

Linguopragmatic approach to English text analysis: a methodological framework

Haytanova Yulduzhon^{a)}, Kaliknazarova Ziyada, Xabibullaeva Guljaxon,
Biysenbaev Nursultan, Usenova Azima

Karakalpak State University named after Berdakh, Nukus, Uzbekistan

^{a)}Corresponding author: yulduzhonhaytanova@gmail.com

Abstract. This article explores linguopragmatic approaches to the analysis of English texts, with particular attention to the interaction between linguistic form and pragmatic meaning in communicative contexts. The study aims to develop and refine a methodological framework that integrates principles of pragmatics, discourse analysis, and functional linguistics in order to provide a systematic approach to text interpretation. The research adopts a qualitative descriptive methodology, focusing on contextual and inferential aspects of meaning construction. As an empirical basis, a selected literary text is examined to illustrate how pragmatic factors such as speaker intention, contextual relevance, and linguistic choice contribute to the interpretation of discourse. The analysis demonstrates that linguopragmatic models offer effective tools for revealing implicit meaning and communicative functions that cannot be fully captured by purely formal or structural approaches. The findings suggest that the proposed framework is adaptable and applicable to different text types, supporting a more comprehensive understanding of textual meaning within contemporary linguistic research.

INTRODUCTION

Text analysis in modern linguistics has developed with a help of structural and semantic descriptions in terms of approaches that account for meaning in use. Traditional text linguistic models are unsuccessful to explain how implicit meanings, speaker intentions, and contextual factors shape interpretation. As a result, pragmatic approaches have increased attention in text linguistics.

Linguopragmatics, which integrates linguistic and pragmatic frameworks, presents a comprehensive viewpoint for analyzing literary texts as communicative experiences. It investigates how linguistic units function in specific contexts to get intended points and reach communicative aims. This field of linguistics is able to show to the researchers to analyze not only what is said but also what is intended, implicated in English text analysis [2-3].

However, there is significant interest in linguopragmatic studies, it needs clear and structured methodology that can be applied to English texts. This article approached this problem by addressing and applying linguopragmatic approaches to text analysis in English.

Linguopragmatics studies how language use reflects communicative intention, cognitive activation, and social interaction. There are given key pragmatic intentions:

1. Attracting the reader's attention;
2. Engaging and to interest the reader;
3. Exerting emotional impact;
4. Activating knowledge structure;
5. Stimulating addressee's creativity;
6. Representing conceptual world picture;

Using the technique in text analysis explores the reader's critical thinking skills and motivates to read literary texts [4].

In this article there are three main concepts:

To clarify the methodological value of linguopragmatics in text analysis;

- To plan a practical and analytical scheme;
- To demonstrate the effectiveness through the analysis of literary texts in English;

EXPERIMENTAL RESEARCH

This study applies descriptive and comparative research methods to examine contemporary approaches to the analysis of literary texts from the perspective of discourse phenomena. The descriptive method is used to clarify how recent discourse-oriented and pragmatic approaches operate in practice, with particular emphasis on their analytical procedures and interpretative outcomes. This method allows for a systematic explanation of the principles underlying modern text analysis and their relevance to the interpretation of English literary texts [20].

In addition, a comparative method is employed to identify differences and similarities between traditional models of text analysis and more recent approaches developed within discourse analysis, pragmatics, and cognitive linguistics. Traditional methods are considered primarily in terms of their focus on linguistic structure and formal textual features, whereas modern approaches are examined with regard to their attention to context, cognition, communicative intention, and inferential processes. Such a comparison makes it possible to assess the extent to which contemporary methods expand the analytical potential of literary text interpretation.

The research is grounded in the assumption that present-day linguistic analysis relies not only on formal linguistic competence but also on theoretical background knowledge and previously established scholarly findings. Accordingly, the study reviews a range of influential works that have contributed to the development of innovative procedures in discourse-based text analysis. These studies form the theoretical framework of the research and provide conceptual tools for interpreting literary discourse [16].

