Linguistics and Literary Studies / Linguistik und Literaturwissenschaft

Interfaces, Encounters, Transfers /
Begegnungen, Interferenzen und Kooperationen

Edited by / Herausgegeben von
Monika Fludernik, Daniel Jacob
With assistance from / Unter Mitwirkung von
Caroline Pirlet

DE GRUYTER

ISBN 978-3-11-030756-6
e-ISBN 978-3-11-034750-0
ISSN 1869-7054

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at http://dnb.dnb.de.

Typesetting: jürgen ullrich typosatz, Nördlingen
Printing: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
♾ Printed on acid-free paper
Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Inhaltsverzeichnis / Table of Contents

VI Abschließende Bemerkungen / Epilogue

Eva von Contzen, Bochum

Saints' Lives as Narrative Art? Towards a Pragma-Narratological Approach to the *Scottish Legendary*

Abstract: Classical narratology is problematic when it comes to comprehensive narratological analyses of medieval narrative texts. After a brief discussion of these problems and challenges for medievalists I propose a new approach to medieval narrative, by the example of saints' legends, from a narratological perspective. This new approach, pragma-narratology, combines theories taken from the linguistic branch of pragmatics, such as conversation analysis or deixis, with core aspects of narratology, including the narrator's discourse and various kinds of perspective. Both narratological predecessors and pragmatics are introduced before pragma-narratology and its three areas, vocalisation, focalisation and localisation, are outlined in further detail. A sample analysis of the legend of St Mathias from the *Scottish Legendary*, a late fourteenth-century compilation of saints' lives, concludes the article.

Classical narratological models can only be applied to medieval narratives such as saints' lives to a limited extent because they take one modern genre as the prototype for all narrative analyses and thus marginalise older texts and different genres. To avoid this problem and facilitate an unbiased analysis of medieval texts and their narrative structure, a new approach will be introduced that combines linguistic approaches and narratology. This new theory of narrative uses pragmatics and discourse analysis as its foundation with the specific purpose of analysing medieval saints' lives. Established methodologies from these two fields, such as speech act theory, politeness theory and the analysis of implicature and presupposition, are taken as a basis to systematically analyse aspects traditionally treated and covered by narratology: the role of the narrator, the narrator's and the characters' discourse, questions of sequence and chronology, and so forth. Such an approach, I propose, may be referred to as pragma-narratology.

1 Pragma-Narratology: Roots and Background

1.1 Narratology and Medieval Narratives

A medievalist interested in saints' lives and their narrative design is confronted with the problem of how to use narratological methodologies and approaches that have specifically been established for and are based on modern texts. This is not an issue as long as the focus of the analysis lies on one isolated aspect, such as point of view, discourse levels or narratorial roles. In those cases it is relatively unproblematic to use and apply selected concepts that were originally part of a larger theoretical framework because they are treated as if they were not part of a coherent whole, and difficulties associated with the theory at large do not arise. However, as soon as one's interest is widened to several narratological aspects, let alone to the application of a narratological framework in its entirety, further problems emerge. Gérard Genette's *Narrative Discourse* (1980) may serve as one very eminent example to illustrate this problem.

The text used by Genette to explain his theory is Marcel Proust's novel *À la recherche du temps perdu* (1909–1922). This novel was written over 500 years later than most medieval saints' lives: the two genres are quite different from each other with regard to historical periods, the circumstances in which they emerged, as well as their literary norms and forms. Further differences arise as to their assumptions about literature, authors and writing. If one takes the narratological framework established by Genette for the analysis of Proust's novel and then applies it to a medieval collection of saints' lives, the result is an anachronistic reading of the text(s). The parameters for which Genette's theory was designed had not yet emerged. At the same time, such an application stresses those parts of the narrative that saints' lives share with the novel (e.g. the different narrators and discourse levels) because they 'fit' into the framework. Others, by contrast, are marginalised. Examples of such aspects include the role and function of the very static characters, the absolute centrality of the saint, the ideological background of the church, the particular view of Christian time in the context of salvation history or the compilation structure of many legendaries. Put provocatively, one could argue that to apply a classical narratological theory such as Genette's to a medieval saint's life results in a blurred and distorted picture. The theory, seen as a magnifying glass, only highlights those elements with which it is familiar from the novel and neglects or ignores aspects that do not fall within its scope. If narratology claims to offer an instrument universally applicable to measure the narrative world, it runs the risk of providing those 'results' that are already inscribed in its theoretical framework (cf. Kocher 2010: 417).

This problem is a threat to medieval studies and narratology alike: classical narratology does not provide an adequate basis for a comprehensive analysis of the narrative structure of a medieval text, which means that medievalists tend to avoid it (with the exception of taking isolated parts for studies of very specific narrative phenomena). At the same time, a wealth of narrative texts and their idiosyncrasies are excluded from narratologists' awareness. Granted that a solution to this problem is of mutual interest for both disciplines, two possible solutions present themselves: first, one may try to revise and adapt a framework such as Genette's to meet the demands of medieval narratives. This, however, can only be attempted with great care and would involve major rewritings of the theory. Also, it is questionable whether a theory designed for the novel can be changed to fit other and older texts when priority is given to the theory rather than the texts. Instead, it stands to reason that one tries to start from the texts one is interested in and to develop a theory that does not impose its structure but rather takes the texts themselves as its basis to develop a new framework. To do so, it is not necessary to invent completely new categories. Most of the aspects considered by classical narratology are valid and important for medieval texts, too, since they describe very broad and general phenomena of narratives. Thus, one can pick up on the categories of classical narratology and combine them with theoretical considerations that take the specific design of medieval texts into account. While the broad categories remain the same or very similar, their content, i.e. the parameters or 'members' of each category, are in need of revision. In order to come to terms with the specific cultural and historical footing of medieval narratives, it is important to link the structural elements to their respective purposes and functions. In this manner it will be possible to go beyond a narrative's text-internal features and include the audience and their reception as aimed for and mediated by the narrative layout. I suggest that such an approach is possible by combining the linguistic branches of pragmatics and discourse analysis with narratology. In what follows, I will first introduce two studies that have influenced the new approach. Next I turn in more detail to the two fields that pragma-narratology combines. Only then will I present an outline of my approach and give a short example of its practical application to a medieval saint's life from the *Scottish Legendary*.

1.2 Predecessors: Claudia Maria Riehl and Monika Fludernik

Pragma-narratology, like any 'new' theory, does not appear out of thin air but was inspired and influenced by existing studies at the intersection of linguistics and narratology. Two theories that can be regarded as important guides to the new

approach are Claudia Maria Riehl's adaptation of the Labovian episode structure to German translations of the *Legenda Aurea* (1993) and Monika Fludernik's 'natural' narratology (1996). Both scholars are concerned with literary texts predating the novel and solve the methodological problem of an adequate narratological approach by combining strategies and frameworks from both narrative theory *and* linguistics. Riehl focuses on the medieval genre of the martyr's life and death (*passio*) in order to gain insight into the cognitive perception of these narrative texts, which, she argues, requires the inclusion of their historical and ideological background (1993: 10). Riehl first reduces the texts to a narrative skeleton, which is then used to analyse the linguistic features prominent in her choice of examples. She aims at tracing changes in the martyr's *passio* over time (1993: 32–3). Since one narratological model can hardly be applied universally, she bases her study on selected elements from various models. Starting out from (a) Labov and Waletzky's six-fold episode structure (abstract, orientation, complicating action, evaluation, resolution, coda), (b) van Dijk's adaptation of it with the inclusion of deep-structural elements and Longacre's deep-structural model, Riehl develops a new schema (1993: 52). This model is hierarchical. It contains sequential elements on each level of the hierarchy, thereby connecting narrative elements on the discourse level with those on the deep-structural level. Thus, the narrative as a whole (i.e. the 'head' of the model) falls into exposition, narrative and solution. 'Narrative' is further divided into complication, concentration and conclusion, all of which are based on Labov and Waletzky's episode structure. The idea of grounding – the distinction between fore- and backgrounded narrative material – is taken as the most important feature of Riehl's analysis (1993: 53–63). This consists of a close linguistic study of the use of tenses, particles, word order, sentence structure and conjunctions. In the main part of her study, Riehl applies her model to a number of medieval German renderings of Latin *passiones* from different periods and links her findings to the historical and ideological backgrounds of the texts. She concludes that one can follow a movement from what she calls conceptual orality (i.e. features of oral storytelling) to conceptual literacy (1993: 271).

