

LANGUAGE AND IDEOLOGY

NORMAN FAIRCLOUGH

Centre for Language in Social Life
University of Lancaster

1. INTRODUÇÃO

In the Marxist tradition, the economic, the political and the ideological constitute a complex unity determined 'in the last instance' by the economic. I shall take theoretical question of what sort of relationships there are between language and ideology, and the methodological question of how such relationships are shown in analysis (which together I refer to as 'language/ideology'), to be aspects of the specification of how ideology works within this complex.

Language/ideology has been closely associated with unfashionable forms of structuralist Marxism (Althusser) and has tended to share their priorities: reproduction rather than transformation; domination and function rather than struggle and contradiction; language structures or codes or formations rather than language practices, texts and events; the subject as puppet rather than the subject as agent; meanings as preconstructed rather than meanings as produced. The key problem is to find a way of correcting these imbalances through a dialectical formulation of the structure/practice relation for language. And to do so without escaping from the Scylla of structuralism only to fall prey to the idealist Charybdis of an ideology ('language' or 'discourse') which is free from constraints of structure or infrastructure.

This paper constitutes notes towards this goal. I briefly review Althusser's contribution to conceptualizing ideology, which reopens the language/ideology issue (already substantively discussed in Voloshinov 1973(1929)), Pecheux's attempt to operationalize Althusser's theory in a theory of discourse and method for discourse analysis, and Pecheux's subsequent self-criticism. I then discuss the merits of 'locating' ideology in language structures or language events and conclude it is present in both. I outline a conception of discourse and discourse analysis which is compatible with this conclusion, and suggest that a more diverse range of

linguistic features and levels may be more ideologically invested than is usually assumed, including aspects of linguistic form and style as well as 'content'. I then argue that language/ideology issues ought to figure in the wider framework of theories and analyses of power, for which the Gramscian concept of hegemony is fruitful. This implies a focus on studies of language/ideology upon change in discursive practice and structures, seen as a dimension of change in the balance of social forces. I conclude with a discussion of the limits of ideology and the possibilities for combatting ideological discourse.

2. ALTHUSSER

The theorization of ideology which has hitherto been most influential in studies of language/ideology is surely that of Althusser (Althusser 1971, Larrain 1979). Althusser's theory contains elements which have materially contributed to theorizing (and ultimately operationalizing) language/ideology, but it also has certain widely debated limitations which carry over to its application in this domain.

The first positive (I mean for present purpose) element is Althusser's assertion that ideology does not exist in some mysterious realm of 'ideas', but has a material existence, in the sense that 'an ideology always exists as an apparatus and its practice, or practices' (1971: 156). Locating ideology in practices puts the emphasis on ideology as 'lived' in ordinary experience rather than ideologies in systematized forms. By 'apparatus' here, Althusser means one of what he calls the 'Ideological States Apparatuses' (ISAs) such as education, religion or the law which (following Gramsci) he regards as parts of the state complementary to its repressive apparatus, the two types of apparatus jointly securing the reproduction of social relations of production. Given that the practices of an apparatus include linguistic (or more properly **discursive**, see below) as well as non-linguistic practices, Althusser's assertion opens the way to seeing language as a (and indeed the preeminent) form of material existence of ideology, and so to the language/ideology issue. Of course, we must add that if ideology has a material and so linguistic existence, language has an ideological existence, **pace** linguistics! Althusser has a footnote to that effect: 'Linguistics ..often runs up against difficulties which arise because they ignore the actions of the ideological effects in all discourses' (1971: 161 fn 16).

In addition to attributing to ideology the function of securing reproduction, Althusser attributes to it the function of constituting subjects (in fact, 'there is no ideology except by the subject and for the subject' 1971: 160), through what he calls ideological 'interpellation', and indeed reproduction is achieved by way of subjection. This claim gives rise

to the issue of the relationship of language to the subject (Henriques et al 1984), which can scarcely be separated from the language/ideology issue, and it also links language to Althusser's definition of ideology as representing 'the imaginary relationship of individuals to their conditions of existence' (1971: 153). If language is a form of the material existence of ideology, then the constitution of subjects in imaginary relationships to their real conditions of existence comes to be one of the more significant processes that take place 'in' language, as one of the ideological effects in discourse that linguists ignore.

The third positive element in Althusser's account is his claim that 'Ideological State Apparatuses may be not only the **stake**, but also the **site** of class struggle' (1971:140). Struggle in the practices of an apparatus, struggle in language. This evokes Volosinov's statement, also formulated in the context of a discussion of ideology but in this case a direct discussion of language/ideology, that 'sign becomes an arena of class struggle' (1973:23). Language (or again more properly discourse) as a site of class struggle in the sense that struggle between classes actually takes linguistic forms, and as a stake in class struggle in the sense that antagonistic forces have an interest in shaping conventions which shape linguistic practice.

