



**LACUS  
FORUM  
XXXI**

***Interconnections***

**UIC**  
UNIVERSITY  
OF ILLINOIS  
AT CHICAGO

© 2009 The Linguistic Association of Canada and the United States (LACUS).  
The content of this article is from *LACUS Forum* 31 (published 2005). This article and others  
from this volume may be found on the Internet at <http://www.lacus.org/volumes/31>.

---

## YOUR RIGHTS

This electronic copy is provided free of charge with no implied warranty. It is made available  
to you under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial license  
version 3.0

(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>)

Under this license you are free:

- **to Share** — to copy, distribute and transmit the work
- **to Remix** — to adapt the work

Under the following conditions:

- **Attribution** — You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author  
or licensor (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the  
work).
- **Noncommercial** — You may not use this work for commercial purposes.

With the understanding that:

- **Waiver** — Any of the above conditions can be waived if you get permission from the  
copyright holder.
- **Other Rights** — In no way are any of the following rights affected by the license:
  - Your fair dealing or fair use rights;
  - The author's moral rights;
  - Rights other persons may have either in the work itself or in how the work is  
used, such as publicity or privacy rights.

**Notice:** For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of  
this work. The best way to do this is with a link to the web page cited above.

For inquiries concerning commercial use of this work, please visit  
<http://www.lacus.org/volumes/republication>

---

**Cover:** The front cover of this document is licensed under the Creative Commons  
Attribution-No Derivative Works 3.0 license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/3.0/>) and may not be altered in any fashion. The LACUS “lakes” logo and University  
of Illinois at Chicago logo on the cover are trademarks of LACUS and the University of  
Illinois at Chicago respectively. The University Illinois at Chicago logo is used here with  
permission from the trademark holder. No license for use of these trademarks outside of  
redistribution of this exact file is granted. These trademarks may not be included in any  
adaptation of this work.

## CLASSIFYING HORTATORY AND PERSUASIVE DISCOURSE

Shin Ja J. Hwang

*Graduate Institute of Applied Linguistics/SIL International*

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS is by nature a multidisciplinary pursuit involving interconnections between language use, cognition, and interaction in social and cultural situations (van Dijk 1997)<sup>1</sup>. Classifying discourse types is crucial in discourse analysis since different types display diverse patterns in linguistic features, some of which can only be properly understood within the context of the given type. Different types of discourse, for example, use differing forms of tense, aspect, and mode to mark their mainlines. While much study has been carried out on narrative discourse, other types of discourse have received only limited attention by researchers. This is partly due to the pervasiveness of narrative texts with their high human interest, which occur around us every day, but it is also due to the difficulties involved in analyzing and classifying non-narrative texts.

This paper focuses on hortatory and persuasive discourse types in particular, which, according to Longacre (1996), aim at influencing conduct and at influencing beliefs and values, respectively. Certain classification systems group them together, while others distinguish between them because of the differences in purpose, macro-level units (macrosegments), and morphosyntactic features. Analyzing naturally occurring texts of hortatory and persuasive types, this paper asks whether they are two distinct types and whether persuasive discourse is similar to other types of discourse, such as expository.

1. DISCOURSE TYPOLOGY. Several studies have proposed discourse typology, in general, either based on text internal criteria such as linguistic features (Longacre 2004) or on communicator's intent and purpose (Tuggy 1992). Since the two bases may not always coincide and in fact often mismatch, several models try to encompass both aspects. For example, Virtanen (1992) discusses two parallel levels of types: text type, closer to the actual texts, and discourse type, connected with the purpose of discourse. She further states that narrative might be viewed as the basic text type with its possibilities of manifesting a variety of notional intents including narrative, descriptive, instructive, expository, and argumentative. Conversely, the argumentative type is the basic discourse type, since it 'is typically exposed through a range of different text types' (Virtanen 1992:305). The argumentative type, which may be exhortation or evaluation in her approach, seems to match with the hortatory or persuasive type in others.

