Text Typology: Register, Genre and Text Type

Anna Trosborg
The Aarhus School of Business

Introduction

It is obvious that not all texts are of the same type. We may distinguish between political texts, legal texts and medical texts; fairy tales, novels and short stories differ from newspaper reports, essays, and scientific papers; food recipes, instructions booklets and advertisements may show similarities but they are not the same, expository texts differ from argumentative texts, etc. All these types of text differ in ways that are somewhat obvious, intuitively, but which nevertheless invite detailed analysis.

The development in the fields of language and linguistics, communication and rhetoric, the ethnography of speaking, pragmatics and discourse, etc. have contributed to and influenced our view of text typology. Throughout the last decade, genre analysis, in particular, has enjoyed immense popularity. This field of study has attracted the attention of literary scholars, rhetoricians, sociologists, discourse analysts, cognitive scientists, machine translators, computational linguists, ESP specialists, business communication experts, language teachers a.o. (see Bhatia 1993: ix).

This popularity does not mean, however, that there is a general consensus on the meaning of the term. A number of questions prevail. How do genres relate to register and text types? How is one genre to be identified and distinguished from other genres? Are the defining criteria text-internal, or is the classification based on text-external criteria, or both? Do we need uni-criterial or multi-criterial classification systems? What are the characteristics of specific genres? Do these characteristics differ cross-culturally and if so in what ways? Besides, our knowledge of specific genres still leaves much to be desired.

The aim of this article is to point to a number of classificatory categories which each in their own right (and together) can be used to classify as well as explain ways in which types of discourse may usefully be categorized and

counted for. Terminological problerms and considerations, comprising notions such as text and discourse, register, genre, and text type, discourse purpose, communicative purpose or communicative function, etc. are dealt with. No pretense to an exhaustive coverage is suggested in this brief outline, of course. A framework comprising a classification into *registers* and *genres*, with *communicative function* and *text type* as crucial categories within a discourse framework of field, tenor and mode will be suggested. This framework forms guidelines for identifying and generating Conventions and functions of language and the implications for translating is discussed.

Text and discourse

For some scholars, *text* refers to written language and *discourse* to spoken language. For others, texts may be spoken or written, and they may involve one or more text-producers (cf. Virtanen 1990: 447). Halliday and Hasan (1976) and Quirk et al. (1985) talk about text, while e.g. Grimes (1975) and Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) and their followers deal with discourse. Do these scholars refer to the same thing, albeit the difference in their use of terminology? A study of the various uses of text and discourse in the literature during the past two decades (traced by Virtanen (1990)) highlights this problem.'

The two separate terms *text* and *discourse* have, in fact, been related to two different but complementary perspectives on language. A text may be viewed as structure and/or it may be regarded as a process. In line with these two approaches, text has often been used of a static concept - the product of a process - while discourse has been used to refer to a dynamic notion - the process of text production and text comprehension (Virtanen 1990: 453).

However, the notion of text has expanded from a descriptive structural to a processual unit adopting situational factors into its scope. Seen within this development, it seems rather arbitrary today to maintain a strict boundary between text linguistics and discourse analysis. As a result, the two separate terms text and discourse may be used interchangeably - that is if no definition to the contrary has been proposed?

Text and discourse can be directed to any aim of language or refer to any kind or reality; it can be a poem, a comedy, a sports commentary, a political speech, an interview, a sermon, a TV ad., etc.

Register

The concept of a "whole language" is so vast and heterogeneous that it is not operationally useful for many linguistic purposes, and the description of communicative situations and events is now fairly widely recognized as a proper goal of linguistic analysis.

Two sets of insights from anthropology and linguistics have been particularly influential, namely the work of Malinowsky (1923, 1935), and that of Firth (1935, 1951). Malinowsky's theory of context was originally developed with the translator in mind. Faced with the task of portraying remote cultures, he became increasingly concerned with the context of situation in order to truly convey cultural insights. Malinowsky -believed that the cultural context, comprising a variety of factors ranging from the ritualistic to the more practical aspects of everyday life, was crucial in the interpretation of the message.

The insights of Firth relate to culture as determining our world of language and cognition. Cultural factors influence and determine linguistic choices. This view of language was built on the views of Malinowsky and emphasized situation and culture. The contextual factors outlined were those components of speech events referred to in the ethnography of speaking research, i.e. setting, speaker-hearer role relationship, channel, genre, key. etc. (cf. Bauman and Scherzer 1975).

The finding that language varies with its function led to descriptions of "varieties" of language use referred to as *registers* (Reid 1956, Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens 1964). A framework devised by Halliday, McIntosh and Strevens (1964) divided language into user-related varieties also termed dialects (Corder 1973), and use-related varieties known as registers. User-related varieties comprise geographical, temporal, social (non)standard dialects and idiolects, while registers comprise an open-ended set of varieties (or styles) of language typical of occupational fields, such as the language of religion, the language of legal documents, the language of newspaper reporting, medical language, technical language, etc. Register, as a functional language variation, is a ` contextual category correlating groupings of linguistic features with recurrent situational features" (Gregory and Carroll 1978: 4). Sub-codes of a particular language were distinguished on the basis of the frequency of lexico-grammatical features of a particular text-variety (see, e.g. Crystal and Davy 1969, Gregory and Carroll 1978). Studies on the frequencies of syntactic properties (see, e.g. Barber 1962, Crystal and Davy 1969, Gustaffsson 1975) provide empirical evidence confirming intuitive and impressionistic statements about high/low frequencies of certain syntactic features in various varieties of language.

Studies to investigate the relationship between grammatical choices and rhetorical functions (i.e. communicative functions) were carried out in written English for Science and Technology by, e.g. Lackstrom, Selinker and Trimble (1973), Swales (1981), Trimble (1985). An interesting finding was how specific linguistic features take on restricted values in the structuring of

situation types. A recognition that it is often the collocation of two or more lexical items, rather than the occurrence of isolated items that determines the identity of a given register was another major finding.