Monika Fludernik's theory is much wider in scope: she is interested in a diachronic overview of narrative forms across genre boundaries. Arguing that the written and the spoken mode of narrative are based on the same underlying premises, she introduces the processes of narrativization and narrativity. She argues that all storytelling activity is grounded in a human agent or experiencer (1996: 12–13). Fludernik takes cognitive linguistics as one basis of her approach, thus linking narratology to the more general processes in which a narrative occurs and is received (1996: 17). Crucially, Fludernik incorporates the readers and their perception of the text into her theory since a narrative only becomes, i.e. is

recognised as, a narrative by the reader imposing the macro-frame of narrativity on the linguistic material (1996: 34). This process is called narrativization, which constitutes the fourth level in her four-level model of a 'natural' narratology. Essentially "a multi-layered model of the reading process which relies on a combination of cognitive models on each and every level" (Fludernik 1996: 41), 'natural' narratology provides a framework for analysis according to the degree of experientiality a text offers. The first level consists of real-life parameters, such as events or intentions. On the second level, there are four basic mediating frames, namely Telling, Viewing, Experiencing and Acting. Level three and four are broader and more general: the third comprises generic frames and the fourth describes the cognitive process of narrativization. Narrative structure is linked to cognitive processes and thus indicative of ways of thinking. Fludernik's interest is diachronic; in her analysis of pre-novel narratives, including medieval prose and verse saints' lives (1996: 96–103; 107–14), she focuses on discourse structure (back- and foregrounding, discourse markers, use of tenses, deictics, etc.) in order to trace the development of narrative structures according to their degree of experientiality. Fludernik shows that natural storytelling parameters are exploited to serve the didactic and ideological aims of the Christian church (1996: 98) – the narratives are directed towards the audience's feelings and experiences. Also, differences between verse and prose lives as well as between earlier and later lives composed in the Middle Ages become obvious.

What is important in both Fludernik's and Riehl's work is that they take parameters and frameworks developed for oral storytelling as their basis for the analysis of narrative structures and designs in saints' lives. They dismiss existing, novel-based approaches and create their own methodologies. Neither of the two scholars uses an inherently narratological terminology or one originally developed for a specific genre; rather, they are both heavily influenced by linguistics, starting out from the linguistic realisations in the text (as does Riehl) or from cognitive frames and concepts (as does Fludernik). Both studies are prime examples of a successful combination of narrative analysis and linguistics. The use of methods from discourse analysis and the combination of narratological concepts on a broader scale with (parts of) linguistic frameworks applied on a narrower scale is useful and important for pragma-narratology. As in pragma-narratology, both Riehl and Fludernik develop a schema consisting of categories and subdivisions describing broader features of narrative texts (e.g. Riehl's concentration and conclusion or Fludernik's four levels, including the four parameters on level four). The description of these features is in both cases preceded by a close linguistic analysis of phenomena such as fore- and backgrounded material, sentence connectors or word order. However, since Riehl and Fludernik focus on diachronic development, their overviews of the individual texts are necessarily reduced, their

choice of examples is eclectic and the parameters they consider are limited. For a comprehensive synchronic analysis a different set of methodological tools is called for, which attempts to cover all aspects of a narrative text from a synchronic perspective. To avoid confusion and to avert the danger of creating a loose assemblage of models borrowed from pragmatics and discourse analysis, the linguistic tools have to be systematised while still allowing a flexible handling.

1.3 Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis

In contrast to syntax (the relation of signs to one another) and semantics (the relation of signs to their denotations), pragmatics can be defined as "the relation of signs to their users and interpreters" (Horn and Ward 2004: xi). Of the three, pragmatics is the only branch that includes in its analyses the *users* of language and thus the important variable of the context in which a written or spoken linguistic utterance occurs: "pragmatics is the study of linguistic indices, and indices can be interpreted only when they are used. One cannot describe the meaning of indices – one can only describe rules for relating them to a context, in which the meaning can be found" (Bates 1976: 3). In Chomskyan terms, pragmatics is concerned with performance rather than competence, i.e. with language in actual use. The core topics of pragmatics are implicature, speech act theory, deixis and presupposition (Huang 2007: 2). Classically, pragmatics focuses on instances of spoken language taken from real-world contexts. However, in recent years, due to the increasing success of discourse analysis (see below), written texts have become equally worthwhile and generally accepted objects of study, too. Pragma-narratology follows Levinson's definition of pragmatics, which explicitly links the scope of the field with structural elements: "Pragmatics is the study of those relations between language and context that are grammaticalized, or encoded in the structure of a language" (1983: 9). In pragmatics, linguistic form and context consequently create a meaningful whole.

Importantly, pragmatics is not concerned with sentences, but with utterances: "a sentence is an abstract theoretical entity defined within a theory of grammar, while an utterance is the issuance of a sentence, a sentence-analogue, or sentence-fragment, in an actual context" (Levinson 1983: 18). In the case of a narratological study, this actual context is the bulk of text that constitutes a literary work, such as Proust's *Recherche* or a collection of saints' lives. The narrative text is one large meta-utterance, consisting of many individual utterances: the sentences that form and create the narrative. A narrative can hence be defined "as a product of literary performance. A theory of narration, then, must be part of a theory of linguistic performance" (Kuroda 1976: 108). Pragmatics

allows for such a view on texts as linguistic performances. One branch of pragmatics called literary pragmatics is of special importance for the present discussion. Literary pragmatics

> [...] sees the writing and reading of literary texts as interactive communication processes. Like all such processes, literary writing and reading, even though they do not function face-to-face, one-to-one or even contemporaneously with each other, are inextricably linked with the particular sociocultural contexts within which they take place. Literary pragmatics takes for granted that no account of communication in general will be complete without an account of literature and its contextualization, and that no account of literature will be complete without an account of its use of the communicative resources generally available. (Sell 1991: xiv)

Closely related to literary pragmatics and partly overlapping with its concepts is discourse analysis. The object of discourse analysis comprises both written and spoken linguistic utterances (cf. Brown and Yule 1983: 1; 5–7). As a theoretical field it is situated "at the intersection of disciplines as diverse as sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, philosophical linguistics and computational linguistics" (Brown and Yule 1983: viii). 'Text' in discourse analysis is broadly defined as "the verbal record of a communicative event" (Brown and Yule 1983: 190). This may be a recording of a telephone conversation, a discussion in a classroom, a newspaper article, or the narrative text of a novel or any other genre. As regards the analysis of written texts, discourse analysis primarily focuses upon cohesion and coherence, topicalisation, different types of reference and information structuring, but, on the other hand, also on inference, implicature, maxims of conversation, politeness and speech acts (Brinton 2001: 138).[1] Many of these methods have sometimes been more narrowly defined as parts of text linguistics (cf. de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981), which is largely identical to text-based discourse analysis and therefore included in my terminology by implication. The diversity of 'texts' in the broadest sense and the wealth of methods and approaches already show the flexibility of discourse analysis. Like pragmatics, its toolbox can be applied to very different examples of human utterances: the linguistic structure of the respective text basis determines its interpretation. Lakoff rightly argues that "of all the aspects of language, discourse analysis is singularly interdisciplinary" (2001: 199).

