



**HAL**  
open science

**Review of: Anna Ewa Wieczorek (2013), Clusivity: A  
New Approach to Association and Dissociation in  
Political Discourse**

Naomi Truan

► **To cite this version:**

Naomi Truan. Review of: Anna Ewa Wieczorek (2013), Clusivity: A New Approach to Association and Dissociation in Political Discourse. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 2016, pp.660-663. 10.1075/jlp.15.5.jlp.15.5.11tru . halshs-01734550

**HAL Id: halshs-01734550**

**<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01734550>**

Submitted on 14 Mar 2018

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Anna Ewa Wieczorek. (2013) *Clusivity: A New Approach to Association and Dissociation in Political Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. ISBN 978-1443844031 (hb), 250 pp., £44.99.

Reviewed by Naomi Truan (Université Paris-Sorbonne (Paris IV) / Freie Universität Berlin)

After the collective book *Clusivity: Typology and Case Studies of the Inclusive-Exclusive Distinction* edited by Elena Filimonova in 2005, Anna Wieczorek's monograph *Clusivity: A New Approach to Association and Dissociation in Political Discourse* (2013) provides a new insight into a still very new field in pragmatic Linguistics: clusivity. As Wieczorek recalls, "clusivity" is "a newly-coined term used to describe different aspects of inclusion and exclusion encoded in language" (p. 24). It can occasionally be treated "as a separate grammatical category and enumerated along with other such categories, e.g. aspect, case, definiteness, modality, mood, voice, etc. (*ibid.*). In her approach, "clusivity markers are treated [] as units that encode the relationship between the speaker and other discourse participants in relation to the context in which the speaker's utterances are delivered" (p. 212). Although this definition seems quite general, the book actually focuses on "the relationship with the addressees" (p. 1). The specificity of Wieczorek's work is to understand clusivity as a pragmatic phenomenon in American political discourse in a cognitively grounded model, therefore providing a comprehensive overview of a linguistic phenomenon which cannot be grasped only through the lens of grammar, whereas many previous studies put emphasis on the cross-linguistic distribution of clusivity markers (person marking, pronouns, deixis). The study is based on a small corpus of pre-electoral speeches held by Barack Obama between and February 2007 and November 2008 (p. 122).

The first chapter is devoted to a dynamic state of the art in which Wieczorek brings together remarks on clusivity from a social, psychological and linguistic point of view, showing how fruitful interdisciplinary foundations can be for the analysis of political discourse.

Chapter 2 is dedicated to the "linguistic means of communicating association and dissociation". The central term of "clusivity" is based on the distinction between inclusive and exclusive pronouns, which some languages encode linguistically and others do not. Wieczorek's book focuses on American pre-electoral discourse and offers a very promising perspective on a language (English) that does not mark clusivity at all. The author underlines the difference between first and

second persons, whose prototypical roles refer to the participants of the situation of communication and the third person referring to the absent(s), demonstrating how group identities play a part in cohesion building (p. 28).

In chapter 3, Wiczorek draws on “pragmatic-cognitive aspects of clusivity”, fruitfully bringing together linguistic politeness, shared knowledge, referentiality and indexical expressions and conceptual metaphors. In the first subsection (p. 32-48), the various aspects of (im)politeness are presented and the main authors introduced (Goffman 1967; Brown & Levinson 1978; Brown & Levinson 1987; Chen 2001; Culpeper, Bousfield & Wichmann 2003). The link between face and inclusion/exclusion is explored as well as the fundamental asymmetry between speaker and addressees. The second subsection (p. 48-64) focuses on the concept of “common ground” and other related terms. The review of literature is very complete, still it sometimes appears slightly unrelated to the corpus, for instance when Barr and Keysar’s (2005) view is presented: “the speaker and the addressee frequently disregard common ground and their mutual knowledge in interaction” (p. 54). One can wonder to which extent this claim is relevant for the study of single-turn political discourse, where the interaction between the speaker and his/her addressees relies mainly on non-verbal reactions from the audience (laughter, applause), whereas in a (dyadic) conversation, speaker and addressee exchange roles throughout the communication process. In the third subsection “Clusivity vs. Metaphors” (p. 64-80), the metaphors of proximity/distance and container are very convincingly drawn upon. The last subsection (p. 80-99) details the relationship between clusivity and referentiality, articulating person, spatial and time deixis.

