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The author, Hartmut Haberland, begins this text explaining a previous lecture he gave in 1995, where he exposed two notions titled “Situation Pragmatics v/s discourse pragmatics” analyzing how pragmatic information is presented in sentences through a pragmatic process. Furthermore, in this pragmatic process, information can relate to the co-text where discourse-pragmatics is involved and to the context which is focused on situational-pragmatics.

One of the first main key concepts Haberland mentions are ‘discourse’ and ‘text’. He, borrowing Bronislaw Malinowski’s concept, explains that discourse is a set of utterances which are connected by several relations, integrating it as a whole. Besides, he claims that these utterances might be produced either by one speaker, or more, giving birth to a conversation. On the other hand, Malinowski says that ‘text’ is what occurs when the ‘discourse’ is taken out of the situation of production, by being written down, recorded, quoted or remembered. Also, contrary to ‘discourse’, the relations between utterances cannot be represented when written down. Thus, it is necessary to highlight that when we make use of reported speech, we are in presence of a ‘text’.

Haberland also states, that ‘text’ is transportable in space and time. As ‘discourse’ leaves textual traces by being transformed into a text, traditions and different cultures are preserved. Additionally, different varieties of texts can be analyzed and reused as many times as the reader wants. On the other hand, the author explains that ‘discourse’ vanishes the minute it has happened, it can be recalled but not called back. Indeed, there is a concept called ‘deictic anchoring’, introduced by Rommetveit, which defines the discourse as the moment of speaking “here and now”.

According to the german linguist Konrad Ehlich, ‘text’ is the way in which the utterance of a speaker can be preserved in time after the immediate speech situation. Additionally, Ehlich states that it is possible to do pragmatics of a dead language where no context of situation and no “live” speech acts are available, giving as an example the Hebrew Bible that is a text based on the recordings of speech situations. The term ‘discursive event’ is also mentioned by this author, who defines it as experiences in real time and events that have already happened. Additionally, previous or past discourses can only survive as texts, such as a video taped.

Moreover, Haberland introduces the author Jacob Mey who rejects the content-free concept of text developed in text grammar. According to Mey, ‘discourse’ differs from ‘text’ in that the former, not only involves the text itself, but it is also bound to a context. Additionally, Mey emphasizes the pragmatic perspective of the concept ‘discourse’, by defining text as a collection of utterances, better known as sentences, which merely have cohesion and coherence, but no social context.

Michel Foucault introduced a concept known as *‘discours’*, making reference to both definitions given by Haberland and Mey, but claiming that ‘discourse’ can not be transformed or reduced to a text. Besides, Foucault agrees with the definition of “Discourse” given by Mey explaining that it is “controlled, selected and organized by a number of procedures”. This author also states that “Text” and “*discours*” interact. Nonetheless, the author somehow disagrees by saying that discourse precedes the text, and that discourse can stem from texts since they are as divergent as necessary to one another.

In order to summarize, the main differences between Discourse and Text given by Haberland are:

* Contextualization (pragmatics versus semantics)
* Utterances (discourse) and sentences (text).
* Whereas discourse vanishes the moment it is produced, text can be reused and analyzed, helping to preserve extinct cultures.