Obviously (literary) pragmatics and discourse analysis are hard to tell apart when discourse analysis is applied to a literary text, since they pursue very similar goals. For pragma-narratology, the primacy of context is crucial, as well as

1 A useful and comprehensive overview of discourse analysis and its various disciplines is offered in Schiffrin, Tannen and Hamilton (2001).

the explicit link of the linguistic structure used to its respective functions. Also, pragma-narratology borrows from pragmatics the understanding that all literature is fundamentally communicative; any piece of literature is aimed, however broadly, at an audience to fulfil more or less specific aims. To that end, the linguistic layout of a text is employed purposefully and can be decoded accordingly.

The great advantage of pragmatics and discourse analysis is that they are easily applicable to medieval texts as well. It is taken for granted that Middle English and the literature written in that period of the English language are different from modern uses of English since language is never a homogenous entity but bound to its temporal and cultural context. Pragmatics and discourse analysis were not developed to scrutinise a specific corpus of (spoken or written) utterances in a specific language at a given point in time, but rather as tools to access any text on the basis of its linguistic features. The parameters remain the same, yet the object of study is variable. For instance, the analysis of deixis is based on a number of features that can be summarised as follows: derived from the Greek verb *δείκνυμι*, meaning "to show, to point", deixis

> [...] can be defined as the phenomenon whereby features of context of utterance or speech event are encoded by lexical and/or grammatical means in a language. Linguistic expressions that are employed typically as deictic expressions or deictics include (i) demonstratives, (ii) first- and second-person pronouns, (iii) tense markers, (iv) adverbs of time and space, and (v) motion verbs. (Huang 2007: 132)

These linguistic forms are used to describe deixis of time, space, society and discourse (Verschueren 1999: 18). In practice, one may concentrate, for instance, on the use of demonstratives in a text, their referential functions, or time and space deixis. In the case of the latter, one could analyse how distance or closeness is achieved through distal and proximal deictics (in Modern English: *then, there* vs. *now, here*, etc.).

Importantly, the model itself does not specify which deictics to consider. It merely provides examples that can be extended by further pronouns in different languages for cross-linguistic studies, or by examples taken from earlier periods for diachronic approaches. Historical linguists embraced this flexibility of pragmatics in the second half of the 1990s and made the field an important branch of historical linguistics. Broadly speaking, "historical pragmatics focuses on language use in past contexts and examines how meaning is made. It is an empirical branch of linguistic study with focus on authentic language use in the past" (Fitzmaurice and Taavitsainen 2007: 13). Depending on whether one is interested in a synchronic or diachronic approach, different fields can be distinguished: "the study of historical data from a pragmatic perspective, the diachronic study of

pragmatic elements or the study of language change from a pragmatic perspective" (Jucker 2000: 90). The pragma-narratological approach can be placed within the first of the three orientations of historical pragmatics, which has been termed pragmaphilology. In contrast to diachronic studies, pragmaphilology "describes the contextual aspects of historical texts, including the addressers and addressees, their social and personal relationship, the physical and social setting of text production and text reception, and the goal(s) of the text" (Jucker and Jacobs 1995: 11).

Like pragmatics, historical pragmatics is related to discourse analysis, too, which becomes historical discourse analysis due to its focus on texts from earlier periods of (in this case) English. Clearly, "text-based historical pragmatics and historical discourse analysis overlap" (Fitzmaurice and Taavitsainen 2007: 14). Discourse analysis has been divided into very similar categories to the three branches of historical pragmatics;[2] to differentiate between the fields is intricate. Brinton tries to distinguish pragmatics and discourse analysis – the latter being "more text-centred, more static, more interested in product (in the well-formedness of texts)", the former being "more user-centred, more dynamic, more interested in the process of text production" (2001: 139). This distinction, however, is already a compromise and presents tendencies that can easily shift from one side to the other. Therefore, it seems reasonable to avoid the discussion of this "terminological maze" (Fitzmaurice and Taavitsainen 2007: 14). Following Fitzmaurice and Taavitsainen (2007: 15), I understand and use 'pragmatics' in the context of pragma-narratology as a blanket term comprising all features of pragmatics and also those more specifically belonging to discourse analysis. Since these disciplines all use the same methodological framework, or at least choose their tools from a common stock, and engage with texts taken from earlier stages in the development of the English language, it is reasonable to make this equation.

To draw a first conclusion: building a narratological theory around the parameters of pragmatics has, first and foremost, the advantage of taking the text as

2 Thus, parallel to the attempts of defining historical pragmatics, historical discourse analysis makes a distinction between three main branches: 1) historical discourse analysis proper, an essentially synchronic approach that focuses upon discourse forms and structures in earlier periods of English; 2) discourse-oriented historical linguistics, which is interested in diachronic language change by looking at discourse matters; 3) diachronic (or diachronically oriented) discourse analysis, which is a synthesis of discourse and diachrony (Brinton 2001: 139–40). To which extent these three branches differ from the three fields of pragmatics is very difficult to tell and may be a matter of ideology imposed on the names rather than a real and fathomable difference.

the basis for the analysis. The linguistic features of the medieval text provide the starting point. In doing so, one avoids defining the text by means of the features it lacks because certain elements do not fall into the prescribed categories established with a completely different genre and time in mind. Instead, pragmatic analysis offers a list of those linguistic features the text has to offer, which then can be further analysed and interpreted. The great advantage of historical pragmatics (meaning pragmatics *and* discourse analysis) is their inevitable focus on the users of language. At first glance, one might have gotten the impression that pragmatics provides a toolkit which in practice allows for an analysis of texts according to certain features and hence is not much different from a study in semantics or syntax. However, pragmatics always and necessarily links its findings to their meanings, to their specific functions and purposes. Language is regarded as purposefully employed by its users and never as an end in itself.

Pragmatics alone, however, does not suffice for a narratological analysis of a medieval text. Studies in historical pragmatics usually focus on one or more aspects, such as discourse markers, deictics or speech acts, which are necessarily limited in their respective scope and predominantly remain purely linguistic treatments. The following section introduces the narratological background that my new approach is essentially based upon.

1.4 Narratology

Pragma-narratology is a methodology that fundamentally belongs to the field of narrative theory. This field, however, is so diverse in its approaches and foci that a concise summary would go beyond the scope of this article. I will therefore concentrate on those aspects that are relevant for the present purpose. Broadly speaking, "narratology is *the theory of the structure of narrative*. To investigate structure, one dissects an object into its constituent *elements*, and then tries to determine the *relations* between those elements" (Jahn and Nünning 1994: 284). The focus on structure as the underlying interest of narratology is rooted in the beginnings of the field, which were heavily indebted to Ferdinand de Saussure's linguistic theory. Thus, from the start, a close interrelation has existed between literary studies and linguistics in narratology and this is also true of the pragma-narratological approach, although a different branch of linguistics is used. Just as linguists have analysed paradigmatic and syntagmatic choices in language either at a specific point in time or diachronically, and have extracted in this manner the constituting elements of meaningful language production, narrative theorists have traditionally focused on the meaning-bearing units of narrative texts in order "to discover, describe and

explain the mechanics of narrative, the elements responsible for its form and functioning" (Prince 1982: 163). If a narrative consists of "material signs, the discourse, which convey a certain meaning (or content), the story, and fulfil a certain social function", then these three parts "correspond, roughly to the three components of semiotic theory: syntax, semantics, and pragmatics" (Ryan 2007: 24). Classical narratology was mainly concerned with approaching narrative from a syntactic angle, i.e. considering the constituents of narratives, their combinations and underlying rules.

