in question, (2) conducting a comparison between them and (3) drawing some conclusions grounded on the findings of the study.

Key words: pragmatics, discourse analysis, context, discourse pragmatics, and critical discourse analysis

1. Introduction

  Pragmatics and discourse analysis are two fields of study that are sometimes regarded as interdisciplinary because both share interest in those aspects of language that are context-dependent.

   Barron and Schneider (2014: 1) suggest that the study of discourse is not perceived as falling outside the realm of pragmatics: Rather it can be seen as an integral part of it. Hence, the pragmatics of discourse and the pragmatics of utterance represent two complementary levels of analysis, correspondingly emphasizing more global and more local aspects of human interaction. Whereas the latter concentrates on investigating speech acts as the fundamental units of analysis, the former investigates how speech acts can combine into larger units. The two- level analysis referred to above has been termed as micropragmatics and macropragmatics.

   It is assumed that several approaches to discourse analysis are pragmatic in nature because they are more concerned with interactional issues than with syntax . These include some recent trends such as *discourse pragmatics* and *critical pragmatics*.

2.Pragmatics

   Levinson (1983: 1) suggests that the use of the term pragmatics is pioneered by the philosopher Charles Morris denoting a branch of semiotics (1938). Within semiotic traditions, syntax is concerned with the formal

relations among signs. As for semantics, it is interested in the relations between signs and the objects they signify, while pragmatics investigates the relations between signs and their users.

According to Yule (1996:3), pragmatics is interested in the analysis of meaning as expressed via a speaker and understood via a listener. Thus, it can be said that pragmatic analyses are more concerned with what people convey through using certain utterances than with what the words in those utterances may mean in isolation.

It is worth mentioning that in pragmatics, meaning is not considered to be as stable as linguistic forms. On the contrary, it is dynamically created in the course of employing language (Verschueren, 1999: 11).

Mey (2001: 6) believes that a genuine pragmatic account has to deal with the language users in their social context; it cannot confine itself to those grammatically encoded aspects of context.

Broadly speaking, pragmatics is concerned with those facets of meaning that are context-variable. It endeavors to widen the scope of traditional linguistics by housing many issues and aspects that characterize language in use (Horn and Kecskes,2013: 356)

It is stated that certain events contribute to the emergence of pragmatics. These include: first, the innovation of speech act theory by Austin (1962) with its subsequent development by Searle, second, the appearance of Grice's (1975) notion of the cooperative principle supported by four maxims which can be infringed to generate conversational implicatures. Finally, the introduction of Sperber and Wilson's Relevance theory which is a developed version of Grice's theory (ibid: 357).

3. Discourse Analysis

Discourse belongs to a category of terms that are recurrently employed in all sorts of context. It may be used interchangeably with text to denote longer chunks of written or spoken language. Additionally, It may refer to the semantic representation of some connected sentences, or it could refer to various communication on a specific issue, e. g. human rights discourse (Fetzer, 2014: 35).

Thus, *discourse analysis* is possible to be interpreted in a number of diverse ways and can accordingly be conducted in different fashions. It is an interdisciplinary field of inquiry (Barron and Schneider, 2014: 1)

Driven by the desire to differentiate sentences from propositions, and propositions from utterances, a group of theorists have endeavored to go beyond the sentence boundary and to become concerned with the meaning of discourse around the beginning of the seventies. Their basic assumption is centred on the fact that besides the well-known linguistic units pertaining to the diverse levels characterizing a language, one is capable of postulating a another unit of analysis which goes well beyond the boundary of the sentence (Puig, 2003: 2).

Previously, Brown and Yule (1983:1), assert that analyzing discourse means analyzing language in action. Consequently, it is unlikely to be confined to the clarification of linguistic formulas excluding the goals and tasks that those formulas are proposed to accomplish in human issues. Hence, a discourse analyst devotes himself/herself to conducting an investigation of what language is utilized for.

The discourse analyst needs to take a pragmatic perspective when doing discourse analysis. Thus, he has to take into consideration the context in which a fragmentary discourse appears. This is due to the fact that specific linguistic units like deictic forms demands contextual clues to be understood (ibid: 27).

Puig (2003.: 1) states that discourse is likely to be considered as a linguistic component, or as an interactive level attached to that who creates it. In the latter case, discourse is regarded as a coherent whole. Hence, specific linguistic units are proposed as indications of the cohesion of a text. These include devices such as prounouns, definite descriptions and discursive anaphoric nominal.

