

UNIVERSITATEA “BABEȘ-BOLYAI” CLUJ-NAPOCA

FACULTATEA DE LITERE

TEZĂ DE DOCTORAT

THE EDITORIAL: A PURPOSE-BASED DISCOURSE

COORDONATOR ȘTIINȚIFIC:

PROF. DR. MIHAI M. ZDRENGHEA

DOCTORAND:

ILIES-SZENDRŐDI NORBERT

2016

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

1. Pragmatics	1
1.1 Pragmatics and Traditional Linguistics: The borders	3
1.1.1 Defining Pragmatics: What is Pragmatics about?	3
1.1.2 How does Pragmatics work? - Introducing Pragmatic Acts	5
1.1.3 The context of appearance and sudden emergence of Pragmatics	8
1.1.3.1 The ‘Pragmatic Turn’	8
1.1.4 The borders between pragmatics and other branches of linguistics	19
1.1.4.1 Pragmatics and Syntax	20
1.1.4.2 Pragmatics and Semantics	22
1.1.4.3 Pragmatics and Logic	25
1.2 Defining Pragmatics	28
1.2.1 Towards a definition of Pragmatics	29
1.2.2 The importance of the user-User’s context	31
1.2.3 The ever expanding context: from co-text to societal context	37
1.3 Pragmatic Acts (From Speech Acts to Pragmatic Acts)	40
1.3.1 From Speech Acts to Pragmatic Acts	43
1.3.1.1 Speech Acts	43
1.3.1.2 Indirect Speech Acts	44
1.3.1.3 Pragmatic acts	48
2. Discourse	57
2.1 What is Discourse? Discourse and Critical Discourse Analysis	61
2.1.1 Defining Discourse	61
2.1.2 Content analysis or discourse analysis? (from content to discourse analysis)	67
2.1.3 Discourse as ‘social practice’	74
2.1.3.1 Language and discourse. Langue or parole?	74
2.1.3.2 Five aspects of language use as social practice	75
2.1.4 Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)	83
2.1.5 Fairclough’s method of Critical Discourse Analysis	88
2.1.5.1 Texts	89
2.1.5.2 Discursive practices	91
2.1.5.3 Sociocultural practice	93
2.2 Sociocultural Practice and Discourse	95

2.2.1	Economic Practices- the source of power and dominance	98
2.2.2	Power and Power relations in discourse	102
2.2.3	Dominance and hegemony	104
2.2.4	Access	107
2.2.5	Ideology and ideological work	109
2.2.6	Social cognition	114
2.3	Linguistic tools for analyzing texts	116
2.3.1	Lexical tools for mind management	121
2.3.1.1	Naming and reference	124
2.3.1.2	Predication	127
2.3.2	Syntactic tools for analysis	130
2.3.2.1	Transitivity and mind management	131
2.3.2.2	Nominalisation	136
2.3.2.3	Permutation, initialisation and innuendo	137
2.3.2.4	Modality	139
2.3.2.5	Speech Acts	144
2.3.3	Rhetorical tropes	145
2.3.3.1	Hyperbole	146
2.3.3.2	Metaphor	147
2.3.3.3	Metonym	148
2.3.3.4	Neologism	149
2.3.3.5	Puns	150
3.	Analytical framework and method of analysis	152
4.	Analysis	156
4.1	The BP oil spill	157
4.1.1	BP Oil Spill in the <i>Daily Express</i>	158
4.1.1.1	Editorial 1: GULF OIL SPILL CATASTRPHE FOR BP	159
4.1.1.2	Editorial 2: CAMERON MUST REMEMBER OUR INTERESTS COME FIRST	164
4.1.2	BP Oil Spill in the <i>Daily Mail</i>	173

4.1.2.1 Editorial 3: BARACK OBAMA’S ANTI-BRITISH PREJUDICE HELPS NEITHER BP NOR AN ALLIANCE THAT HAS SERVED THE WORLD FOR MORE THAN 100 YEARS	173
4.2 The David Laws case	191
4.2.1 The David Laws case in the <i>Daily Express</i>	191
4.2.2 Editorial 4. DAVID LAWS’ RESIGNATION A CRUCIAL TEST FOR THIS DELICATE ALLIANCE	192
4.2.3 The David Laws case in <i>The Times</i>	196
4.2.3.1 Editorial 5. THE LAWS OF POLITICS	196
4.2.4 Other Pragmatic acts concerning the David Laws case in the <i>Daily Telegraph</i>	206
5. Conclusions	211
Bibliography	215
Appendices	223
5.1 Editorial 1	223
5.2 Editorial 2	224
5.3 Editorial 3	225
5.4 Editorial 4	228
5.5 Editorial 5	229
5.6 Editorial 6	231

Summary

Key words: pragmatics, pragmatic acts, context, purpose, discourse, CDA (Critical Discourse Analysis), social, ideology, power, groups.

Introduction

This paper is an investigation of the implicit or linguistically unstated assumptions in text, which may although not be visible or perceivable at first sight, have major influences on how readers perceive and interpret them, because of their ideological implications. In both everyday life as well as in the most various fields including politics and the media we can detect a lot of implicit or hidden assumptions that guide the way a text is perceived, understood and interpreted, and the way they establish ideological connections. We assume that a lot of these implicit or ‘hidden’ meanings with ideological implications represent purposeful acts on the part of the speaker, respectively writer by which they are able to assume or suggest things without being compelled to make them explicit. We shall call this phenomenon in line with Jacob L. Mey (1993) ‘pragmatic acts’.

