Annual Review of Applied Linguistics (2002) **22**, 136–149. Printed in the USA.
Copyright © 2002 Cambridge University Press 0267-1905/01 $9.50

7. DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND STYLISTICS

Paul Simpson and Geoff Hall

This review focuses on contemporary work in discourse stylistics, defined here as that designated branch of stylistics which draws specifically on the techniques and methods of discourse analysis. The review acknowledges a key assumption in modern discourse stylistic research, namely that the distinction between 'literary' and 'nonliterary' discourse, if tenable at all, is drawn not on a purely linguistic basis but in terms of multiple intersections among texts, readers, institutions, and sociocultural contexts. In spanning studies of both literary and nonliterary discourse, therefore, the coverage of the present review is intended to reflect this axiom. It also attempts to foreground the diversity of method and approach in contemporary discourse stylistics. Given that the techniques of discourse analysis are themselves many and various, the survey seeks to cover stylistic work that offers productive applications of the many available models in pragmatics, conversation analysis, cognitive linguistics, speech act theory, and discourse psychology. Finally, in covering a selection of important monographs, articles, and book chapters, the review seeks both to highlight some of the critical, cultural, and ideological frameworks currently employed by discourse stylisticians and to demarcate, in more general terms, the current state-of-play in this research tradition.

A recurrent issue in modern discourse stylistic research has been the problematic literary/nonliterary divide, with a general consensus emerging that any divisions made are not effected on a purely linguistic basis. Rather, discourse stylistics views literary texts as instances of naturally occurring language use in a social context, where discourse analysis should reveal as much about the contexts as about the text, and where readers, audiences, and institutions will form a key component of characterizations of these contexts (compare Carter & Simpson, 1989; Coupland, 1988). Discourse stylistics at its best will necessarily be a thoroughgoing interdisciplinary, even transdisciplinary, endeavor. These are stringent demands, and have unsurprisingly not always been fully achieved in published discourse stylistic work. The publications reviewed here are characteristically conservative, tending to focus more on text explication and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

interpretation than on social and institutional explanations and implications. Nevertheless, the issues broached, if not always explored in depth, are at the heart of social theory, and the validity of dynamic and grounded discourse analytic approaches to these large and sometimes overly abstract topics is well illustrated in considerations of identity and individuality, politeness and power relations, or storytelling and mediatized social interaction. As in so many other disciplines at present, Bakhtin is a salient name in much of this research, but areas such as conversation analysis, pragmatics, speech act theory, and discourse psychology have also importantly influenced researchers and research agendas. We turn first to significant book-length approaches to discourse and dialogue in and around literary texts.

Recent Books Drawing on Stylistics

Magnusson's monograph, *Shakespeare and Social Dialogue* (1999) offers a valuable rapprochement of poetics and linguistics, specifically New Historicism (e.g., Greenblatt, 1984, 1988) and pragmatics, especially politeness theory (Brown & Levinson, 1987). The study of Shakespeare's language is historicized by contextualizing verbal interaction in the plays through a study of Elizabethan letter writing and etiquette and letter-writing manuals for courtiers, merchants, and others. The textuality of documents formerly treated as mere contexts for literary works becomes an object of attention in itself. The boundaries between the literary and the nonliterary are problematized. Dominant approaches to studies of Shakespeare's dramatic language are criticized for New Critical-inspired formalism (valorization of intricacies, images, ambiguities, and puns out of context) and "a focus on the speech rather than the exchange as the unit of dramatic discourse" (Magnusson, 1999, p. 4). Speech, moreover, is traditionally studied as issuing from an individual 'character' with an 'essential nature,' expressed through his or her words, rather than in the conversation analysis tradition proposed by Magnusson, where self is viewed as an online, contingent, and provisional co-construction requiring continual 'repair' and maintenance (see chap. 6 especially). This perception of conversation as self maintenance in everyday interaction views identity as a leakier vessel than, for example, that posited by Greenblatt in *Renaissance Self-Fashioning* (1984). It is a view of identity as always undergoing maintenance and repair, always being patched even in the making, and a view of that patchwork and maintenance of selves as a cooperative or collaborative activity. 'Character effects' (chap. 1) will accordingly derive from speakers' relative social positions and speech patterns. Social position and 'subjectivity' are determinants of style to a greater degree than any posited individual personal identity.