Longacre (1996) proposes etic notional typology and emic surface typology, with the possibility of skewing between the two. There are four basic notional types based on two parameter features: Agent Orientation (AO) and Contingent Temporal

Succession (CTS). Thus narrative exhibits both AO and CTS, procedural only CTS, behavioral only AO (but logical succession instead of temporal succession), and expository lacks both features but has thematic orientation and logical succession. Behavioral discourse divides into two subtypes: hortatory with plus Projection, and eulogy with minus. He says the intent of hortatory discourse is to propose, that is, to suggest, urge, command, which underlie the whole text.

2. HORTATORY AND PERSUASIVE AS SEPARATE TEXT TYPES. In his analysis of 1 Corinthians, Terry (1995:81) identifies the book as hortatory in general with extensive embedding of persuasive and expository types. Unlike expository, he says, both hortatory and persuasive have motivational material. Persuasive tries to ‘effect a change in belief and value systems’, while hortatory tries to ‘effect an action in the reader’ and has imperative verbs and other command forms as its mainline, at least in Koine Greek. He gives a constituent analysis of a persuasive text, 1 Cor. 2:6–16, whose non-imperative main thesis is found in v. 6: ‘We do, however, speak a message of wisdom among the mature, but not the wisdom of this age or of the rulers of this age, who are coming to nothing’ (New International Version). Other examples of persuasive texts occur in chapters 12 (about one body with many parts), 13 (love), and 15 (our resurrection and the resurrected body). Along with chapter 14, chapters 12 and 13 constitute a hortatory discourse, whose macrostructure (the central gist or thrust) is proposed as: ‘**Seek** spiritual gifts, especially prophecy, which builds up the church, but above all, **show** love’ (Terry 1996:10). The macrostructure of chapter 15 is ‘Just as Christ was raised from the dead, so you should believe that Christians will be raised with a spiritual body at His coming’. The macrostructure of chapters 12–14 is stated using imperatives<sup>2</sup>, while that of chapter 15 uses a verb with deontic modal, ‘should believe’, which can be considered a type of command form (Longacre 1992). In terms of contents, however, chapter 15 is about belief, while chapters 12–14 are about acts.

In presenting notional structure schema for each type—such as the plot in narrative including inciting incident, climax, and denouement—Longacre (1996:34) adds the persuasive type as distinct from both hortatory and expository. For example, hortatory may have macrosegments of (1) the authority and credibility of the text producer, (2) indication of a problem/situation, (3) one or more command elements (which may be brusque or mitigated), and (4) motivation (essentially threats or promises). Persuasive may have (1) presentation of a problem or question, (2) proposed solution or answer, (3) supporting argumentation which may include appeal to the authority or experience of the text producer, and (4) an appeal to give credence or to adopt certain values. Expository discourse differs from hortatory in lacking the feature AO and yet is described as having macrosegments similar to those of persuasive: (1) problem, (2) solution, (3) supporting argumentation, and (4) evaluation of the solution. So expository lacks the command of hortatory or appeal of persuasive, the segment that is minimal and basic to each type, but it instead has evaluation.

3. HORTATORY AND PERSUASIVE AS A SINGLE TYPE. Some researchers do not distinguish between hortatory and persuasive types but simply use either term to cover the texts that aim at influencing both actions and thoughts or beliefs.

Robin Lakoff (1982:28) defines persuasive discourse ‘as a type of discourse that non-reciprocally attempts to effect persuasion’ and states that persuasion is ‘the attempt or intention of one participant to change the behavior, feelings, intentions or viewpoint of another by communicative means’. Although she does not propose a comprehensive text typology, it is clear that she includes within this type both the hortatory and the persuasive types of Longacre and Terry. She focuses on the unequal distribution of power or manipulation in the speech situation and states that advertising, propaganda, political rhetoric, and religious sermons are typical persuasive discourse. When Schmidt and Kess (1986:287) say that persuasion is the ‘process of inducing a voluntary change in someone’s attitudes, beliefs or behavior through the transmission of a message’, they also include change in beliefs and behavior as a single type.