As for the structure of discourse, it is possible to distinguish between local and global structures. Whereas the former has to do with the individual speech acts and their connectedness, the latter relates to the series of speech acts as a whole. For instance, one may locally issue an assertion followed by a request, but with the entire sequence of speech acts one may globally produce a speech act of request. Put differently, the global structure pertains to the global function of the utterance (Van Dijk, 1980: 6).

4. Pragmatics versus Discourse Analysis

Cutting (2002:2) believes that pragmatics and discourse analysis have much in common in the sense that both investigate context, text and function. Both fields concentrate on the significance of words in communication and how interlocutors convey more than the words they utilized. Additionally, both of them study discourse and text focusing on how pieces of language become significant and integrated for their users. Furthermore, the two fields are interested in function.

For instance, in order to interpret a piece of discourse such as *We are not amuse*, pragmatics and discourse analysis will take into consideration the fact that Queen Victoria had been in a long depression, resulted from the death of her husband. Her words were a reply to a joke which her courtiers had just made. Analysts will infer that her intention was to stop them attempting to make her laugh and lift her out of the depression (ibid: 1)

Similarly, Puig (2003: 1) states that the two domains, pragmatics and discourse analysis, move behind the formal description of phrases and concentrate on upper components, for instance, speech acts and conversational turns. Moreover, both approaches investigate context and its structuring. Nevertheless, pragmatics exerts more effort to the identification of the speaker's intention in addition to the recovering of the covert ingredients which the hearer needs to access.

As for the divergence of pragmatics and discourse analysis, Coulthard (1985: viii) says that discourse analysis examines how stretches above the sentence level are knitted together. Moreover, discourse analysis has to depict the construction of suprasentential text or social transaction through forcing a certain apparatus on the data either overtly or covertly.

To draw the borderlines between the two fields, Puig (2003: 2) believes that, whereas discourse analysts focus on the elucidation of the implied components within the language without considering anything external, pragmatics utilizes diverse domains of human affairs to appropriately interpret utterances. For example:

A: **You should hurry up a little in persuading them, because we 're all in a hurry to do all that.**

B: **Do you read the papers?**

In order to interpret B's response, A has to infer that it is based on conversational implicature. That is, B's reply implies *if you read the newspapers, you will know that I have done so many times*. Such aspect of meaning is pragmatic because it is not explicitly stated in the utterance but has to be inferred depending on the context (ibid).

The two notions of *context* and *intention* are vital to pragmatics. It is worth mentioning that no other approaches to language have made use of such concepts. Whereas in discourse analysis, context refers to something static in nature and external to the speaker, in pragmatics it signifies something personal and dynamic. That is, it is not offered at the beginning, but is created by the interlocutors utterance by utterance (ibid: 3).

As for intention, pragmatics assumes that success in the overall interpretation of an utterance involves a recognition of the speaker's intention.

According to Sauerland and Schumacher, 2015: 6), Grice proposes that two notions of meaning need to be distinguished. The first is the speaker's meaning, i. e. a reconstruction of the speaker's intention when producing that utterance. The second is the sentence meaning, i. e. the semantic representation of the grammar allocated to a sentence.

For instance, when a happy father says to his wife *The boys have arrived*, his intention may be to make her attentive to the fact that their sons will soon be home. However, a robber, a Mafiosi, or a policeman producing the very sentence can easily be understood to have a totally different intents. The example above indicates that diverse utterances grounded on the same sentence meaning can convey various speaker's meaning (ibid).

For, de Saussure (2007: 152) a pragmatic account of meaning supplies all the components that discourse analysis portrays. On the one hand, if *discourse* is taken to represent verbal communication, then it can be elucidated merely with reference to the speaker's intended meaning. On the other hand, if it is considered as standing for organised spans of texts or utterances, then they have to be meaningful spans of texts or meaningful utterances.

5. Context versus Co-text

Allott (2010: 38) states that the context of an utterance signifies a source of information that assists the hearer in finding out what the speaker wishes to express. Without taking the context of words and phrases into consideration, it will not be likely to interpret the implicatures of an utterance. Moreover, in numerous situations, it will be impossible to calculate   the proposition conveyed or the desired illocutionary force. Since pragmatics is interested in speaker's meaning and how the hearer interprets it, context is vital to pragmatics.

According to Song (2010: 876-877), context performs crucial functions that help interactants in interpreting utterances. These includes removing ambiguity, specifying referents, and distinguishing conversational implicature.