The three key words of the title summarize and describe our main hypothesis, or working assumption, namely that the editorial is an instance of a purpose based discourse. The first word: the ‘editorial’ refers to the object of our analysis while the other two words: ‘purpose-based’, respectively ‘discourse’ refer to two of its main characteristics, namely that it is ‘purpose-based’ and that it is not a simple text but ‘discourse’.

The term purpose-based relates to the fact that editorials as part of newspaper discourse having a well-defined purpose or a function, and this function is determined, on the one hand, by the communicative needs that the editorial has to serve, and on the other hand, it influences the form and content of the text. As Halliday puts it, the nature of language is closely related with the function it has to serve, which at turn is closely connected with the ‘social and ‘personal’ communicative needs of the speaker (Halliday, 1970 qtd. in Fowler, 1998:32), or in other words ,the purpose or goals it has to serve.

The term ‘discourse’ refers to language use that is not restricted simply to content, but it refers to the text in the light of all the social, cultural, institutional or individual conditions of its production including its purpose or function as an act, to which Fairclough refers to as

‘social practice’ (Fairclough 1992:28 qtd. in Coupland and Jaworski 2006:2) conceiving of discourse as existing on three distinct, but at the same time interrelated, dimensions, that is: as text, as discursive practice, which includes the production and interpretation of texts and social practice (Titscher et al. 2000:149-150).

Talking about the discourse of the media, respectively editorials that represents the subject of my investigation, we have to note, that contrary to the claims of many people including journalists in the first place, it is unfortunately not as factual, objective or neutral as we might think. This is because before being published in the form of articles and editorials, raw facts undergo a lot of changes which or in line with the ideologies or ideological positions of newspapers these processes being called “selection” and “transformation” in Fowler’s words the content of newspapers, which the editorial is also part of, is not “facts about the world” but ‘ideas’, ‘beliefs’, ‘propositions’ or ‘ideologies’ (1998:1-2). In other words we can say that, since they are part of given newspaper, editorials also encode the main ideologies and stance of the respective newspaper in the form of ideological assumptions, which in spite of being not explicitly stated, influence the way we perceive and interpret their content. This fact may account for the different representations of the same social event along various editorials belonging to different newspapers.

We shall assume that texts including newspaper editorials are made up by both an explicit content and implicit assumptions some of which are ideological and have ideological implications and that these ideological assumptions that are not explicitly stated represent purposeful communicative acts which are in concordance with the stance, policy and interests of the newspaper they are part of most of which appear in the form of “pragmatic acts” (Mey,1993). In this paper we are going to analyze the pragmatic acts in editorials present in the implicit assumptions with ideological implications and effects, with the help of a theoretical framework, that accounts for both purposeful non-explicit assumptions and the social conditions that influence and govern the form and content of discourse, called CDA integrating the notion of pragmatic acts and pragmatic acting as a main working tool to identify analyse purposeful non-explicit messages with ideological implications as part of the ‘ideological’ and ‘political practices’ (Coward and Ellis, 1977:63) of newspapers.

The paper will have five major parts: the first two discussing the theoretical part and basis of analysis including pragmatics and pragmatic acting and discourse, respectively CDA or Critical Discourse Analysis, with the third providing the description of the theoretical framework and methods of analysis, while the fourth and fifth will contain the analysis of various newspaper editorials, respectively the conclusions of the analysis.

1. Pragmatics

The first part of the paper deals with pragmatics and pragmatic acts. Because discourse is pragmatic according to Brown and Yule the discourse analyst “necessarily takes a pragmatic approach to the study of language in use” (1998:27). As such, in order to understand discourse, we have to understand its pragmatic nature and outline the basic pragmatic principles. In this part, we will describe what pragmatics is, the importance of context as user’s context and pragmatic acts (May, 1993). We will describe the evolution of this branch of linguistics mentioning the major changes that took part in the field that brought about the emergence of ‘pragmatic acts’ briefly contrasting pragmatic analysis with syntactic, semantic, or logical analysis. In this part we are going to compare speech acts and pragmatic acts defining what pragmatic acts are, respectively its characteristics and constraints.

Given the pragmatic nature of discourse, in order to be able to successfully analyse the discourse of editorials, this section of the paper will be dedicated to understand and describe what the term pragmatics covers, or so to say what pragmatics is all about, and how it works, alongside of its short history, that would help us to situate pragmatics on the map of linguistics. The insights that are going to be presented about pragmatics are going to be based mostly on the groundbreaking works in the field of Stephen C. Levinson (1983) and Geoffrey Leech (1983) respectively Jacob L. Mey (1993) who summarizes their main insights, completing them with his own observations and amendments, when necessary, creating a new standard for modern pragmatics. References are going to be made to other emblematic figures in the field, some of the most relevant pioneers of pragmatics as ‘theory of action, who laid the foundations of this branch of linguistics like: J. L. Austin, J. L. Searle, H.P. Grice etc. The aim of this chapter is not to present an extensive pragmatic theory, nor to give exhaustive details of every pragmatic phenomenon, but to briefly summarize what pragmatics is all about, the reasons of its sudden emergence and increasing interest in the field, and how it came to be what it is today, discussing those pragmatic notions that I think to be necessary for my investigation and construction of a theoretical framework for the analysis of the discourse of newspaper editorials.