Much literature presents studies of so-called hortatory discourse without trying to make the fine distinction between beliefs and acts. Breeze (1992) presents two types of information in Ephesians: exhortation type in direct or mitigated commands, and supportive type, which includes situational, motivational, credential, and enabling information. Breeze (1992:346) states that ‘Christian experience, theology, and ethics cannot be separated’, quoting Stott (1979:193) from his study of Ephesians: ‘what we are governs how we think, and how we think determines how we act’.

Clendenen’s study (1993) is on Malachi as a hortatory text. He presents three movements in the structure of Malachi, each of which has macrosegments of change, motivation, and situation. The changes urged in the three movements are: to end vain offerings, end faithlessness, and return to God with tithes. While his term change seems to be referring to changes affecting behavior, to end faithlessness involves changes in both belief and behavior.

Longacre analyzes 1 John as hortatory because, as he states, overt command forms are basic to the text, although only 9% of main clause verbs are command forms and 58% are relational and static. The frequency counts make the surface structure of 1 John look more expository than hortatory (Longacre 1992:278). But, in many hortatory texts, it is not unusual to have only a small percent of command forms, which tend to be rather blunt. We often use less blunt forms like indicative mood, rather than imperative, to persuade hearer to be more inclined to listen to us and act accordingly. According to Longacre, the macrostructure—a summary, precis, or abstract—is explicitly stated in 1 John 3:23: ‘And this is His commandment, that we should believe in the name of His Son Jesus Christ and love each other’ (ibid. 281). This theme of the correct belief and behavior is echoed in 5:1 as well. In terms of notional intent, then, the book has both persuasive and hortatory elements. In surface structure, it includes elements of expository, persuasive, and hortatory types, but the mainline is in command forms.

Wendland (2000:25) shows that the epistle of 1 Peter presents biblical instruction and practical exhortation. The purpose of the letter is stated in 1 Peter 5:8–11 and in

5:12: ‘to encourage believers to remain steadfast in faith and hope while manifesting purity of life as the “called and elect” of God in the face of some strong opposition, temptation, and persecution.’ He (ibid. 55) discusses the structure of an argumentation model by Thuren (1995:88) regarding the arguments pertaining to conviction (of one’s intellect) and persuasion (of one’s emotions and volition). The former is said to influence the thinking of the reader by convincing them of the validity of a certain assertion, whereas the latter is to move people to action. A solid conviction is needed to persuade someone to change action, so persuasion normally builds upon conviction<sup>3</sup>. The overall arguments of 1 Peter are found throughout the epistle in three types of information: problems, motivations, and appeals (Wendland 2000:66–67). The last type, appeals, includes actions (endure suffering, good behavior to all, live in harmony with others) and beliefs (remain steadfast in faith).

4. SAMPLE TEXTS. The following texts illustrate different combinations of surface and notional features of hortatory, persuasive, and expository texts. The first text comes from *The Dallas Morning News* (June 8, 2004), with the headline in an imperative, ‘**Prepare** to be bugged, bitten.’ A box in the middle of the article has its own headline in capital letters, with four bulleted items:

(1) TIPS ON REDUCING PROBLEMS

- **Get rid** of standing water—**overturn** containers, **change** the water in pet dishes frequently, **cover** trash cans and **repair** leaking plumbing or exterior faucets.
- **Maintain** door, porch and window screens to keep mosquitoes out.
- **Wear** long-sleeved shirts and long pants when outdoors, and **spray** clothing with repellents containing permethrin or DEET because mosquitoes may bite through thin clothing.
- **Stay** indoors at dawn, at dusk and in the early evening.