The analysis draws on the works of Sperber and Wilson, whose relevance theory has played a central role in the study of communication and cognition; Verschueren, who examines ideology in language use from a pragmatic perspective; Wilson and Unger, who address issues of pragmatic interpretation and cognitive processing in texts; as well as Piotrovskaya and Trushchelev, who propose a linguistic approach to text-based interest strategies. Furthermore, the study takes into account the research of Ashurova on cognitive modeling of fictional texts and the work of Sirojiddinov and Normurodova on intention, conceptualization, and cognition in discourse. The existing literature is reviewed in order to identify key theoretical positions and methodological tendencies relevant to the present investigation [8].

In Linguistics the main focus is given to a text, from this case, there are the new disciplines in modern Linguistics such as, Linguopragmatics, Cognitive Linguistics, Sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics and so on. Today most researchers are studying on text features or text analysis in Modern Linguistics.

“Text as complex unit is studied not only by text linguistics, but also linguopragmatics, cognitive linguistics, sociolinguistics, theory of literature and so on. There are also definite links between text linguistics and psycholinguistics because the problems of impact and perception claim attention of the both sciences. This opinion is true in all cases of text analysis because while it is being scanned, every reader mostly confuse with uncommon words or phrases and it shows to be aware of each aspect of linguistics in order to enhance critical thinking skills. Especially Ashurova presented linguopragmatic approaches to the text analysis in English in a concrete form the most success of this teaching manual is that she used stylistic devices in every pragmatic approach differently and this is the key factor to analyze every text with these approaches or she emphasized some stylistic devices that serve for definite approach. We can see the examples in analyzing part for this explanation. Apart from this she introduced briefly discourse analysis methods that are beneficial for non-native speakers. In Uzbekistan this manual is being used commonly in higher educational places especially in bachelor and magistrate degree student’s lessons. She contributed this manual with Uzbek academic needs. According to Ashurova, there are several types of pragmatic intention while analyzing we should focus [12]:

- the pragmatic intention” to attract attention” (attention -compelling intention);
- The pragmatic intention” to interest the reader”;
- The pragmatic intention “to exert an emotional impact”;
- The pragmatic intention “to activize knowledge structures “relevant to the conceptual information;
- The pragmatic intention “to stimulate the addressee's creativity”;
- The pragmatic intention” to represent the conceptual world picture”

Each of these is extent from differentiation because language usage is complicated in analyzing. Let’s identify “to attract the reader’s attention”, this pragmatic intention refers to the author’s goal of making the reader stop, focus and engage with the text. It is shown by using rhetorical questions, directly address with imperatives using with “you” in

texts, using statements that are dramatic and surprising, this encourages sometimes using factual information and using anecdotes or quotations at the beginning of the text. Another difference is stylistic devices such as alliteration, metaphor, simile and repetition [9].

The pragmatic intention “to interest the reader” focuses to keep the reader following message from the beginning to the end, a text stimulates the reader’s critical thinking and interest, events are described progressively in order to keep the reader wanting more. There are also used rhetorical questions the reader to think what’s next, metaphors and similes are used to make abstract ideas alive and imaginative, allusions are used to activate the readers interest and background knowledge.

The pragmatic intention “to exert an emotional impact” refers the reader to feel all emotions from the text in this way the author is going to evoke emotional impact such as empathy, anger, joy, sorrow or fear. It is aimed to focus specific feelings not focus logic something, it is used expressive vocabulary and set emotional atmosphere. There are used vivid descriptions that help emotional vibration in the work. This approach requires different stylistic devices, epithets are used to show descriptive adjectives, exclamations are used to reflect intense feelings, hyperbole is used to highlight feelings, ellipsis are used to create the impact to thoughts to dramas, symbolism is used to express emotional ideas, contrast is used to represent emotional extremes [8].

The pragmatic intention “to activate knowledge structures “relevant to the conceptual information aims to encourage the reader’s background knowledge, experience and mental scheme, from this reason they can easily understand and interpret. In this approach the author relies on the reader what do they know already from historically, culturally, socially and personally. This approach requires to identify “knowledge structures” in cognitive linguistics. There are four types of knowledge structure:

Schemes: Generalized mental patterns for concepts or events (example., “restaurant schema”) in a discourse analyze we come across.