In recent years, narratology has advanced in that it has broadened this structuralist core area so as to include approaches of a historical and contextual orientation. Thus, one can observe "a shift from text-centred and formal models to models that highlight the context and functions" of narrative texts (Neumann and Nünning 2009: 144). Whereas the early, 'classical' theories of narratology solely focused on the text and its structures and often analysed texts in complete isolation from their historical and cultural background, "[*p*]*ostclassical approaches*, meanwhile, encompass frameworks for narrative research that build on this classical tradition but supplement it with concepts and methods that were unavailable to story analysts such as Barthes, Genette, Greimas, and Todorov during the heyday of structuralism" (Herman 2007: 12). These new narratologies, which draw, among others, on gender theory, cognitive science or media studies allow for a revival of narratology that is no longer largely text-inherent and restricted to form-function mappings. Postclassical narratologies thus show "a growing awareness of the complex interplay that exists between both texts and their cultural contexts and between textual features and the interpretive strategies involved in the reading process" (Neumann and Nünning 2009: 145).[3] From the perspective of narratology, pragma-narratology belongs to these postclassical approaches of the field. It does not only consider the structure of medieval texts, but always includes the users (readers, listeners) in its analysis as well. Based on the aforementioned analogy to syntax, semantics and pragmatics, pragma-narratology is not only metaphorically concerned with pragmatics in that texts are contextualised, but also literally: it is based on pragmatics itself.

One of the aspects pragma-narratology shares with Riehl and Fludernik's approaches to narrative texts is the notion that narrative texts are fundamentally communicative: narrative texts always fulfil communicative intentions and are

3 A growing number of publications is available which reviews, orders and evaluates the emerging narratologies. See, for instance, as useful starting points Nünning (2000), Fludernik (2000), the articles in Heinen and Sommer's collection (2009) or Alber and Fludernik (2010).

geared towards an addressee or an audience to achieve more or less specific or clearly formulated aims. Thus, there is no inherent reason to distinguish written narratives from other linguistic activities such as conversations, messages or speeches: "[...] in essence all language use is dialogic, whether it is written or spoken [...]. Speakers or writers use language to communicate with some actual, potential or merely fictional addressee or addressees" (Jucker, Fritz and Lebsanft 1999: 1).

The communicative approach to narratives solves another problem that medievalists may encounter when it comes to narrative analyses. Since many medieval texts rely heavily on sources or are more or less close translations, whether from Latin, Anglo-Norman or French, one could object that the narrative structure of a text might as well be scrutinised in the original. However, due to the pragmatic perspective it is not the text devoid of any context that is the object of analysis, but the text within a very specific time and place. Within that context, the medieval audience would have had no access to an author's Latin or French sources and could only receive the stories as they were linguistically realised in the vernacular. Thus, one has to start from the discourse or story level of the text in order to unveil the strategies and mechanisms resulting in the deliberate creation of the artful whole. Thereby, the aspects pragma-narratology covers correspond to those traditionally covered by narratological models: the roles and functions of the narrator, his mediation of the narration, characters and their communication, perspective on any level of the narrative, the various levels of narrating, the sequencing and ordering of events, the presentation of an episode (as a summary, in direct speech, etc.), as well as setting and its time and place. What is different in pragma-narratology concerns the way these traditional aspects are scrutinised.

First of all, since linguistic theories provide the basis, the analysis starts off from the linguistic structure of the text, which is independent from any preconceived categories and, importantly, also from questions and expectations of genre. The linguistic models allow for a high degree of flexibility in their application, depending on the idiosyncrasies and demands of the text. What is more, since not any linguistic theories but pragmatic ones are used, individual structural elements singled out in the analysis are always and necessarily understood as function-oriented, i.e. constituent narrative elements are connected to specific functions within the text and ultimately also to the reception of the text. As it is based on pragmatics, which always already includes speakers and audiences in its models, pragma-narratology is – at heart – a theory of *reception*: narrative texts have functions, which are only meaningful when being tied in with its audience, even if this audience can only be reconstructed from a modern scholar's point of view.

In the case of medieval saints' lives, the close linguistic analysis of many features within one legend can offer alternative readings to the position holding that the one dominant function of saints' legends is spiritual edification and the invitation to imitate Christ. In contrast to classical narratological models, the linguistic foundation of pragma-narratology enables a systematic collection of data; studies can easily be repeated, results reproduced and, if needed, to be revised. This, in turn, facilitates the reconstruction and comparison of findings, which again offers insight into the functions and potential differences in the reception across different texts. Finally, a major advantage of pragma-narratology is its treatment of the characters, which are often neglected in narrative theories. Pragma-narratology understands characters as the crystallisation of the interrelationships of voice, perspective and place. 'Character' then is the sum of the narrative elements, the result of a narrative process that in the context of saints' lives could be referred to as a hagiographical strategy of narration. I will now introduce a first outline of pragma-narratology, its categories, methods and pragmatic toolbox.

2 Pragma-Narratology

2.1 Three Pillars of Analysis

Most of the issues addressed above concern topics traditionally treated by narratology: narrator, setting, levels of the narration, the depiction of characters, point of view, sequence and the presentation of the events. For pragma-narratology it is important to realise that these categories are descriptive and very broad labels for structural elements in narrative texts; there are no expectations as to when they occur, how often or in which ways. The extent to which these categories are subdivided and filled with meaning depends on the linguistic structure and material of the text that is analysed. To facilitate the illustration of such categories, they are here arranged in three broad pillars: focalisation, vocalisation and localisation.

Focalisation may be used to refer to all instances of point of view, meaning both visual-sensual and ideological perspective. Thus, the term comprises not only the narrator's, but the characters' points of view as well. To access focalisation, one will have to closely examine the discourse structure of the narrative text and its employment of presupposition, implicature as well as deixis and other forms of reference, but also schemata and background knowledge, which can reveal possible biases, opinions, ideas or perspectives (in its literal and metaphorical sense).

In my model, **vocalisation** is the term used to cover all representations of voicing: the narrator's voice, the characters' direct or indirect discourse, but also descriptions, which are in fact articulations of the narrator's voice representing narrative information. Vocalisation may be analysed by means of speech act theory, implicature and presupposition, as well as conversation analysis. Whereas conversation analysis is useful for taking the overall distribution of voices into account, speech act theory presents itself as a perfect tool for looking closely at a speaker's various instances of speech, which includes the narrator's voice. Thus, we may find that the speech of a lady in love is dominantly characterised by emotives, to use Searle's taxonomy (1979), whereas the narrator will be likely to use representatives in most cases.

The third component, **localisation**, subsumes all instances of time and space, i.e. what is conventionally referred to as setting, but also the 'setting' of the communicative situation in general. This means that the sequence of the discourse and its structural composition would fall into this category, too, for instance whether we are facing a meta-commentary by the narrator, a story-within-a-story told by one of the characters, whether the plot moves chronologically or uses back- or fore-shifting. The tools borrowed from pragmatics and discourse analysis to scrutinise localisation are, for example, deixis and reference or the concepts of cohesion and coherence.

What does it mean to use the categories free of expectations and narratological prejudices? The narratorial level or levels may serve as an example. Within localisation, this category simply refers to the fact that there is at least one level on which the narrative is told, i.e. a narrator or a voice is situated somewhere to communicate something to the audience. Possibly there is more than one level, but this is optional and depends on the text. From the toolbox of pragmatics for "localisation", one can now scrutinise the location(s) of the narrator and the characters, the linguistic features that describe, introduce and heighten the awareness of these levels, and so on. This involves a detailed analysis of the textual features of reference and deixis (distal and proximal pronouns, anaphora and cataphora, etc.), of back- and foregrounded narrative material and of cohesion and coherence. Significantly, "localisation" has a double meaning: it refers, on the one hand, to every place that is used in the literal sense (i.e. described or mentioned) on the discourse level of the narrative and, on the other hand, metaphorically to the meta-level of the general 'place' or position of the narrative text, often marked by introductory or transitory phrases such as "We will now turn to..." or "Here I will provide some background...", etc.