The difficulties begin with Althusser's distinction between 'ideology in general' and particular ideologies. Ideology in general has the function of securing cohesion, being the 'cement' which holds together the social edifice, in **all** societies. In class societies, ideologies are additionally a means of maintaining domination. Althusser broaches ideology from the perspective of the problem of how social relations are reproduced, which highlights ideology as social cement, and tends to see domination as the one-sided and basically unproblematic imposition of a dominant ideology. There is an unresolved contradiction between this vision (which many commentators see as inclining in a structural-functionalist direction) and the insistence upon class struggle in the ideological apparatuses, and class struggle comes in effect to be marginalized. Discourse itself is perhaps the best evidence that practice does not smoothly mirror back structures as this implies. This marginalization is underlined by Althusser's view of the relationship of ideology and science, particularly in the political sphere where it is only the injection of science from outside in the form of Marxism that can lead to an escape from bourgeois ideology. Resistance to ideological domination is thus seen as coming from theory rather than the practice of social struggle.

3. PECHEUX

The advances and limitations of Althusser's theory

have been reflected in the important work on language/ideology of Pecheux and his associates (Haroche, Henry, Pecheux 1971, Pecheux 1975 (1982), Conein et al. 1981, Pecheux 1988) in the French school of discourse analysis (which I refer to as AD). AD reformulated Saussure's **langue/parole** distinction as a distinction between **langue** and **discourse**, on the grounds that different uses of language by people in different social positions (discourses) imply systematic differences in meaning. AD has used Foulcault's concept of **discursive formation** (Foulcault 1972) to operationalize the notion of the linguistic materiality of ideology. Taking 'ideological formations' as antagonistic positions within a given conjuncture, discursive formations are dimensions of ideological formations which 'determine what can and should be said... from a given position in a given conjuncture' (Haroche, Henry, Pecheux 1971: 102). Discursive formations are sets of expressions in relations of synonymy and implication, which are analytically identified on the basis of an extended and partially automated version of Zellig Harris's procedures for discourse analysis. A discursive formation belongs to a network of interrelated discursive formations, or 'interdiscourse', corresponding to an integrated complex of ideological formations, and meaning relationships within a discursive formation are determined by its interdiscourse. Subjects are positioned by (and thus effects of) discursive formations and interdiscourse, in ways which disguise this positioning and give them an imaginary autonomy as sources rather than effects of discourse. The only means of fracturing ideological subjection through discourse is 'from the outside': by the intervention of Marxist-Leninist theory and practice.

From the late 1970s, Pecheux and his associates engaged in a systematic self-critique and reconstruction of AD which can be understood partly in terms of the limitations of Althusser's theory, though the process was also spurred by results of empirical work which problematized the theory and by the break of Pecheux and others with the French Communist Party (see Maldidier, 1984 for a brief account). One direction of criticism relates to the monolithic homogeneity attributed to discursive formations, which were portrayed as existing in static relations of confrontation (a Communist DF here, a Socialist one there, a Christian one over the way). As against this, 'second generation' AD has emphasized the heterogeneity of discourse, how it involves shifting and unstable configurations of discursive formations whose boundaries are constantly being redrawn according to the movements of ideological struggle (Courtine & Maldidier 1981). Earlier methods of constituting corpora are criticized for having effectively imposed homogeneity on heterogeneous discourse data. And the emphasis has shifted from procedures designed to establish regular

and repetitive structures and formations underlying the concrete discursive event, which tended to obliterate the specificity of the event, to the event itself (Pecheux 1988). With the focus upon heterogeneity of the event has come an awareness of the ambivalence of meaning in discourse, and a corresponding recognition that discourse analysis is an interpretative practice, not just a descriptive one. The claim that transformation can come only from a political force outside ideology has been abandoned, and instead the dialectical relationship of reproduction and transformation, domination and resistance, in social practice has been stressed: 'any given discourse is the potential sign of a movement within the sociohistorical filiations of identification, inasmuch as it constitutes, at the same time, a result of these filiations and the work... of displacement within their space' (1988: 648).

These elements of self-criticism provide a valuable resource for going beyond structuralist accounts of language/ideology. I shall draw upon them in what follows.

4. LOCATION OF IDEOLOGY

I want to argue that ideology invests language in various ways at various levels, and that we don't have to choose between different possible 'locations' of ideology all of which seem partly justified and none of which seems entirely satisfactory. The key issue is whether ideology is a property of structures or a property of events, and the answer is 'both'. The key problem is to find a satisfactory account of the dialectic of structures and events.