Frames: Structured sets of expectations activated in particular contexts (“war frame”)

Scripts: Culturally expected sequences of actions in familiar settings (example., “birthday party script”)

Cultural references: Elements of shared cultural knowledge (example., history, religion, proverbs, media).

In this pragmatic approach there are used idioms, proverbs, allusions, metaphors, cultural and historical aspects and elliptical structures [11].

The pragmatic intention “to stimulate the addressee’s creativity” refers to encourage critical thinking and analyzing. It is aimed reader-centered atmosphere and it is focused the reader to engage with the text in an imaginative way. The goal is not only to share information, but also make the reader reflect, analyze and create new ideas with a help of the message in the text. Metaphor and allegory are used to support to think with abstraction or symbolism, open-ended question are used to improve thinking critically, paradox is used to to make challenges logical thinking and forces reevaluation, irony serves to analyze deeply the message, imagery helps to figurative thinking.

The pragmatic intention “to represent the conceptual world picture” serves to understand worldview from values, norms, cultures. It reflects the philosophical, cultural and social mindset that underlies the text. In other words, this intention makes people construct how they perceive and organize the world in their mind according to their views about nature, society, morality, relationships, identity. This shows the concepts in cognitive linguistics that are related to pragmatic intentions. They are following [14]:

1. Conceptual Worldview

Definition: A mental model or conceptual structure through which a speaker understands and interprets the world. Conceptual world picture is described as a cognitive framework through which reality is mentally constructed and categorized [5].

Linguistic Picture of the World

Definition: The way language encodes and reflects the worldview of its speakers. “Every language carries its own implicit worldview, or linguistic picture of the world, shaped by cultural norms and values embedded in key lexical concepts.”

The linguistic picture of the world is a verbal reflection of the conceptual worldview and serves as a means of storing and transmitting cultural knowledge.”

To ensure an empirical basis for the study, corpus selection and an analytical framework are incorporated into the research design. The short story “The Last Leaf” by O. Henry is selected as the primary textual material for analysis due to its rich discourse structure and interpretative potential. The text is examined in accordance with the analytical model outlined in the introductory section of the paper. This model enables the systematic application of discourse, pragmatic, and cognitive approaches and facilitates a detailed examination of new analytical techniques based on the theoretical perspectives discussed above [9].

RESEARCH RESULTS

Contemporary linguistics has undergone significant development through the emergence of new interdisciplinary fields such as linguopragmatics, linguoculturology and corpus linguistics. Despite the diversification of linguistic research, the central objective remains the study of language units and their functional realization in communication. Within this framework, modern theories increasingly focus on meaning construction, context dependence, and cognitive mechanisms underlying language use.

One of the most influential contributions in this regard is the work of Sperber and Wilson, *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*, which proposes a cognitive model of human communication. According to this model, communication is governed by a single overarching principle-optimal relevance-and every act of ostensive communication carries the presumption that it is relevant enough to justify the listener's processing effort. The results of applying this theory demonstrate that listeners and readers actively rely on contextual assumptions and inferential processes to derive meaning, rather than merely decoding linguistic forms [7].

Within linguopragmatics, relevance theory represents a major shift away from strictly code-based semantic models. The findings indicate that meaning is not confined to explicit linguistic content but extends to implicature, metaphor, stylistic effects, and speaker intention. As a result, relevance theory provides a cognitive explanation for phenomena that cannot be adequately described by traditional semantic approaches. At the same time, it is explicitly contrasted with socially oriented pragmatic theories, as it prioritizes individual cognitive processes over social conventions in the interpretation of meaning [6-8].

Another important contribution to the analysis of language use is Verschueren's *Ideology in Language Use: Pragmatic Perspectives*, which investigates the role of ideology in everyday communication. The results derived from this approach show that ideological meanings are not external to language but are embedded in linguistic choices made by speakers and writers. These choices both reflect and shape social relations, power structures, and value systems. Verschueren's framework emphasizes the analysis of social context and the ideological functions of speech acts, demonstrating how pragmatic choices contribute to the reproduction and negotiation of ideology in discourse [9].