Thus, the first step of a pragma-narratological study is a close analysis of the linguistic features of the narrative text according to the pragmatic tools from each of the three pillars. Although the analysis does not impose a framework on the

text but considers its features first, it is at this point not much different from a 'classical' narratological approach. The difference lies in the pragmatic viewpoint on the text. In a pragmatic study, it is but the first step to isolate and collect the linguistic elements of the text. The study will, however, only be complete when these findings are linked to their meanings and functions. Although a pragma-narratological analysis is also partly a structural analysis, it does not stop at the point of describing and categorising linguistic structures. The crucial step is to link the structures to their functions as meaningful parts of the narrative communication. Each and every narrative element fulfils one or more purposes, functions or intentions, always directed at two sides. On the one hand, the direction is inwards, i.e. into the narrative, its layout or plot. A character's discourse or action influences other characters to act or react in certain ways, for instance. On the other hand, the direction is outwards, i.e. directed towards the audience. The same character's direct discourse that brought about the death of his enemy may stir anger within the members of the audience or create expectations regarding the ending of the narrative. Any pragma-narratological analysis is only complete when the close linguistic analyses of the medieval texts are connected to these functions and purposes of the findings. That way, the text is not treated as a static enclosure of meaning but as an open entity of meaning that engages in a constant dialogue with its audience.

2.2 The Communicative Model and the Characters

The pragma-narratological approach starts with the premise that all narratives are fundamentally communicative. Therefore, the different layers or levels of communication within a narrative text first have to be clarified. The classical narratological diagram of real author – implied author – narrator – narrative – narratee – implied reader – real reader (Chatman 1996: 164) serves as a useful starting point, yet requires a number of changes and additions. For one, the usefulness of the implied author/reader has to be critically questioned, since it is not an entity actually participating in the communication, but may rather be regarded as "a set of implicit norms rather than as a speaker or a voice", as Rimmon-Kenan argues (1983: 88). When it comes to Christian texts, a constituent is also needed for God or his divine *auctoritas* because it plays a crucial role from a theological perspective. After all, the medieval author of a collection of saints' lives would by no means have regarded himself as the sole or even the most important agent in the composition of his text. The hagiographical material used by the author, even if its details and arrangement could be changed, belonged to a Christian tradition and was thus part of a framework that extended far beyond the individual author's

influence and *auctoritas*. To include this extra layer in the framework enables us to treat the specific cultural background of the text as an idiosyncratic feature inherent in its general layout. From the very beginning, cultural context can be incorporated in our considerations; it is not added at a later stage, which would give the (wrong) impression of it being an optional extra.

An important point that was briefly mentioned already concerns the treatment of characters. Localisation, focalisation and vocalisation do not seem to offer a suitable platform for the analysis of characters. However, 'character' might be the name of a fourth category that does not necessitate a framework of its own: character is what emerges when considering localisation, focalisation and vocalisation together. This by no means implies that characters do not deserve their own category. Instead, character is the result of what the three pillars and their respective contents and structures create. An example from saints' lives may serve to illustrate my point. It has become a commonplace to state that saints are stock characters who do not develop at all, one-dimensional figures rather than real characters, and this has led to their general exclusion from any serious treatment. Regarded in isolation (i.e. devoid of their hagiographical context) or in relation to, say, characters of a nineteenth-century novel, saints create the impression of being mere "copies of a common prototype" (Boyer 1981: 29). However, within the context of their lives or a collection of lives, the saints, whose stability in character is in fact their most important feature and the reason for their popularity, must be acknowledged as crucial normative figures in their own right. With the saint as the crystallisation and indirect aim of the narrative, the often stereotypical secondary characters become important constituents within the crystal grating, exchangeable in their depiction, but not in their functions as supporting the greatness of the saint.

3 Case Study: The *Scottish Legendary*

The *Scottish Legendary* (late 14th century) presents itself as a suitable basis for a pragma-narratological analysis. So far, this collection of medieval saints' lives has not attracted much attention,[4] although it has repeatedly been praised for

4 Although it is included among the "Saints' Legends" in volume two of the *Manual of the Writings in Middle English* (D'Evelyn and Foster 1970), the recent annotated bibliography of Middle English saints' legends (Scahill and Rogerson 2005) lists only thirteen entries dealing with the *Scottish Legendary*, nine of which were written at the turn of the twentieth century and only two after 1980 (see Tavormina 1986, Scheibe 1989). A first step towards revealing general facts about the compilation is Regina Scheibe's 2012 article, in which for the first time the prologue of the *Scottish Legendary*

its careful narrative design and the narrator's delight in telling his stories (see, for instance, D'Evelyn and Foster 1970: 422; Wolpers 1964: 275–88). The *Scottish Legendary* is extant in a single manuscript[5] and was written in an Early Scots dialect by an anonymous clergyman. The compilation comprises fifty saints' lives of more than 33,000 lines in rhymed octosyllabic couplets. Nothing is known about the audience of the work except that they must have been non-clerical and illiterate in the etymological sense of the word, hence the choice of the vernacular. The main source of the *Scottish Legendary* is the thirteenth-century *Legenda Aurea*, compiled by the Dominican Jacobus de Voragine, which became the most important collection of saints' lives throughout the later Middle Ages.[6] However, although the narrator explicitly states in his introduction to the life of Clement that "to translate is myne entent" (XXI, l. 1; "to translate is my intent"), what he actually does goes far beyond more or less faithful renderings into the vernacular.[7] What in Latin are one or two (summarising) sentences often becomes (to varying degrees) an elaborate episode, enriched with details and often filled with passages of direct speech. Although the author does not alter the basic plot, the result is a much more lively account of the events.

This section cannot provide an extensive pragma-narratological analysis of the *Scottish Legendary* and its narrative art.[8] I will, however, tentatively show by

is analysed in some detail. Also, Melissa Coll-Smiths's unpublished PhD thesis (University of Oxford 2012) deals with the motifs used in the legends; it is, however, not yet available.

5 Cambridge University Library, Gg II, 6. The manuscript has been edited twice. Carl Horstmann (1881a) first edited the life of Machor and provided a lengthy introduction to the *Scottish Legendary*. He published the rest of the text in a two-volume edition (Horstmann 1881b). Horstmann erroneously assumed that John Barbour, author of *The Bruce*, could be identified with the composer of the compilation. For the definitive arguments against this authorship see Buss (1886) and McDiarmid and Stevenson (1980). Between 1887 and 1895, Metcalfe's edition was published in six separate volumes of the Scottish Text Society. In terms of its philological standards, it is superior to Horstmann's and remains the most useful for modern scholars. In 1896, the six volumes were published anew in a three-volume edition (Metcalfe 1896); all quotations from the *Scottish Legendary* are taken from this edition.

6 For further details on the *Legenda Aurea* and its influences on vernacular saints' lives see, for example, Reames (1985) and Fleith (1991). Apart from Jacobus, the compiler also drew on the encyclopaedic *Speculum Historiale* of Vincent de Beauvais and the *Vitae Patrum* as well as some minor sources. See Horstmann (1881a: 101–8; 1881b: iv–vi) and Metcalfe (1896: vii–xii) for a more detailed discussion.

7 Horstmann observes that the narrator treats his sources "mit der grössten Freiheit" (1881b: vii; "with the greatest freedom").