A number of accounts place ideology in some form of system of potential underlying language practice - be it a 'code', 'structure', 'system' or 'formation' (e.g. a set of expressions in specified semantic relations). These structures are defined for various varieties of a language, not for a language per se. The 'structure' option, as I shall call it, has the virtue of showing events, actual discursive practice, to be constrained by social conventions, norms, histories. It has the disadvantage of tending to defocus the event on the assumption that events are mere instantiations of structures, whereas the relationship of events to structures would appear to be less neat and less compliant. This privileges the perspective of reproduction rather than that of transformation, and the ideological conventionality and repetitiveness of events. Pecheux is a case in point. It also tends to postulate entities (codes, formations, etc) which appear to be more clearly bounded than real entities are, thus privileging the synchronic moment of fixity over historical processes of fixation and dissolution.

An alternative location for ideology would be the discursive

event itself. This has the virtue of representing ideology as a process which goes on in events, and it permits transformation and fluidity to be highlighted. But it can lead to an illusory view of discourse as free processes of formation unless there is a simultaneous emphasis on structures. There is a textual variant of this location: ideologies reside in texts. While it is true that the forms and content of texts do bear the imprint of ideological processes and structures, it is not possible to 'read off' ideologies from texts. This is because meanings are produced through interpretations of texts and texts are open to diverse interpretations, and because ideological processes appertain to discourses as whole social events - they are processes between people - not to the texts which are produced, distributed and interpreted as moments of such events. Claims to discover ideological processes solely through text analysis run into the problem now familiar in media sociology that text 'consumers' (readers, viewers) appear sometimes to be quite immune to effects of such ideologies (Morley, 1983).

Both the structure and discourse options (as well as the text option) have the limitation of being localized and particular. Ideologies cut across the boundaries of situation types and institutions, and we need to be able to discuss how they transcend particular codes or types of discourse (a simple example would be metaphors of the nation as a family), how ideology relates to the structuring and restructuring of relations between such entities. The AD concept of 'interdiscourse' is helpful here, so too is Foucault's concept of 'order of discourse' (Foucault 1971) which I shall use. Once again, the structural focus on orders of discourse needs a complementary focus on events, where these restructurings concretely take place.

An issue is what sort of entities are involved in the (re)structuring of orders of discourse. Without attempting a detailed account of the structuring of orders of discourse, I would like to suggest that the entities which make them up are (a) more or less clearly defined, (b) variable in scale, and (c) in various relationships to each other, including the relationships of complementarity, inclusion, and contradiction. I remarked above that structures are sometimes conceived of as more clearly bounded than they are; some entities seem to be sharply differentiated, others fuzzy. The entities which are articulated and rearticulated in discourse are not all fully-fledged codes or registers; they may be smaller scale entities such as turntaking systems, lexicons which incorporate particular classifications, generic scripts for narratives (for instance), sets of politeness conventions, and so forth. Finally, orders of discourse should, I suggest, be seen as heterogeneous in the sense that

they articulate both compatible and complementary entities and contradictory entities - such as contrasting lexicalizations, or turn-taking systems. These suggested properties of orders of discourse accord with thinking in 'second-generation' AD. They also, as I shall show, harmonize with the concept of hegemony.

Ideology is located, then, both in structures which constitute the outcome of past events and the conditions for current events, and in events themselves as they reproduce and transform their conditioning structures. I shall now go on to present in sections 5 and 6 a way of conceptualizing (use of) language and a matrix for conceptualizing ideology in its relation to economic and political relations which harmonize with this position.

5. DISCOURSE AND TEXT

The Saussurean conception of language use or *parole* sees it in individualistic and asocial terms. In using the term 'discourse' I am claiming language use to be imbricated in social relations and processes which systematically determine variations in its properties, including the linguistic forms which appear in texts. One aspect of this imbrication in the social which is inherent to the notion of discourse is that language is a material form of ideology, and language is invested by ideology.

Also inherent to discourse is the dialectical relation of structure/event discussed above: discourse is shaped by structures, but also contributes to shaping and reshaping them, to reproducing and transforming them. These structures are most immediately of a discursive/ideological nature - orders of discourse, codes and their elements such as vocabularies or turn-taking conventions - but they also include in a mediated form political and economic structures, relationships in the market, gender relations, relations within the state and within the institutions of civil society such as education.

The relationship of discourse to such extra-discursive structures and relations is not just representational but constitutive: ideology has material effects, discourse contributes to the creation and constant recreation of the relations, subjects (as recognized in the Althusserian concept of interpellation) and objects which populate the social world. The parent-child relationships of the family, the determination of what positions of 'mother', 'father' and 'child' are socially available as well as the subjection of real individuals to these positions, the nature of the family, or of the home, are all shaped in the ideological processes of discourse. This could easily lead to the idealist inversion referred to earlier whereby the realities of the social world are

seen as emanating from ideas. However, there are two provisos which together block this. First, people are always confronted with the family as a real institution (in a limited number of variants) with concrete practices: existing family structures are also partly constituted in ideology and discourse, but reified into institutions and practices. Second, the constitutive work of discourse necessarily takes place within the constraints of the complex of economic, political and discursal/ideological structures referred to above - and I shall argue later in relation to particular hegemonic projects and struggle. The result is that the ideological and discursal shaping of the real is always caught up in the networks of the real.