The account of language variation sheds light on the conscious stylistic choices made by language users. The factors which affect these choices became the focus of attention:

> The category of register is postulated to account for what people do with their language. When we observe language activity in the various contexts in which it takes place, we find differences in the type of language selected as appropriate to different types of situation. (Halliday et al. 1964:.87, quoted in Hatim and Mason 1990: 46).

The question is what is meant by different types of situation .[4] If the goal is that the user's awareness of conventional situation types is to facilitate effective and appropriate communication, register is too broad a notion. Focusing mainly on the language of a particular field (language of scientific reporting, language of newspaper reporting, bureaucratic language, legal language, etc.), register analysis disregards differences between various genres within a field.

Even if there remains some shorthand convenience attached to retaining Tables such as scientific, medical, legal or even newspaper English, in reality such terms can now be seen to be systematically misleading. They overprivilege a homogeneity of content at the expense of variation in communicative purpose, addresser-addressee relationships, and genre conventions (Swales 1990: 3). While it remains necessary to use texts in order to understand how texts organize themselves informationally, rhetorically and stylistically, textual knowledge remains generally insufficient for a full account of genre. To further confuse the matter, notice also usage like `employer register' (Werlich 1976) focusing on tenor and `written register' (Schleppegrell 1996) adjusted to mode.

Genre

Genres are the text categories readily distinguished by mature speakers of a language, and we may even talk about a "folk typology" of genres. Texts used in a particular situation for a particular purpose may be classified using everyday Iabels such as a guidebook, a nursery rhyme, a poem, a business letter, a newpaper article, a radio play, an advertisement, etc. Such categories are referred to as genres.

Analysis of registers on their own reveal little about the nature of genres, so registers are divided into genres reflecting the way social purposes are accomplished in and through them in settings in which they are used. As pointed out by Bhatia (1993: 17), for example, a science research article is as legitimate an instance of scientific English as is an extract from a chemistry lab report. Academic conversation shows a variety of casual hallway chats, lectures, conversations between teachers and students in and out of class, e-mail, memos, scholarly papers, books (Bhatia 1993: 11). The legal register may comprise the language of the law in legal documents (legislative texts, contracts, deeds, wills), the language of the courtroom (e.g. the judge declaring the law, judge/counsel interchanges, counsel/witness interchanges), the language of legal textbooks, and various types of lawyers' communication with other lawyers and with laymen (Trosborg 1991: 4). Only in the case of restricted registers is there a close relationship between register and genre (for example weather forecasts).

By means of the concept of genre we can approach texts from the macro-level as communicative acts within a discoursive network or system:

> Because it is impossible for *us* to dwell in the social world without repertoires of typified social responses in recurrent situations - from greetings to thank yous to *acceptance* speeches and full-blown, written expositions of scientific or scholarly investigatiorfs - we use genres to package our speech and make of it a recognizable response to the exigencies of the situation. (Berkenkotter and Huckin (1995: 7)

A comprehensive study of genres by Swales (1990) analyses the development of the concept of genre in the fields of folklore studies, literature, linguistics and rhetoric (see Swales 1990: 34-45). Genre analysis has a long established tradition in literary studies. It dates back to Aristotle, who distinguished genres as classes of texts, a view which still prevails. Today, the term genre, which was formerly t sed as "a distinctive type or category of literary composition" (Webster's Third Dictionary) is quite easily used to refer to a distinctive category of discourse of any type, spoken or written, with or without literary aspirations.

However, within linguistics, few studies have distinguished register from genre. Swales points to register as a well-established and central concept in linguistics, while genre is described as "a recent appendage found to be necessary as a result of important studies of text structure".[5] It is only recently in the systemic school that genre has become disentangled from register: Prow (1980: 78), for instance, refers to "discourse genre, or register". An unwillingness to demote register to a second position strengthened by large-scale investment in analysis of language varieties, for example for lexicographic purposes, may well be the reason for the relatively little interest in recognizing texts as genres, that is in seeing "how texts are perceived, categorized and used by members of a commúnity" (Swales 1990: 42).6

Rhetorical scholars who have adópted a more inductive approach have tended to take context more into account and to give genre a more central place thus making a distinction between rhetorical situation and rhetorical genre, with emphasis on the recurrence of similar forms (together in constellation) in genre creation. Recently, rhetorical studies of genre have focused more on the social dynamics and social constitution of nonliterary forms of writing and speaking. With the work during the 1980s in the fields of Language for Specific Purposes and professional discourse, there was a shift of emphasis to a growing interest in the sociocultural functions of disciplinary genres, for example legal and scientific communication, and a number of surveys of key professional areas such as those by Maher (1986) on medical English and Bhatia (1987) on legal English have appeared.

Recognizing the dynamic aspect of genres (amenable to changes), researchers now busy, themselves with establishing genres of specialized language. Defining speech events in a community has become crucial; there is an interest in discovering in a community which communications are generically typed and what labels are used, in order to reveal elements of verbal behaviour which the community considers sociolinguistically salient. This has been the concern of ethnographers for more than a decade (cf. Saville-Troike 1982). It is basic to ethnography that the units used for segmenting, ordering and describing data should be the categories of the community and not *a priori* categories of the investigator (Saville-Troike 1982: 34). The procedure should be to develop sets of a posteriori categories based on empirical investigation and observation within which eliciting the community's category labels plays a central role.

Swales's review includes statements by a number of researchers (e.g. Todorov (1976) and Fowler (1982)) to the effect that genres are not simply assemblies of more-or-less similar textual objects but, instead they are coded and keyed events set within social communicative processes. Recognizing those codes and keys can be a powerful facilitator of both comprehension, composition and translation.