8 See von Contzen (forthcoming) for a more detailed treatment of narrative art in the Scottish compilation.

means of one legend and two aspects of the theory (namely localisation and focalisation) how the analytical framework as established above can be used in practice to offer insights into medieval saints' legends that go beyond traditional approaches to the genre. The legend I will consider for this purpose is that of the apostle Mathias (the twelfth legend in the compilation), who is elected among the apostles to fill Judas' place after his treachery. In fact, Mathias' *vita* is not so much about him as about Judas and how his evil character was formed. The content of the legend is as follows:

ll. 1–6: Introduction; since Mathias takes Judas' place, Judas' story will be outlined first.

ll. 7–56: Judas' mother Tyberea has a vision that her son will be doomed; she and her husband abandon their newborn child to avert the prophecy.

ll. 57–90: Judas is found and raised by a childless king and queen living in Scariot.

ll. 91–141: When the queen gets pregnant and bears a son, Judas has his true background revealed; out of envy he kills the son, flees to Jerusalem and is hired by the city's governor Pilate.

ll. 142–96: Judas (unknowingly) kills his true father and marries the widow, his mother.

ll. 197–246: When Judas realises what has happened, he asks his wife/mother for help and she recommends going to Jesus; he becomes one of the apostles.

ll. 247–99: Judas needs thirty silver coins to pay Pilate; he arranges Jesus' treason with the Jews but cannot cope with his guilt and hangs himself.

ll. 300–56: After Jesus' resurrection, the apostles gather to elect a new twelfth apostle; they choose Mathias.

ll. 357–410: Mathias' background, his mission and miracles in Judea; his execution by the Jews.

ll. 411–76: Further miracles in Macedonia, taken from a different source.

In terms of the communicative situation, one can distinguish between two levels: the narrator communicates with the reader/audience in that he mediates the narrative, whereas the characters communicate with each other on a second level. These two levels are crucial for the analysis of localisation in the legend. The two parts of localisation, the literal setting of the story and the metaphorical one, correspond to the two levels of communication: the narratorial level is concerned with the metaphorical setting, whereas the level of the characters, the story proper, contains the actual setting. To access localisation on both levels, reference and deixis are useful tools from the pragmatic toolkit. Concerning the narratorial level, the use of deictics is straightforward. The narrator refers three

times to the here and now of his telling, in all three instances using the deictic pronoun "here":

> Here begynnis syne þe story... (l. 1)
> ...here wil I/ tel... (ll. 5–6)
> ...to say here is nocht myn will (l. 470)[9]

The spatial deictic "here" not only marks the spatial beginning on the page ("here" as opposed to "there"), but also first and foremost the temporal beginning ("here" meaning "now, at this point"). The reference is immediate and directs the readers' (spatial) and the listeners' (temporal) awareness to the narrator's current activity and location. Especially within the compilation as a whole it is important not to lose track of a saint's life, which is why the references to the narrator's activity fulfil a mediating or guiding function. Apart from the pronoun "here", the narrator refers to two other 'places' that belong to localisation. These locations are references to his sources:

> & in sum buke it is talde (l. 363)
> ande in sum bukis, quhare men redis
> of haly men & of þare dedis (ll. 411–12)[10]

These books, probably Latin collections of saints' lives the author apparently drew on, are other places in which one can find information about Mathias. Although "place" is obviously a metaphorical concept here, these books the narrator refers to are material objects, likely to belong to a university or monastery library and thus closely associated with a literal, geographically definable place. What is more, if the narrator defines his story as the here and now of telling about Mathias (and Judas), then other sources or renderings of the story constitute the implicit but logical "there". Books are places which one can refer to as to a city or building; to quote then means to transfer one place to another, to implement parts of "there" in "here".

On the level of the characters, we exclusively find examples of places in the literal sense of setting. Judas is born in Jerusalem (l. 7), comes to the island Scariot (ll. 58–9) and flees again to Jerusalem (l. 124). Mathias is born in Bethlehem (l. 370), sent as a missionary to the lands of Judea (ll. 358, 380) and Macedonia (l. 414) and, according to one source, is beheaded in Rome (l. 366). These place names not only place the legend historically and geographically, but also point to

9 Here begins soon the story / ...here will I tell... / ...to say here is not my intention.
10 And in some book it is told / and in some book, in which men read about / holy men and their deeds.

the real cities outside the legend that can be visited by pilgrims in the audience's time. They are extraphoric. More importantly even, these places deictically stand for a topographical context that goes beyond the individual legends and links them with crucial aspects of Christian history: Jerusalem as the pivotal city in Jesus' life, Bethlehem as Jesus' birthplace and Rome as the centre for Peter and Paul as well as the new capital of Christendom. Consequently, place becomes symbolic and serves as a means of creating familiarity within the audience. The last aspect, however, only works with an audience – as the author undoubtedly presupposes – who possesses the adequate background knowledge to understand the additional layer of meaning transcending the individual legends. I am now concerned with Christian imagery operating at the level of localisation that is implied in the narrative and shared between narrator and narratee, author and audience via the specific Christian cultural background and schemata. The same background knowledge is addressed when Pilate is simply introduced as the "presydent" governing Jerusalem (ll. 134–5), when the abandoned Judas is compared to Moses (l. 56), or Judas presented as stealing the apples from the garden (ll. 141–90). The latter episode does not only presuppose knowledge about a biblical figure of the New or the Old Testament, but provides an allegory on the paradisiacal eating from the forbidden tree: Pilate takes on the role of the snake who tempts Judas to steal an apple; Judas' theft leads him to the slaying of his own father, which parallels Oedipus' murder and forebodes Judas' final tragic fall, ironically making Jesus' redemption of Adam's Fall possible.

Apart from names of cities or countries, there are also a number of references to places on a narrower level, i.e. *within* a city or country that influence the audiences' spatial imagination of a situation: Judas' parents lie one beside the other in their bed (l. 14), as do Judas and his mother later on (l. 198), Pilate lies in one of the windows of his palace (ll. 142–3) and looks into a garden (l. 149), the apostles gather in a house (l. 303), and Mathias is thrown into prison (l. 442). These places further help to situate the characters and their actions in that they sketch the surroundings. In the legend of Mathias, as in most saints' lives, these descriptions of places are reduced to the most general essentials: a house, a window, a garden; the audience does not get to know any more details that may help to distinguish the apostles' house from any other house. This indifference towards the specificity of the spatial surroundings shows the absolute focus on the characters, their actions and interactions. Sometimes it may be necessary to have a garden (where would Judas otherwise steal his apples from?), but the garden itself is not important; it is the action taking place therein and the consequences these actions have for Judas and ultimately for salvation history.

If places such as Rome or Jerusalem are absolute localisations with an unambiguous identification anchor in the real world, and houses, gardens and

the like variable but static localisations (they are variable as regards their location but remain prototypically the same in every place), a third category exists, which may be called relative localisation. Relative localisation comprises positions that are defined in relation to a fixed centre; when the centre moves, the associated part moves with it so that "here" is always where the centre is. The one example of this phenomenon in the life of Mathias is Jesus, who is the centre for the disciples, including Judas. Judas goes to Jesus (l. 231), yet the exact place where the two meet is irrelevant. Since Jesus' whereabouts change quite often, their master becomes the disciples' hub whom they follow.

Next to place, localisation also comprises all temporal aspects of the legend. Its chronology follows man's life cycle. In the episode on Judas, the narrator begins with Judas' birth and ends with his suicide. In the part about Mathias, the chronological order is slightly violated. Since Judas' death precedes the meeting of the apostles, Mathias' birth and background are introduced after his election in order to keep the logic of the developments intact. Throughout the legend as a whole, time is measured according to Christian time, which means that dates are important only in relation to Christ, and that all events are strictly linear and causally related. Although Mathias' *vita* has a circular structure, starting and finishing with Mathias, its argument is one long chain of divine causalities: Mathias' election requires Judas' death, which is conditioned by Judas' betrayal, which could only happen because his mother recommended his going to Jesus, which she could never have done if they had not been married, which was in turn conditioned by Judas' slaying of his own father, which required his work for Pilate in Jerusalem, where he might never have come to had he not been abandoned as a child. In the divine plan, every part of the story is necessary to return full circle to Mathias and continue with the linear development of Christian time towards the Last Judgement.

This continuity of salvation history goes beyond the borders of the story and extends to the narrator's and his audience's time when the narrator rounds off Mathias' legend by praying to the saint for intercession:

> bot I pray hyme for þat gret grace
> quhare-throw þat he chosine wes,
> þat be his prayer I ma be
> chosine to god in sik degree,
> ovte of þis lyf þat I ma twyne
> but shame, or det & dedly syne. (XII, ll. 471–6)[11]

11 But I pray to him [Mathias] for the great grace / through which he was chosen, / that by means of this prayer I may be / chosen by God to the same degree, / so that I depart this life / without shame, debt or deadly sin.

For the narrator, debt, shame and deadly sin are the three most eminent dangers against which he and his audience have to fight by praying to the saints as epitomes of Christian behaviour. This final coda is one prominent example of the narrator's point of view: he is obviously of a learned Christian background and presupposes a similar knowledge and the same worldview in his audience. Although the personal pronoun appears in the first person singular only, the audience is addressed indirectly since the 'I' can refer to every single reader or listener. Thus, the appeal is personalised and reminiscent of a private prayer: the narrator's point of view becomes every reader's or listener's point of view and thus communal. Further examples of this shared background include references such as "oure lorde" (l. 447), allusions to Judas' subsequent treason (l. 90) and Jesus' ascension (l. 300).

We have now turned to focalisation, which comprises not only the presentation and depiction of knowledge and information, including opinions and sides taken by the narrator as well as the characters, but also more narrowly all kinds of perception (visual, but also emotional or ideational). Who or which instance mediates the perception is variable; the one whose perceptions are presented need not be the one who presents, i.e. narrates them. Since the narrator's and the characters' perspectives highly influence the reception of a legend, their analyses form a crucial part of pragma-narratology.

For the most part, the events in Mathias' legend are presented from the narrator's detached point of view. He is the omniscient presenter who has access to all the characters' secrets. For instance, he can narrate the crimes Judas "quhen na man mycht se" (l. 107; "when no man might see") commits against his stepbrother, the king's and the queen's son. Also, the narrator provides explanations that go beyond the characters' spheres of knowledge, thus enabling the audience to see through the characters' actions and motives: he points out that Jesus was well aware of Judas being his traitor when he accepted him as one of the twelve apostles (l. 242) and explains that, when Pilate desires an apple from a nearby garden, neither Ruben, the owner of the garden, nor Judas are aware of the other's identity:

> & þat þe ȝard of rubene wes,
> þat was þe faddyre of Iudas.
> bot Iudas weste nocht þat rubene
> ves his faddyr, na he þat þane
> þat Iudas wes his sone, kend nocht. (XII, ll. 149–53)[12]

12 And that was the garden of Ruben, / who was Judas' father. / But Judas did not know that Ruben / was his father, nor did he on the other hand know / that Judas was his son.

The passage immediately preceding the narrator's explanation may serve as an example of a shift in perspective to one of the characters. The focalising instance switches from the narrator to one of the characters in order to present the audience with a facet of the narrative that allows for a higher degree of empathy with and sympathy for the characters and their feelings, motives and actions. Pilate is lying in a window, observing the town, when he spots the apples:

> yne It fel apone a day
> þat pylat in his palace lay
> In a wyndow & to þe towne
> be-held radly vpe & downe.
> & as he was lukand forthyrwart,
> he saw fare appolis in a ȝarde,
> & had gret desyr for till ete
> of þame gyf he mycht ony get. (XII, ll. 141–8)[13]

The voice is the narrator's, who describes the governor's actions and thoughts. The point of view the audience shares, however, is Pilate's: the audience can follow his view out of the window, until his eyes fall on the garden, and is granted access to his wish of eating the apples. Similarly, the queen of Scariot, who finds the abandoned Judas, is another focalising instance: her distress at not yet having born a child and heir of her own and therefore tricking the king by passing off the foundling as their own child is presented from her perspective, i.e. in personalised point of view (ll. 62–82).

A further facet of focalisation concerns the overall selection and presentation of the narrative material. Although the actual focus of the legend and the reason why the narrator tells it is the apostle Mathias, more than sixty percent of the narrative is concerned with Judas. Mathias' position as Judas' successor not only justifies the inclusion of the latter in the legend, but becomes its focus: Mathias provides the background for Judas' story, not the other way around; Judas is foregrounded, whereas Mathias is reduced to the background. In Judas' part of the legend, the narrator varies his narrative material by presenting longer passages in direct speech, thereby offering insights into the characters' motives and facilitating both empathy and rejection in his audience. Thus, when Judas' parents, Ruben and Tyberea, discuss Tyberea's visionary dream about their future child's calamity, the two characters appear to be close to the audience in their fears and emotional distress (ll. 21–38), which makes their decision to abandon

13 Then it happened one day / that Pilate lay in a window of his palace / and looked thoughtfully up and down the town. / And as he was looking further around, / he saw fair apples in a garden, / and had great desire to eat / them, if he might get one.

their son plausible. Another passage of similar closeness is Judas' sudden understanding of his many misdeeds when he becomes aware of Tyberea's identity and wishes to change and restore his "sawle-hele" (ll. 213–26), the salvation of his soul. In contrast, Mathias' story is told with much greater detachedness. Many events are recounted as summaries, devoid of any details and personal information about the saint. The introduction to the part of the legend where his story begins is symptomatic of his overall treatment:

> thane mathi til his part can ta
> alhale þe land of Iudea,
> & prechit þare ful stedfastly,
> & wrocht als mony gret ferly;
> & þare, as sum story vs says,
> In-to gud pece endyt his dais.
> & in sum buke it is talde,
> þat one þe croice þe gast he ȝalde,
> & endyt thru sic martyrdome. (XII, ll. 357–65)[14]

The sequence of short sentences connected with the conjunction "&" highlights the succession of the events and not only the inevitability but also the interchangeability of Mathias' life and death. His life is remarkable for his holiness and steadfastness, but also unremarkable in its similarity to the stereotypical virtuous life of an early Christian saint working as a missionary. The narrator's uncertainty and unease about the contradicting sources as regards the end of Mathias' life further increase the distance between the saint and the audience, thus impeding their sympathy and compassion. Although Mathias is unequivocally the saint of his legend, he is not its centre of attention. The traitor Judas, because of his treason as the focal event, is the tragic anti-hero whose story is remembered in Mathias' legend.

To conclude: the sample analysis of localisation and focalisation in the life of Mathias from the *Scottish Legendary* has shown some of the possibilities of pragma-narratology. Narratological categories are systematically scrutinised by means of a close linguistic analysis of selected features, in this case indicative of time, place and perspective in the legend. The findings are linked to and explained in view of their functions or purposes for the audience and, as far as possible, situated within the more general context of the text and its historical context. The hagiographical text is regarded as a means of communication,

14 Then Mathias can wholly take / his part in the land of Judea, / and he preached there steadfastly, / and also performed many miracles; / and there, as some story tells us, / he ended his days peacefully. / And in some book it is told / that he died on the cross / and thus ended his life through martyrdom.

whose discoursal elements as well as overall layout are treated as meaningful narrative parts. Combining the tools of pragmatics with a narratological approach, pragma-narratology promises to systematically cover the narrative elements of the compilation by taking the communicative nature of the text as a starting point. Since localisation, focalisation and vocalisation operate at all levels of the communicative situation and can be accessed by the same pool of pragmatic and discourse analytical tools, the new approach is very flexible in its application. Based on the actual instances of language as found in the text, it does not fall prey to the shortcomings of a narratological model that is specific to (later) genres. What is more, since the text itself is taken as the basis, we can attempt to cover the characteristics of medieval legendaries, especially their Christian framework and imagery. Thereby, the medieval context of the collection is acknowledged as well. The pragma-narratological approach provides a hands-on method for the many major and minor functions and purposes towards which the *Scottish Legendary* is geared.