I see discourse as a complex of these elements: social practice, discursal practice, and text, and the analysis of a specific discourse calls for analysis in each of these three dimensions and their interrelations. Analysis of a discourse as a piece of social practice is analysis of the total social event which the discourse partially (and maybe even wholly) constitutes, and of the interrelationship within it of discursal and nondiscursal practice. This includes a specification of conditioning structures (economic, political, ideological) of the event, of its relationship to struggles over (to impose, sustain or resist) these structures, and outcomes and effects of the event.

Discursal practice is not in opposition to social practice, it is a particular form of it. Analysis of a particular discourse as a piece of discursal practice focuses upon processes of text production, distribution, and consumption. All of these processes are social, but production and consumption also have a partially sociocognitive nature in that they involve cognitive processes, based upon internalized social structures and conventions (hence the socio-prefix), of text production and interpretation. In the account of these sociocognitive processes, one is concerned to specify which (elements of) orders of discourse are drawn upon, and how (in broadly innovative or normative ways). The hypothesis is that significant connections exist between ways in which texts are put together and interpreted, the production-distribution-consumption of texts in a wider sense, and the nature of the social practice. Thus the degree to which discourse reproduces or transforms orders of discourse depends upon the positioning of the social practice in relation to social struggles.

Texts are described in terms of their content and their forms at various levels of organisation (see below). Features of texts constitute traces of processes of production, and cues in processes of interpretation, but the relationship between features and processes is not a transparent one - it requires interpretative work by the analyst. One target of

interpretative work is the 'intertextuality' of a text (Kristeva; 1980); texts are to a greater or lesser degree patchworks of diverse elements which can be traced to specific networks of prior texts or text elements. There is no clear demarcation between textual heterogeneity which originates in orientation to diverse (and potentially contradictory) networks of actual prior texts, and heterogeneity which results from drawing upon diverse (and potentially contradictory) elements (registers, genres, etc.) within an order of discourse. Perhaps the concept of order of discourse needs to be expanded to include such textual networks.

Ideology enters this picture first in the ideological investment of elements which are drawn upon in producing or interpreting a text, and the ways they are articulated together in orders of discourse; and second in the ways in which these elements are articulated together and orders of discourse rearticulated in discursual events. In the former connection, it should be noted that the richness of the ideological elements which go into producing and interpreting a text may be sparsely represented in the text. An example might be the way in which scare quotes are used to signal a point of confrontation between ideologies (and discourses) which are not further represented in the text - around the word 'personal' in the expression **the 'personal' problems of young people** in a leftwing newspaper (for which many 'personal' problems will be social).

A further substantive question about ideology is what features or levels of language and discourse may be ideologically invested. A common claim is that it is 'meanings' (sometimes specified as 'content' as opposed to 'form') that are ideological (e.g. Thompson 1984), and this often means just or mainly lexical meanings. Lexical meanings are of course important, but so too are presuppositions, implicatures, metaphors, and coherence, all aspects of meaning. For instance, coherent interpretations of texts are arrived at by interpreters on the basis of cues in the text, and resources (including internalized ideological and discursual structures) which they bring to text interpretation. Coherence is a key factor in the ideological constitution and reconstitution of subjects in discourse: a text 'postulates' a subject 'capable' of automatically linking together its potentially highly diverse and not explicitly linked elements to make sense of it. In postulating such a subject, a text contributes to constituting such a subject.

The 'form' - 'content' opposition is itself misleading, however. If content is to enter the realm of practice, it must do so in formal clothing, in texts or other material forms, though it is possible to study forms as if they were unrelated to content, as linguists sometimes do. In fact, formal features of texts at various levels may be ideologically invested. For

example, the representation of slumps and unemployment as akin to natural disasters may involve a preference for intransitive and attributive rather than transitive sentence structures (**the currency has lost its value, millions are out of work**, as opposed to **investors are buying gold, firms have sacked millions**) - see Fowler et al 1979. At a different level, crime stories in newspapers are written according to relatively predictable scripts which embody ideological representations of crime (Jordanidou MS). Again, the turn-taking system in a classroom or politeness conventions operating between a manager and secretary imply particular ideological representations of teacher-pupil and manager-secretary relations. Nevertheless, it may be useful to think of ideologies in terms of content-like entities which are manifested in various formal features, and perhaps frame, schema, script and related concepts are of value in this respect (Schank & Abelson, 1977).