In line with both New Historicism as well as studies in discourse analysis, Magnusson analyzes verbal negotiations as social and political interaction through which power relations such as 'service' or 'friendship' are co-constructed. In a hierarchical society, 'negative politeness' (see Brown & Levinson, 1987) is traced

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in letters and the interactions of Shakespearean characters, though the solidarity constructed through 'positive politeness' is much in evidence too (as, for example, in Iago's apparently undue familiarity with Othello as they discuss his errant wife) (Ch.7). Against the old dictum 'style is the man,' Magnusson argues, after Bakhtin (1984), "style is at least two persons" (p. 24).

The book falls into three sections: Part I. The rhetoric of politeness; Part II, Eloquent relations in letters; and Part III, A prosaics of conversation. The careful work of the earlier sections most obviously bears fruit in Chapter 6, The pragmatics of repair in *King Lear* and *Much Ado About Nothing*; and Chapter 7, 'Voice potential:' Language and symbolic capital in *Othello*. In *Much Ado*, for example, Magnusson usefully traces the pervasiveness of miscommunication and concerns about miscommunication. But where some deconstructive readings stop at this point, Magnussson shows the workings of repair mechanisms in characters' dialogues, and careful anticipations of possible misunderstandings (compare Bakhtin's anticipatory poetics), so that the play's "concern is not only with how language fails but with how language works" (p. 158). The study of *Othello* in the following chapter explores the relevance of Bourdieu's (1979) notion that the social position of a speaker affects the meaning and value of what is said more than the content of the utterance in itself. Desdemona is used to being listened to and understood. Her reception by Othello is increasingly problematic and distressing. Iago's mastery of politeness is studied not as 'polite eloquence,' since he makes a point of bluff speaking, but as a deep and sophisticated understanding of the 'social logic' of social interaction (p. 179), when and how to speak. The workings of Bourdieu's (1979) 'habitus' and subjectification are shown to be relevant in observing Cordelia (Ch. 6) as an instance of "history turned into nature," the speaker "endlessly overtaken by [his] own words" (Bourdieu, 1979, as cited in Magnusson, pp. 151–153). Where commentators on *King Lear* have frequently noted and examined the 'recognition' scenes, Magnusson offers a new perspective on these instances of the importance of 'reciprocal acknowledgment' (or not: dying Lear-Kent; Kent-Oswald) as enacted in dialogue. Here again her intersubjective theory of identity stresses "the role of talk both in generating social identities and shared realities and in negotiating social change" (p. 142).

Magnusson could be criticized for a certain eclecticism in her borrowings from conversation analysis (hereafter CA) and discourse analysis (hereafter DA), and even in the use of Brown and Levinson (1987). At times readers may wish to see more analysis of Shakespeare and less quotation of Elizabethan letters. Some of her work has of course been anticipated as her own generous notes fully acknowledge. Nevertheless, the bringing together of a linguistics of social interaction with the demands of literary theory in the form of New Historicism makes this book one of the more important contributions to the study of dialogue and discourse in the field of stylistics in recent years. In his influential 1989 essay, Montrose proposes that the linguistic and the social are not opposed, and instead

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

emphasizes "their reciprocity and mutual constitution" (p. 6), but offers no further examples of discussion. Greenblatt (1988), on the other hand, castigates formalist linguistics as "textual analyses...[which] convey almost nothing of the social dimension of literature's power" (p. 5). *Shakespeare and Social Dialogue* is an important response to these criticisms and should be followed up by more such studies not restricted to the Renaissance.

A monograph that complements Magnusson in a number of useful ways is Culpeper's *Language and Characterisation: People in Plays and Other Texts* (2001). The points of intersection between the two volumes are indeed multiple. Both are interested in how characterization is mediated through structures of dialogue and discourse, both draw on stylistic and pragmatic models of analysis (and notably on Brown and Levinson's model of politeness), and both place a strong emphasis on the language of Shakespearean plays. Where Culpeper's study differs principally from Magnusson's is in his greater reliance on the insights offered to stylistics by, in particular, schema theory and theories of discourse processing (such as that exemplified by van Dijk and Kintsch's 1983 model of text comprehension). However, many other stylistic models are brought into play here, as well as a body of sociolinguistic research on variation and speech styles, making Culpeper's monograph highly eclectic.