Nevertheless, various types of context can be identified. One type is designated as linguistic context or the co-text. The co-text of a certain word refers to all other words that occur within the very phrase or sentence. It has a

powerful influence on working out the meaning of a particular word. Another type of context is the physical context in which words are embedded. Here, the physical location guides the interpretation of meaning.(Yule, 1985: 98-99).

Consequently, it can be said that pragmatics is concerned with the physical context whereas discourse analysis has more to do with the co-text.

6. Discourse Pragmatics

This kind of study shows where the two fields in question meet. According to Van Dijk (2007: 8), the term *discourse pragmatics* refers to the hybrid field of investigating which comes into being as a result of the collaboration between pragmatics and discourse. There are numerous discoursal researches that can be called *pragmatic* as they are more concerned with language in use than with syntax.

Discourse pragmatics concentrates on speech acts such as assertions, promises, questions, congratulations and the like. Moreover, it focuses on how such social acts are performed by language users and those that are performed in texts. It stresses the idea that speech acts typically occur in series as in conversations, where one speech act supplies a motivation for a forthcoming one as in *It's stuffy in here. Could you please open the window?*(ibid).

Horn and Kecskes (2013: 262) state that discourse pragmatics is an attempt at widening the realm of pragmatics via emphasizing the importance of the social and cultural restrictions for interaction besides the linguistic and semantic properties of utterances. It aims at producing a sophisticated image of the functions and connectedness of pragmatics and discourse in the process of interactional and intercultural interaction. Accordingly, there are two versions of discourse pragmatics: interactional and intercultural.

As for interactional discourse pragmatics, Verschueren (1999: 7) regards it as a cognitive, social and cultural approach to linguistic phenomena. This recent field of inquiry stresses the idea that pragmatic research has to take into consideration social and cultural restrictions on language use in addition to the expression of intention. On the other hand, intercultural discourse pragmatics is grounded on the assumption that interculturality is a phenomenon that is not merely interactionally and socially bonded but also depends on identifiable cultural models and norms representing speech communities to which interlocutors belong.

7. Trends in Pragmatics

Horn and Kecskes (2013: 366) believe that pragmatics is primarily an utterance-based field. Nevertheless, because utterance is not that easy to define and because utterance meaning is determined both by the linguistic components of a specific utterance and subsequent utterances, pragmatics has looked for meaning elements inside and outside the utterance. Consequently, three different approaches to pragmatics have emerged.

The first approach is referred to as **pragma-semantics**. It is pursued by the inheritors of Paul Grice and numerous scholars with a referential-logical background and with diverse degrees of commitment to truth-conditionality. It concentrates on the construction of meaning through cognitive and formal models (de Saussure, 2007: 2).

A second trend, labeled **pragma-dialogue**, endeavors to attract attention to the dialogic nature of interaction through stressing the idea that interactants are actors who both act and react. Hence, the speaker-hearer not only interprets but also reacts to the other interactant's utterance. The dialogic principle identifies dialogue as a chain of actions and reactions (Horn and Kecskes, 2013: 366).

Another trend is **pragma-discourse** which goes beyond the utterance and shows a special consideration to socially determined linguistic behavior. It can be assumed that the crucial difference between pragmatics proper and discourse is that whereas the former concentrates on individual utterances(organized set of words) in context, the latter focuses on an organized set of utterances (ibid).

The relation between the components of utterances and the components of discourse is somewhat similar. It is assumed that discourses, just like utterances, possess properties of their own. Hence, an utterance is not the sum of the lexical items that forms it, nor is discourse the sum of the utterances that made it. Both single utterances and sequences of utterances are needed in order to uncover what is conveyed by interactants (ibid: 367).

It is worth mentioning that all the three trends discussed above try to discuss the issue of the speaker meaning, which is the basis of all of pragmatics.

8. Speech Acts and Conversation

The notion of speech act is first introduced by Austin (1962), and then developed by Austin's student, Searle (1969).

In his book, *How to Do Things with Words*, Austin (1962) proposes that when articulating certain utterances speakers perform certain actions. According to Austin, there are three types of act that an utterance performs: locutionary act, illocutionary act, and prelocutionary act. However, he confines his use of the term *speech act* to refer exclusively to the second type of act, i. e illocutionary act (Levinson, 1983: 236)

According to Moeschiler (1998: 2), there exists an argument among philosophers and linguists concerning the stretching of speech act theory to discourse analysis. The essence of this argument is the idea that conversation consists of a series of speech acts. This argument is as follows:

"Speech acts are not isolated moves in communication: they appear in more global units of communication, defined as conversations or discourses."