With every sentence in imperative mood, we are told what to do (the command macrosegment) to avoid being ‘bugged, bitten’, which is the motivation universally shared and thus implied.

The main body of the text, surrounding the box, has an indicative sentence as the sub-headline. See the first sentence in (2).

(2) Wet, cool spring is expected to bring more bloodsucking critters.

[a] The recent storms are going to bring swarms.

‘It’s going to be pretty much perfect for insects through the summer. We had one of those springs that was wet and coolish, but never got horrible. Everybody remembers it as pleasant’, said Dr. Roger Gold, an urban entomologist... ‘So did the bugs’.

[b] The repercussions of the wet, temperate weather will be felt for months to come. Mosquitoes, ticks, chiggers and fleas are expected to bite their way into our lives.

- ‘Tons of people already have been coming in with complaints of out-of-control flea infestations in their homes and their yards,’ said Kendall Sheffield, a vet technician... ‘The fleas have taken over their animals.’
- [c] People need to protect themselves and their pets from the coming scourge since some pests carry disease. Insect repellent containing DEET is recommended.
- [d] Mosquitoes can carry West Nile virus, which can sicken people and horses. They also carry heartworms, which can be fatal for dogs and cats. ‘The more mosquitoes you have, the more opportunity you have for disease,’ said Dean Brown, a master gardener...
- [e] Creepy crawlers, such as slugs, snails and cockroaches, will have a banner year also. Unfortunately, when the summer heats up, they’ll want to move inside where it’s air-conditioned.
- [f] ‘They just love us to death,’ Dr. Gold said.

The main text in (2) presents problems and undesirable situations, except in [c], which adds a mitigated command (with a modal form *need* and a recommendation). The text includes quotations from three people explicitly named, whose areas of expertise are related to the issue (an urban entomologist, a vet technician, and a master gardener), thereby giving the authority or credential to the article. This text can be viewed as a prototypical hortatory text, aiming at influencing the reader’s conduct, with four macrosegments: authority, problem/situation, command, and motivation (avoid getting bugged and bitten, which is implicit given human nature). The conditions predicted for the future may be viewed as the motivation to act now. The warnings about West Nile virus, etc. in [d] and [e] may be threats that Longacre (1996) refers to.

Another article from *The Dallas Morning News* (July 3, 2004) warns about mosquitoes. The headline and sub-headline are in the first two lines in (3). As an indication of authority, *Associated Press* follows the headings, and *COLLEGE STATION, TEXAS* appears before the main text. Again, an expert’s opinions are given several times in direct and indirect quotations.

- (3) **Call** in the swat team: Mosquitoes to be thick this summer.
- After June rains, bugs should hatch by the millions across Texas.
- [a] Now that much of the rains that plagued Texas throughout June have slowed or stopped, it’s time for a plague of a different kind in July.
- [b] **Get out** the mosquito repellent.
- [c] ‘They are now all congregating at the edge of town, in town or coming to town within the next few days, and they’re probably going to meet everybody on the Fourth of July in the back yards and lawn parties,’ said Jim Olson, entomologist with Texas Agricultural Experiment Station.
- [d] The consistent rains have flushed out breeding sites of the dreaded *Culex* mosquitoes, notorious carriers of St. Louis encephalities and West Nile. But

- different breeds of the bloodsucking bugs, called floodwater mosquitoes, will be hatching by the millions.
- [e] Some of these insects can travel 25 to 30 miles looking for a meal, although most varieties in Texas—except for the *Aedes vexans* in far West Texas—don't carry West Nile.
- [f] Coastal cities can expect an influx of two types of mosquitoes. The floodwater variety will attach from inland pastures while traditional salt marsh varieties will descend from rice patties and marshes.
- [g] 'These particular species will meet in the streets of downtown Houston and Beaumont and other cities along the coast about the Fourth of July,' Mr. Olson said.
- [h] As with all mosquitoes, he advises using protective measures, including clothing and repellent.
- [i] Eventually, puddles of standing water left by the rains will produce West Nile-carrying bugs, Mr. Olson warned.  
'We may be in disease trouble,' he said. 'The standing-water mosquitoes aren't going to have to look far to find a breeding site. They'll be in mosquito heaven.'