Many people and, according to Mey, (Mey, Jacob L. “Pragmatics: Overview” *Concise Encyclopaedia of Pragmatics. Second edition* (2009):786-797, 787) many linguists as well think that communication and human understanding in general, is based entirely on the words spoken, or in the case of texts, the ones written. All of us or at least most of us have

encountered situations in our lives, when we, for some reason or other, did not, or were not able to, get our messages across and were misunderstood by our interlocutors, just because they did not understand the message, as it was in our heads, or they missed some aspects of it, which we had a clear picture of in our minds. There can be cases, when people do not make some of the aspects of what they want to communicate intentionally explicit, for various reasons. Some popular handbooks of communication and advertising, for example, often propagate the slogan that “in business, the words count for 5%, the body language for the remaining 95% of your message” (Mey, Jacob L. (2009): “Pragmatics: Overview” *Concise Encyclopaedia of Pragmatics. Second edition* (2009):786-797, 787). This may be an exaggeration, but the point these experts in business communication want to make is, that words themselves do not communicate the entire message, and speaking about business, we know that many times business strategy involves partners not laying bare all their intentions, or lay out all their cards on the table. There are also other cases, when people think that it is in their interest to keep some of the messages ‘hidden’ or not to express them openly or directly for various reasons. These may range from reasons of politeness, face-keeping, the wish to establish and maintain certain impressions, fear, humour etc. to even attempts of manipulation, which we encounter many times in everyday life, the mass-media and especially editorials where the opinions and views of the newspaper are openly expressed. This is when pragmatics comes into the picture. Pragmatics, in general, is said to be preoccupied with the study of meaning but not in the way semantics does. The main difference between the two branches of linguistics is that pragmatics besides being interested in how people communicate and use language, is also preoccupied with the fact that, as Geoffrey Leech puts it, speakers often “mean more than they say” (Leech, 1983:9). Pragmatics is also considered to be the study of “invisible meaning” (Yule, 2006:112) or as Mey refers to it: “the science of the unsaid” (1993:281). If we are trying to grasp the essence of what pragmatics represents in contrast to semantics, we can use Gazdar’s words, which became an often quoted formula, namely: “Pragmatics is meaning without semantics” (Gazdar, 1979:4).

Pragmatics studies those aspects of meaning, that are somehow ‘there’ in an utterance or a text, but which cannot be seen with the “naked eye” (Mey, 1993:182). Although they are not directly visible in the forms and meanings of an utterance respectively text, we can say, that they have an influence, or they exercise an influence on the interlocutors or addressees of texts. There can be situations when these ‘hidden’ meanings that manifest themselves, or better to say, are encoded in the form of some cues must not be underestimated as trivial,

insignificant elements, because they can play a major role in conveying meanings that would not have the same effects, if these 'invisible' elements would be made explicit or would not be left implicit, like in the case of manipulation, an important aspect of our analysis of the discourse of editorials, but also in other cases where 'invisible meanings serve various purposes, they would not achieve the same goals. We are going to illustrate this with many examples throughout the sections to come.

The following sections will be dedicated to describe the reasons of the so called 'pragmatic turn' that is the context of appearance and emergence of pragmatics, respectively the importance of context in pragmatic analysis.

The most important reasons that contributed to the appearance and establishment of pragmatics as one of the main branches of linguistics together with syntax and semantics were, on the one hand, are of historic origin relating to the long lasting dominance of 'grammar' or syntax over the other branches of linguistics, and, on the other hand, they can be seen, as the direct consequence of the unexplainable linguistic phenomena by the other two branches. The problems encountered by syntax, that was preoccupied mainly by the rules under which a sentence might be deemed as correct or 'grammatical', like the problems of meaning were shifted to semantics that became so to say the 'wastebasket' of semantics, but later on as semantics encountered problems on its own, these came to be handled by another branch of linguistics that came into being, pragmatics. Pragmatics is clearly separated by the other two branches because it is able to describe problems which had been impossible to handle within the fields of syntax and semantics which relied on a more formalist descriptions of language. Pragmatics realised that 'idealised examples' which syntax and semantics overwhelmingly seemed to rely on, respectively applying strict rules were not able to analyse most of everyday language use, which in many cases seemed to frustrate these rules. Traditional linguists seemed to deem many utterances connected to everyday use of language as ungrammatical or incorrect or ambiguous while pragmatics managed to analyse, describe and explain them successfully. Many ambiguities seemed to be elucidated by pragmatics.

Pragmatic came to be very popular among linguists, because it answered questions like why people would say a particular thing on a particular occasion? or what people are trying to do with their language? (Austin, 1962) being able to account for those extra-textual or extra-linguistic that influenced the form and content of utterances and texts. In other words pragmatics recognised the importance of context for a better or more complete understanding of linguistic material. Pragmatics recognised the importance of the language user and his context, because it is the users of language the entire communication process starts from,