Chapter 4 (“Pragmatic-Cognitive Strategies for Representations of Clusivity”) describes the axes of the deixis centre (distance, time and modality (p. 114) or space, time, and axiology, Cap 2006). Many examples lead to visual representations of clusivity as “clusivity projection in the three-dimensional space” (p. 128). The analysis of indexical expressions is very convincing, but Nominal Phrases (third person) could have benefited from further analysis. For example, the grammatical similarity between “politicians” and “people”, which are identified as the addressees, is not taken upon, even though both NP are situated outside the deictic centre and refer to the absents. From this perspective, it might be slightly imprecise to assert that “people” are “entities with the inclusionary status, located within deictic centre” (p. 133).<sup>1</sup>

1. For another example, the author makes the distinction, affirming that “he” (third person singular) is an “exclusive person deictic” (p. 147) when it refers to President Bush, opponent of Barack Obama. Strictly grammatically speaking, nothing allows to consider that “he” has an exclusionary status and “people” does not. This reveals the ambiguities between the (inclusionary

One of the most inspiring analyses of Wiczorek draws on the Deictic Shift Theory (p. 136). The concept of “point-of-view operations” inspired by Levinson (1983) enables her to successfully scrutinise many examples (p. 138-197) where conceptual insights into someone else’s mind are operated. Wiczorek distinguishes between “apparent axiological shifts”, where the perspective shift “does not lead to the creation of another deictic centre tied to another participant” (p. 140) and “full axiological shifts”, which require “two separate fully-operational deictic centres” (p. 143). Wiczorek’s use of the “Speech/Thought Representation” (STR) (Vandelanotte 2004) provides a very interesting corpus-based perspective on the distinction between “sayer” and “speaker” (p. 145). Finally, in chapter 5, Wiczorek develops an “application of P(erpective)-D(istanciation)-P(roxialisation) Model”.

Albeit the empirical findings are based on a very limited number of examples (76), which Wiczorek does not claim to be fully representative (xii), there are very conclusive. Nevertheless, it is a pity that the analysis remains strictly qualitative. Moreover, the political genre chosen – pre-electoral speeches – is very few commented and not put in relation with a reflexion in terms of genre. Do the analysed patterns appear more or less when the speaker is already in a power position? Are the discursive representations of the political opponents (or out-group members in Wiczorek’s words) less frequent in more consensual types of political speeches?

The very imprecise, though slightly overused word “aura” and its linguistic foundations could be theoretically deepened. Following this path, the book could also benefit from a solidier definition, and, potentially, distinction of “addressee”, “recipient” and “hearer”, which seem to be used one for another (see p. 53). One also regrets that (too) many mentioned references are missing in the bibliography.

Nevertheless, the book really offers a “new approach to association and dissociation in political discourse”, providing dynamic tools for understanding political discourse at the cognitive-pragmatic interface.

## References

- Barr, Dale J. & Boaz Keysar. 2005. Mindreading in an Exotic Case: The normal adult human. In Bertrand F. Malle & Sara D. Hodges (eds.), *Other Minds: How Humans Bridge the Divide between Self and Other*, 271–283. New York: Guilford Press.
- Brown, Penelope & Stephen C. Levinson. 1978. Universals in Language Usage. Politeness Phenomena. In Ester N. Goody (ed.), *Questions and politeness: strategies in social interaction*, 56–311. Esther N. Goody. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---

or exclusionary) enunciative status of the category of person and the semantics of the third-person pronouns or nouns.

- 
- Brown, Penelope & Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness. Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cap, Piotr. 2006. *Legitimation in Political Discourse. A Cross-Disciplinary Perspective on the Modern US War Rhetoric*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press.
- Chen, Rong. 2001. Self-politeness: A proposal. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33(1). 87–106. doi:10.1016/S0378-2166(99)00124-1.
- Culpeper, Jonathan, Derek Bousfield & Anne Wichmann. 2003. Impoliteness revisited: with special reference to dynamic and prosodic aspects. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35(10–11). 1545–1579. doi:10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00118-2.
- Filimonova, Elena. 2005. *Clusivity. Typology and Case Studies of Inclusive-Exclusive Distinction*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing. doi: 10.1075/tsl.63
- Goffman, Erving. 1967. *Interaction Ritual. Essays in Face to Face Behavior*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vandelanotte, Lieven. 2004. Deixis and grounding in speech and thought representation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36. 489–520. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2003.10.003