This article has a few command elements: the title, [b] in an imperative mode, and [h] with the verb *advises*. Other than these, most of the article presents problems and undesirable situations with bugs after heavy rains, with the covert motivation that we won't get bitten and get sick. The problems that are predicted to occur in the future may actually be explicitly stated threats as motivation for actions (note the verb *warned* in [i]). Having all the macrosegments of a hortatory discourse, this is a hortatory text as well in its overall text type. However, the bulk of it is explaining the current and future situations and gives the flavor of an expository text. The macrosegment of command gives generic instructions and seems secondary to that of the problem. Compared to the earlier text, in (1)–(2), this is less prototypically hortatory, because of extensive embedding of expository material and the weight placed on it.

Let us compare these with a third text by Dean Ornish (*The Reader's Digest*, July 1998) that tries to convince the reader that love and intimacy encourage healing. Due to space limitations, eight paragraphs between [c] and [d] are omitted. They comprise embedded narratives reporting on the studies done in Berkeley, Israel, etc. to document supporting evidence for the thesis.

#### (4) How Love Heals

- [a] 'I ask virtually every patient I see,' says Dr. Harvey Zarren, a cardiologist in Lynn, Mass., "'With whom do you share your feelings?' They look at me like I'm from outer space. But *when people feel loved, things happen in their body's physiology that encourage healing*. It's just amazing to watch.'
- [b] My work with cardiac patients over the past 20 years has convinced me that *love and intimacy are at the root of health and illness*. If a new drug had

the same impact, virtually every doctor in the country would be recommending it for his patients. It would be malpractice not to prescribe it. Yet with few exceptions we doctors don't learn much in our medical training about *the healing power of love*.

- [c] *It may be hard to believe that something as simple as talking with friends, feeling close to your parents or sharing thoughts openly can make such a powerful difference in your health. But many studies document that these things do.*

*[Not included here are five embedded narratives in eight paragraphs: studies from Berkeley, Israel, Sweden, Finland, and Pittsburgh.]*

- [d] *I believe the evidence is compelling: love and intimacy lead to greater health and healing, while loneliness and isolation predispose one to suffering, disease and premature death.*
- [e] Why these factors are so important, however, remains a bit of a mystery. I find it extraordinary that such an important and well-documented health factor is not better understood.
- [f] 'There is a factor here that's difficult to measure,' says Dr. Rachel Naomi Remen... 'Why do some people get well even though their physicians think they have no chance, while others die who seem to have had every chance to recover? Survival seems to depend on something more than just having the right treatment. Perhaps *knowing that others care, that you matter to other people, strengthens a deep impulse toward life—a will to live—that is in every one of us*'.
- [g] I have no intention of diminishing the power of diet and exercise or even drugs and surgery. But *scientific studies have made it clear that the capacity to nurture and be nurtured—to have what I call an open heart—is vitally important to having a long, healthy life.*

The thesis (shown in italics in (4)) occurs in every paragraph except [e]. The mystery introduced in [e] about why love is important leads to the second expert's quoted opinion in [f]. A new paragraph may have been made because of the direct quote starting [f], following English orthographic convention. Virtually every paragraph repeats the thesis in paraphrases, including the two, [a] and [f], which are direct quotations.

On the surface of discourse, this text is clearly expository—explaining how love heals—with arguments and evidence to support the thesis. The text starts with a quote by an authority introducing the thesis in [a], and it ends with a concluding evaluation in [g]. It has the grammatical features of the expository type, such as the use of present tense for timeless truth, inanimate subjects, and verbs of low transitivity in main-line clauses. The fact that there is no imperative or command form also supports the classification of this text as expository. The problem is covert: how can we heal when we are sick? The solution, at least part of the solution, is the thesis repeated that love heals. There is no appeal (as in persuasive discourse) or command (as in hortatory).