Implicit in much of Culpeper's central thesis is the assumption that if literary critics insist on talking about characterization in literature, then they should do so with a firm grasp of relevant aspects of social psychology or with, at least, a solid grounding in stylistic research on dialogue and discourse. Culpeper casts his position rather more diplomatically than we have done by identifying and critiquing, early in the book, two traditional approaches to characterization in literary criticism. The first is the 'humanizing' tradition, wherein fictional characters are judged as if they were real people in the real world. The second, the 'dehumanizing' tradition, is where characters are resolutely divorced from real life and seen purely as agents for, and reflexes of, plot development. Culpeper suggests that in their purer forms each tradition is manifestly flawed, and that the process of inferring character from text is rather more complex. His own aim is to show "how the cognitive structures and inferential mechanisms that readers have already developed for real-life people might be used in their comprehension of characters" (p. 10). Further, he sees his task as describing "both the textual factors and the cognitive factors that jointly lead a reader to have a particular impression of a character" (p. 11). Later in the book, Culpeper looks at structuralist approaches to characterization in the vein of Propp's folk-tale morphology, although he highlights problems in these models as well. The main problem is that structuralist models fail to discriminate between psychological and textual aspects of characterization. As Culpeper puts it, "our conception of a particular character arises as a result of a complex interaction between the contents of our heads and the incoming textual information" (2001, p. 56).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In addition to the special emphasis on Shakespeare noted earlier, which includes a chapter devoted exclusively to characterization in *The Taming of the Shrew*, there is a chapter which applies Brown and Levinson's (1987) model of politeness specifically. In a sense, Culpeper subverts the Brown and Levinson model, preferring to recast their strategies of politeness as strategies of *impoliteness*; in other words, he isolates a specific set of strategies which speakers use consciously to attack the face of the interlocutor. It is not clear to what extent this marks a genuine departure from the Brown and Levinson framework (given that their original model offers a full account of face threatening acts) nor it is clear how much descriptive benefit can be derived from designing a set of parallel categories which invert the original ones, though this observation marks a theoretical debate which is perhaps best conducted elsewhere. What is important here is the way in which Culpeper, working principally from discourse patterns in John Osborne's play *The Entertainer*, traces the intersection between politeness strategies (or impoliteness as he would see it) and the manner by which verbal conflict and opposition impact the development of both character and plot.

Culpeper ultimately seeks to present a model that accounts for how categories of characterization are realized both cognitively and sociolinguistically. Indeed, relatively early in the book, he offers a diagrammatic representation of this composite, heterogeneous model which embodies the theoretical eclecticism noted above. The extent to which this model will become part of contemporary stylistics' methodological stock-in-trade is still too early to assess, but this is undoubtedly a lively and cogent book which, moreover, demonstrates considerable skill in its synthesis of such a diverse array of material.

Person's short monograph *Structure and Meaning in Conversation and Literature* (1999) examines the ways in which conversational structures are represented in literary discourse and the ways in which the reading process is guided by these structures. Person synthesizes two broad strands of research in conversation analysis (CA) and in reader response theory, although only the first of these is given significant prominence in his analytic framework. While Person quite properly acknowledges the existing body of work in stylistics that draws on CA and DA frameworks for dialogue analysis, the principal impetus for his own study comes from not from the stylisticians but from scholars working on non-literary discourse. Lakoff and Tannen (1984), in particular, argue that the formal analysis of naturalistic conversations can be enriched by the study of dialogue in plays and novels and that, moreover, "artificial dialog may represent an internalized model or schema for the production of conversation—a competence model that speakers have access to" (1984, p. 323). In developing further the rationale for his study, Person argues that his work differs from that of other stylisticians in terms of its coverage. Whereas previous stylistic work has suffered from an over reliance on the mechanisms of turn taking and preference organization, Person's remit is broader, adopting Harvey Sacks' axiom that a

