

Style in cognitive linguistics: the perspective from genre

Gerard Steen, Dept of Language and Communication, VU University Amsterdam
Gj.steen@let.vu.nl

Handout Part One
 Interdisciplinary Workshop Stylistics
 Leiden, 11 January 2008

Table 1
 Position of style in various genres

<i>Dimensions</i>	<i>Variables</i>	<i>Conversation</i>	<i>Novel</i>	<i>News article</i>	<i>Academic article</i>
Text	Form		suspense, surprise, or curiosity	instalments, most-important first	introduction – methods – results – discussion - references
	Content		fiction	new facts	theory and research
	Type		narrative		
	Structure			right-branching	right-branching
Context	Participants: roles	interlocutors, two-way	one author – many anonymous readers; one-way	one author – several editors – many anonymous readers; one-way	one or more authors – several reviewers – two editors – many anonymous readers; one-way, but ...
	Participants: aims	socialize	divert	inform	inform, persuade, instruct
	Setting	concrete place	disjunction between producers and receivers	disjunction between producers and receivers	disjunction between producers and receivers
	Domain	private	public: arts: literature	public: journalism: newspapers	public: science and education
	Medium	talk	print	print / internet	print / internet
	Channel	air	paper	paper / cable	paper / cable
Code	Language	any language	any	any	any
	Register			journalese	academese
	Style	informal; styles of speakers	style of author	relatively formal; style of newspaper and of author	relatively formal: style of journal and of author(s)
	Other	role of gesture	none	role of visuals: pix	role of visuals: graphs

Table 2
Illustration for position of style in various subgenres

<i>Dimensions</i>	<i>Variables</i>	<i>News article</i>	<i>Front page</i>	<i>Editorial</i>	<i>Background</i>
Text	Form	instalments, most- important first	v	?	?
	Content	new facts	v	comments on new facts	causes of and interpretation of new facts
	Type		narrative	argumentative	expository
	Structure	right- branching	v	v	v
Context	Participants: roles	one author – several editors – many anonymous readers	v	v	v
	Participants: aims	inform	v	persuade	v
	Setting	disjunction between producers and receivers	v	v	v
	Domain	public: journalism: newspapers	v	v	v
	Medium	print / internet	v	v	v
	Channel	paper / cable	v	v	v
Code	Language	any language	v	v	v
	Register	journalese	v	v	v
	Style	relatively formal; style of newspaper and of author	v	relatively more personal?	v
	Other	role of visuals: pix	v	none	v

Table 3
Illustration for position of style in various ‘super’ genres

<i>Dimensions</i>	<i>Variables</i>	<i>Fiction</i>	<i>Narrative</i>	<i>Literature</i>	<i>Talk</i>	<i>Journalese</i>
Text	Form					
	Content	always fiction				
	Type		always narrative			
	Structure					
Context	Participants: roles					
	Participants: aims			divert		inform
	Setting					
	Domain			always arts: literature		typically journalism, but cf imitation in advertising, fiction, etc.
	Medium				always talk	
	Channel					
Code	Language					
	Register	‘language of fiction’	‘language of narrative’	‘language of literature’	‘language of talk’	always jornalese
	Style	any style, for many genres and individual producers	any style, for many genres and individual producers	any style, for many genres and individual producers	any style, for many genres and individual producers	any style, for many genres and individual producers
	Other					

Table 4
Biber's five dimensions plus variables

Dim 1: *involved vs informational production*

Involved: THAT deletion, contractions, pres-tense verbs, 2PP, DO as pro-verb, etc
Informational: nouns, word length, preps, type/token, attrib adj

Dim 2: *narrative vs non-narrative concerns*

Narrative: past-tense vbs, 3PP, perfect-aspect verbs, present-participial clauses
Non-Narrative: present-tense verbs, attrib adj

Dim 3: *explicit vs situation-dependent reference*

Explicit: WH rel cl on O, WH rel cl on S, phrasal coordination, nominalization
Sit-dep ref: time adverbials, place adverbials, adverbs

Dim 4: *overt expression of persuasion*

Overt: infinitives, prediction modals, suasive verbs, conditional subordination, necessity modals, split auxiliaries, possibility modals
Not overt: no features

Dim 5: *abstract vs nonabstract style*

Abstract: conjuncts, agentless passives, past-participial clauses, BY-passives, etc
Nonabstract: no features

Figure 1
Simple love scenario

X WANTS Y

DOES Y WANT X? à NO

YES

DOES X GET Y? à NO

YES

DOES Y GET X? à NO

YES

DOES X KEEP Y? à NO

YES

DOES Y KEEP X? à NO

YES

Table 5

Causation in love scenarios: motivation and positive and negative results

WANT / GET / KEEP BECAUSE OF

DESIRE
PASSION
NEED

WANT / GET / KEEP RESULTS IN

HAPPINES
AFFAIR
RELATIONSHIP

NOT WANT / GET / KEEP BECAUSE OF

INTERNAL LACK OF
DESIRE, PASSION, NEED
EXTERNAL IMPEDIMENT
COMPETITOR, SOCIETY

NOT WANT / GET. KEEP RESULTS IN

LACK OF HAPPINESS
ANGER > HATE > JEALOUSY
LACK OF AFFAIR
DISAPPOINTMENT
LACK OF RELATIONSHIP
LONELINESS

Table 6

Genre analysis of personal ads

<i>Dimensions</i>	<i>Variables</i>	<i>Personal ad</i>
Text	Form	headline, body, box number; brief
	Content	wanting-stage of love-scenario: wanting self, other wanted
	Type	descriptive
	Structure	list, joint
Context	Participants: roles	one author – many anonymous readers; two-way; both participants in specific gender role.
	Participants: aims	persuade
	Setting	disjunction between producers and receivers
	Domain	private-in-public: journalism: newspapers
	Medium	print / internet
	Channel	paper / cable
Code	Language	any language
	Register	no register?
	Style	informal?
	Other	none?