What is the notional intent of this text, however? Is it just to explain that it is the case that love and intimacy heal many patients? I believe there is more to it under the surface. That is, it tries to persuade us to change our beliefs or views about illness and healing, and possibly even to do something about it (i.e. change our behavior) if we don't have people who we love and who love us. As we understand the expository material in the text, we become persuaded to change our thinking (if we didn't know about it or believe it before). Then as we apply the conviction to our own circumstances, the text may go further to influence our acts. Therefore, in terms of notional intent we may call it a persuasive text. Going beyond explaining the findings, it urges us to change our views.

In (5) below are the beginning nine sentences and the final six sentences from another text. This rather sarcastic article by Steve Chapman (*The Chicago Tribune*, October 3, 2002) answers the question it poses in the title negatively and argues that Hussein is not crazy and would not attack us or use weapons of mass destruction<sup>4</sup>.

(5) Is Hussein too crazy for us to control?

- [a] He's a megalomaniac who has weapons of mass destruction and dreams of conquest. If left alone, he *is bound* to shatter the stability of the Middle East and the world. Anyone who expects him to behave rationally *is deluded*. He's so reckless and warlike that there's no telling what he might do.
- [b] No, *I'm not talking* about President Bush. *I'm talking* about Saddam Hussein, as portrayed these days by those advocating war with Iraq. They claim we must act now to keep him from getting nuclear warheads and other weapons of mass destruction.
- [c] Skeptics, including myself, reply that he would never use those weapons against us because he *knows we would obliterate* his regime and his country. The administration's supporters *insist* that though our nuclear arsenal was enough to contain Joseph Stalin and Mao Tse-tung, it can't deter the Iraqi dictator.

*[Sentences 10–39 omitted, which give problems and arguments based on the incidents in Iran and Kuwait.]*

- [d] Hussein would stop at nothing to keep himself in power. That *explains* his attacks on Iran and Kuwait. But it also *explains* why he would never dare to use weapons of mass destruction against us, unless he were going to be destroyed regardless. If he were suicidal, he would have unleashed his chemical and biological weapons during the Gulf War—which he very rationally chose not to do.
- [e] Yet today, the Bush administration and its supporters *insist we must go* to war because Hussein can't be deterred from doing the very thing he has already been deterred from doing. If you're looking for a leader who's disconnected from reality, you don't need to go to Baghdad.

The italicized verbs in present tense (e.g. *is, claim, reply, explains*) show that this text may be expository on the surface, but it also includes modal forms (underlined here) like *would* and *must* along with such speech verbs as *claim, reply,* and *insist*, displaying persuasive features. Certainly, its intent is not just to explain the situation but to persuade the reader to believe that Hussein would not attack the U.S. This text displays sarcasm in comparing Hussein and Bush. The middle part, omitted here, shows less sarcasm but presents arguments against the view that Hussein is crazy and dangerous, citing incidents in Iran and Kuwait.

The next text to consider is the famous speech 'I have a dream' by Martin Luther King, Jr. (available on-line at <http://www.americanrhetoric.com>). It is much too long to reproduce here. It starts with a sentence implying the authoritative situation, the greatest demonstration for freedom: *I am happy to join with you today in what will go down in history as the greatest demonstration for freedom in the history of our nation.*

Then it presents the problem that the Negro (as used in his speech in 1963) still is not free one hundred years after the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation. The command stretches seven long paragraphs: we have come to demand justice. A section shown in (6) addresses *the fierce urgency of Now*. If we remove the mitigating repetitive expression *Now is the time to*, we get the commands.