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

properly exhaustive study must examine 'order at all points' in conversation. To the author's credit, he takes his study of discourse features beyond the familiar territory of turn-taking and preference organization and to a level of analytic detail that is refreshing. That said, the first two chapters of Person's book cover familiar terrain, looking respectively at how conversations between fictional characters are presented and at how preference organization is negotiated in literary dialogue. The material on speech presentation includes a critique of the influential work of Short and his coresearchers on 'hypothetical' speech presentation (see, for example, Short, Semino, & Wynne, 1997). This phenomenon, in the context of natural occurring conversation, is where a speaker projects what another participant might have said or might typically be assumed to say. It is their contention that literary speech presentation assumes a nonhypothetical, *verbatim* reproduction of what another character said, because in fiction the 'original' piece of speech has no independent existence and is only accessible via the report itself (Short et al., 1997, p. 222).

Person disagrees and argues that reported speech *can* be hypothetical in literary discourse. He provides this example: in an E. Annie Proulx short story, a female character "reports" the written text of another character in the following way: "She shuffled a deck of envelopes. 'Here sheriff writes blah, blah, vandals broke in. Threw chairs and furniture over the ledge . . .'"(Person, 1999, p. 26). It is obvious that the putative antecedent discourse (the sheriff's report) does not literally contain a 'blah blah' sequence. Rather, the female character's rendition creates a discoursal space for which the reader must hypothesize about the nature of the anterior discourse. Person's observations on this and related issues of speech presentation promise a rich debate for contemporary stylistic theory, although his critique concludes rather abruptly at the end of the chapter which houses it and it is not clear how this fits into the overall direction of the book.

As the book develops, Person examines literary realizations of a number of discourse features that do not come under the traditional compass of stylistic work in this area. These features include nonlexical items such as 'mm hm,' 'uh huh,' 'sort of,' and 'y'know'—features referred to variously by discourse analysts as hedges, particles, fillers, discourse markers, pragmatic devices, and so on. He uncovers many instances of such items in literary dialogue, and in a variety of discourse functions, although something might have been made of the fact that all the exponents identified were in twentieth century fiction. This may suggest a possible diachronic shift in writing styles towards greater sociolinguistic realism in the representation of speech.

Person does indeed take the traditional remit of CA-influenced stylistic work on dialogue and discourse a step further, with later chapters of the book encompassing prosody, restarts, interruptions, body movement and gaze, mimicry across speaker turns, and even a survey of the interactive consequences of the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

reporting of good and bad news. What is intriguing is just how many instances of these features turn up in his corpus of 77 fictional works. However, the level of analytic rigor promised in the earlier chapters is not always sustained, with the discussion of prosody, in particular, becoming a little speculative and self-evident. For instance, on basis of the reporting verb in the sequence " 'You helped Soha with her box. I saw you,' Mama Bisi accused," Person concludes that 'accused' suggests an "accusatory tone of voice" (1999, p. 84). To be fair, certain paralinguistic features of discourse are hard to accommodate in the linear, graphological medium that constitutes literature, which is why certain of the interpretations on offer here tend toward the anodyne.

The basic conclusion of Person's study, although not articulated in quite these terms, is that readers' communicative competence, derived from the everyday routines of naturally occurring social interaction, acts as a conceptual template for the processing of dialogue in fiction. Over the course of the development of a fictional dialogue, readers may align themselves synchronously with different viewpoints within the literary situation. According to Person, there is no aspect of naturally occurring conversation that is *not* found in literary dialogue. This is only one of many conclusions drawn in the book that would sustain future investigation in contemp139ry stylistics.

Narration and narrative continue to receive much attention at the interface of literary, linguistic, and cultural studies. Norrick (2000) is intended as a book-length contribution to conversation analysis as well as to narrative studies. He is suspicious of large claims or characterizations concerning narrative, preferring to look at narratives arising in ordinary everyday conversations. (Compare, in this respect, Fludernik, 1996). Such narratives tend to be diffuse, multiauthored, and in general more 'polyphonic' (Norrick, following Bakhtin, 1984) than the narratives described in Labov's classic studies or by Linde (1993). This, then, is a pragmatic study out of which certain recurrent features are highlighted: repetition patterns; the use of dialogue, tense shifts, and formulaicity to focus interlocutors' attention; segmentation of stories into memorable chunks; and evaluation construction. The focus is always firmly on what the narratives are doing in the ongoing conversational interaction. The data are interesting, the analyses penetrating, and there are plentiful further references for the curious. A bonus for literary stylisticians is a literature chapter (Ch.7) exploring the relevance of consonances and differences between Norrick's 'natural narratives' and narrative in Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* and Beckett's *Endgame*. In keeping with several of the other scholars whose work is reviewed in this section, Norrick uses stylistics as an illustration of "how linguistic analysis of everyday conversation can inform our study of meaning in literary texts" (2000, p. 189).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Recent Articles on Discourse Analysis and Stylistics