Even aspects of the 'style' of a text may be ideologically significant. When, for instance, public bodies such as government ministries produce public information on their schemes and activities, they select a style of writing (or indeed televising) partly on the basis of the image they thereby construct for themselves. This can be regarded as a special sort of ideological process of subject constitution. A topical case in point is the Department of Trade and Industry's publicity for its 'enterprise' initiatives. The Department seems to be trying to create for itself the image of the entrepreneur of 'enterprise culture', in its efforts to persuade others to adopt the same image and identity. It does this in part stylistically. Its publicity for instance is full of categorical, authoritative and unmitigated statements about business practice aimed at businessmen (e.g. **It's no good expecting to make the right decisions for your business if you don't start with decent information**) which have more to do with establishing a categorical and authoritative and decisive image than with giving 'information' (or rather opinions) which addressees must already have.

6. HEGEMONY

The concept of hegemony originates in Lenin but is the centrepiece in an elaborated form of Gramsci's analysis of western capitalism and revolutionary strategy in western Europe. I shall make use of it both because it harmonizes with the dialectical conception of structure/event advocated above, and because it provides a framework for theorizing and analyzing ideology/discourse which avoids both economism and idealism. Hegemony cuts across and integrates economy, politics and ideology, yet ascribes an authentic place to each of them within an overall focus upon politics and power, and upon the dialectical relations between

classes and class fragments.

Hegemony is leadership as well as domination across the economic, political, cultural and ideological domains of a society. Hegemony is the power over society as a whole of one of the fundamental economically-defined classes in alliance (as a bloc) with other social forces, but it is never achieved more than partially and temporarily, as an 'unstable equilibrium'. Hegemony is about constructing alliances, and integrating rather than simply dominating subordinate classes, through concessions or through ideological means, to win their consent. Hegemony is a focus of constant struggle around points of greatest instability between classes and blocs, to construct or sustain or fracture alliances and relations of domination/subordination, which takes economic, political and ideological forms. Hegemonic struggle takes places on a broad front which includes the institutions of civil society (education, trade unions, family), with possible unevenness between different levels and domains.

Ideology is understood within this framework in terms which bear the seeds of all Althusser's advances (Buci-Glucksmann 1980:66), in, for instance, its focusing of the implicit and unconscious materialization of ideologies in practices (which contain them as implicit theoretical "premises"), ideology being 'a conception of the world that is implicitly manifest in art, in law, in economic activity and in the manifestations of individual and collective life' (Gramsci 1971:328). While the interpellation of subjects is an Althusserian elaboration, there is in Gramsci a conception of subjects as structured by diverse ideologies implicit in their practice which gives them a 'strangely composite' character (1971:324), and a view of 'common sense' as both a depositary of the diverse effects of past ideological struggles, and a constant target for restructuring in ongoing struggles. In common sense, ideologies become naturalized, or automatized. For Gramsci, ideology is tied to action, and ideologies are judged in terms of their social effects rather than their truth values. Moreover, Gramsci conceived of 'the field of ideologies in terms of conflicting, overlapping, or intersecting currents or formations' (Hall 1988:55-6), which highlights the question of how the elements of what he calls 'an ideological complex' (Gramsci 1971:195) come to be structured and restructured, articulated and rearticulated, in processes of ideological struggle. This is a perspective developed by Laclau & Mouffe (1985), though in terms which reject basic Gramscian positions such as the rootedness of hegemony in class.

The ideological dimensions of hegemonic struggle can be conceptualized and analyzed in terms of the view of discourse I have introduced above. An order of discourse constitutes the discourses/

ideological facet of a contradictory and unstable equilibrium (hegemony); notice that the view outlined above of an order of discourse as complex, heterogeneous and contradictory harmonizes with the concept of ideological complex. And discursal practice is a facet of struggle which contributes in varying degrees to the reproduction or transformation of the existing order of discourse, and through that of existing social and power relations. Let us take the political discourse of Thatcherism as an example. Thatcherite discourse can be interpreted as a rearticulation of the existing order of political discourse which has brought traditional conservative, neo-liberal and populist discourse elements into a new mix that has also constituted an unprecedented discourse of political power for a woman leader. This discursal rearticulation materializes an ideological project for the constitution of a new political base, new political subjects, and a new agenda, itself a facet of the political project of restructuring the hegemony of the bloc centred upon the bourgeoisie in new economic and political conditions. Thatcherite discourse has been described along these lines by Hall (1988), and Fairclough (in press) shows how such an analysis can be carried out in terms of the conception of discourse introduced above, in a way which accounts for (as Hall does not) the specific features of the language of Thatcher's political texts. I should add that the rearticulated order of discourse is a contradictory one: authoritarian elements coexist with democratic and egalitarian ones (textually, for instance, inclusive **we** coexists with indefinite **you**), patriarchal elements with feminist elements, but always with the latter member of each pair being contained and constrained by the former. The rearticulation or orders of discourse, however, is achieved not only in productive discursal practice, but also in interpretation: because of the heterogeneous elements which go into their production, texts are open to many ambivalences which are reduced if not eliminated by particular interpretative practices which draw upon particular configurations of discursal elements as parts of their interpretative procedures.