Table 7

Metaphorical aspects of love and love stories

WANT / GET / KEEP BECAUSE OF
DESIRE > **HUNGER**
PASSION > **NATURAL FORCE**
NEED > **ADDICTION, ILLNESS**

WANT / GET / KEEP RESULTS IN
HAPPINES > **UP**
AFFAIR > **UNION**
RELATIONSHIP > **POSSESSION**

NOT WANT / GET / KEEP BECAUSE OF
INTERNAL LACK OF
DESIRE, PASSION, NEED > *see above*
EXTERNAL IMPEDIMENT
COMPETITOR, SOCIETY > **ENEMY**

NOT WANT / GET. KEEP RESULTS IN
LACK OF HAPPINESS
ANGER > HATE > JEALOUSY > *other metaphors*
LACK OF AFFAIR
DISAPPOINTMENT > *other metaphors*
LACK OF RELATIONSHIP
LONELINESS > *metaphors?*

References

- Abelen, E., Redeker, G., & Thompson, S. (1993). The rhetorical structure of US-American and Dutch fund-raising letters. *Text*, 13(3), 323-350.
- Berkenkotter, C., & Huckin, T. N. (1995). *Genre knowledge in disciplinary communication*. Hove: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Bhatia, V. K. (1993). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. Harlow: Longman.
- Biber, D. (1988). *Variation across speech and writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Biber, D. (1989). A typology of English texts. *Linguistics*, 27, 3-43.
- Biber, D. (1995). *Dimensions of register variation: A cross-linguistic comparison*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Biber, D., & Finegan, E. (Eds.). (1994). *Sociolinguistic perspectives on register variation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Clark, H. H. (1996). *Using language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross cultural aspects of second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1994). Conversationalization of public discourse and the authority of the consumer. In R. Keat, N. Whitely & N. Abercrombie (Eds.), *The authority of the consumer* (pp. 253-268). London: Routledge.
- Freedman, A., & Medway, P. (Eds.). (1994). *Genre and the new rhetoric*. Basingstoke: Burgess Science Press.
- Gavins, J., & Steen, G. J. (Eds.). (2003). *Cognitive poetics in practice*. London: Routledge.
- Hamilton, H. E., Schiffrin, D., & Tannen, D. (Eds.). (2001). *The handbook of discourse analysis*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Kintsch, W. (1998). *Comprehension: A paradigm for cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Langacker, R. W. (2001). Discourse in cognitive grammar. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 12(2), 143-188.
- Leech, G. N. (1969). *A linguistic guide to English poetry*. London: Longman.
- Leech, G. N., & Short, M. H. (2007 [1981]). *Style in fiction*. London: Longman.
- O'Keefe, D. (1990). *Persuasion: Theory and research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Paltridge, B. (2001). *Genre and the language learning classroom*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Schram, D. H., & Steen, G. J. (Eds.). (2001). *The psychology and sociology of literature: In honor of Elrud Ibsch*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Semino, E., & Culpepper, J. (Eds.). (2002). *Cognitive stylistics: Language and cognition in text analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Steen, G. J. (1999). Genres of discourse and the definition of literature. *Discourse Processes*, 28(2), 109-120.
- Steen, G. J. (2000). Kunstcritiek in de negentiende eeuw: een historisch genreprofiel. In W. Spooren, T. Sanders & C. Van Wijk (Eds.), *Samenhang in diversiteit* (pp. 67-76). Tilburg: Faculteit der Letteren, KU Brabant.
- Steen, G. J. (2003a). Metaphor in Bob Dylan's 'Hurricane': Genre, language, and style. In E. Semino & J. Culpepper (Eds.), *Cognitive stylistics: language and cognition in text analysis* (pp. 183-210). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Steen, G. J. (2003b). Conversationalization in discourse: Stylistic changes in editorials of *The Times* between 1950 and 2000. In L. Lagerwerf, W. Spooren & L. Degand (Eds.),

- Determination of Information and Tenor in Texts: Multidisciplinary Approaches to Discourse 2003* (pp. 125-124). Muenster: Nodus Publikationen.
- Steen, G. J. (2003c). 'Love stories': Cognitive scenarios in love poetry. In J. Gavins & G. J. Steen (Eds.), *Cognitive poetics in practice*. London: Routledge.
- Steen, G. J. (2007). *Finding metaphor in grammar and usage: A methodological analysis of theory and research*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Stockwell, P. (2002). *Cognitive poetics: an introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Talmy, L. (2000). *Toward a cognitive semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.). (1997). *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*. London: Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. A., & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage.