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the emergence of meaning during face-to-face interactions; they provide detailed linguistic analyses of texts and their relationships to other contexts. Shown through this review is that sociolinguistic research in discourse works not only against compartmentalization within scholarship, but also against the division between scholarly and social goals, and hopefully, against the divisions among groups of people who struggle to balance autonomy with interdependence, and to maintain mutual respect for one another, in just and peaceful co-existence.
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syntactic level, or choices at the lexical level. Furthermore, in addition to the linguistic levels mentioned, some languages exhibit a system of politeness forms at the morphological level. Each language has a system of honorifics, and the study of these forms in the wider context of linguistic politeness can shed light on politeness forms in general and lead to the rethinking of their function. The goals here therefore are to review the discussion of the issue of universality in the politeness issue, to illustrate how politeness forms are used, both in non-honorific and in honorific languages at the discourse, the syntactic, the lexical and the morphological levels, and to discuss what is universal and what is not universal in politeness forms and why politeness forms are used.

2. Universal principles

Universal principles of linguistic politeness proposed by Labov (1973; 1975), Brown and Levinson (1987) and Lecch (1983) have been supported by various studies which attempt to show the universal applicability of linguistic politeness. However, when examined in the light of languages with morphological politeness, their principles do not appear to explain certain factors of politeness forms. These factors are: Politeness forms are 1) limited in choice, 2) sociopragmatically obligatory, 3) chosen in accordance with a person who may be the addressee, the referent or the speaker.

In the decade, universal principles of linguistic politeness have been reexamined by those who use a non-Indo-European perspective to investigate honorific languages (de 1989; Matsumoto 1989). In Brown and Levinson’s framework, politeness forms are treated under strategy No. 5, negative politeness. By this it is meant that politeness forms are used as a strategy according to the speaker’s intention using the speaker’s rationality. This explanation does not deal with the most crucial aspect of the ritualistic use of these politeness forms. A chosen politeness form is appropriate to the context, not because the choice most closely reflects the speaker’s intention with regard to the topic of conversation, but purely because it is in accordance with a set pattern of language use. Brown and Levinson describe the situation with honorifics as follows: “Honorifics provide obvious and important evidence for the relation between language structure, politeness and social forces in general, yet because of the ethnocentric nature of much sociolinguistics they have been relatively neglected” (Brown and Levinson 1990). There may be another reason that the study of honorifics has been limited: When one approaches a culture different from one’s own, features encountered there tend to be equated with those with which one is familiar.

From the study of honorific languages, one can gain insight into the fact that politeness is often expressed in the form of pre-determined forms in both honorific and non-honorific languages. In honorific languages, the speakers’ choice among the politeness forms is much constrained by the framework of honorifics themselves, while in non-honorific languages, the speakers’ choice among the politeness forms is not constrained by such a linguistic framework. It can be said, however, that in all languages, politeness forms at the morphological level are the linguistic expressions most highly influenced by sociocultural expectations of how politeness should be expressed. Therefore, in different languages, there are differences in sociocultural expectations and how these expectations can be met linguistically, but in all languages, the speakers make use of politeness forms to show politeness in communication.

3. What are politeness forms?

What is politeness in language? Here, politeness in language is defined as language usage associated with smooth communication, realized 1) through the speaker’s use of intentional strategies to allow the intended message to be received favorably by the addressee, and 2) through the speaker’s choice of expressions to conform to the expected and/or prescribed norms of speech appropriate to the contextual situation in individual social contacts.

The following illustrations show how politeness forms are in different types of languages. Politeness forms are categorized as belonging to one of four levels; the discourse, the lexical, the syntactic, or the morphological level.

3.1. The discourse level

Examples of politeness forms are easily observed in courteous speech formulas such as ‘thank you’, ‘excuse me’, and ‘it’s my pleasure’ in English. Such speech formulas are also observed in non-Indo-European languages; Japanese uses such expressions as ‘oogawanade’ (thanks to), ‘jidasanai’ (I am going to eat), ‘sumimase’ (excuse me) and ‘yoroshiku onegai shimasu’ (I humbly ask you to look favorably upon me). Such expressions not only express the speech act, they also serve as an expression of the cultural appropriateness of the communication. Ide (1998) examined the expression ‘sumimase’ (excuse me) in Japanese and showed that the expression functions as one of the ritualized formulae used in Japanese society to facilitate public face-to-face interaction.

3.2. The syntactic level

The use of politeness forms on the syntactic level is also observed in various languages. For example, in English, paraproaching a statement with a question, adding a tag question, use of the past or the progressive tenses, or negation are among the many devices that can make statements seem less imposing on the addressee (e.g., ‘Would you open the window?’, ‘Will you open the window?’, ‘Did you open the window?’).

In Japanese, too, the choice of syntactic structure can be seen as an example of politeness forms. The following three examples illustrate this:

(1) Mado-wo atete kudasai. Window-OBJ open please

(2) Please open the window.

(3) Mado-wo atete kudasai mata-ka? Window-OBJ open please HON Q Would you please open the window?

(4) Would you mind opening the window?

Example (1) is a basic form of asking a favor of someone. By making a statement into a question as in example (2), the utterance becomes more polite than the basic form. When the question is further transformed into a negative question as in example (3), the utterance becomes even more polite than the question in (2).

3.3. The lexical level

In many Indo-European languages, the plural pronoun ‘you’ (e.g., yours as opposed to tu in French) is used as a singular high level form (Brown and Gilman 1960). V-forms and their transformation into plural forms in some Indo-European languages. The contrast of politeness vs. non-politeness forms is observed in lexical forms such as ‘hello’ vs. ‘hi’, and ‘purchase’ vs. ‘buy’ and ‘dine’ vs. ‘eat’. When speakers often interpret these as differences in the level of formality, formality is of course a question of politeness. Also in English, TLN (Title plus Last Name) as opposed to FN (First Name) is a politeness form.

In Japanese, too, the choice of address terms can be seen as an example of politeness forms at the lexical level. As in many other languages around the world, TLN (Title plus Last Name) as in ‘Yamadakoo shi (LN-department chief)’ when addressing the boss at the office, and ‘Sato-sensei (LN-teacher)’ when addressing the teacher at school is used in Japanese.

3.4. The morphological level

It is at the morphological level that a feature becomes apparent that has no direct equivalent in Indo-European languages, a feature that has proved so difficult to include in overall theories of linguistic politeness. In honorific languages like Japanese, a system of politeness forms on the morphological level is apparent. In Japanese, honorifics are expressed by means of changing the shape of predicative elements and can be divided into two types: referent honorifics and addressee honorifics. Referent honorifics occur when the noun phrase of a sentence refers to someone toward whom respect is due. The first type, referent honorifics, can be further divided into two types: subject honorifics and object honorifics. The former represents the speaker’s respectful attitude toward the subject referent, while the latter expresses the speaker’s attitude of humility toward the referent of a non-subject noun phrase.

(4) *Sensei-wo kore-o yonda. Prof-TOP this-OBJ read(PAST)

‘The professor read this.’

Subject honorifics are used when the subject noun phrase refers to a person toward whom
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The speaker is expected to show great respect. They involve the prefix \( o(\)go) and the ending \( ni\ naru\), which is attached to the infinitive form of a verb. Only the prefix is attached when the honoriﬁc is an adjective or a nominal adjective. In (5), the subject honoriﬁc form is used in referring to the action of a person of higher status, in this case a professor. This is because the social rules of Japanese society require one to use these forms to a high status person like a professor.

(6) \( seisei\ ni \ kore-o \ etzumare-

Professor-DAT this-OBJ ask
#I ask this of the professor.

Professor-DAT this-OBJ ask

'I ask this of the professor.'

The other type of referent honoriﬁcs, object honoriﬁcs, occurs in connection with non-subject noun phrases. These honoriﬁcs involve the prefix \( o(\)go) and the ending \( naru\) attached to the inﬁnitive form of a verb. In (7), the object honoriﬁc form is used to show the speaker’s attitude of humility when talking about a person of higher status, in this case, a professor. In the examples (5) and (7), subject-predicate concord of honoriﬁcs is observed. These examples show that the use of these forms is the sociopragmatic equivalent of grammatical concord, and may thus be termed sociopragmatic concord, because the honoriﬁc used must agree with the relative status of the person referred to. Subject-predicate concord in Japanese honoriﬁc is determined by the social position of the speaker. In Japanese society, (5) and (7) are appropriate, but (4) and (6) are not.

The other type of honoriﬁcs is addresser honoriﬁcs, and these honoriﬁcs occur when the speaker’s respectful attitude toward the addressee must be expressed. These honoriﬁcs are a part of the entire discourse, in contrast to the referent honoriﬁcs mentioned above. They are determined by the status of the person the speaker is talking to, not talking about.

(8) \( kyou-wa \ doryoubi \ da.

Today-TOP Saturday COP (plain)
'Today is Saturday.'

(9) \( kyou-wa \ doryobi \ de-us.

Today-TOP Saturday COP (polite)
'Today is Saturday.'

(10) \( kyou-wa \ doryoubi \ de gozaimasu.

Today-TOP Saturday COP (super-polite)
'Today is Saturday.'

Matsumoto (1989, 209) discusses the obligatory choice of plain forms or polite forms of copulas in Japanese, illustrating three variants of ‘Today is Saturday’, all of which are non-FTA (Face Threatening Act) utterances. In (8), the plain form is used. In (9), the polite form is used. In (10), the super politeness form is used. Matsumoto (1989, 209) states that even in such cases of non-FTA utterances, the speaker is required to make an obligatory choice among the variants, with or without politeness forms, according to the formality of the setting and the relationship among the participants.

4. How and why are politeness forms used?

4.1. Pitfalls in cross-cultural interpretation

In the previous section, the use of linguistic politeness at four levels of language use was illustrated. In general, politeness seems common and quite similar in Indo-European and non-Indo-European cultures, but there are important differences. Sociocultural differences in politeness use are evident in the way in which politeness forms are used in different societies and cultures. Several studies have shown that politeness is used differently in different cultures, and that there are important differences in the way in which politeness forms are used in different societies and cultures. For example, in some cultures, politeness forms are used more frequently than in others. In some cultures, politeness forms are used less frequently than in others.

As Gearing (1971) has pointed out, observers of cultures other than their own tend to identify acts and circumstances as they would identify them in their own culture. He gave as an example the case of a Fox Indian giving another Fox a blanket, which appeared to be a generous act, and he felt justified in concluding that 'the Fox are generous'. It was only later, after he had spent time with the Fox, that he realized that Fox A was culturally required to give Fox B the blanket at that time, and therefore Fox A could more accurately be described as being culturally adequate or culturally appropriate. Thus, what appeared to the outsider to be generous behaviour was in fact viewed within the society as appropriate, not generous.

All cultures have specific views on what is considered appropriate behaviour in different circumstances within that culture, and such views are passed on from generation to generation as and shared. Almost every facet of cultural activity has a range of appropriate behaviour, and sociocultural factors influence teaching children the ranges of behaviour felt to be appropriate, from table manners and dressing to interaction with all varieties of individuals and institutions.

They could be viewed as marked forms. This contrasts with Japanese honoriﬁcs, in that their correct usage is not felt by the society to be optional. A speaker cannot NOT use some form, so every utterance requires some choice, and every choice is more or less appropriate. The omission of honoriﬁcs in cases where they are felt to be appropriate is not so much impolite (usually not an insult), but rather inappropriate.

4.2. "Wakimen" - Japanese honoris

Honoriﬁcs are a term introduced by Hill et al. (1996) and in Japanese, refers to sets of social norms deﬁning appropriate behavior that people have to observe in order to be considered polite in the society in which they live. One is polite to the extent one behaves in accordance with the expected norms in a certain situation, in a certain culture and society. The wakimen type of linguistic politeness proposes a framework which takes account of the use of such politeness forms in languages with honoriﬁcs, and includes such features as honoriﬁcs, address terms, pronouns, and indirectness. It also incorporates the politeness forms which have been traditionally termed linguistic etiquette and protocol.

Hill et al. (1996) conducted an empirical study and came to the conclusion that Japanese linguistic politeness, as compared with American linguistic politeness, can be determined by the wakimen type of language use. The analysis was made by giving the same questionnaire to both Japanese and American students. The students were asked to choose from a list of expressions those they would use to request a pen from various categories of people.

Comparing ﬁgures 71 and 72.2, it is found that although both Japanese and American English speakers show graded responses in which the relative ranking of an address form correlates with the relative politeness of the linguistic form, Japanese subjects’ responses cluster more tightly than do those of the Americans. Specifically, Japanese responses cluster more tightly within two larger groupings. The one grouping reﬂects the fact that speakers of Japanese would use the expressions with politeness forms to soto (out-group) people such as people with higher status or strangers. The other grouping shows that speakers of Japanese would use the expressions without politeness forms to soto (in-group) people such as people of...
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Fig. 72.1: Correlations of Request Forms and People Categories – Japanese

equal status or familiar persons. In other words, expressions used toward *soto* (out-group) members contain politeness forms and addressive honorifics, while the expressions used toward *uchi* (in-group) members do not. Examining figure 72.2, it can be said that the clearer the distinction between the white area and the dotted area, the higher the relative weight of discernment. However, some expressions, such as 'Could I borrow ...?' , 'Can I borrow ...?' and 'Can I use ...?', are used for almost all the categories of people. The distribution of responses is broad, with little compartmentalization. This result from American English speakers shows that the discernment aspect of politeness forms in American English has a lower degree of relevance.

This difference between Japanese and American English provides a clue to finding the key factor that determines how Japanese people characterize Japanese politeness forms according to *wakimae*. In Hill et al., the Japanese speakers were obliged to make choices among linguistic forms with or without honorifics. This shows that the speaker of an honorific language has to be sensitive to the levels of formality of the immediate context, just as a native speaker of English, for example, must be sensitive to the countable and non-countable property of things because of the grammatical distinction between count and mass nouns in English. To the extent the linguistic system of a language provides a linguistic system of politeness forms such as honorifics, the greater will be the part the *wakimae* aspect of language use plays in the language. It follows that speakers of languages with honorific systems like Japanese have a strong con-

Fig. 72.2: Correlations of Request Forms and People Categories – American English
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cern for the *wakimae* aspect of linguistic politeness. *Sanada* (1993) also presents conclusive empirical research demonstrating clearly that the usage of honorifics in Japanese is governed by *wakimae*. Sanada made a detailed study of the use of honorifics by every member of a hamlet where only six families live in six households. This research was conducted in the early 1970s. The reason for introducing it here is for the figure that it shows the whole structure of *wakimae*.

As figure 72.3 shows, the choices of honorifics are determined by the referent's or addressee's family status and age. What is remarkable in reading these figures is that the same honorific form is used to the same listener or about the same referent regardless of who is speaking. This shows the extent to which the choice of expressions is determined by cultural appropriateness, as well as the overwhelming agreement in the community about what constitutes appropriate behavior. Unlike the Indo-European tradition of speaking, in which the speaker actively chooses expressions according to current intentions, these speakers are unambiguous in their choice of expressions according to the social status of the referents and addresses. The speaker's mind is geared toward matching the social norm to the context, and to asking "what is supposed to be said, what is appropriate?" instead of asking "what seems indicated at the moment". The speaker thus expresses the *wakimae* type of politeness by conforming to the social norm. This is not to say that the speakers perform this matching in a painstaking, step by step process consciously. On the contrary, the question of how to match the social norm to the context may be decided almost automatically, so that it is as much a routine part of speaking the language as making subjects and verbs agree in Indo-European languages.

If a person in the hamlet did not use the linguistic form expected in that community and that to that particular listener, but used an alternate form which would be standard form for an outsider, it would convey a clear message. Silverstein (1978, 35) described the multifunction of language use in context as presupposed or creative. Viewed from that perspective, the *wakimae* use of language discussed here equates to the presupposed use, a violation of that presupposed use would be 'creative use', because there is a clear rule. Any time that rule is not adhered to, the meaning conveyed is that the speaker either does not know the rule, or wants to highlight a lack of agreement with the rule, and thus with society.

What figure 72.3 illustrates is that the existence of *wakimae* is prescribed by the social norm, not a system to be employed as the individual chooses or in accordance with momentary intentions. It is easy to understand that this way of using a language conveys politeness when the individual is seen as a part of the whole, the whole consisting of partners, family, community, town, city, country, the globe, and nature. This view is important in Japanese traditional philosophy, where they conceive of ourselves as a part of nature.

Why does matching linguistic forms to the expected social norm make speech polite? According to the definition of politeness in language use offered at the outset, polite speech is partially realized through the speaker's choice of expressions to conform to the expected and/or prescribed norms of speech appropriate to the contextual situation in individual speech communities. This can be described as concord of linguistic form with the contextual situation, or sociopsychological concord. Speakers of honorific languages react to incorrect sociopsychological concord in the same way speakers of Indo-European languages respond to incorrect subject-predicate concord. Just as a speaker of an Indo-European language feels that a plural verb "fits" a plural subject, speakers of languages with honorifics react to the fit exhibited by a pragmatically well-constructed utterance. Whether pragmatic concord is equal to positive politeness or negative politeness is difficult to determine. This type of politeness is different from what Brown and Levinson defined as politeness, which is geared to the primacy of the individual speaker and the individual hearer, because this type of politeness puts much larger elements into focus. While a Indo-European language focuses on the coherence at sentence level, an honorific language like Japanese focuses on the coherence realized by the matching of language use and the contextual situation. The difference is the speakers perspective in language use.

These examples illustrate the various functions of politeness forms in indexing speakers' acknowledgment of their sense of place in relation to both the situational and the social context. The use of honorifics expresses the appropriate relationship between the speaker and the hearer and at the same time it expresses the speaker's attributes or identities. (By identity is meant the fact that, at different times, a person can be a teacher talking to a pupil at school, a shopper talking to a clerk at a store, and a friend in a group.) In this sense, honorifics do more than express the contextual information of the immediate speaking contexts. Honorifics can index the speakers' acknowledgment of the social norm of behavior. If honorifics are used appropriately according to the social norm, *wakimae*, a person is likely to be judged as a person who has a sense of cultural appropriateness.

Studies of honorific languages suggest that speakers subconsciously carry on a continuous and complex analysis of a variety of factors while speaking. These factors include the speaker's relationship with the addressee, the situation in which the communication is taking place, the attributes of the speaker and the identity of the speaker. Ide (1989) explains that the speakers first acknowledge a variety of factors and then choose the linguistic forms which index the all the contextual factors. Therefore, it is important that speakers establish a fit between their comprehension of the contextual factors and the system of language. Hanks (1996,193) describes what speakers must have as "...the ability to judge the fit between a linguistic form and the immediate context of its production". This fit is exactly what is described here as pragmatic concord according to *wakimae*.  

---

**Fig. 72.3: "Where are you going?" (Individuals are identified by a letter indicating the household to which they belong, followed by age) (Sanada 1993, 84)**
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73. Text/Text

1. Text/Diskurs

2. Diskurstraditionen - Texttraditionen:
   - Fortschritte in Beschreibung und Modellbildung
   - Die gesellschaftliche Relevanz der Texte/Diskurse

3. Beispiele

4. Literatur (in Auswahl)

1. Text/Diskurs

1.1. Definitionen

Der Begriff des Texts teilt das Schicksal vie-
ler, gerade zentraler Begriffe der Sprach-
wissenschaft wie etwa Wort oder Satz: Je-
ne Deinition steht in Konkurrenz zu einem
einlagesprachlichen Vorverständnis. Text
wird dem Bild gegenübergestellt in der Bild-
unterschrift, den Noten im Liedtext, der Bib-
elsaizung in den Unterschieden zur heiligen
Sprache, entsprechend variiert der Umfang
zwischen mindestens einem Wort und mehr-
seitigen Ausführungen. Verbindende Ele-
mente eines solchen Alltagsverständnisses
text wären etwa: Schriftlichkeit, nicht
veränderbare Formulierung, Abgeschlos-
sehenheit.

In der Sprachwissenschaft hat dieser Be-
griff zunächst eine Erweiterung dargestell
erfahren, dass auch mündliche Diskurse ein-
geschlossen wurden: "Text (wird) als Sum-
m aller kommunikativen Signale verstan-
den, d. h. dass auch nonverbale Zeichen wie
Mimik, Gesten, Bilder, Verkszeichnen a.
.m. unter dem Oberbegriff Text subsumi
iert werden" (Bußmann 1983, 535). Auch
wir werden im letzten Teil dieses Artikels
(4.4) einen solchen weißen Textbegriff in der
Tradition der Rhetorik (als Rhetorik als Vorläufer der Textlinguistik vgl. Kalver-
kämper 2000) zu Grunde legen, wenn
beiden verbilichen Zeichen andere, die Si-
tuation und die Finalität der Handlung be-
einflussenden kontextuellen Phänomene in
den Beschreibung einbezogen werden, um
dem Ziel einer Rekonstruktion des im sozia-
len Kontext bedeutsamer Sinns der sprach-
lchen Handlung näher zu kommen.

In der Wissenschaftsgeschichte scheint die
Verwendung eines literären und orale Texte
tumfassenden Textbegriffs in engem Zu-
 sammenhang mit der Notwendigkeit zu ste-
hen, die Ausweitung des Gegenstandes der
Linguistik auf mündliche Sprache einerse-
its zu rechtfertigen, andererseits zu kaschieren,
indem der Text ausgetauscht wurde, die Be-
schütz der mündlich gesprochenen Rede sei ledig-
l eine Beschäftigung mit einer anderen
Art von Texten (vgl. 1.4). Das Bedürfnis
ach einer durchschiebenden und mengenmäßig
Erscheinungsformen überwindenden ge-
meinsamen Oberbegriff wurde nicht nur mit
dem Begriff Text erprobt, sondern auch mit
dem Begriff Diskurs. Insbesondere in einer
gesellschaftskritisch ausgerichteter Theorie
der mit dem Sprechen und Schreiben ver-
knüpften Texten entfalteten zu-
ächst Französische Wissenschaftler den
Begriff des Diskurss, der in einer demokrati-
ischen Gesellschaft die Teilhabe von Indivi-
duen und sozialen Gruppen am Entschei-
dungsprozess und den Zugang zu den in
dem Zusammenhang zu vertiefenden ge-
sellschaftlichen Dingen wesentlich mitbe-
stimmt (vgl. auch 3.2). Die Arbeiten von
Jacques Derrida (1967), besonders aber die von Michel Foucault (1963, 1971; 1972;
1975), leitet die Arbeiten von Pierre Bour-
dieu (1972; 1984; 1993) steuern auch in an-
deren Sprachräumen auf eine große Reso-
nanz und die daran anknüpfende kritische
Diskursanalyse (vgl. 3.3.) hat Eingang in
den sprachwissenschaftlichen Kanon in vie-
l Ländern der Erde gefunden (Wedak

Aus einem mittlerweile erreichten histori-
ischen Abstand lassen sich jedoch auch für
eine inhaltliche Trennung der Begriffe Text
und Diskurs gute Gründe nennen. In diesem
Fall soll näherliegende Weise das Charakte-
ristikum der Schriftlichkeit konstitutiv für
Text sein, für mündliche Rede wäre im Ge-
genatz dazu die Bezeichnung Diskurs zu
wählen.

Die Theorien text und discourse beinhalten
determinations of their value in the whole of linguist-
ischen action. Ihre Interrelation in linguistische
re does not contribute to a better understanding
but hinder a thorough analysis of the phenomena
under consideration. One of the main
the indiscriminate use of the two terms in new litera-
ture is the simple application of terms like action
e. etc. to text. This application in general simply
uses either the term text or the term action or both
terms in a metaphorical way, without indicating
the exact value of either of the terms in a larger
theoretical framework. (…) The use of metaphors
in science underlies specific constraints with re-
gard to their formation and application. (I would
not agree that metaphors should be totally elimi-
nated from scientific discourse. Instead, precision
in the determination of what semantic parts are
actualized to do what job in meaning, is necessa-
r) (Ehlich 1992, 21-22)

Obwohl wir diese Unterscheidung für gut
zeigen, wird aufgrund der angesprochenen
Tradition im Folgenden von Diskursen und
Texten unter dem Oberbegriff Text die Rede
sein, insbesondere soll die Ebene der dichten
zu Grunde liegenden Diskurstraditionen bzw.
Texttypen berücksichtigt werden. Die Wahl
für Text als Oberbegriff folgt einerseits die
philologischen Traditionen, für die Texte
schon immer der ausgewählte Gegenstand
waren (vgl. Ashenbry, die von einer herme-
uteutischen verstandenen Textlinguistik spricht,
1999, 5), andererseits läßt sie erkennen,
dass auch bei der Beschäftigung mit Diskur-
en die Übertragung ins schriftliche Medi-
um mit allen damit verknüpften Verkürzung-
ungen und Veränderungen erst die Grundlage
für die wissenschaftliche Analyse schafft
(zur Biais der Linguistik und der schriftli-
Die dabei entstehenden Texte schaffen die
Daten für eine qualitative Forschung, die
sich in den Sozialwissenschaften einschließ-
lich der Ethnographie und der Psychologie
mitberührt etabliert hat (Bohnetsch 1975; Flick
1996b; R. Berg/Fuchs 1993). Gerade auch
diejenigen, die sich soziologischi
Anzahen versperrt sehen, ist inso-
fern ein umfassender Textbegriff berechtigt,
der die Gemeinsamkeiten mit den angen-
zungsten Disziplinen durchsieht lässt.