In this regard, Van Dijk (1977: 213) states that speech acts usually occur in sequences such as an assertion followed by an explanation or addition, an assertion followed by a correction or alternative, or an assertion followed by a denial or contradiction. For example:

I need money. Can you lend me a thousand dollars?

In the example above, the first speech act is executed to establish conditions for the following speech act. It can be said that the former provides a reason for the latter. Hence, it may alter the context of communication in a way that the speech act of request becomes not only appropriate but also a normal act (Van Dijk, 1980:185).

Similarly, Ferrara (1980: 234) says that speech acts customarily occur in series where they are issued via speakers who are involved in rule-governed acts like debating, making conversation, proposing bills in parliament and the like. For instance:

There are thirty people in here. Could you open the window?

The utterance above is possible to be delivered in a *stuffy* classroom via someone near enough to someone else sitting by the window. Here, the speaker's principal goal is to get the window open whereas his subsidiary goal is to supply a good justification for the request (ibid: 235).

It is worth emphasizing that the speech act sequences cited above are produced by solitary speakers, but it is possible for sequences of speech acts to be issued by different speakers as in conversation. In this case, such sequences are referred to as **adjacency pairs**.

The notion of 'adjacency pairs' is originally introduced by Schegolff and Sacks (1973:73-74). They propose that there exists a category of strictly interconnected sequences of turns that they call adjacency pairs. Examples are question-answer, greeting-greeting, request-acceptance, etc. According to Coulthard (1985: 70), adjacency pairs are fundamental structural ingredients in exchanges because they can be employed for initiating and concluding a conversation.

It is worth emphasizing that *adjacency pairs* is a notion which reflects how much pragmatics and discourse analysis are interrelated. This is due to the fact that they are composed of basic pragmatic ingredients (sequences of speech acts) occurring in the course of a conversation, an area which falls within the domain of discourse analysis.

9. Conversational Implicature

Brown and Yule (1983: 31) mention that the term *implicature* is adopted by Grice (1975) to deal with those aspects of meaning that a speaker implies beyond what he literally states. According to Mey (2001: 450), this word is derived from the verb *to imply*. Consequently, a conversational implicature refers to something that is left embedded in conversation. That is why pragmatics is concerned with implicatures.

Thomas (1995: 56) suggests that Grice's theory is an attempt at elucidating the process in which the hearer moves from the level of expressed meaning to that of implied meaning. According to Levinson (1983: 101) Grice proposes four essential maxims guiding the undertaking of conversation, which together convey a broad cooperative principle.

The cooperative principle reads as follows:

Make your contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.

(ibid)

The conversational maxims supporting the cooperative principle include the maxims of **quality**, **quantity**, **relevance**, and **manner**.

According to Grice (1975: 49) cited in Eemeren and Grootendorst (1984: 120), it is assumed that conversationalists abide by these maxims when they are engaged in a conversational encounter. However, they often breach them to implicate a hidden meaning, i. e. implicature, as in:

Johnny: Hey Sally let's play marbles

Johnny's Mother: How is your homework getting along Johnny?

In this instance, Johnny's mother violates the maxim of relevance in order to convey an additional meaning. She reminds her son that he may not yet be free to play marbles(Levinson, 1983: 111).

According to Sauerland and Schumacher (2015: 6), when speakers intend to express a certain meaning, they usually employ diverse components which go beyond the linguistic capabilities. Nevertheless, listeners are somewhat accustomed to the various factors speakers resort to and therefore often succeed in uncovering the meaning the speaker wishes to convey. As a result, the meaning of an utterance is possible to be left unspecified.

For example, the sentence *The boys have arrived* could be produced with diverse intentions. It could be said by a parent hosting a party to announce that it is time to serve the cake. However, it could be uttered by a Mafia boss to produce a threat to someone or by a robber to warn an partner that the police have gotten to the scene (ibid).

According to Thomas (1995: 57), Grice suggests that there are two different types of implicature: conventional and conversational. These are similar in that they both express an extra level of meaning which goes beyond the semantics of the words spoken. In conventional implicature, however, the very implicature always occurs independent of the context in opposition to conversational implicature where implied meaning differs based on the context.

It is assumed that Grice's model can be applied to all forms of communication. However, the case of language is the most interesting one because of the fact that the grammar of sentence meanings provides an infinite array of possibilities to the speaker (Sauerland and Schumacher, 2015: 6)

10. Presuppositions

Crystal (2003: 410) argues that a presupposition refers to something presumed by a speaker when uttering a specific sentence in apposition to what is explicitly stated.