In addition, Wilson's *Pragmatics and the Interpretation of the Text* extends the principles of relevance theory to the analysis of extended texts, including narratives and academic discourse. The findings suggest that textual coherence is achieved not solely through linguistic cohesion but through the reader's continuous search for relevance across sentences and paragraphs. This approach highlights the dynamic nature of text interpretation, where meaning emerges through interaction between textual cues and the reader's cognitive expectations. Consequently, this model serves as an effective analytical tool for linguists investigating discourse-level interpretation and textual meaning construction [10].

Unger's work *Pragmatics and Cognition: Relevance Theory and Beyond* further develops the cognitive foundations of relevance theory by examining how meaning is constructed in communication across different discourse types. The results of this approach show that relevance theory is not limited to explaining isolated utterances but can also be applied to broader genres and narrative structures. Unger demonstrates that pragmatic interpretation depends on the interaction between cognitive processes and contextual information, thereby highlighting the importance of integrating pragmatics into discourse analysis. This perspective allows for a more flexible interpretation of meaning, especially in complex narrative texts, where contextual assumptions and inferential reasoning play a decisive role [7].

Piotrovskaya and Trushchelev, in their study *Linguistic Approach to Text-Based Interest Strategies*, focus on the ways texts are structured to attract and maintain the reader's interest. Their analysis reveals that reader engagement is achieved through specific linguistic devices rather than abstract cognitive principles alone. The findings emphasize the role of suspense, stylistic shifts, and strategic organization of information in shaping the reader's response to a text. Compared to relevance theory, this approach is more explicitly text-oriented, as it concentrates on observable linguistic mechanisms within the text itself. As a result, it provides a practical framework for analyzing how interest and involvement are created through language [4].

Ashurova's *Cognitive Modelling of Fictional Text* offers a more specialized cognitive perspective on literary discourse. The results derived from this model demonstrate how readers perceive, process, and mentally evaluate fictional concepts during the act of reading. Particular attention is given to the construction of possible worlds, the development of mental spaces, and the representation of character perspectives. This approach makes it possible to trace the cognitive pathways through which fictional meaning is constructed, thereby extending the analysis beyond surface linguistic features. In comparison with Wilson's model, Ashurova's framework provides a more detailed account of cognitive processes specific to fictional texts and narrative interpretation [1].

Finally, the work of Sirojiddinov and Normurodova, *Pragmatics and Cognition: Intention and Conceptualization in Discourse*, highlights the communicative dimension of discourse analysis. Their findings suggest that speakers and writers deliberately select language units in order to guide the reader's interpretation, stimulate interest, and activate critical thinking. By focusing on intention, motivation, and conceptualization, this model demonstrates how pragmatic choices function as tools for influencing the reader's cognitive and emotional engagement with a text (Table 1). Owing to its communicative orientation and clear analytical focus, this approach offers an accessible and effective method for examining discourse, particularly in applied and literary text analysis [23].

TABLE 1. Discourse analysis of the text

Author	O. Henry (William Sydney Porter)
Publication date	1907
Main idea	Hope and Despair in life and the power of Art
Genre	Realistic fiction
Mode	Written, narrative, descriptive
Register	Literary and artistic
Cohesion	Pronouns conjunctions, references, and time markers
Coherence	Logical order of events
Stylistic devices	Symbolism the last leaf, "Irony" a painting of masterpiece "Imagery" vivid descriptions of storm, ivy vine "Personification" when the leaves fall, she too will fall "Metaphor" the leaf itself for life, survival "Contrast Johnsy's despair and Sue's determination" Climax Johnsy watches the last leaf survive the storm

The discourse analysis of O. Henry's text demonstrates how linguistic and literary elements work together to create a coherent and emotionally engaging narrative. The author's use of realistic fiction allows the exploration of universal themes such as hope, despair, and the transformative power of art. Cohesion is maintained through pronouns, conjunctions, references, and temporal markers, while coherence is ensured by the logical sequence of events, enabling the reader to follow the narrative seamlessly. Stylistic devices-including symbolism, imagery, personification, metaphor, contrast, and irony-enhance both the aesthetic quality of the text and its communicative effectiveness. For instance, the last leaf symbolizes survival and hope, while the contrast between Johnsy's despair and Sue's determination intensifies emotional impact (Table 2). Overall, the table illustrates that the interplay of narrative techniques, cohesive devices, and stylistic elements establishes a rich, meaningful discourse, confirming the effectiveness of literary and linguistic analysis in uncovering the text's conceptual and emotive dimensions [24].