- (6) Now is the time to make real the promises of democracy. Now is the time to rise from the dark and desolate valley of segregation to the sunlit path of racial justice. Now is the time to lift our nation from the quicksands of racial injustice to the solid rock of brotherhood. Now is the time to make justice a reality for all of God's children.

In the sub-unit specifically addressing *my people*, he uses command forms more explicitly: several imperatives (*continue to work* and *go back*), cohortative *let us* twice, and the deontic modal *must* seven times (e.g. *We must not allow our creative protest to degenerate into physical violence*).

Finally, the motivation of hope and faith covers several paragraphs up to the end, with *I have a dream* repeated nine times, two of which are shown in (7).

- (7) I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal. I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slave owners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood.

The statement *we will be free one day* along with another poignant repetition of *Let freedom ring* nine times in parallel structure provides further motivation. The final part of the speech is given below.

- (8) Let freedom ring—from every hill and molehill of Mississippi, from every mountainside, let freedom ring!

And when this happens, when we allow freedom to ring, when we let it ring from every village and every hamlet, from every state and every city, we will be able to speed up that day when *all* of God's children, black men and white men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual,

'Free at last, free at last.

Thank *God* Almighty, we are free at last.'

What type of discourse is this beautiful, profound speech full of rhetorical devices? The text demands the hearer to change his values and beliefs on racial justice (unless these values are already right). However, it also involves the hortatory function of arguing for a change of action, e.g. recognizing every citizen's right to vote. In the surface structure, it has features of both hortatory and persuasive types, imperatives and other forms of command, rhetorical questions, and present and future tense forms, especially in the motivation section. The text may be hortatory in both surface and notional structures, but the persuasion for the belief is so strong that it might be called a persuasive text. Once a person has correct belief, correct behavior should follow.

5. CONCLUSIONS. A discourse typology established by plus or minus certain features may not be able to handle all sorts of texts. Such a typology provides a basic starting point. But a prototype approach, as applied to several areas of linguistics (George Lakoff 1987, Taylor 2003, Hopper & Thompson 1984), is helpful in text classification for analyzing those texts that tend to fall on the borderlines between types.

In the basic notional discourse typology for texts with logical succession (i.e. minus contingent temporal succession), we may just posit expository (no particular, specific agent orientation) and hortatory (specific agent or audience oriented to have their beliefs and behavior changed). Then how should we classify persuasive discourse in the overall classification scheme? Persuasive may be grouped with hortatory in its intent, or it may be expository on the surface when no command forms feature on the mainline. A given feature may be present more-or-less, rather than on-and-off as if the distinction were black and white. A text may in fact be gray, displaying degrees of being more hortatory-like or expository-like on a continuum with the persuasive type in the middle. Thus the 'How love heals' and 'Hussein' texts are between expository and persuasive, while 'I have a dream' would be between persuasive and hortatory<sup>5</sup>. 'Prepare to be bugged' would be prototypical hortatory. The text on mosquitoes is hortatory in its effort to impact our behavior to avoid being bitten and yet it is a less prototypical text due to the overall weight and extensive embedding of expository material<sup>6</sup>. Less prototypical types of texts may have skewing or mismatch between surface and notional types or extensive embedding of a different discourse type.

We might describe the continuum as follows: a prototypical expository text tries to make us understand with our head and mind, a prototypical persuasive text to make us believe with our heart, and a prototypical hortatory text to make us behave with action. Head/mind, heart, and action can all come together and be integrated in one hortatory discourse. At the expository end of the continuum, there is no agent orientation, that is, the discussion or explanation is generic, not pertaining to specific individuals. As we move towards the persuasive middle, individuals are brought in to believe personally, and then at the hortatory end, we are led to behave, the external action shown toward others.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Les Bruce, Andy Bowling, Jonathan Coombs, Marlin Leaders, and Bob Longacre for their comments on the paper. I alone am responsible for any remaining mistakes or the view presented here. I also express my thanks to the students in Text Analysis seminar classes for their selection and discussion of texts. Special thanks are extended to Jonathan Coombs for his insights on the text of 'I have a dream' by Martin Luther King, Jr.
  - <sup>2</sup> Throughout the paper, imperatives are boldfaced, and underlining and italics are used for other highlighting. In Section 4, small letters, a, b, c, etc. are added in brackets for ease of reference.
  - <sup>3</sup> Here arguments for conviction vs. those for persuasion are compared, roughly corresponding to the persuasive and hortatory types of Longacre and Terry and displaying terminological differences among models.
  - <sup>4</sup> See Owens' thesis (2003) comparing this text with a Russian text in her study of peaks in expository texts.
  - <sup>5</sup> All biblical texts mentioned in Sections 2–3 would also be similar to this 'I have a dream' text.
  - <sup>6</sup> In a discrete scheme with only expository and hortatory types for texts with logical succession, 'How love heals' and 'Hussein' may be classified as expository on the surface but hortatory in notional intent. They are examples of skewing of discourse types. 'I have a dream', 'Prepare to be bugged', and 'Mosquitoes' would be hortatory in both surface and notional intent.

## REFERENCES

- BREEZE, MARY. 1992. Hortatory discourse in Ephesians. *Journal of translation and textlinguistics* 5:313–47.
- CLENDENEN, E. RAY. 1993. Old Testament Prophecy as hortatory text: Examples from Malachi. *Journal of translation and textlinguistics* 6:336–53.
- VAN DIJK, TEUN A. 1997. The study of discourse. *Discourse as structure and process*, 1–34. London: Sage Publications.

- HOPPER, PAUL & SANDRA A. THOMPSON. 1984. The discourse basis for lexical categories in universal grammar. *Language* 60:703–52.
- LAKOFF, GEORGE. 1987. *Women, fire, and dangerous things*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- LAKOFF, ROBIN T. 1982. Persuasive discourse and ordinary conversation, with examples from advertising. In *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk*, ed. by Deborah Tannen, 25–42. (Georgetown University Round Table in Languages and Linguistics 1981.) Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- LONGACRE, ROBERT E. 1992. Towards an exegesis of 1 John based on the discourse analysis of the Greek text. In *Linguistics and New Testament interpretations: Essays on discourse analysis*, ed. by David A. Black, 271–86. Nashville: Broadman.
- . 1996. *The grammar of discourse*. 2nd ed. New York: Plenum Press.
- . 2004. Complementarity: Verb types and discourse types in Biblical Hebrew. *LACUS forum* 29:123–33.
- OWENS, CARLA. 2003. Peak in expository text. MA thesis, University of Texas at Arlington.
- SCHMIDT, ROSEMARIE & JOSEPH F. KESS. 1986. *Television advertising and televangelism: Discourse analysis of persuasive language*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- STOTT, JOHN R. W. 1979. *God's new society: The message of Ephesians*. Downers Grove IL: InterVarsity Press.
- TAYLOR, JOHN. 2003. *Linguistic categorization*, 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- TERRY, RALPH BRUCE. 1995. *A discourse analysis of First Corinthians*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- . 1996. Patterns of discourse structure in 1 Corinthians. *Journal of translation and textlinguistics* 7(4):1–32.
- THUREN, LAURI. 1995. *Argument and theology in 1 Peter: The origins of Christian paraenesis*. (Journal for the study of the Old Testament supplement series 114.) Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- TUGGY, JOHN C. 1992. Semantic paragraph patterns. *Linguistics and New Testament interpretations: Essays on discourse analysis*, ed. by David A. Black, 45–67. Nashville: Broadman Press.
- VIRTANEN, TUIJA. 1992. Issues of text typology: Narrative—a 'basic' type of text? *Text* 12:293–310.
- WENDLAND, ERNST R. 2000. 'Stand fast in the true grace of God!' A study of 1 Peter. *Journal of translation and textlinguistics* 13:25–102.