Broadly speaking, speakers regularly formulate their messages depending on the presumptions regarding what their hearer previously knows. Such presumptions are possible to be wrong, but they determine much of what speakers say in their actual language use (Yule, 1985:100).

Sbisa (1999: 8) suggests that pragmatic presuppositions refer to the assumptions shared by the speaker and hearer which constitute the background of their ongoing discourse. Some of these shared background assumptions have linguistic markers or triggers.

In pragmatics, two major types of presupposition are discussed: conventional and pragmatic presupposition. The former is less reliant on context than the latter and is typically tied up to specific linguistic forms. For

instance, *would you like some coffee?* Suggests that coffee is already prepared. Nevertheless, pragmatic presuppositions are context-dependent and arise from the use of an utterance in a specific context (Paltridge, 2006: 60).

Prior to that, Yule (1996: 27-28) suggests that there are three types of presupposition: **existential**, **lexical** and **structural**. Existential presuppositions are associated with definite descriptions, lexical presuppositions are those arisen by certain forms such as factive verbs, and structural presuppositions are linked to specific syntactic structures such as cleft constructions.

As for discourse analysis, Polyzou (2014: 123) states that presuppositions are currently utilized in the critical approaches to discourse analysis. It is proven that they are decisive to reveal naturalized ideologies underlying discourse, and scrutinize manipulative functions of discourse, particularly strategies making it socially or cognitively difficult to challenge ideological presumptions.

11. Reference

Reference is a notion which is central to discourse analysis because it is a basic meaning of textual cohesion and coherence.

In this regard, Halliday and Hasan (1970: 31) propose that cohesion can be provided by relationships involving reference. They assert that in every language there exist specific items having the property of reference. That is, rather than being interpreted in their own right, they look for something for their interpretation. These include personals, demonstratives and comparatives. For example:

Three blind mice, three blind mice.

See how they run! See how they run!

What distinguishes this specific type of cohesion is that the information to be recovered consists of the referential meaning, the identity of the particular thing that is being referred to. Hence, in the example above, *they* refers to *three blind mice*.

Generally speaking, reference items may be exophoric or endophoric. The latter category is subdivided into anaphoric and cataphoric (ibid: 33).

As far as pragmatics is concerned, Yule (1996: 17) mentions that it is possible to consider reference as an act in which a speaker employs linguistic formulas in order to help a listener to recognize something. Such referring expressions can assume the forms of proper nouns, noun phrases, and prounouns.

According to Birner (2013: 110), a referring expression designates a linguistic form utilized via the speaker in the pursuit of assisting the addressee to identify an entity in the world. Moreover, referring expressions belong to heterogeneous sub-classes including deixis, definite, indefinite anaphoric expressions, and demonstratives.

Yule (1996: 17) states that the selection of a certain referring expression is claimed to be grounded on the speaker's assumption regarding what the listener formerly identifies. Hence, in shared visual contexts, the speaker can resort to those pronouns that function deictically for appropriate reference, as in *Take this*. However,

more expanded noun phrases can be utilized when identifications are problematic, such as *Remember the old foreign guy with the funny hat?*.

According to Yule (2010: 131), successful reference requires recognition of the significance of inference. Inference refers to supplementary information resorted to by the hearer in order to establish a link between what is expressed and what is left implicit. Hence, it is not possible to make sense of the following utterance without carrying out the process of inference.

A: Can I look at your Chomsky?

B: Sure, it's on the shelf.

12. Politeness

According to Paltridge (2006: 72), politeness is an area of pragmatics that is of concern to people interested in looking at language from a discourse perspective. It is proposed that politeness and face are important for understanding why people decide to say things in a certain way in spoken and written discourse.

The most influential work in politeness theory is Brown and Levinson's (1987). They assert that their notion of face is based on that of Goffman's (1967) and the English folk notion of face, which ties up with notions of being embarrassed, humiliated or losing face. Face refers to the public self-image that every individual wishes to maintain for himself. Their concept of face is broken down into positive and negative face.

For Brown and Levinson, politeness is the reflection of respect of the interlocutor's face. In interpersonal communication, participants wish to sustain each other's face, and want to defend it whenever it is threatened. The underlying assumption is that face is vulnerable. That is, some acts are threatening social harmony and therefore involving softening or mitigation by means of a wide spectrum of linguistic strategies (Geyer, 2008:16).