Works Cited

Alber, Jan, and Monika Fludernik (2010) Eds. *Postclassical Narratology: Approaches and Analyses*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Bates, Elizabeth (1976) *Language and Context: The Acquisition of Pragmatics*. New York and London: Academic Press.

Beaugrande, Robert-Alain de, and Wolfgang Ulrich Dressler (1981) *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London and New York: Longman.

Boyer, Régis (1981) "An Attempt to Define the Typology of Medieval Hagiography." *Hagiography and Medieval Literature: A Symposium*. Eds. Hans Bekker-Nielsen, Peter Foote, Jørgen Højjgaard Jørgensen and Tore Nyberg. Odense: Odense University Press. 27–36.

Brinton, Laurel J. (2001) "Historical Discourse Analysis." *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Eds. Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen and Heidi E. Hamilton. Malden: Blackwell. 138–60.

Brown, Gillian, and George Yule (1983) *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buss, Peter (1886) "Sind die von Horstmann herausgegebenen Schottischen Legenden ein Werk Barbere's?" *Anglia 9*: 493–514.

Chatman, Seymour (1996) "Voice." *Narrative Theory*. Ed. David H. Richter. New York: Longman. 160–9.

Coll-Smith, Melissa M. (2012) *The Scottish Legendary and Female Saints' Lives in Late Medival Scotland*. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Oxford.

Conzen, Eva von (forthcoming) *Hagiographic Narration in the Scottish Legendary: Reading for the Discourse*. Manchester: Manchester Univerity Press.

D'Evelyn, Charlotte, and Frances Foster (1970) "Saints' Legends." *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English c. 1050–1500*. Vol. 2. Ed. J. Burke Severs. New Haven: Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences. 410–57.

Fitzmaurice, Susan, and Irma Taavitsainen (2007) "Historical Pragmatics: What it is and How to Do it." *Methods in Historical Pragmatics*. Eds. Susan Fitzmaurice and Irma Taavitsainen. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 11–36.

Fleith, Barbara (1991) *Studien zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der lateinischen* Legenda aurea. Brusseles: Societée des Bollandistes.

Fludernik, Monika (1996) *Towards a 'Natural' Narratology*. London: Routledge.

Fludernik, Monika (2000) "Beyond Structuralism in Narratology: Recent Developments and New Horizons in Narrative Theory." *Anglistik* 11: 83–96.

Genette, Gérard (1980) *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Heinen, Sandra, and Roy Sommer (2009) Eds. *Narratology in the Age of Cross-Disciplinary Narrative Research*. Narratologia 20. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Herman, David (2007) "Introduction." *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative*. Ed. David Herman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 3–21.

Horn, Laurence R., and Gregory Ward (2004) *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Malden: Blackwell.

Horstmann, Carl (1881a) *Altenglische Legenden: Neue Folge*. Heilbronn: Henninger.

Horstmann, Carl (1881b) *Barbour's des schottischen Nationaldichters Legendensammlung, nebst den Fragmenten seines Trojanerkrieges*. 2 Vol. Heilbronn: Henninger.

Huang, Yan (2007) *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jahn, Manfred, and Ansgar Nünning (1994) "Forum: A Survey of Narratological Models." *Literatur in Wissenschaft und Unterricht* 27.2: 81–93.

Jucker, Andreas H. (2000) *History of English and English Historical Linguistics*. Stuttgart: Klett.

Jucker, Andreas H., and Andreas Jacobs (1995) "The Historical Perspective in Pragmatics." *Historical Pragmatics: Pragmatic Developments in the History of English*. Ed. Andreas H. Jucker. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 3–33.

Jucker, Andreas H., Gerd Fritz and Franz Lebsanft (1999) "Historical Dialogue Analysis: Roots and Traditions in the Study of the Romance Languages, German and English." *Historical Dialogue Analysis*. Pragmatics and Beyond 66. Eds. Andreas H. Jucker, Gerd Fritz und Franz Lebsanft. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 1–33.

Kocher, Ursula (2010) "'Schreib nie einen Roman aus der Perspektive einer Türklinke!' Möglichkeiten und Grenzen einer historischen Narratologie." *Historische Narratologie: Mediävistische Perspektiven*. Trends in Medieval Philology 19. Eds. Harald Haferland and Matthias Meyer. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 415–27.

Kuroda, S.-Y. (1976) "Reflections on the Foundations of Narrative Theory: From a Linguistic Point of View." *Pragmatics of Language and Literature*. Ed. Teun A. van Dijk. Amsterdam: North-Holland. 107–40.

Lakoff, Robin Tomach (2001) "Nine Ways of Looking at Apologies: The Necessity for Interdisciplinary Theory and Method in Discourse Analysis." *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Eds. Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen and Heidi E. Hamilton. Malden: Blackwell. 199–214.

Levinson, Stephen C. (1983) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McDiarmid, Matthew P., and James A.C. Stevenson (1980) *Barbour's Bruce: A Fredome is a Noble Thing!* Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society.

Metcalfe, William M. (1886–1895) *Legends of the Saints in the Scottish Dialect of the Fourteenth Century*. 6 Vol. Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society.

Metcalfe, William M. (1896) *Legends of the Saints in the Scottish Dialect of the Fourteenth Century*. 3 Vol. Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society.

Neumann, Birgit, and Ansgar Nünning (2009) *Introduction to the Study of Narrative Fiction*. Stuttgart: Klett.

Nünning, Ansgar (2000) "Towards a Cultural and Historical Narratology: A Survey of Diachronic Approaches, Concepts, and Research Projects." *Anglistentag 1999 Mainz: Proceedings*. Eds. Bernhard Reitz and Sigrid Rieuwerts. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier. 345–75.

Prince, Gerald (1982) *Narratology: The Form and Functioning of Narrative*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Reames, Sherry (1985) *The* Legenda aurea*: A Reexamination of its Paradoxical History*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Riehl, Claudia Maria (1993) *Kontinuität und Wandel von Erzählstrukturen am Beispiel der Legende*. Göppingen: Kümmerle.

Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith (1983) *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*. London and New York: Methuen.

Ryan, Marie-Laure (2007) "Toward a Definition of Narrative." *The Cambridge Companion to Narrative*. Ed. David Herman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 22–35.

Scahill, John, and Margaret Rogerson (2005) *Middle English Saints' Legends*. Annotated Bibliographies of Old and Middle English Literature VIII. Woodbridge: Brewer.

Scheibe, Regina (1989) "Aspects of the Snake in the Legends of the Saints." *Bryght Lanternis: Essays on the Language and Literature of Medieval and Renaissance Scotland*. Eds. Derrick J. McClure and Michael R.G. Spiller. Aberdeen: University of Aberdeen Press. 67–89.

Scheibe, Regina (2012) "*Scottish Legends of the Saints*: 'Idilnes Giffis Novrysingis to Vicis': The Prologue of the Scottish Legends of the Saints." *Literature and Religion in Late Medieval and Early Modern Scotland*. Essays in Honor of Alasdair A. MacDonald. Mediaevalia Groningana n.s. 18. Ed. Luuk Houwen. Leuven: Peeters, 1–21.

Schiffrin, Deborah, Deborah Tannen and Heidi E. Hamilton (2001) *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Malden and Oxford: Blackwell.

Searle, John R. (1979) "A Taxonomy of Illocutionary Acts." *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Ed. John R. Searle. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1–29.

Sell, Roger D. (1991) *Literary Pragmatics*. London: Routledge.

Tavormina, Teresa M. (1986) "A Liturgical Allusion in the *Scottish Legendary* in the Largesse of St. Lawrence." *Notes and Queries* 33.2: 154–7.

Verschueren, Jef (1999) *Understanding Pragmatics*. London: Arnold.

Wolpers, Theodor (1964) *Die englische Heiligenlegende des Mittelalters: Eine Formgeschichte des Legendenerzählens von der spätantiken lateinischen Tradition bis zur Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.