However, most discourse does not bear upon hegemonic struggle in such a direct way as Thatcherite discourse. In most discourse, the protagonists (as it were) are not classes or political forces linked in such relatively direct ways to classes or blocs, but for instance teachers and pupils, counsellors and clients, police and public, women and men. Hegemony is a process at the societal level, whereas most discourse has a more local character, being located in or on the edges of particular institutions - the family, schools, neighbourhoods, workplaces, courts of law, etc. We have to honour the specificity of such institutional domains. However, hegemony still provides both a model and a matrix. It provides a

model: in, let us say, education, the dominant groups also appear to exercise power through constituting alliances, integrating rather than merely dominating subordinate groups, winning their consent, achieving a precarious equilibrium which may be undermined by other groups, and doing so in part through discourse and ideology, through the constitution of and struggle around local orders of discourse, no less heterogeneous and contradictory than their societal counterpart. It provides a matrix: the achievement of hegemony at a societal level requires a degree of integration of local and semiautonomous institutions and power relations, so that the latter are partially shaped by hegemonic relations. This directs attention to links across institutions, and links and movement between institutional orders of discourse. What is necessary but difficult to accomplish is giving proper weight to integration without thereby playing down the relative autonomy and integrity of non-class struggles: between the sexes, ethnic groups, and the various categories of institutional agents.

From the perspective of hegemony, it is processes which are in focus: local processes of constituting and reconstituting social relations through discourse, global processes of integration and disintegration transcending particular institutions and local orders of discourse. Discourse. Discoursal change, and its relationship to ideological change and to social struggle and change in a broader sense, is where the emphasis must be placed, and where the language/ideology problem should be confronted. And in accordance with the dialectical view of structure/event above, a study of discoursal change needs a double focus on the discoursal event and on the societal and institutional orders of discourse.

By change in discoursal events I mean innovation or creativity which in some way goes against conventions and expectations. Change involves forms of transgression, crossing boundaries, such as putting together existing codes or elements in new combinations, or drawing upon orders of discourse or their elements in situations which conventionally preclude them in a way which gives a sense of a struggle between different ways of signifying a particular domain of experience. Change leaves traces in texts in the form of the co-occurrence of contradictory or inconsistent elements - mixtures of formal and informal styles, technical and non-technical vocabularies, markers of authority and familiarity, more typically written and more typically spoken syntactic forms, and so forth. The immediate origins and motivations of change lie in contradictions which may problematize conventions in a variety of ways. For example, contradictions which occur in the positioning of subjects, such as those

involving gender-relations, where gender-linked discursal and other practices have been problematized and changed under the impact of contradictions between traditional gendered subject positions which many of us were socialized into, and new gender relations. People are faced with what Billig et al (1988) call 'ideological dilemmas', which they attempt to resolve or contain through discursal forms of struggle. On a rather different plane, Thatcher's political discourse can be seen to arise out of the problematisation of traditional rightwing discursal practices in circumstances where contradictions become apparent between the social relations, subject positions and political practices they are based in and a changing world. Such subjective apprehensions of problems in concrete situations have their social conditions in structural contradictions at the institutional and societal levels, upon which discursal events have cumulative effects. In terms of the framework for discourse analysis introduced in the previous section, social conditions and effects are analysed in the dimension of social practice, 'ideological dilemmas' and attempts to resolve them in the dimension of discursal practice, and textual trace in the dimension of text.

In respect of structural change, changes which appear to move across boundaries between institutional orders of discourse are of particular interest in their possible links to wider hegemonic projects. Let me refer to two changes of this sort. One is an apparent democratisation of discourse which involves the reduction of overt markers of power asymmetry between people of unequal institutional power - teachers and pupils, academics and students, employers/managers and workers, parents and children, doctors and patients. This tendency is manifested in a great many different institutional domains. Although there are variations between them, it appears to be generally interpretable not as the elimination of power asymmetry but its transformation into covert forms. For example, teachers may exercise control in discourse with pupils less through direct orders and overt constraints on their rights to speak than through indirect requests and suggestions and the way they react and respond (facially and physically as well as verbally) to pupils' contributions. Such discourse can be seen in terms of contradictory mixtures of discourses of equality and power. The second example is what I have called 'synthetic personalisation' (Fairclough, in press). This is the simulation of private, face-to-face, person-to-person discourse in public mass-audience discourse - print, radio, television. Both examples are interpretable in hegemonic terms, though to do so properly would require more space than I have here. Discursal democratisation is of course linked to political democratisation, and to the broad shift from coercion to

consent, incorporation and pluralism in the exercise of power. Synthetic personalisation is a facet of a concomitant process of the breaking down of division between public and private, political society and civil society, as the state and its mechanisms (especially ideological) of generating consent expand into private domains. Although both cases can perhaps be seen in pessimistic terms as illusions of democracy, informality and so forth being projected for ulterior motives, the fact that orders of discourse do incorporate these elements if only in ways limited and constrained by others renders them open, if we adopt a hegemonic model, to discursive struggle directed at promoting these elements, as it were. In this sense democratisation and personalisation as strategies are high risk.