Previously, Lakoff (1973) proposes a conversational-maxim approach to politeness. As a conversational maxim, politeness can be considered as an extension of the cooperative principle, where Grice's maxims are complemented by other rules or principles. That is, in this model, the interpersonal rule *be polite* supplements the cooperative principle which she rephrase as the rule *be clear* (ibid: 14).

Similarly, Leech (1983) suggests additional interactive maxims completing Grice's cooperative principle. He places politeness within the domain of interpersonal rhetoric, which is associated with social goals rather than illocutionary aims.

For him, some verbal acts are inherently impolite, while others are inherently polite. Consequently, politeness involves reducing the influence of impolite acts and enhancing that of polite ones (Cruz, 2015: 6).

It is asserted that the shortcoming of these pragmatic models is their extreme dependence on utterance-level. That is, politeness is presumed to be predicated by the speaker and not the outcome of the hearer's valuation of the speaker's behavior, and mitigation is considered to be intended for certain discourse fragments. Therefore, several modern studies have stressed the need to go beyond the analyst's interpretation and to take into account

interlocutors' own perception of politeness as they surface in continuing conversation through their reactions and responses (ibid).

This requires adopting a discourse approach so as to scrutinize how persons convey their social identities and maintain their relations through their verbal actions and their reactions to these, and how they negotiate the impact of their acts in longer stretches that go beyond the utterance-level (ibid).

13. Impoliteness

Impoliteness is a key notion in the areas of pragmatics and discourse analysis. Culpeper (1996: 349) states that whereas numerous studies have been conducted on politeness strategies, little work has been done on communicative strategies whose goal is to attack one's interlocutor and cause disharmony. For him, impoliteness is very much the parasite of politeness.

Bousfield (2008: 72) considers impoliteness as the broad opposite of politeness. That is, while politeness seeks to mitigate face-threating acts, impoliteness constitutes the communication of deliberately gratuitous and conflictive verbal face-threatening acts which are purposefully conveyed.

It is asserted that defining impoliteness constitutes a real challenge. This is due to the fact that although some behaviours are typically impolite, they will not always be so in all situations. Therefore, impoliteness depends on how one perceives what is said and done and how that relates to the situation (Culpeper, 2011: 22).

Moreover, impoliteness requires (a) a mental attitude held by a participant and comprised of negative evaluation beliefs about certain behaviours in certain social contexts, and (b) the activation of that attitude by those incontext behaviours. Based on what has been said , impoliteness can be defined as a negative attitude towards specific behaviours occurring in specific contexts (ibid: 23).

For the successful performance of impoliteness, and according to Bousfield (2008:72), the intention of the speaker to cause offence must be recognized by those in a recipient role. That is, impoliteness does not occur where one rather than both participants intends/perceives face-threats.

As for impoliteness strategies, Culpeper (1996: 355-7) tries to build a framework for impoliteness in relation to Brown and Levinson (1987) politeness strategies. He shows that politeness superstrategies have their opposite impoliteness superstrategies, which are means of attacking face rather than enhancing it.

Mills (2011: 26) asserts that there has been a discursive turn in politeness research. That is, theorists are no longer satisfied to tackle politeness and impoliteness as if they were realized through employing isolated phrases and sentences. It is obvious that politeness and impoliteness are judgements regarding linguistic phenomena, and judgements are typically constituted over a number of turns or even over much longer stretches of interaction.

Additionally, theorists who adapt a discursive approach normally focus on issues of context. Hence, they do not concentrate on politeness at the level of the phrase or sentence, and do not presume that politeness is somehow inherent in the words used (ibid: 27).

Furthermore, and according to Van der Bom and Mills (2015: 188), discursive approaches to (im)politeness are a more localized, interactive and context-centred form of analysis which takes into consideration the interaction between participants, selects longer chunks of discourse for analysis, and concentrates on the perceptions of the people concerned in terms of what they take to be polite and impolite. Moreover, such approaches are more concerned with ideologies of (im)politeness . That is, these approaches stress the idea that it is significant to chart the role of politeness and impoliteness as moral and ideological systems, rather than simply presuming that interlocutors' politeness as a way of signifying their empathy for others.

14. Pragmatics and Argumentative Discourse

Puig (2003: 3) mentions that argumentation has received a great deal of attention due to the fact that it is pervasive in interaction where it determines the political, legal and advertising discourse genera.

Bermejo-Luque (2011: 1) thinks that for most people, argumentation is an everyday and everywhere conduct in the sense that it is customary to encounter people involved in the process of giving and requesting reasons. For Eemeren and Grootendorst (2004:1):

"Argumentation is a verbal, social, and rational activity aimed at convincing a reasonable critic of the acceptability of a standpoint by putting forward a constellation of propositions justifying or refuting the proposition expressed in the standpoint."