expanding the context of interpretation to the “total human context of use” (Mey, 1993:31) referring not only to those elements of the context that are worded in the body of the texts, but also to other extra-textual elements, including wider social conditions of text production and reception, which, influence their actual form and content. These extralinguistic elements although not being made explicit or “grammaticalised” or encoded in the structure of language (Levinson,1983:9). Moreover the user’s context came to include the language users’ intentions, assumptions and their purposes. (Yule, 1996:4) have a great influence on meanings and, how they are expressed. This implies that language users are seen as having intentions, goals and assumptions, that is, as purposeful human agents. The groundbreaking works of the philosophers: John L. Austin’s: *How to Do Things with Words*. published in 1962, John R. Searle’s: *Speech Acts: An Essay in the philosophy of Language*, published in 1969 and later H. Paul Grice’s: *Logic and Conversation*, published in 1975 opened up new perspectives, pragmatics being seen as action addressing the subject of cooperation that bothered linguists a lot. Despite the rapid expansion and growth of the new linguistic field that began to conquer more and more territory in the linguistic arena, there have still been problems, that speech act theory, pioneered by John L. Austin and later by John R. Searle, who came up with the notion of ‘indirect speech acts’ in order to fill in the gap left open by speech act theory to account for cases where seem to be no cooperation or understanding between parts. These were problems that needed the total human context of production and consumption of texts including even wider elements of society. This was point when pragmatic acts came into the picture (Mey, 1993).With pragmatic acts it became possible to successfully interpret such linguistic utterances as:

“I have brought some sushi home and I cooked it; it wasn’t bad”.(Mey, 1993:4)

as a humorous invitation for specific people with specific backgrounds as part of an advertisement for a cocktail bar. In order to have a functional pragmatic act: first there has to be a “common platform” (Mey, Jacob L. “Pragmatics: Overview” *Concise Encyclopaedia of Pragmatics. Second edition* (2009): 786-797, 787) between addressor and addressee to infer the right presuppositions, secondly, there needs to be an “uptake” (Mey, 1993: 257), which may be cancelled and third pragmatic acts unlike do not need any explicit speech act involved.

Their indirect nature and their possibility or capacity to be cancelled makes them a perfect tool for latent persuasion or subtle manipulation, a ‘Trojan Horse’ of discourse to undisturbedly pass the gates of logic and rational interpretation.

2. Discourse

The second part of the paper will discuss discourse and one of the newest and most popular approach of discourse analysis called CDA or Critical Discourse Analysis. In this chapter and subsequent sections we define discourse and how it differs from content, contrasting discourse analysis and content analysis. We will introduce CDA or Critical Discourse Analysis and discuss the social, political, economic or cultural conditions including: power relations within society, groups, access, and ideologies that determine the actual form and content of editorial discourse. In this chapter we are also going to describe some characteristics of language: lexis and grammar that can be used to encode and convey ideological meanings and become thus pragmatic acts.

Discourse analysis and pragmatics have a lot of things in common, the most important being the importance of context in the interpretation of both linguistic utterances as well as texts. The extended notion of context like in the case of pragmatics also includes the whole social context of production and consumption of the text in question, and represents exactly the point that makes discourse different from content, respectively discourse analysis different from content analysis. What CDA (Critical Discourse analysis) adds to or better to say underlines in the expanded context: is the critical perspective over the subject of inequality and the role of power relations and ideologies in forming iniquitous social relations through influencing the form and content of texts including those of editorials, part of newspaper discourse and a major thought and attitude shaping factor in contemporary society as source of information.

The term ‘discourse’ has become widely used in a variety of disciplines ranging from: critical theory, sociology, philosophy, social psychology to linguistics (Mills: 2001: 1). According to Sara Mills, despite its wide usage, ‘discourse’ frequently remained undefined and treated as if “its usage were simply common knowledge” (ibid.). Both the terms ‘discourse’ and its method of study ‘Discourse Analysis’ (DA) are considered to be very ‘ambiguous’ (Stubbs, M. 1983:1) and “vigorously contested” by linguists,“ (Richardson, 2007:21). According to Shiffrin, contrary to the extensive and sometimes “rather impenetrable” debates in DA (discourse analysis), there are two general approaches to the definition of discourse: first,

there are those who define discourse as a unit of language “above the sentence” or the clause, which is called the ‘formalist’ or structuralist approach or definition of discourse (Richardson, 2007:22). As opposed to the formalist or structuralist definitions of discourse that view discourse as merely a linguistic unit ‘above the sentence’ or clause there the “functionalist” definitions (Richardson 2007: 22), which say that discourse should be defined as ‘language in use’. Functionalists assume that language use is ‘active’, and discourse analysis is the analysis of what people do with language and this use “cannot be restricted to the descriptions of linguistic forms” (Brown and Yule. 1983: 1). Functionalists view language as “social practice” (Fairclough 1992: 28 qtd in Coupland and Jaworski eds. 2006:2) and therefore socially embedded as far as both production and interpretation of discourse is concerned. While formalists seemed to rely mainly on quantitative methods of text analysis focussing rather on content and looking for features that could be generalised, while discourse analysis employed a rather qualitative method relying mainly of interpretation of content in light with the social conditions as part of the wider social conditions that played or could have played a part in the production of the text including ‘latent intentions’ (Berelson, 1952: 262) Critical Discourse Analysis or CDA, a relatively new research method in the field of discourse analysis goes one step further, it views discourse as ‘social practice’ while it considers elements of the social context like: social inequality as a result of ideological power struggle between opposing groups with different interests. CDA recognises that language use may be ideological. Within CDA or Critical Discourse Analysis we are going to focus on the version of Norman Fairclough, who besides of seeing discourse as ‘social practice’ conceives of it as existing or operating on three different dimensions which seem to be interrelated and closely connected: as text, as discursive and respectively social practice. These three dimensions of discourse are closely interwoven: social practices influencing discursive or institutional practices of discourse production, which at turn influence the actual form and content of editorial texts. Social practices: may include: economic, political or even ideological practices, which highly exceed the situational context of texts, while discursive practices refer to the institutional production and consumption, which are influenced by the former, and last there is the textual aspect: the actual form and content of the text of editorials that we read. Texts are the most visible or most evident dimension of discourse, where social or institutional influences or practices may not be salient or observable at first sight, however their effect is to be felt. Taking this into account, we have to note that the texts of newspaper editorials are not to be seen as objective, factual or neutral since they undergo the process of transformation which is governed by the former processes or practices in the light of or in line