Are discursive changes of this order necessarily ideologically invested, and what are their implications for the language/ideology problem? It is quite conceivable that changes in discursive practices and restructuring of orders of discourse could come about for purely rational reasons. For example, it could well be that doctors are more likely to arrive at sound medical judgements if they talk with their patients conversationally on a roughly (at least apparently) equal footing than if they merely subject them to batteries of preconstructed verbal and physical examinations. But the rational motivations for such a change are virtually bound to attract an ideological overlay by the fact that the change takes place within existing power relations inside and outside medicine. Let me spell this out: in so far as changes in practices and restructurings can be said to embody representations, propositions or assumptions which affect (sustain, undermine) relations of power, they can be said to be ideological. This is broadly similar to Thompson's view of ideology as meaning in the service of relations of domination (though I would add resistance to domination), or Frow's view of ideology as a 'political functionalization of speech' (Thompson 1984: 4, Frow 1985: 204). For discourse, being ideological does not therefore preclude being other things as well.

This does not mean however that the specific ideological import of a particular element is fixed. Consider for example the apparently nondirective, nonjudgemental, empathizing way of talking to people one-to-one about themselves and their problems which we call 'counselling'. Counselling has its origins in therapy, but it now circulates as a technique across many institutional domains. It is highly ambivalent ideologically. Most counsellors see themselves as giving space to people as individuals in a world which increasingly treats them as ciphers, which makes counselling look like a counter-hegemonic practice. However, counselling is now used in preference to practice of an overtly disciplinary

nature in various institutions, which makes it look like a hegemonic technique for subtly drawing aspects of people's private lives into the domain of power. Hegemonic struggle of an ideological order is partly though counselling and partly over counselling.

The picture/ideology which emerges from this discussion is moving towards Frow's view of ideology as 'a state of discourse... in reaction to the class struggle' (1985: 204). That is, rather than attributing specific and fixed ideological 'contexts' to elements, ideology is seen more dynamically as the shifting relationship of discursive practices to hegemonic (and more local-institutional) struggle. Clearly some elements are more ideologically fixed than others - think for instance of vocabularies it would be difficult not to regard as sexist or racist. The point is however that discursive elements at least which may manifest a degree of ideological fixity may nevertheless be turned around. Foulcault makes the same point in referring to the 'tactical polyvalence of discourses':

'Discourses are tactical elements or clocks operating in the field of force relations; there can exist different and even contradictory discourses within the same strategy; they can, on the contrary, circulate without changing their form from one strategy to another, opposing strategy'. (Foulcault 1981: 101).

This suggests a homology between discursive 'strategies' and hegemonic political strategies for constructing alliances and incorporating subordinate groups, which underscores the value of the hegemony concept for exploring discursive change and language/ideology. It also suggests that perhaps the relationship between discourse hegemony is a matter of the latter limiting the potential of the former: there is no specifically discursive reason why there should not be an unlimited articulation and rearticulation of elements. It is hegemony - history - that curtails this discursive potential and constrains articulations which actually come about, their durability, and so forth. I should add that the view I have set out of changes in the structure of orders of discourse as facets of an evolving hegemonic struggle will hopefully evoke Foulcault's explorations of discourse and the technologies of power (Foulcault 1972, Dreyfus & Rabinow 1981).

7. LIMITS OF IDEOLOGY

I have suggested that discursive practices are ideologically invested in so far as they contribute to sustaining or

undermining power relations. Relations of power may in principle be affected by discursive practices in any type of discourse, even in scientific and theoretical discourse. This precludes a categorical opposition between ideology on the one hand and science or theory on the other which some writers on language/ideology have suggested (Pecheux 1982, Zima 1981). This does not however imply that all discourse is irredeemably ideological. Ideologies arise in class societies characterized by relations of domination, and in so far as human beings are capable of transcending such societies they are capable of transcending ideology. I do not therefore accept the view of 'ideology in general' as a form of social cement which is inseparable from society itself.