At the sentence level, argumentation is seen as consisting of elementary speech acts belonging to the category of assertives. By contrast, at the textual level, the complete constellation of elementary speech acts constitutes the complex speech act of argumentation (Henkemans, 2014: 43). From speech act perspective, and according to Eemeren and Grootendorst (1984: 47), the illocutionary act complex of argumentation is intended to convince or persuade the listener of the acceptability of the speaker's opinion.

Huber and Snider (2006: 3) says whereas persuasion can be defined as the activity of affecting the conduct of attitudes of others, argument is the logical approach of persuasion.

In considering a strategy to convince interlocutors by means of argumentation, the notion of discourse orientation is extremely important. It is proposed that *discourse orientation* designates the movement or direction that speakers desire to assign to the comprehensible whole of speech acts which they desire to induce in their audience. As such, they try to manipulate audience by directing them to the explanatory route which will serve the speakers' interest best. They will accomplish this communicative aim by proposing a strategy, selecting words and a certain discourse movement (Puig, 2003: 4).

15. Critical Discourse Analysis

According to Crystal (2003: 149), critical discourse analysis refers to an approach that investigates the relation which holds between discoursal events and sociopolitical and cultural elements particularly the manner in which discourse is ideologically affected by power and ties in society. Previously, Van Dijk (2001: 352) expresses this same view as follows:

"Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. With such dissident research, critical discourse analysts take explicit position, and thus want to understand, expose, and ultimately resist social inequality."

Wodak (2007:209) asserts that in this field of investigation, language constitutes an excellent manifestation of the discrimination of power in the hierarchy of the social structures. Critical discourse analysis concentrates on the ways in which linguistic formulas are utilized in heterogeneous expressions and manipulations of powers. Actually, power is shown not merely by syntactic forms employed in a text, but also through a speaker's dominance of a social event via the sort of a text selected.

Widdowson (2007: 71) suggests that this approach to discourse is critical because it questions the legitimacy of ideas and presumptions that have been taken for granted as sound based on the idea that they really maintain a status quo that in effect retains discrimination and unfairness via privileging the elite and the powerful. Hence, the job of the analyst is to explore hints of ideologies and prejudice in texts.

Within the last few years, there has been promising cooperation between pragmatics and critical discourse analysis. This cooperation has been reflected in the utilization of specific pragmatic aspects and notions like implicatures, presuppositions, allusions, etc., when tackling such subjects as racism, inequality and specific features of political discourse. The interaction between the two fields of study reflect sophistication of such critical matters (Wodok, 2007: 210).

16. Conclusions

On the basis of the discussion throughout this study, it can be concluded that:

1. Pragmatics is a field of study that investigates those aspects of language that are context-variant. Discourse analysis resembles pragmatics in that it also studies language in use but it differs from pragmatics through its emphasis on the structure of texts and its concentration on longer chunks of language.

2. As the discourse analyst investigates language as used by interlocutors, he has to adopt a pragmatic perspective. This means that he must resort to pragmatic notions such as speech act, implicature, presupposition, reference, and (im)politeness in his analysis of discourse.

3. Context is a concept which serves to draw a clear line of demarcation between pragmatics and discourse analysis. Whereas in the former, context is more personal in nature, in the latter it denotes the place and time in which a communicative activity occurs i. e. it has nothing to do with the speaker. In other words, pragmatics has more to do with the external or physical context, while discourse analysis focuses on the linguistic context.

4. In addition to context, intention also helps to draw the borderlines between pragmatics and discourse analysis . While a discourse analyst usually explains matters without having recourse to elements outside language, a pragmatist often interprets utterances by making use of different realms of human activity including that of speaker's meaning or intention.

5. Numerous recent approaches to discourse analysis are pragmatically oriented as they have more to do with language in use . This is exemplified by the hybrid field of investigation termed *discourse pragmatics*. It focuses on issues such as the performance of sequences of speech acts. Moreover, it aims at expanding the realm of pragmatics via stressing the role of the social and cultural restrictions in communication. It has two versions: interactional and intercultural

References

Allott, N. (2010). **Key Terms in Pragmatics**. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Barron, A. and Schneider, K. (2014). Discourse Pragmatics: Signposting a vast field. In Bublitz, W, Jucker, A. and Schneider, K. (Eds.) **Pragmatics of Discourse**. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Bermejo-Luque, L. (2011). **Giving Reasons: A Linguistic-Pragmatic Approach to Argumentation Theory**. Madrid: Springer.