with the ideological, or political stances or position of the respective newspaper they are part of. Fairclough works with a multifunctional view of texts that sees texts as having three main functions: ideational, interpersonal, respectively textual. These correspond to the terms: representations, identities and relations (Fairclough, 1995a:58). This resonates with what Berger and Luckman who sees the discourse of the media not as objective or factual representation of social events and social actors but as social representations “the social construction of reality” (Fowler 1998:2). This is why in order to understand the reason behind certain linguistic choices we need to have an understanding of the social structures and context that surrounds the production and interpretation of texts. We assume that in the case of newspaper editorials which constitute a very prominent and important part the discourse of particular newspapers this social construction involves and includes ideological aspects, that are part of the ideological stance or position of the newspapers they are part of and in concordance with the interests of the newspaper and their associates (which might be political, economic or social). Because newspaper texts are so closely connected to various ideologies, it is not surprising, that the events of the world are represented and interpreted from a particular angle, in Fowler’s view “anything that is said or written about the world is articulated from a particular ideological position” (1998:10). Different newspapers have different views and different ideological positions and this may account to a great extent to why various newspapers represent the same events so differently encoding sometimes entirely different messages. Newspapers not only encode their ideological positions into the text of the articles and editorials they publish, which make their presence felt in the way different events are represented, but they also counter other ideologies which are not in line, or opposed, to their own. Thus, newspaper discourse, respectively, the discourse of editorials, often become “sites of struggle” between groups “in that they show traces of differing discourses and ideologies contending and struggling for dominance.” (Wodak, 2006: 4). This means, that when we want to analyse newspapers, we will find traces of the ideologies and views represented by the newspaper and ideologies of the opposing groups, which are socially, politically or economically differently situated (Fowler, 1998:10). We also have to note again that ideological struggle is the result of social struggle for power between groups and because of their more overt or covert ideological positions editorials major tools in shaping public opinion by giving more explicit or implicit support for a given political position, ideology or view or by legitimating, naturalising, defending and advocating various social or political views, which are in the best interest of the political party and political views or stances which are in the best interest of the political party and political views or stances they support or

denying, concealing or mitigating, political views and stances, which are opposed to theirs or of the political stance of the political organisations they support openly or in a more covert, or indirect way.

Although linguistic analysis cannot be considered the primary goal of CDA when it is restricted to strict content analysis without taking into account the relationships between language use, and the wider socio-cultural context that influences discourse production. However, it is important to find out how language structure mediates various social influences and values, and how properties of language can be exploited to produce ideologically-laden messages. There are certain areas of the lexical and grammatical system of language that seem to be particularly implicated in the coding of social values and ideology. Halliday seemed to identify some linguistic tools from the areas of lexis and grammar that seem to serve as very useful analytic categories, that is, very useful tools to analyze newspaper, respectively, editorial discourse. We have to note that the vocabulary and grammar of a text are not of significance on their own, they are important rather from the point of view of the functions, that is, their goals, purposes and interests that they serve. We have to note that every aspect of textual content, meaning, and every word or grammatical structure is the result of a choice (2007: 38) and what was said, could have been expressed in a lot of different ways having different social or ideological implications. The way things are expressed by making use of lexical and grammatical devices, may change the meaning of propositions to various degrees. Therefore, we must examine the traditional forms of linguistic analysis listed above in relation to their direct or indirect involvement in (re)producing or resisting the systems of ideology and social power (Richardson, 2007:39). Besides, when we analyse texts, we have to pay attention and must be sensitive, not only to what is there in the text, but also, to what is absent, that is, to the things that might have been there but are not, to what is 'foregrounded' that is, what is explicitly or overtly present in a text, and what is informationally 'backgrounded' as part of the implicit meaning (Fairclough, 1995a:106). Some linguistic choices may have wider social effects as part of the 'social practice', serving the purposes and goals of their producers like others. The linguistic tools that can encode ideological messages that we described here include: lexical tools :like naming and reference to name social actors, predication strategies to describe the qualities and properties of social actors, respectively grammatical or syntactic tools: like transitivity which refers to the description of roles of social actors, modality, which refers mainly to the degree of commitment to the truth value of certain propositions or reflects value judgements, respectively nominalisations to delete specific information, permutations, initialisations or speech acts. Besides these we have

described some rhetorical tropes like: hyperbole, metonym, metaphor, neologisms and puns. These categories will be of great help in our analysis and we have to note that in certain contexts each of the above enlisted linguistic tools have the potential to ideologically-laden messages and can thus become pragmatic acts.