On a less utopian level, it is also quite possible to combat ideology now. The fact that all types of discourse are open in principle and no doubt to some extent in fact in our society to ideological investment does not mean that all types of discourse are ideologically invested to the same degree. It should not be too difficult to show that advertising is in broad terms more heavily invested than the physical sciences, though the thrust of Foucault's work (even if he resists the concept of ideology) is to show that the social sciences have a heavy ideological investment. There are structural determinants of degrees of ideological investment, but that does not mean that ideology cannot be effectively combatted in any circumstances. Ideology works, as Althusser reminds us, by disguising its ideological nature. It becomes naturalized, automatized - 'common sense' in Gramsci's terms. Subjects are ideologically positioned as independent of ideological determination. Yet subjects are also contradictorily positioned, and when contradictory positions overlap they provide a basis for awareness and reflexivity, just as they lead to problematization and change. A critically oriented discourse analysis can systematize awareness and critique of ideology (which does not of course mean it is itself automatically immune from it). From awareness and critique arise possibilities of empowerment and change (Fairclough, in press, chapter 9). Since all such movements take place within the matrix of hegemonic struggle, however, they are liable not only to be resisted but also to be incorporated. A critical discourse analysis must aim for constant vigilance about who is using its results for what, and about whether its critique of certain practices is not helping to naturalize other equally but differently ideological practices.

REFERENCES

- ALTHUSSER, L. Ideology and ideological state apparatuses, in **Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays**, New Left Books, 1971.
- BILLIG, M. CONDOR, S. et al. **Ideological Dilemmas**. Sage Publications, 1988.
- BUCI-GLUCKSMANN, C. **Gramsci and the state**. Lawrence & Wishart, 1980.
- CONEIN, B. et al. **Materialités Discursives**. Presses Universitaires de Lille, Lille, France, 1981.
- COURTINE, J-J. Marandin, J-M. Quel objet pour l'analyse de discours? In Conein 1981.
- DREYFUS, H. Rabinow, P. **Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics**. Harvester Press, 1982.
- FAIRCLOUGH, N. Critical and descriptive goals in discourse analysis. **Journal of Pragmatics**, 9, 1985.
- FAIRCLOUGH, N. Register, power and sociosemantic change. In D. Birch, M. O'Toole, **Functions of Style**. Frances Pinter, 1988.
- FAIRCLOUGH, N. (in press) **Language and Power**, Longman.
- FOUCAULT, M. **The Archaeology of Knowledge**. Tavistock Publications, 1972.
- FOUCAULT, M. **History of sexuality**. vol. 1, Penguin Books, 1981.
- FRASER, L. Where? What? and How? Awkward questions in the theory of ideology. Language and Politics Working Papers 1986. (Available from **Language and Politics**, Centre for Language in Social Life, Department of Linguistics, University of Lancaster), 1986.
- FOWLER, R. et al. **Language and Control**. RKP, 1979.
- FROW, J. Discourse and power. **Economy and Society**, 14, 1985.
- GRAMSCI, A. **Selections from the Prison Notebooks**, edited and translated by Q. Hoare & G. Nowell Smith, Lawrence & Wishart, 1971.
- HALL, S. The toad in the garden: thatcherism among the theorists. In C. Nelson & Grossberg (eds), **Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture**, Macmillan Education, 1988.
- HAROCHE, C. Henry P, Pecheux, M. La semantique et la coupure saussurienne: langue, langage, discours. **Langages** 24, 1971.

- HENRIQUES, J. et al. **Changing the Subject**. Methuen, 1984.
- JORDANIDOU, A.M.S. 'Read me the old news': a study of discourse practice.
- KRESS, G. & Hodge, R. **Language as Ideology**, RKP, 1979.
- KRISTEVA, J. Word, dialogue and novel, In **Desire in Language**, 1980.
- LACLAU, E. Mouffe, C. **Hegemony and Socialist Strategy**. Verso, 1985.
- LARRAIN, J. The concept of ideology. Hutchinson, 1979.
- MALDIDIER, D. Michel Pecheux: une tension passionnée entre la langue et l'histoire. In **Histoire et Linguistique**. Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Paris, 1984.
- MORLEY, D. cultural transformation: the politics of resistance. In H. Davis, P. Walton (eds.) **Language, Image, Media**. Blackwell, 1983.
- PECHEUX, M. **Language, Semantics and Ideology**. Macmillan, 1982.
- PECHEUX, M. Discourse: structure or event? In Nelson & Grossberg, 1988.
- SCHANK, R. Abelson, H. **Scripts, Plans, Goals and Understanding**. Lawrence Erlbaum, New York, 1977.
- THOMPSON, J.B. **Studies in the Theory of Ideology**. Polity Press, 1984.
- VOLOSINOV, V.N. **Marxism and the Philosophy of Language**. Seminar Press, 1973.
- ZIMA, P. Les mécanismes discursifs de l'idéologie. **Revue de l'institut de Sociologie (Solvay)**, 4, 1981.