Birner, Betty J. (2013). **Introduction to Pragmatics**. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Bousfield, D. (2008). **Impoliteness in Interaction**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983) **Discourse Analysis**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1987). **Politeness**: **Some Universals in Language Use**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coulthard, Malcolm (1985). **An Introduction to Discourse Analysis**. London : Longman .

Cruz, M. (2014). Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis. University of Seville.

Crystal, David (2003). **A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics**. Oxford: Blachwell.

Culpeper, J. (1996). Towards an Anatomy of Impoliteness. **Journal of Pragmatics**, 25, 349-367.

_____ (2011). **Impoliteness: Using Language to Cause Offence**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cutting, J. (2002). **Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis**. London: Routledge.

de Saussure, L. (2007). Procedural Pragmatics and the Study of Discourse. Universite de Neuchatel.

Eemeren, F. and R. Grootendorst. (1984) **Speech Acts in Argumentative Discussions**. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

_____ (2004) **Systematic Theory of Argumentation**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferrara, A. (1980). An extended theory of speech acts: appropriateness conditions for subordinate acts in sequence. **Journal of Pragmatics** (4). 233 – 252 .

Fetzer, A. (2014). Conceptualizing Discourse. In Bublitz, W, Jucker, A. and Schneider, K. (Eds.) **Pragmatics of Discourse**. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Geyer, N. (2008). **Discourse and Politeness: Ambivalent Face in Japanese**. London: Continuum.

Halliday, M. A. K. and Hasan, R. (1970). **Cohesion in English**. London: Longman.

Henkemans, F. (2014) Speech Act Theory and the Study of Argumentation. **Studies in Logic**, **Grammar and Rhetoric**, 36 (49).

Huber, R. and Snider, A. **Influencing Through Argument**. New York: International Debate Education Association.

Horn, L. and Kecskes, I. (2013). Pragmatics, Discourse, and cognition. Yale University.

Isabelle, Van der Bom and Mills, S. (2015). A Discursive Approach to the Analysis of Politeness Data. **Journal of Politeness Research**, 11 (27), 179-206.

Levinson, S. (1983). **Pragmatics**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mey, Jacob (2001). **Pragmatics**: **An Introduction**. Oxford: Blackwell .

Mills, S. (2011). Discursive Approaches to Politeness and Impoliteness. In Linguistic Politeness Research Group's (Eds.) **Discursive Approaches to Politeness**. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Moeschiler, J. (1998). Speech Act Theory and the Analysis of Conversation. University of Geneva: Department of Linguistics.

Paltridge, B. (2006). **Discourse Analysis**. London: Continuum.

Polyzou, A. (2014). Presupposition in Discourse: Theoretical and Methodological Issues. **Critical Discourse Studies**, 12, 123-138.

Puig, M. B. (2003). Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis. In *http://www.gencat.cat/llengua/noves*

Sauerland, U. and Schumacher, P. (2015). Pragmatics: Theory and Experiment Growing Together. **Linguistische Berichte**, 245, 3-24.

Sbisa, M. (1999). Presupposition, Implicature and Context in Text Understanding. Department of Philosophy, University of Trieste.

Schegloff, E. and Sacks, H. (1973). Opening up Closings. In *(web.stanford.edu/~eckert/PDF)*

Song, L. (2010). The Role of Context in Discourse Analysis. **Journal of Language Teaching and Research**, Vol. 1, No.6, pp. 876-879.

Thomas, J. (1995) **Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics**. London: Longman.

Van Dijk, Teun A. (1977) **Text and Context**. London: Longman.

_____ (1980a) **An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse**, **Interaction**, **and Cognition**. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

_____ 2001. Critical discourse analysis. In D. Tannen, D. Schiffrin and H. Hamilton (Eds.), **The Handbook of Discourse Analysis**. Oxford: Blackwell.

_____(2007) The Study of Discourse: An Introduction. **Discourse Studies**. SAGE Publishings Ltd

Verschueren, J. (1999). **Understanding Pragmatics**. London: Edward Arnold.

Yule, G. (1985) **The Study of Language**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____(2010) **The Study of Language**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

_____ (1996) **Pragmatics**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Widdowson, H. (2007). **Discourse Analysis**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wodak, R. (2007). Pragmatics and Critical Discourse Analysis. **Pragmatics and Cognition** (15), pp. 203-225.