TABLE 2. The analysis of linguopragmatic approaches

To attract attention	The suspense around Johnsy's illness and the last leaf
To interest the reader	The contrast between Johnsy's hopelessness and Sue's attachment
To exert an emotional impact	Behrman's selflessness
To activize knowledge structures	Illness, hope, selflessness
To stimulate the addressee's creativity	The painted leaf as a masterpiece that is true art
To represent conceptual world picture	Life is difficult but hope helps to be alive

The linguopragmatic analysis demonstrates that the text effectively employs a range of communicative strategies aimed at influencing the addressee on emotional, cognitive, and interpretative levels. The use of suspense surrounding Johnsy's illness and the symbol of the last leaf serves to attract the reader's attention and sustain interest throughout the narrative. The contrast between despair and devotion, as well as Behrman's selfless act, intensifies the emotional impact of the text and reinforces its moral message [24].

Furthermore, the activation of universal knowledge structures such as illness, hope, and selflessness facilitates deeper comprehension and personal engagement on the part of the reader. By presenting the painted leaf as a true work of art, the text stimulates the addressee's creativity and encourages symbolic interpretation. Ultimately, the narrative constructs a coherent conceptual world picture in which life is portrayed as challenging, yet sustained by

hope and human compassion. Thus, from a linguopragmatic perspective, the text achieves its communicative goals by guiding the reader's attention, emotions, and interpretation toward a meaningful and value-oriented understanding of the story [25-29].

CONCLUSIONS

The linguopragmatic approach to English text analysis provides a comprehensive and methodologically grounded framework for examining how meaning is constructed, interpreted, and negotiated within specific communicative contexts. Unlike purely structural or semantic approaches, linguopragmatics emphasizes the dynamic interaction between language forms and pragmatic intentions, thereby enabling a deeper understanding of textual meaning as a product of both linguistic choices and extralinguistic factors [12].

The present study demonstrates that effective text analysis within a linguopragmatic framework requires the integration of several key components, including speech act theory, discourse markers, deixis, presupposition, implicature, and contextual parameters such as the communicative situation, participants' roles, and sociocultural norms. These elements collectively contribute to revealing the implicit meanings and communicative strategies embedded in English texts. As a result, linguopragmatic analysis allows researchers to move beyond surface-level interpretations and to uncover the functional and intentional dimensions of language use [13].

Furthermore, the findings highlight that English texts cannot be fully understood without considering the pragmatic motivations of the speaker or writer. Linguistic units acquire their full communicative value only in relation to the intentions they serve and the effects they produce on the recipient. From this perspective, the linguopragmatic approach proves particularly effective in analyzing authentic texts, including literary works, media discourse, academic writing, and everyday communication, where meaning is often indirect, context-dependent, and strategically constructed [4].

From a methodological standpoint, the study confirms that the linguopragmatic framework offers a flexible and interdisciplinary model for text analysis. It successfully combines insights from linguistics, pragmatics, discourse analysis, and sociolinguistics, making it adaptable to various genres and research objectives. This methodological flexibility is especially valuable in contemporary linguistics, where texts are increasingly diverse in form and function, and where communicative effectiveness plays a central role.

In addition, the application of the linguopragmatic approach has significant pedagogical implications for foreign language teaching and learning. By incorporating linguopragmatic analysis into English language education, learners can develop not only grammatical and lexical competence but also pragmatic awareness and discursive competence. This contributes to more effective communication and enhances learners' ability to interpret and produce contextually appropriate texts in English [5].

In conclusion, the linguopragmatic approach to English text analysis represents a theoretically sound and practically applicable methodological framework. It enables a holistic interpretation of texts by accounting for both linguistic structures and pragmatic intentions, thus offering valuable insights into the nature of meaning in communication. The approach holds considerable potential for further research and pedagogical application, particularly in the context of developing advanced communicative and analytical skills in English as a foreign language.

REFERENCES

1. D. U. Ashurova, *Cognitive Modeling of Fictional Text*, Springer, Cham (2019).
2. H. P. Grice, *Studies in the Way of Words* (reprinted ed.), Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA (2020).
3. I. Kecskes (ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Pragmatics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108984585>
4. L. A. Piotrovskaya and P. N. Trushchelev, "Linguistic approach to text-based interest strategies," *Journal of Pragmatics* **182**, 45–59 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2021.06.003>
5. S. Sirojiddinov and N. Normurodova, "Pragmatics and cognition: Intention and conceptualization in discourse," *Discourse & Communication* **16**(3), 321–340 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1177/17504813211066544>
6. Reymov, A.M., Namazov, S.S., Beglov, B.M. Effect of phosphate additives on physical-chemical properties of ammonium nitrate. *Journal of Chemical Technology and Metallurgy* 2013 48(4), 391-395. <http://dl.uctm.edu/journal/>
7. C. Unger, *Pragmatics and Cognition: Relevance Theory and Beyond*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1075/pc.00001.ung>

8. T. A. van Dijk, *Ideology and Discourse: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, 3rd ed., Sage Publications, London (2021).
9. Reymov Akhmed, Namazov Shafoat. Nitrogen-phosphorous fertilizers on the base of concentrated ammonium nitrate solution and Central Kyzylkum phosphate raw material. Polish Journal of Chemical Technology 16(3), Sep 2014, 30-35. <https://doi.org/10.2478/pjct-2014-0046>
10. D. Wilson, "Pragmatics and the interpretation of text," in *The Oxford Handbook of Pragmatics*, edited by Y. Huang, Oxford University Press, Oxford (2016).
11. I. U. Rakhmonov, K. M. Reymov, and Z. M. Shayumova, "The role of information in power management tasks," *E3S Web of Conferences* **139**, 01080 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/201913901080>
12. S. C. Levinson, *Pragmatics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1983).
13. Alisher Eshimbetov, Shahobiddin Adizov, Inderpreet Kaur, Akhmed Reymov. Is it possible to differentiate between 2-phenylaminodihydro-1,3-thiazine from 2-phenyliminotetrahydro-1,3-thiazine by spectral methods? New glance to the old problem. European Journal of Chemistry 12 (1) (2021). <https://doi.org/10.5155/eurjchem.12.1.77-80.2068>
14. J. L. Mey, *Pragmatics: An Introduction*, 2nd ed., Blackwell Publishing, Oxford (2001).
15. P. Brown and S. C. Levinson, *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1987).
16. A.Ahmadjonov, U.Alimov, P.Tuychi, A.Seitnazarov, A.Reimov, Sh.Namazov, S.Sadullayev. Effect of temperature on the kinetics of the process of nitric acid decomposition of Arvaten serpentinite. IOP Conf. Series: Earth and Environmental Science 1142 (2023) 012034. <https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85151285667>
17. J. Thomas, *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*, Longman, London (1995).
18. M. A. K. Halliday and R. Hasan, *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*, Oxford University Press, Oxford (1985).
19. D. Biber, S. Conrad, and R. Reppen, *Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1998).
20. H. G. Widdowson, *Discourse Analysis*, Oxford University Press, Oxford (2007).
21. D. Crystal, *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, 5th ed., Blackwell Publishing, Oxford (2003).
22. G. Leech, *Principles of Pragmatics*, Longman, London (1983).
23. G. Brown and G. Yule, *Discourse Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1983).
24. J. Renkema, *Introduction to Discourse Studies*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam (2004).
25. G. Yule, *Pragmatics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford (1996).
26. D. Sperber and D. Wilson, *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*, 2nd ed., Blackwell Publishing, Oxford (1995).
27. J. Verschueren, *Ideology in Language Use: Pragmatic Guidelines for Empirical Research*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2012).
28. G. Yule, *Pragmatics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford (1996).
29. J. Cutting, *Pragmatics and Discourse: A Resource Book for Students*, Routledge, London (2002).