3. Analytical framework

In order to establish my theoretical framework for the analysis of newspaper editorials I shall integrate the notion of ‘pragmatic acts’ into the theory of Critical Discourse Analysis as a main working tool, as acts that account for the propositions that are not explicitly stated in, but are part of the ideological practice of editorial texts. I shall assume that in discourse, including the discourse of newspaper editorials, there are besides the ‘grammaticalised’ parts of the text, some propositions which are not explicitly stated with a reason, or a purpose, which in many cases is ideological, and it serves the best interest and policy of the newspaper that they remain hidden, or operate as part of the implicit meaning of the text. I shall identify such acts within discourse as pragmatic acts and I shall assume that they constitute the main ideological platform of editorial discourse, meaning that most ideological messages that the newspaper chose to remain implicit are contained in them.

4. Analysis

In this chapter we analyse some_topics that had been discussed for more consecutive weeks on the pages of various broadsheets and daily tabloid newspapers. Because of their importance and controversial nature, they were consecrated numerous articles respectively editorials.

In this section we are going to analyse some of the most relevant editorials in terms of how social events have been represented and the linguistic choices that have been made in order to ensure the persuasive effect and the ideological messages encoded in the text in the light of the various social conditions that influenced their production at institutional level. We are going to focus on pragmatic acts, encoded in the ideologically-laden properties of discourse

The two topics that are going to be analysed are: ‘The BP oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico’, respectively, the expenses scandal connected to the name the gay MP of the new coalition between the Conservatives and the Liberal-Democrats.

In many cases it will be observable that, although the same topics are being discussed, their representations can differ radically from newspaper to newspaper due to the differing ideological, respectively political standpoints they represent. We are going to see, how newspapers give unanimous support to BP representing the oil company as victim and not the one responsible for the oil spill which is contrary to the later standpoint of the decision of the US District court that ruled that BP was primarily responsible for the oil spill, because of negligence and reckless conduct. Concerning the case of David Laws, we are going to see that while the Daily Express and the Times tried to depict him as innocent and as deeds as mistake rather than fraud while the Daily Telegraph under the guise of fairness and objectivity represent him as a hypocrite.

In both cases we are going to see that pragmatic acts operate within the frame called ‘ideological square’ which is, according to Van Dijk common “in all ideological discourse” (2006: 374).

Conclusions

We have seen how the wider social practices including: economical, political respectively ideological practices influence the representations of social events bringing about ideological changes in the form and content of texts in comparison with the raw facts being manifested in the form of pragmatic acts.

Throughout the whole analysis we concentrated on identifying pragmatic acts in the light of the social conditions influencing the production of discourse like: political affiliations and stances and the ideologies connected to them, political and economic interests of various newspapers. We have analyzed different social events as ideological representations, not as factual and objective representations, accounting for the implicit assumption having ideological implications, analyzing and explaining them in the light of other possible choices and alternatives concentrating on the ideological consequences of presences and absences and detailing the possible ideological implications and effects of certain propositions and linguistic elements. Our analysis has confirmed the existence of the ideological square in the discourses of the analysed editorials as marker of ideological discourse (2006: 374). We could observe how the members of the in-group have been constructed emphasizing their positive

characteristics, while mitigating or de-emphasizing their negative characteristics, and at the same time, attributing blame to members of out-groups by emphasizing their negative characteristics and negative aspects of their actions, while de-emphasizing, belittling, playing down their positive characteristics, and positive aspects of their actions.

As we have seen throughout our analysis, pragmatic acts can be expressed through both lexical and syntactical or structural characteristics of language, aspect of language, because their ideological effect is achieved through connotation, innuendo, allusion, and ideological connection which is operational only in a given context. This is why some linguistic features or propositions may be manipulative in a certain context, and completely innocent assertions, in another.

Bibliography:

Abercrombie, N., Hill, S. & Turner, B.S. *The Dominant Ideology Thesis*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1980.

Austin, John L. *How to Do Things with Words*. London: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Bachrach, P. and Baratz, M. S. *Power and Poverty: Theory and Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1970.

Bar, Hillel, Y. "Out of the pragmatic waste-basket." *Linguistic Inquiry* *Linguistic Inquiry* 2, (1971): 401-405

Berelson, Bernard.(1952) „Content analysis in communication research” in Bernard Berelson and Morris Janowitz (eds) *Reader in Public Opinion and Communication*. Second edition. New York: The Free Press, (1966):260-266.

Billig, M. *Ideology and Opinions: Studies in Rhetorical Psychology*. London: Sage Publications.1991.

Blommaert, Jan. *Discourse. A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Brown, Gillian and George Yule. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: University Printing

- House, 1998.
- Bublitz, Wolfram, Neal R. Norrick (eds.). *Foundations of Pragmatics*. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co, 2011.
- Callinicos, A. *Marxism and Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1983.
- Cameron, Deborah. *Working with Spoken Discourse*. London: Sage, 2001.
- Chomsky, Noam. "Three Models for the Description of Language". *Transactions on Information Theory* 2 (3) (1956): 113–124.
- Chomsky, Noam. *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton, 1957.
- Coward, R. and Ellis J. *Language and Materialism: Developments in the semiology and the Theory of the Subject*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1977.
- Dahl, Robert A. *Who governs? Democracy and Power in an American City*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961.
- Domhoff, G. W. *The Powers That Be: Processes of Ruling Class Domination in America*. New York: Random House. 1978.
- Dumitrăcel, Stelian. *Limbajul Publicistic Românesc din Perspectiva Stilurilor funcționale*. Iași, Institutul European, 2006.
- Eagleton, T. *Ideology*. London & New York: Verso, 1991.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press. 1992.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Media Discourse*. London: MPG Books Group, Bodmin and King's Lynn. 1995a.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language*. Longman. London and New York. 1995b.
- Fairclough, Norman. *Language and Power*. Longman. London and New York, 1998.
- Fowler, R, Hodge, R, Kress G. and Threw, T. *Language and Control*. London: Routledge, 1979.
- Fowler, Roger. *Language in the News. Discourse and ideology in the Press*. London and New

- York: Routledge, 1998.
- Gazdar, G. *Pragmatics: implicature, presupposition and logical form*. New York: Academic Press, 1979.
- Gee, Paul. J. *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses*. London: The Falmer Press, 1990
- Gerbner, George. "On content analysis and critical research in mass communication." (1958) in L.A. Dexter and D. Manning (eds). *People, Society and Mass Communication*. New York: Free Press (1964):476-500
- Gramsci, A. *Selections of the Prison Notebook*, trans. Q. Hoare and G. N. Smith. London: Lawrence & Wishhart. 1971.
- Grice, H. Paul. "Logic and Conversation" in Peter Cole and Jerry Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics, vol. 3: Speech Acts* New York: Academic Press, (1975): 41-58
- Grice, H. Paul. "Further notes on logic and conversation" Peter Cole and Jerry Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics, vol. 9: Pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press, (1978): 41-58
- Grice, H. Paul."Presupposition and conversational implicature" in Peter Cole (ed.), *Radical Pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press, (1981): 183-98
- Hackett, R. and Zhao, M. "Challenging a Master Narrative: Peace Protest and Opinion Editorial Discourse in the United States Press During the Gulf War" *Discourse and Society*" 5:4 (1994): 509-41.
- Harcup, T. "Journalists and Ethics: The Quest for a Collective Voice" *Journalism Studies*. 3:1(2002):101-114.
- Hardman, Dean. "Political Ideologies and Identity in British Newspaper Discourse." Diss. University of Nottingham, 2008.
- Hodge, R. & Kress, G. *Language as Ideology*. London and New York: Routledge. 1993.
- Jaworski, Adam and Nikolas Coupland (eds.). *The Discourse Reader*. second edition. Routledge, 2006
- Katz, Jerry, J. *Propositional Structure and Illucutionary Force*. New York: Crowel, 1977.

- Lagonikos, Irene, Theodosia. "Ideology in Editorials: A Comparison of Selected Editorials in English- Medium Newspapers After September 11."Diss. Rhodes University, 2005.
- Lakoff, George. "On generative semantics" in Danny Steinberg and Leon Jakobovits (eds), *Semantics and interdisciplinary Reader in Philosophy, Linguistics and Psychology*.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.pp:232-96, 1971.
- Lakoff, George. "Presupposition and relative well-formedness" [1968] in Danny Steinberg and Leon Jakobovits (eds), *Semantics and interdisciplinary Reader in Philosophy, Linguistics and Psychology*.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971.
- Larrain, J. *The Concept of Ideology*. London: Hutchinson, 1979.
- Leech, Geoffrey, N. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman, 1983.
- Levinson, Stephen. C. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press, 1983
- Lodge, David. *Paradise News*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1992.
- Luke, A. "Beyond "Science and Ideology Critique: Developments in Critical Discourse Analysis" *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22 (2002): 96-110.
- Lukes, Steven. *Power: A Radical View*. London: McMillan Press. 1979.
- Lyons, John. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- Lyons, John. *Semantics*. Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Macdonald, M. *Representing Women: Myths of Femininity in the Popular Media*. London: Edward Arnold, 1995.
- Marmaridou, Sophia. *Pragmatic Meaning and Cognition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co., 2000.
- Marx, K. and Engels, F. *The German Ideology*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1974.
- McLellan, D. *Ideology*. Mineapolis: University of Minesotta Press, 1986.
- McNair, B. "The emerging chaos of global news culture" in S. Allan (ed.) *Journalism: Critical Issues*, Maidenhead: OU Press, (2005): 151-167.

- Morris, C. (1938), "Foundations of the theory of signs". In O. Neurath, R. Carnap and C. Morris (ed.), *International Encyclopaedia of Unified Science I*, Chicago University of Chicago Press, pp. 77-138. Reprinted in C. Morris, *Writings on the general theory of signs*, The Hague: Mouton. 1971.
- Mey, Jacob. L. *Whose language? A study in Linguistic Pragmatics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1985.
- Mey, Jacob L. *Pragmatics. An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd. 1993.
- Mey, Jacob L. (ed.) *Concise Encyclopaedia of Pragmatics. Second edition*. Oxford: Elsevier Ltd. ,2009.
- Mey, Jacob. L. "Pragmatics Overview." in Jacob L. Mey (ed.) *Concise Encyclopaedia of Pragmatics. Second edition*. Oxford: Elsevier Ltd. , (2009): 786-97)
- Mey, Jacob.L. "Pragmatic Acts" in Jacob L. Mey (ed.) *Concise Encyclopaedia of Pragmatics. Second edition*. Oxford: Elsevier Ltd., (2009): 747-53.
- Mills, C.W. *The Power Elite*. London: Oxford University Press. 1956.
- Mills, S. *Feminist stylistics*. London: Routledge.1995.
- Mills, Sara. *Discourse*. London and New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Nordlund, M. "Linguistic Manipulation. An Analysis of How Attitudes are Displayed in News Reporting". Luleå University of Technology. Extended Essay English. 2003.
- Oktar, L. "The ideological organisation of representational processes in the presentation of us and them". *Discourse & Society*. Vol. 12:3 (2001): 313-346.
- Orwell, G. "Politics and the English Language." *Why I Write*, London: Penguin Books. (2004): 102-120.
- Pêcheux, M. "The Mechanism of Ideological (Mis)recognition". in S. Žižek (ed.) *Mapping Ideology*. London: Verso. (1994): 141-151.
- Partee, Barbara.H. "Opacity, coreference, and pronouns." in Donald Davidson and Gilbert Herman (eds), *Semantics of Natural languages*. Dordrech: Reidel (1072): 415-41
- Reah, Danuta. *The Language of of Newspapers*. London: Routledge, 1998..

- Reboul, A., Moeschler, J., *Pragmatica Azi. O nouă știință a comunicării*. Trans. Liana Pop. Cluj: Editura Echinoc, 2001.
- Sbisà, Marina, Jan Ola Östman and Jef Verschueren (eds.). *Philosophical Perspectives for Pragmatics. Handbook of Pragmatic Highlights*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2011.
- Searle, John R. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Searle, John. "Indirect Speech Acts" in Peter Cole and Jerry Morgan (eds.) , *Syntax and Semantics, vol. 3: Speech Acts*, New York: Academic Press, (1975): 59-82
- Searle, John, R. *Expression and meaning. Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Shaikh, A. "Capital as a social relation" in J Eatwell, M. Milgate and P. Newman (eds.) *The New Palgrave: A Dictionary of Economic Theory and Doctrine*". London: Macmillan, (1986): 72-78.
- Shank, Roger C. and Danny Edelson. "A role for AI in education: using technology to reshape education." *The Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*. 1(2) (1990): 3-20.
- Shiffrin Deborah. *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.1994.
- Shiffrin, Deborah, Deborah Tannen, and Heidi E. Hamilton (eds.) *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 2001.
- Strawson, Peter. F. Intention and Convention in Speech Acts. *Philosophical Review*. 73 (1964): 439-60.
- Stonecipher, W. Harry. *Editorial and Persuasive Writing. Opinion Functions of the News Media*. second edition, printed in the USA, 1997.
- Stubbs, Michael. *Discourse Analysis. The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language*. The University of Chicago Press, 1983.
- Thomson, A. *Critical Reasoning: A Practical Introduction*. London and New York: Routledge, 2009.

- Thomson, J.B. *Ideology and Modern Culture*. UK: Polity Press, 1960.
- Titscher, S. , Meyer, M., Wodak,R., and Vetter E. *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*.London: Sage, 2000.
- Van Dijk, Teun. A. *Text and Context. Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse*. London: Longman, 1977.
- Van Dijk, Teun. A. "Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis". *Discourse & Society* London: Sage, vol.4 (2):249-283, 1993.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1996) "Opinions and ideologies in editorials". accessed on 16 Oct. 2013.
<http://www.discursos.org/unpublished%20articles/Opinions%20and%20ideologies%20in%20editorials.htm>
- Van Dijk, Teun.A. *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage Publications, 1998.
- Van Dijk, Teun. A. "Discourse, Ideology and Context" in Wolfgang U. and Dressler W. (eds.) *Folia Linguistica* Vol. 35: 1-2, (2001): 11-40.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. "Discourse and manipulation" in *Discourse and Society*. Vol. 17(2), (2006): 359- 383. Sage Publications.
- Van Dijk, T.A. "Discourse, Power and Access" , *Discourse and Power*. Van Dijk, Teun.(ed) New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Van Dijk, Teun.A. „Critical Discourse Analysis" in Shiffrin, Deborah, Deborah Tannen, and Heidi E. Hamilton (eds.) *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Blackwell Publishers Ltd., 2001.
- Van Dijk, Teun .A *Power and Discourse*. Van Dijk, Teun.(ed) New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Van Dijk, Teun .A. "Structures of Discourse and Structures of Power" in *Power and Discourse*. Van Dijk, Teun.(ed) New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- Vershueren, Jeff and Jan Ola Östman (eds.) *Key Notions for Pragmatics*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2009.

- Wodak, Ruth. "What CDA is about- a summary of its history, important concepts and its developements" in Wodak R. and Meyer M. (eds.). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage , (2001): 1-13.
- Wodak, Ruth, "Mediation between discourse and society: assesing cognitive approaches in CDA" *Discourse Studies*. London: Sage Publications. Vol.8:1 (2006): 179-190.
- Wodak, Ruth. „Critical Linguistics and Critical Discourse analysis" in Östman, Ola Jan & Jeff Vershueren, (eds.) *Handbook of Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2006.
- Wodak, Ruth. "Pragmatics and Critical Discourse Analysis: A cross disciplinary inquiry." *Pragmatics and Cognition* 15:1 (2007): 203-225.
- Wooden, Cindy. "Who am I to judge?' Pope's remarks do not change church teaching" *Catholic NewsService*". Jul-31-2013. accessed on 16 Mar. 2014.
<http://www.catholicnews.com/data/stories/cns/1303303.htm>
- Yule, George. *The Study of Language*. third edition. Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Yule, George. *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press, 1996.