Similarly, Miller (1984: 151) argues that "a rhetorically sound definition of genre must be centred not on the substance or form of the discourse but on the action it is used to accomplish". Martin (1985: 250) considers genres to embrace each of the linguistically realized activity types which comprise so much of our culture. Genre is recognized as a system for accomplishing social purposes by verbal means. Genre "refers to the staged purposeful social processes through which a culture is realized in a language" (Martin and Rothery 1986: 243).

Communicative purpose as the defining criterion of genre

How then is genre to be identified, classified and described? How can one genre be distinguished from another? These and similar problems have been a scholarly concern for the last decade. For some scholars, genres are defined primarily on the basis of external criteria; newspaper articles are found in the news sections of newspapers, academic articles.are found in academic journals (see Biber 1989: 6), while for other scholars, communicative purpose and/or linguistic content and form play a role.

When accounting for the concept of genre, Swales emphasizes the sociorhetorical context of genre, the categories to be defined *are* those of the community, and communicative purpose is the decisive defining criterion. His analysis focuses on genre as a class of communicative events, and the principal criterial feature that turns a collection of communicative events into a genre is some shared set of communicative purposes. Exemplars or instances of genres vary in their prototypicality with the discourse community's nomenclature for genres as an important source of insight (see Swales 1990: 49-52). Crucial factors are discourse community, genre and task bound together by communicative purpose. It is communicative purpose that drives the Ianguage activities of the discourse community; it is communicative purpose that is the prototypical criterion for genre identity, and it is communicative purpose that operates as the primary determinant of task (Swales 1990: 10).

Of recent studies, attention must be drawn to Bhatia (1993) and Berkenkotter and Huckin (1995). Bhatia (1993) (following Swales (1981, 1985, 1990)) takes genre to be primarily characterized by the communicative purpose(s) that it is intended to fulfil. It is this shared set of communicative purpose(s) which shapes the genre and gives it an internal structure, and a major change in the communicative purpose(s) is likely to result in a change of genre, while minor changes or modifications are likely to be distinctive of sub-genres, even though it is not possible to draw a fine distinction between genres and sub-genres (Bhatia 1993: 14)?

A further point to be stressed is that genres are meant not so much to classify but to clarify and explain the rationale of social behaviour (cf. also Fowler 1982: 286). The concept of genre as social action, one situated in a wider sociorhetorical context operates not only as a mechanism for reaching communicative goals but also as a means of clarifying what these goals might be (Swales 1990: 44).

Aknowledging that there are a number of other factors, like content, form, intended audience, medium or channel, which influence the nature of the construction of a genre, Bhatia (1993: 13) also sees a close connection between the communicative purpose of a particular genre and its typical cognitive struc-

tuning. For exemplification; he poiñts to a comparison of a typical news report and a feature article in a newspaper. Factors relating to mode (including channel and nature of participation) and tenor of discourse (including the status and the social distance between the participants) remaining the same, their communicative purposes change from an objective reporting in the news report to a balanced analysis of some interesting and controversial issue in the feature article: These differences in communicative goals require different strategies to be used in the two genres. In cases like these, where the communicative purposes of the genre-text are considerably different, requiring different cognitive structuring, the two texts are viewed as different genres (Bhatia 1993: 21-22).

In agreement with the stand taken by Swales, Bhatia takes genre analysis from linguistic description to explanation. He has emphasized the importance of motive as an approach to linguistic analysis. His aim is to find answers to the question "Why do members of a specialist community write the way they do" (Bhatia 1993: 1). As such, genre analysis must attempt explanation and go beyond description to rationalize conventional aspects of genre construction and interpretation.

Finally, Berkenkotter and Huckin (1995), who combine their expertise in the fields of discourse analysis and cognitively based rhetorical research, have developed what they call a *sociocognitive theory of genre.* Their theory is explained by Trosborg (this volume), who uses it as an explanatory approach when discussing the translation of documents of the European Union as hybrid political texts.

A multi-dimensional approach to genre

So far, genre has been established as a system underlying register.[8] Taking register in its narrow sense of occupational field, contracts will always be part of the legal register, a sermon will involve the religious register, and so on, but a pa rticular genre may cut across a number of registers. A study carried out by Swales (1981) has shown that a research article in chemistry may not be very different from a research article in, for example, sociology. This finding questions the assumption that genre is subordinated to register. Genres are subordinated to registers only in the sense that one register may be realized through various genres. Conversely, one genre may be realized through a number of registers just as a genre constrains the ways in which register variables of field, tenor and mode can be combined in a particular society. Some topics will be more suitable for lectures than others, while other topics are likely to be chosen for informal conversation between equals.

Both concepts need to be considered. Registers impose constraints at the linguistic level of vocabulary and syntax, whereas genre constraints operate at the level of discourse structure. Furthermore, genre specifies conditions for beginning, structuring and ending a text, for which reason genres, unlike registers, can only be realized in completed texts (see Couture .1986: 82). Therefore, I do not see genre as subordinated to register or field .[9] Instead, I see genres as having complementary registers,' and communicative success with texts may require an appropriate relationship to systems of genre and register (cf. Couture 1986: 86). Acknowledging these points, a description of genre in its own right, independent of a subordination to a particular register, is needed.

Furthermore, communicative purpose may be a dubious criterion for identification of genre. For Bhatia, the use of this criterion leads to the classification of advertisements and job applications as belonging to the same genre: to promote the value of something, be it an article or a person.t[0] There are genres for which purpose is unsuited as a primary criterion, for example poetic genres aimed at giving verbal pleasure defy ascription of communicative purpose. So do a number of texts types in which medium is a decisive criterion, for example memos, e-mails, faxes etc., which are characterized and influenced by their medium of communication.

What we need is not a classification according to a narrow specification of field, neither is it a uni-criterial model focusing, for example on communicative purpose. Instead, we need a multicriterial model in which all relevant dimensions count.

Recent approaches to language acknowledging language as text (beyond the sentence) and language as social action embedded in communicative situations led to the availability of just such a model. The approach developed by Michael Halliday and his colleagues in Britain in the 1960s and 1970s provided translation studies with an alternative view. They launched a functional approach to language, an approach "which attempts to explain linguistic structure, and linguistic phenomenon, by reference to the notion that language plays a certain part in our lives; that it is required to serve certain universal types of demand" (Halliday 1971: 331). This social theory of language, with its three-fold division in field, tenor and mode, and known as the systemic-functional model is now acknowledged world-wide in the fields of linguistics, sociolinguistics, communication studies, applied linguistics, etc. The use of this model for translation purposes is the'great discovery of Vermeer and Nord (see also Hatim and Mason 1990; Baker 1992).

Genres can be defined multicriterially through an extension of the variables field, tenor and mode, with a development of field in the ideational component covering linguistic content, of tenor in the interpersonal component covering communicative functions in relation to sender/receiver role relationships, and, finally, the development of mode in the textual component involving medium.

While a genre can only be. fully accounted for through a specification of field, tenor and mode ' and a description of linguistic features realized in the ideational, the interpersonal and the textual components of particular texts (see Eggins (1994) for further development), it may nevertheless be recognized by any (outstanding) feature which has been made the focus of attention. See also Kussmaul- (this volume) for an extensive presentation of how change of a single parameter may result in a change of genre.

Text types cutting across registers and genres

Recent interest in the structure of discourse has brought attention'to one of the oldest issues in the discipline of rhetoric. Two traditions of classifying texts run through the 2,400-year-old history of rhetoric, both deriving from Aristotle's *Rhetoric.) t* One tradition classifies texts according to *purpose,* the other by *type* (also called `mode', see Kinneavy (1980); Faigley and Meyer (1983)). A discourse may be characterized in terms of its communicative function. Is the discourse intended to inform, to express an attitude, to persuade or create a debate, etc? Additionally, it may be classified according to text type into descriptive, narrative, expository, argumentative, instrumental etc. The focus is on functional categories, also termed rhetorical strategies, which is not normative, but abstract knowledge, fundamental in the creation of texts.t[2]

Criticism has been launched on genre analysis to the effect that genre distinctions do not adequately represent the underlying text functions of English. Texts within particular genres can differ greatly in their linguistic characteristics; for example, newspaper articles can range from extremely narrative and colloquial in linguistic form to extremely informational and elaborated in form. On the other hand, different genres can be quite similar linguistically; for example, newspaper articles and popular magazine articles can be nearly identical in form.

Whereas the notion of genre refers to completed texts, communicative function and text type, being properties of a text, cut across genres. Thus informative texts may comprise newspaper reports, TV news, textbooks, etc. and argumentative texts may comprise debates, political speeches, newspaper articles, etc. Genres and text types are clearly to be distinguished, as linguistically distinct texts within a genre may represent different text types, while linguistically similar texts from different genres may represent a single text type (cf. Biber 1989: 6)'

Communicative function, speech act and text act.

In determining the purpose of discourse, many previous theories have taken the component of the language process into consideration, implicitly or explicitly. Four factors of the linguistic process are often listed: speaker, listener, thing referred to, and the linguistic material.[13] According to a framework acknowledging Aristotle and Bühler as their sources, a text is classified into a particular type according to which component, in the communication process receives the primary focus. If the main focus is on the sender, the discourse will be expressive; if on the receiver, it will be persuasive; if on the linguistic code, literary; and if the aim is to represent the realities of the world, it will be referential (see Jakobson 1960, Kinneavy 1971). In *Linguistics and Poetics* (1960), Roman Jakobson also emphasized language product as a pleasurable end in itself (cf. his poetic function) and added two other uses: the metalanguage, in which language is used to talk about language, and phatic communication, which is the use of language merely to keep the channel open, as in an introduction or in some seemingly trivial conversational crutches. Jakobsen's basic model has been adopted by some important anthropologists, for example Dell Hymes (1974). For a more recent account, see Kinneavy (1980: 65), who acknowledges the work of Aristotle and Aquinas, Cassier, Morris, Miller, Russell, Reichenbach, Richards, Bühler, Jakobson, when comparing their categories with his own. For a typology of texts based on communicative functions and used to form the basis of translator's decisions, see Reiss (1976). See also Nord (this volume) for whom communicative functions play a crucial role in establishing her functional typology of translations.

Another body of research concerned with communicative purpose is speech act theory, which views language as action made up of communicative acts (cf. Austin 1962, Searle 1969, 1976, and their followers). Thus Searle (1976) distinguishes five major classes of speech acts: Representatives, directives, expressives (and evaluatives [14]), commissives and declarations. Each class divides into a number of different speech acts; for example it makes a difference whether a speaker is begging, asking, ordering or threatening; the illocutionary point is the same, namely that of influencing the hearer, however, different illocutionary forces are expressed. Acknowledging Traugott and Pratt (1980) as their source, Hatim and Mason (1990) has adopted this framework for translation purposes.

The illocutionary (or communicative) force, which is the dynamic element in communication, is not to be treated in isolation as the illocutionary force of each utterance. Rather, the interrelationship of speech acts within sequences leads to the notion of illocutionary structure of a text. The overall purpose may be that of achieving equivalence of illocutionary force at text Ievel. For ex-

ample, an advertisement may be predominantly referential in nature, consisting of informative (and expressive) statements, but still, as is well known, the aim is that of persuading the consumer to buy. Advertisements are. difficult to classify at the level of typical formation patterns, but they all share the same function of promoting the sales of a product, i.e. they are directive at text level.

Real text will display features of more than one type. As (this) multifunctionality is the rule rather than the exception, any useful typology of texts will have to be able to accommodate such diversity (Hatim and Mason 1990: 138). The expressed intent of the author may not be the real intent. In many cases in these overlaps, one of the aims is dominant and the other is a means. Information included in an advertisement is there to further the persuasion, so that persuasion is the primary aim. In some literature, it is obvious that persuasion is a secondary motif, etc. In expressing an opinion, factual knowledge as well as evaluative judgements may be brought as supportive statements. Studies of how entire sequences of speech acts are evaluated on the basis of higher order expectations about the structure of a text, and how these sequences of coherent microtexts'contribute to the global coherence of a larger text have become the ultimate goal of text pragmatics (Ferrara 1985: 140).

In translating, the aim is not necessarily matching speech act for speech act. The reader's (client or consumer, etc.) interest must be constantly matched against the communicative intent of the producer of the source text. For example, if the intention of the producer of the ST is to sell a product, any translation of the as an advertisement must be evaluated in terms of how well it serves that purpose (i.e. the persuasive text act involved), rather than on the basis of a narrow linguistic comparison. If, on the other hand, a translation of advertising copy is required purely for information, the translator's product will be adjusted accordingly.

The predominant illocutionary force of sequences of speech acts, i.e. the *text act,* must be recognized (see Hatim and Mason 1990: 78-82, cf. Homer 1975). Failure to recognize the text act can be a stumbling-block in conveying the communicative intention of a message and may easily lead to misunderstandings (see, e.g. Hatim and Mason 1990: 78-79). Recognizing the text act is therefore an important precondition in translation and interpreting.

Text type and text type focus

The varities of discourse have been established in register analysis and elaborated on in genre-analysis. Particular genres, each with its own characteristics, within and across registers, have been discussed. Newspaper reporting imposes a certain demand that the main content be given in the opening sentences, and the details are to be given in successive sentences and paragraphs of the story (cf. the news pyramid), the validity of legal documents may depend on the expression of specific formulae, a business letter requires a high level of explicitness, while a private letter is the writer's own concern, etc. There are, on the other hand, similarities between certain types Of discourses. The fairy tale, the novel, the short story, are all types of story telling; a first person novel may have much in common with a first person account of an informal sort. First person accounts, newspaper reporting, and historiography make claims to factuality. Essays and scientific papers have much in common as do sermons, pep talks and some political speeches. Food recipes have something in common with instruction booklets, etc. (cf. Longacre 1982). Certain discourse types are then somewhat similar to others. Our classification therefore needs to include both classification into registers and genres and specifications into *modes* of discourse made up by text types.

While communicative purpose represents the overall aim of a text, rhetorical purpose is made up of the rhetorical strategies which constitute the mode of discourse realized through text types. Text types are identified as "a conceptual framework which enables us to classify texts in terms of communicative intentions serving an overall rhetorical purpose" (Hatim and Mason 1990: 140). While genres form an open-ended set (Schauber and Spolsky (1986), text types constitute a closed set with only a limited number of categories» Building on Aristotle, Kinneavy (1971, 1980) theorizes a classification of text types in terms of modes, which derive from philosophical concepts of how reality can be viewed. His primary distinction is between static and dynamic, between looking at something at a particular time and looking at how it changes over time, and he arrives at the four classes of narration, classification, description, and evaluation. If our static view of reality focuses on individual existences, we *describe;* if it focuses on groups, we *classify.* If our dynamic view of reality looks at change, we *narrate; if* it looks at the potential for reality to be different, we *evaluate.* As such, these text types are cognitive categories offering ways of conceptualizing, perceiving and portraying the world.

Werlich's (1976) typology, which includes five idealized *text types* or *modes:* description, narration, exposition, argumentation, and instruction has later been adopted by Hatim and Mason (1990) for translation purposes with a divison of instruction into two subclasses: *instruction with option* (as advertisements, manuals, recepes, etc.) and *instruction without option* (e.g. legislative texts and contracts). The typology is based on cognitive properties of text types: Differentiation and interrelation of perceptions *in space* (description), differentiation and interrelation of perceptions in time *(narration),* comprehension of general concepts through differentiation by *analysis* and/or *synthesis* (exposition), *judging, i.e.* evaluation of relations between and among concepts through the extraction of similarities, contrasts, and transformations (argumen

tation), *planning* of future behaviour (instruction). For differentiation and further description of these categories, see Hatim and Mason (1990: 153-160), Albrecht (1995: 117). For example, exposition is to be distinguished from argumentation on the grounds of factuality established by means of a, *scene-setter*, whereas argumentation is established through a *tone setter* as evaluative discourse. See also Biber (.1989) for a classification based on formal Iinguistic criteria.

Text types often cut across genre categorizations. The relationship between genres and text types is not straightforward. However, this finding does not invalidate genre analysis. Genres and text type categorizations have different theoretical bases, which are both valid as distinct text constracts. Genres correspond directly to the text distinctions recognized by mature adult speakers, reflecting differences in external format and situations of use. The theoretical basis of genres is independent from those for text types. Genres are defined and distinguished on the basis of systematic non-linguistic criteria, and they are valid in those terms. Text types may be defined on the basis of cognitive categories (as described above) or on the basis of strictly linguistic criteria (similarities in the use of cooccurring linguistic features, cf. Biber's (1989) typology). Contrary to most previous findings, Biber's types are valid in linguistic terms and captures the salient linguistic differences among texts in English. See also Longacre (1976, 1982) and Smith (1985).

No theory of modes of discourse is rigid in its categorization. Most discourse employs multiple views of reality and is therefore multiple in type (cf. Kinneavy 1980: 37), and pure narration, description, exposition and argumentation hardly occur. Thus, a particular genre may make use of several modes of presentation, though typically with one of these as the dominant type. The *idea* of an overall function was recognized by what Morris (1946: 75) calls a " dominant" mode. Today, *text type focus,* or *contextual focus,* refers to text type at the macro level, i.e. the dominant function of a text type exhibited in or underlying a text (cf. Werlich 1976, Hatim and Mason 1990).[16] If a text is incorporated into a larger text with a different overall purpose, the performative impact of the incorporated text may be changed by its incorporation. This explains why linguistic features at microlevel need not be isomorphic with the particular characteristics of the contextual focus. The same principle holds in uses of speech acts (see above for a dominant communicative function or *text-act).*

Thus, we need a two-level typology for text types (as well as for communicative functions) rather than a single level of types only. At the macrolevel of discourse, text type may be assumed to precede the level of text-strategic choices, thus affecting the whole strategy of the text. The choice of microlevel text types on the other hand, has to do with the textualization process, which is particular text (or genre) need not agree with its contextual focus. An argumentative text-type focus may be realized through narration, instructions may take the form of description, and so forth. In the sense of various blends of different text types, a dominant text type is often recognizable. Hatim and Mason (1990: 146-148) account for types of "hybridisation", stressing the need for translators to become aware of these aspects.

Of great interest is the interaction between communicative purpose and rhetorical purpose (text type), for example, in order to persuade one can narrate, describe, counterargue, etc. (cf. Hatim and Mason 1990» 145). The interrelation between the purpose of the communication and the rhetorical strategies determining the text type(s) employed to achieve the intended communicative goal is an object of study deserving further attention.

Concluding comments

The persistence of classifications of texts according to aims and modes in the 2, 400-year-old history of rhetoric suggests that these classifications do reflect some fundamental properties of'discourse. However, the discourse framework is decisive, so we are back to discourse situation and genre. The interaction between discourse situation and genre, on the one hand, and text type and communicative functions on the other, is an all important goal of future investigations within as well as across languages and cultures.

Genre knowledge, knowledge of form-function relations of communicative functions and text types are important not only to scholars and researchers in the fields of communication, rhetoric, and sociology of science, to linguists who teach and conduct research in ESP and LSP, but also to practitioners who compose or translate in the disciplines. Today, there is a growing interest in assessing rhetorical purposes, in unpacking information structures and in accounting for syntactic and lexical choices. Moreover, the resulting findings are no longer viewed only in terms of stylistic appropriacy but, increasingly, in terms of the contributions they may or may not make to communicative effectiveness and appropriateness. We deal increasingly with the communicative character of discourse.

Understanding the genres of written communication in one's field is essential to professional success. The function of the genre must be understood from the perspective of the composer/translator who must draw upon knowledge of register and genre to perform effectively. However, the acquisition of conceptual knowledge, like the learning of the use of tools, is "both situated and progressively developed through activity", and "to learn to use tools as practitioners use them, a student, like an apprentice, must enter the community and

its culture" (Brown, Collins, and' Duguid 1989: 33, reported in Berkenkotter and Huckin 1995: 12). Learning the genres of disciplinary and professional discourse requires immersion into the culture for a lengthy period of apprenticeship and enculturation (cf. Freedman 1993). The problem for translators operating in a different culture is that they are often asked to ***use*** the tools of a discipline without being able to adopt its culture. As compensation, knowledge of cióss-cultural differences and similarities regarding text typology and conventions may be a useful source.

A particular genre is often a highly structured and conventionalized communicative event. This specific structure and convention is of great importance to the translator. Likewise, the constraints on allowable contributions in terms of their intent, positioning, form and functional value are likely to constrain the translator.who must conform to standard practices within the boundaries of a particular genre.

Even if we grant that surface features and local decisions are highly contributory to the performance outcome, it is still very much the case that it is facilitative for a participant to have a sense of the underlying logic or rationale of text typologies in both reception and production. This is even more so in cases where no guiding linguistic features are identified.

The translator may in some contexts have to pay particular attention to the way the `official" function of a text is being manipulated (Hatim and Mason 1990: 146). As mentioned, failure to recognize the illocutionary force of single utterances as well as the superordinate communicative intent of the text act c an be a major stumbling-block in establishing the aims of discourse and may result in faulty translations. Similar problems hold for text types. Conducting a translation exercise, Hatim and Mason (1990: 149) found that the majority of twelve translator trainees produced translations which could be faulted on the grounds that they misinterpreted text-type focus. Recognizing text act and text-type focus are important goals in translation.

In using the genres customarily employed by members of their discourse community, text producers help constitute the community and simultaneously reproduce it (Berkenkotter and Huckin (1995: 25). Similarly, translators aware of the conventions play the same role. Communicative functions and text types are universal, but subservient to cultural norms reflected in realisation strategies and the organisation of texts. Lack of relevant knowledge of genre, communicative functions, text types and culture may result in distorted translations.

Text typology..with genre conventions and knowledge of how communicative functions and text types are realized in different languages within and across genres are useful knowledge in translator training and in translation itself.

Notes

1 For recent surveys on definitions of text and discourse, see also Vitacolonna (1988).

2 For example, Longacre (1982) has an article on "Discourse typologyin relation to language typology", whereas Biber (1989) has one on "A typology of English texts". Both authors are concerned with the classical rhetorical classes of narration, description, exposition and argumentation.

3 For example, Swales (1990: 26) has shown how pre-modifying en-participles textualize two different aspects of chemistry text depending upon whether the author is exemplifying or generalizing.

4 For Hatim and Mason (1990: 48), "situation type" includes any ríumber of similar situations (tokens) of the general type. For example, making your next appointment with the dentist's receptionist is a particular token of a recognized type of situation.

5 Linguistics as a whole (apart from Martin (1985), Martin and Rothery (1986) and Couture (1986) has tended to find genre indigestible (Swales 1990: 41).

6 In fact, it was mainly due to the influence of the register concept that recognition of differences between, say, medical journal editorials and articles (Adams Smith 1984) or between legislative prose, legal textbooks and legal case reports (Bhatia 1983) has developed . rather slowly in the English for Specific Purposes field (cf. S wales 1990: 3).

7 The division of genres into sub-genres is dependent on the degree of specificity of the classification: letter/business letter/letter to The Bank of Westminster.

8 The relationship between genre and 'the longer established concept of register is not always very clear (see Ventola (1984) for a discussion of this uncertainty).

9 Hatim and Mason (1990: 75) see genre as a development of field.

10 Bhatia places advertising to sell goods and letter of job application as the same genre, neglecting the fact that the two kinds of text have different receivers: people (often in general) who may not be interested in the product, and a specific firm who have already formulated its needs and interest in the type of person being advertised for.

I *Rhetoric,* traditionally (and for over a century in English departments), often refers to the whole field of the uses of language. A more specific meaning is the use of rhetoric to refer to modes of discourse realized through text types (narration, description, exposition, argumentation, etc), i.8. the classification of texts by type (see Kinneavy 1980: 3-4). To complicate the matter further, some scholars also refer to communicative functions as rhetorical strategies (cf. Trimble 1985).

12 Longacre (1976, 1982), Smith (1985) and Biber (1989) all refer to text types as "underlying shared communicative functions". Here we reserve communicative functions to a classification of speech acts in accordance with the typology suggested by Kinneavy and others, restricting text types to modes of discourse. For different authors in linguistics, "function" has referred to: the kind of reality referred to (Cassirer 1944: 171 ff, Urban 1939: 134 ff); the level of social formality of a given discourse (Kenyon 1952: 215 ff.) nonmorphological classes of words in grammar (Fries I952). Clearly, none of these meanings are intended • here.

13 In fact, Aristotle proposed what he called "a language concerned with things", and a "language directed to the hearer". A three-dimensional model of communication, resulting in the so-called communication triangle was originally proposed by Bühler (1933: 74).

14 Searle collapses expressives and evaluatives, originally distinguished by Austin as two separate classes, into one class, while Traugott and Pratt (1980) keep the six original classes.

15 See also Chafe (1982), who proposes a four-way classification of texts with respect to the parameters of 'involvement-detachment' and 'integration-fragmentation'.

16 Note that Virtanen (1992).uses *discourse type to* refer to text type at the macrolevel reserving text type for microlevel analysis. However, as text and discourse have been defined to be used interchangeably (compare also the alternate use of discourse type and text type), it seems confusing to use discourse type at the macrolevel in contrast to using *text type at the*

. microlevel. For this reason, I do not use the term discourse type to represent text type at the macrolevel; instead, **I** use the term 'text-type focus' or 'contextual focus' employed by Werlich (1976) and adopted by Hatim and Mason (1990) to refer to the predominant text type.

References

Adams Smith, Diana E. 1984. "Medical discourse: Aspects of author's comment". *The ESP Journal* 3: 25-36.

Aristotle. 1960. *Rhetoric.* (L. Cooper, trans.) New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Albrecht, Lone. 19.95. *Textual Analysis.* Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur.

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

Baker, Mona 1992. *In Other Words: A coursebook on translation.* London and New York: Routledge.

Barber, C.L. 1962. "Some measurable characteristics of modern scientific prose". In *Contributions to English Syntax and Phonology,* 1-23. Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell.

Bauman, R. and Sherzer, J. 1975. "The ethnography of speaking". In B. Siegel (ed), *Annual Review of Anthropology* 4: 95-120.

Berkenkotter, Carol and Huckin, Thomas N. 1995. *Genre Knowledge in Disciplinary Communication: Cognition/culture/power.* Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Bhatia, Vijay K. 1983. "Simplification vs. easification: The case of legal texts". *Applied Linguistics* 4(1): 42-54.

Bhatia, Vijay K. 1987. "Textual-mapping in British legislative writing". *World Englishes* 6(1): **1-10.**

Bhatia, Vijay K. 1989. Nativization of job application - a microethnographic study. Paper presented at the International Conference of English in South Asia, Islamabad, Pakistan, 4-8 Jan., 1989.

Bhatia, Vijay K. 1993. *Analysing Genre. Language use in professional settings.* London/New York: Longman.

Biber, Douglas. 1989. A Typology of English Texts. *Linguistics* 27: 3-43.

Brown, J.S., Collins, A., and Duguid, P. 1989. "Situated cognition and the culture of learning". *Educational Researcher* 18: 32-42.

Bühler, Karl. 1933. "Die Axiomatik der Sprachwissenschaften". Berlin: *Kant-Studien* 38: 19-90.

Cassirer, Ernst. 1944. *An Essay on Man.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Chafe, W.L. 1982. "Integration and involvement in speaking, writing, and oral "literature". In D. Tannen (ed), *Spoken and Written Language: Exploring orality and literacy.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 35-53.

Corder, S. Pit. 1973. *Introducing Applied Linguistics.* Harmondsworth: Penguin. .

Couture, Barbara (ed). 1986. *Functional Approaches to Writing: Research perspectives.* Norwood; NJ: Ablex.

Crystal, David and Davy, Derek. 1969. *Investigating English Style.* London: Longman.

Eggins, Suzanne. 1994. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics.* London: Pinter.

Faigley, Lester and Meyer, Paul. 1983. "Rhetorical theory and readers' classifications of text types". *Text* 3(4): 305-325.

Ferrara, A. 1985. "An extended theory of speech acts: appropriateness conditions for subordinate acts in sequences". *Journal of Pragmatics* 4: 233-252.

Firth, J.R. 1935. "The technique of semantics". *Transactions of Philological Society,* reprinted in Firth (1951), 7-33.

Firth, J.R. 1951. *Papers in Linguistics: 1934-1951.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fowler, Alastair 1982. *Kinds of Literature.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Freedman, A. 1993. "Show and tell? The role of explicit teaching in the learning of new genres". *Research in the Teaching of English* 27: 222-251.

Fries, Charles Carpenter. 1952. *The Structure of English.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.

Frow, John. 1980. "Discourse genres". *The Journal of Literary Semantics* 9: 73-79.

Gregory, M. and Carroll, S. 1978. *Language and Situation: Language varieties in their social contexts.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Grimes, J.E. 1975. *The Thread of Discourse.* The Hague/Paris: Mouton.

Gustafsson, M. 1975. Some syntactic properties of English law publication (Publication no. 4). Turku, Finland: University of Turku, Dept. of English.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1971. "Linguistic function and literary style: An inquiry into the language of William Golding's *The Inheritors".* In S. Chatman (ed), *Literary Style: A Symposium.* New York: Oxford University Press

Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, R. 1976. *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman.

Halliday, M.A.K., McIntosh, A. and Strevens, P. 1964. *The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching.* London: Longman.

Hatim, Basil and Mason, Ian. 1990. *Discourse and the Translator.*London/New York: Longman.

Homer, W.B. 1975. Text act theory: A study of non-fiction texts. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Michigan.

Hymes, Dell. 1974. *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jakobson, Roman. 1960. "Linguistics and poetics". In Thomas E. Sebeok (ed), *Style in Language.* M.I.T. Press: Cambridge, Massuchusetts, 350-378.

Kenyon, John S. 1952. "Cultural levels and functional varieties of English". In Harold B. Allen, *Reading in Applied Linguistics.* Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.

Kinneavy, James L. 1971. *A Theory of Discourse: The aims of discourse.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall International.

Kinneavy, James L. (1980)A *Theory of Discourse.* New York: Norton.

Lackstrom. J. E., Selinker, L. and Trimble, L. 1973. 'Technical rhetorical principles and grammatical choice". TESOL *Quarterly*, 7.

Longacre, Róbert E. 1976. *An Anatomy of Speech Notions.* Lisse: P. de Ridden.

Longacre, Robert E. 1982. "Discourse typology in relation to language typology". In S. Allén (ed), *Text Processing. Text Analysis and Generation. Text Typology and Attribution.* Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Maher, John. 1986. "English for medical purposes". *Language Teaching* 19: 112-45.

Malinowsky, B. 1923. "The problem of meaning in primitive languages". Supplement I to C.K. Ogden and I.A. Richards, *The Meaning of Meaning.* London: Kegan Paul.

Malinowsky, B. 1935. *Coral Gardens and Their Magic*,vol. 2. London: Allen & Unwin.

Martin, James R. 1985. "Process and text: two aspects of human semiosis". In James D. Benson and Greaves, S. William (eds), *Systemic Perspectives on Discourse,* vol. 1. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 248-274.

Martin, James R. and Rothery, Joan. 1986. "What a functional approach to the writing task can show teachers about `good writing". In Barbara Couture (ed), *Functional Approaches to Writing: Research perspectives.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex. 241-265.

Miller, Carolyn R. 1984. "Genre as social action". *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70: 151-167.

Morris, C.W. 1946. *Signs, Language, and Behaviour.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, *J.* 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language.* London/New York: Longman.

Reid, T.B.S. 1956. "Linguistics, structuralism and philology". *Archivum Linguisticum* 8.

Reiss, K. 1976. *Texttyp and Ubersetzungsmethode.* Der Operative Text. Kronberg: Scriptor.

Saville-Troike, Muriel. 1982. *The Ethnography of Communication.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Schauber, Ellen and SpoIsky, Ellen. 1986. *The Bounds of Interpretation.* Stanford, Cal: Stanford University Press.

Schleppegrell, Mary J. 1996. "Conjunction in spoken English and ESL writing". *Applied Linguistics* 17(3): 271-285.

Searle, John R. 1969. *Speech Acts.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Searle, John R. 1976. "A classification of illocutionary acts". *Language in Society 5:* 1-23.

Sinclair, John McH. and Coulthard, Malcolm. 1975. *Towards an Analysis of Dis-*

Smith, Edward L. 1985. "Text type and discourse framework". *Text* 5(3): 229-247.

Swales, John M. 1981. Aspects of article introductions. Aston ESP Research Report No. 1, Language Studies Unit, University of Aston in Birmingham, Birmingham, UK.

SwaIes, John M. 1985. "A genre-based approach to Language across the curriculum". Paper presented at the RELC Seminar in Language Across the Curriculum, at SEAMED Regional Centre, Singapore, April 1985. In M.L. Tickoo (ed) (1986), *Language Across the Curriculum,* Singapore, SEAMED Regional Language Centre.

Swales, John M. 1990. *Genre Analysis. English in academic and research settings.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Todorov, Tzvetan. 1976. "The origin of genres". *New Literary History* 8: 159-170.

Tragott, E. C. and Pratt, M. L. 1980. *Linguistics for Students of Literature.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovitch.

Trimble, Louis. 1985. *English for Science and Technology: A discourse approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trosborg, Anna. 1991. "An analysis of legal speech acts in English Contract Law". *Hermes* 6: 1-25.

Urban, Wilbur Marshall. 1939. *Language & Reality.* New York: The Macmillan Company.

Ventola, Eija. 1984. "Orientation to social semiotics in foreign language teaching". *Applied Linguistics* 5: 275-286.

Virtanen, Tuija. 1988. Discourse functions of adverbial placement in English: clause-initial adverbials of time and place in narratives and procedural descriptions. Unpublished Licentiate thesis. Turku: University of Turku.

Virtanen, Tuija. 1990. "On the definitions of text and discourse". *Folia Linguistica* XXIV/3-4: 447-455.

Virtanen, Tuija. 1992. "Issues of text typology: Narrative - a `basic' type of text?" *Text* 12(2): 293-310.

Virtanen, Thija and Warvik, B. 1987. Observations sur les types de textes. In *J.* Harrm8 and I. Makinen-Schwanck (eds), *Rencontre des professeurs de francais de l'enseignement supérieur: Communications.* Publications du Département des Langues Romans 6, Université de Helsinki, 91-114.

Vitacolonna, L. 1988. 'Text'/'Discourse' definitions". I J.S. Petáfi (ed), *Text and Discourse Constitution: Empirical aspects, theoretical approaches.*Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 421-439.

Werlich, E. 1976. A *Text Grammar of English.* Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1985. "Different cultures, different languages, different speech acts". *Journal of Pragmatics* 9: 145-178.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1991. *Cross-cultural Pragmatics. The semantics of human interaction.* Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.