Turning now to article-length treatments of the interplay between discourse analysis and stylistics, Piazza (1999) applies conversation analysis to literary dialogue, looking at examples of exchanges and speeches in modern drama from the point of view of repairs in particular, as self-initiated, other-initiated, self-performed, or other-performed. Piazza takes account of the context of repairs in drama scripts and in performance so that they are recognized even when not purely linguistic in form. The dominance of a type of repair is taken to reveal important features of relations between characters in these plays as well as contributing to characterization itself, if not to wider thematic meanings of the plays. Less realistic characters and scenes in Hayes's play, for example, are found to lack self-repair, the unmarked preference, CA tells us, in everyday conversation. Other characters are found to prefer indirection or mitigation, or more aggressive conversational styles, from which playgoers are likely to form impressions of personality. A sense of lack of meaningful interaction, a struggle to communicate in Pinter's plays, is related to a high proportion of self-initiated self-repairs. In some ways, what Piazza does is simply to recast an ordinary reader's or spectator's responses into the CA jargon, thus adding little to our understanding of the play. The stylistic claim would have to be that seeing these exchanges within a CA framework adds to our understanding of how conversations work (or do not work) both on and off the stage.

In a study in narrative stylistics, Toolan (2000) argues that there has been a shift in recent fiction in English away from detached third-person narration in Standard English toward novels written in first-person vernacular English. Moreover, represented speech in contemporary fiction—whether it be from first-person 'voiced' narrators or even from the characters portrayed in third-person narratives—is marked by an increased use of the dysfluencies, hesitations, and repetitions that characterize everyday spoken language (cf. discussion of Person, 1999, above). This trend suggests a 'quasi-autobiographical turn' in modern writing, which Toolan finds most in evidence in first-person narratives focalized by a speaker or thinker and developed in the form of extended monologue. One of the clearest recent exponents of this pattern, according to Toolan, is Don de Lillo's novel *Libra*, although examples are provided of similar narrative strategies in works by James Kelman and Roddy Doyle who use, respectively, Glaswegian and Dublin vernacular speech in their novels. Toolan's broad thesis, worth quoting here, is that

> as a part of a widespread contemporary understanding of "how to render characters"—thus as part of the contemporary aesthetics of narrative fiction (in English, at least)—it has become accepted that it may be appropriate for "direct speech" in fiction to contain ungrammaticality, repetition, structurally-fractured sentences and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

> so on to an unprecedented extent . . . it is possible that this is in part is due to a contemporary literary antipathy for anything that might imply omniscience or essentialist foundations. (pp. 169–171)

Toolan concludes that this sort of 'quasi-transcriptional' direct speech may be related to the explosion of film and televisual forms of narrative during the twentieth century. He adds that the current range of contrasting methods for creating narratives has consequences for the particular effects sought in, and the particular techniques developed by, each competing format within that range.

Two articles which focus on nonliterary discourse, but which nevertheless draw on the methods, techniques and principles of stylistics, are Günthner's 1999 study of prosodic devices in everyday reported speech and Culpeper and Semino's 2000 study of the use of speech act verbs in Early Modern English witchcraft narratives. Günthner takes the idea of a 'layering of voices' from Bakhtin (1981) to capture the behavior of interactants in her German language everyday conversational data. She contends that the interactants use 'poetic devices and polphonic strategies' in recognizably Bakhtinian ways as they perform past dialogues reported in the present for the benefit of interlocutors: 'double voiced discourse,' in short. Günthner's critical point here is that these performative-poetic devices (voice quality and prosodic techniques such as exaggeration or changed pitch) are used to offer an evaluation in the very moment of apparently simply 'reporting' past utterances of another speaker:

> In real life we hear speech about speakers and their discourse at every step. We can go so far as to say that in real life people talk most of all about what others talk about—they transmit, recall, weigh, and pass judgement on other people's words, opinions, assertions, information; people are upset by others' words, or agree with them, contest them, refer to them and so forth. (Bakhtin, 1981, pp. 337–8,) as cited in Günthner, 1999, p. 686)

We hear two voices: the voice reported and the reporter's evaluation of it—often, in this dataset, exaggerated mimicry which can only be taken ironically or parodically. 'Stylization' (Bakhtin, 1984, pp. 185ff.) may also of course be non-linguistic (e.g., facial expression), though this is not Günthner's interest in the article. Nevertheless, Günthner claims that the performed reported utterances she highlights are characteristically 'recontextualized' for present interactional purposes, and that this is a pervasive device in everyday interaction. Here is an altogether neat illustration of what some of us have argued for many years: that the 'literary' and the 'everyday' are not so easily distinguished at the purely linguistic level (compare also Magnusson, 1999, reviewed above): in this case hybridity

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(including code mixing) and 'polyphony' deconstruct any simplistic notions of register or genre.

Culpeper and Semino's (2000) intriguing account of the witchcraft narratives is driven theoretically by work in speech act theory (most notably that of Austin, 1962, and Searle, 1979) and by the work of Levinson on activity types (Levinson, 1992). Using a corpus of late sixteenth and early seventeenth century courtroom witness depositions, they chart the shift in illocutionary status of the class of verbs that include 'curse' and 'wish (harm/evil upon).' Whereas in contemporary English usage, a verb like 'curse' falls neatly into Austin's category of 'behabitive' or into Searle's category of 'expressive,' in early modern usage it had stronger institutional status such that it could be only be weakly aligned with Austin's category of 'exercitive' or, slightly better, with Searle's category of 'expressive.' Working from the special pragmatic function of the earlier use, Culpeper and Semino develop first a set of prototypical felicity conditions for the 'performing' of a witch's curse and then, using Levinson's model, draw up a set of clustered speech act types which represent the various stages in the discursive practice of witchcraft (right up to the trial of 'witches' in the courtroom). What is chilling about the culturally legitimized aspects of witchcraft is just how little it takes to instantiate a witchcraft 'activity type': the occurrence of some negative event (such as someone falling ill) would in itself suffice as proof of a successful curse. Given that anyone uttering the alleged curse could be assumed to have a pact with the devil, and that the testimony of accused witches is in any case unreliable, the prospects were indeed bleak for the hundreds of invariably poor, old, and marginalized women who were accused and eventually executed as witches around that period.

Interest among stylisticians in the public and media construction of discourse continues to be strong. In 1999 two articles were published (independently of one another) which examine specifically the various discourse representations of Diana, Princess of Wales. In the first of these, Abell and Stokoe (1999) argue that involved speakers routinely allocate and avoid blame, or construct 'accountability' in everyday talk. In this case, Princess Diana's well-known *Panorama* BBC television interview is explicated as a set of narratives and descriptions of events which cumulatively portray herself and her actions, in her separation from Prince Charles and after, in a favorable light. 'The media,' 'Charles,' and 'the royal household' are presented as making her life difficult despite her own best intentions and interventions. Abell and Stokoe represent these strategies as 'resources for blame management.' The title of their article ('I take full responsibility, I take some responsibility, I'll take half of it but no more than that') summarizes Abell and Stokoe's argument (and is not, as might be inferred, a direct quotation from Diana herself). In fact, only limited, brief extracts from the interview transcript itself are used. However, the relation of this formal interview to ordinary everyday talk is defended because, it is argued, royalty and the British

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

royal family are increasingly viewed as ordinary people 'really,' with ordinary problems. However, since the royals' lives are up for scrutiny on TV, there are elements of soap opera too. The intellectual context of the study is conversation analysis and discursive psychology, above all, Billig's work (1998). Diana constructs herself as 'reasonable' where others are obstructive and unreasonable. Just one more way in which she shows her ordinariness then—though most of us will not generally be invited to the *Panorama* television studio.

Montgomery's article on the discursive representation of Princess Diana complements that of Abell and Stokoe in several respects, although Montgomery's principal focus is on the mediatized public reactions to her death in 1997 (Montgomery, 1999). More specifically, Montgomery examines, in the first instance, the linguistic properties of the tributes paid to Diana by Tony Blair, by the Queen, and by Diana's brother, Earl Spencer, and, in the second, the manner by which these tributes are assessed by the media and the public. The conceptual framework which informs this study is drawn from Jürgen Habermas's model of 'Universal Pragmatics' (Habermas, 1979). Montgomery highlights the different means by which speech in the public sphere (as in, for example, the tributes offered to Diana) projects itself as valid in context in determinate ways: it can be seen as *true*, *sincere* or *appropriate*. Furthermore, it is often the case that only one of these validity claims will be foregrounded in media judgments on public speech at any one time. Montgomery argues persuasively that of the three Habermasian parameters, it is sincerity that in the main becomes the touchstone against which the behavior of the tribute-paying public figures is measured; he notes as a significant exception that in some of mediatized reception of the Queen's tribute, the shift is toward the validity claim of appropriateness.

As the survey of these last two articles suggests, contemporary discourse stylistic research tends to straddle the literary—nonliterary divide in terms of both its focus and its coverage. Indeed, our introduction touched upon this issue, where we noted the consensus view in discourse stylistics that the literary/nonliterary division is drawn not on a purely linguistic basis, but in terms of its constitution as a reflex of text and social context. What contributes further to this generally broad remit is the manner by which, within this research paradigm, the application of techniques in discourse analysis serves as a channel to a number of other aspects of text processing and textual understanding. For instance, in a book whose relevance is more implicitly than explicitly related to the compass of the present review, Hidalgo-Downing (2000) draws upon logical, philosophical, and semantic concepts of negation in her investigation of the generation of humor in fictional writing. The bulk of the data used for her study is taken from Joseph Heller's novel *Catch 22*, with much of her analysis concentrated specifically on modelling the humorous aspects used in the dialogue of the novel. Similarly, the Jucker, Fritz, and Lebsanft (1999) volume is a highly diffuse collection of papers on the analysis of dialogue in its historical context. Although manifestly historical-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

linguistic, as opposed to discourse-stylistic, in orientation, there are nonetheless significant elements in this book's interplay between dialogue and discourse which stylisticians will find interesting. And finally, a book which narrowly misses the publication cycle covered in the present review but which again has relevance to discourse stylistics is Culpeper, Short, and Verdonk (1998). This is a collection of papers specifically devoted to the analysis of drama dialogue, and its twelve chapters, by scholars from around the world, are written at introductory level. With a selection of exercises and activities appended to each contribution, this makes for a useful introductory textbook for the teaching of stylistics and discourse analysis to undergraduate students.

Conclusion

Recent work in discourse stylistics of the sort reviewed here suggests that this particular branch of applied linguistics is becoming progressively more interdisciplinary in scope. Our review has highlighted some of the critical, cultural, and ideological frameworks currently employed by stylisticians. When those frameworks are married with the many available models of analysis in pragmatics, conversation analysis, cognitive linguistics, speech act theory, and discourse psychology, the research paradigm becomes heterogeneous indeed in terms of its variety of approaches and methods of analysis. In consequence, the boundaries of discourse stylistics are sometimes fuzzy: Our conclusion has cited just two works (Hidalgo-Downing, 2000; Jucker et al., 1999) whose relationship is more tangential than direct, although these are only two of many possible candidates that straddle the boundaries. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that discourse stylistics has now its own rich history of established, seminal work and that interest in this subject area, if not all-consuming, is sufficient to guarantee continued, steady output for the foreseeable future.

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Culpeper, J. (2001). *Language and characterisation: People in plays and other texts*. Harlow: Longman.

An eclectically driven stylistic analysis of how characterization is developed in fictional dialogue, with particular emphasis on the plays of Shakespeare.

Magnusson, L. (1999). *Shakespeare and social dialogue: Dramatic language and Elizabethan letters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

This study brings together the historical pragmatic study of politeness and etiquette in Shakespeare's plays and sonnets with letters and other

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

contemporary writings on the subject. An important attempt to speak equally to both literary criticism and the study of discourse and conversation in everyday and literary language.

Montgomery, M. (1999). Speaking sincerely: Public reactions to the death of Diana, Princess of Wales. *Language and Literature*, *8*(1), 5–33.

An intriguing study which uses the ideas of Jürgen Habermas to explore the discursive construction of public and media tributes in the aftermath of the death of Diana, Princess of Wales.

Person, R., Jr. (1999). *Structure and meaning in conversation and literature*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Working from a substantial corpus of texts, this compact study probes dialogue in fiction using models in ethnomethodology and conversation analysis.

OTHER REFERENCES

Abell, J., & Stokoe, E. (1999). 'I take full responsibility, I take some responsibility, I'll take half of it but no more than that:' Princess Diana and the 'Panorama' interview. *Discourse Studies, 1,* 297–319.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. (M. Holquist, Ed.; C. Emerson & M. Holquist, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics*. (C. Emerson, Ed. & Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bakhtin, M. M., & Voloshinov, V. N. (1983). Discourse in life and discourse in poetry. In A. Shukman (Ed.), *Bakhtin School Papers: Russian Poetics in Translation, Vol. 10* (pp. 5–30). Oxford: RPT Publications.

Billig, M. (1998). *Talking of the royal family*. London: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1979). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carter, R., & Simpson, P. (1989). Introduction. In R. Carter & P. Simpson (Eds.), *Language, discourse and literature. An introductory reader in discourse stylistics* (pp. 1–20). London: Unwin Hyman.

Coupland, N. (1988). Introduction: Towards a stylistics of discourse. In N. Coupland (Ed.), *Styles of discourse* (pp. 1–19). London: Croom Helm.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Culpeper, J., & Semino, E. (2000). Constructing witches and spells: Speech acts and activity types in early modern England. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics, 1*, 197–116.

Culpeper, J., Short, M., & Verdonk, P. (Eds.) (1998). *Exploring the language of drama: From text to context*. London: Routledge.

Fludernik, M. (1996). *Natural narratives*. London: Routledge.

Greenblatt, S. (1984). *Renaissance self-fashioning: From More to Shakespeare*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Greenblatt, S. (1988). *Shakespearean negotiations: The circulation of social energy in Renaissance England*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Günthner, S. (1999). Polyphony and the 'layering of voices' in reported dialogues: An analysis of the use of prosodic devices in everyday reported speech. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*, 685–708.

Habermas, J. (1979). Universal pragmatics. In *Communication and the evolution of society* (pp. 1–68). Boston: Beacon Press.

Hidalgo-Downing, L. (2000). *Negation, text worlds, and discourse: The pragmatics of fiction*. Stamford, CT: Ablex.

Jucker, A., Fritz, G., & Lebsanft, F. (Eds.) (1999). *Historical dialogue analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lakoff, R., & Tannen, D. (1984). Conversational strategy and metastrategy in a pragmatic theory: The example of *Scene from a Marriage*. *Semiotica, 49*, 323–46.

Levinson, S. L. (1992). Activity types and language. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work* (pp. 66–100). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Linde, C. (1993). *Life stories: The creation of coherence*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Montrose, L. (1989). Professing the Renaissance: The poetics and politics of culture. In H. Aram Veeser (Ed.), *The New Historicism* (pp. 15–36). London: Routledge.

Norrick, N. (2000). *Conversational narrative*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Piazza, R. (1999). Dramatic discourse approached from a conversational analysis perspective: Catherine Hayes's *Skirmishes* and other contemporary plays. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*, 1001–1023.

Searle, J. (1979). *Expression and meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Short, M., Semino, E., & Wynne, M. (1997). A (free direct) reply to Paul Simpson's discourse. *Journal of Literary Semantics, 26*, 219–228.

Toolan, M. (2000). Quasi-transcriptional speech: A compensatory spokenness in Anglo-Irish literary fiction. In A. Bex, M. Burke, & P. Stockwell (Eds.), *Contextualized stylistics* (pp. 153–172). Amsterdam: Rodopi.

van Dijk, T., & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. London: Academic Press.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000077 Published online by Cambridge University Press