LOCAL CONTEXT AS SYSTEMIC INNER FORMATION THROUGHOUT ACADEMIC DISCOURSE

Svoikin Konstantin B., Ph.D.
Ogarev Mordovia State University, Russia
svoikin@gmail.com

Abstract: *In contemporary linguistics two contextual structures have been singled out: horizontal context (supplying the necessary semantic environment for a word in its word distribution) and vertical context (supplying the necessary semantic environment for a text in its discourse distribution). Both the contexts are automatically realized and distinguished through the sentence or text analysis independent on any particular type of text. However, the constant spreading of the investigatory base of the present linguistic research involves the spheres and communicative registers where the context itself becomes a functional category and might be regarded as dependent on the author of the text. This dependence realizes through particular textual structures quite consciously inserted into the text by its author in the function of presuppositional elements necessary for the adequate understanding of the text as a whole. This way of explicit context actualization is rather productive and common in academic writing. These structures are borrowed from convergent disciplinary texts and designed as integrated intertextual elements of various semantic and syntactic completeness. We think it proper to identify these stereotypical structures as "Local Context" (LC) and define it as a part of disciplinary dialogue (or vertical context) consciously chosen by the author in order to be used in the text as a complex of particular preliminary information necessary for understanding the text effectively.*

Keywords:*academic text; reader's competence; vertical context; local context;*

1. Introduction

Academic text is considered to be systemically and cognitively monosemantic, i.e. written to be understood completely close to its author's original message. In other words, the academic text pragmatics implies the necessity that the text while being read should generate in the mind of the reader the same (or maximally close) semantic structures that should correspond to the author' cogninve or academic aim, which allows us to speculate on a dual (author-reader) monosemantic structure. Therefore, every academic text is organized (both in formal and cognitive meaning) so as to be relevant to the academic communicative situation itself as well as to the academic thesaurus of the communicants.

The understanding of the academic text totally depends on the reader's competence within the cognitive situation of the disciplinary dialogue which can be associated with the vertical disciplinary context either common or particular for each text. As far as this preliminary knowledge is quite individual for each participant of the disciplinary dialogue, none of the communicants can completely guarantee absolute sufficiency of the partner's academic o disciplinary background. This statement is valid for both the communicants (the author and the reader), that is why one of the writer's text pragmatics is considered to support the goal reader with the necessary preliminary (in this meaning local for the text in particular) context which would provide the effectiveness to which the text is expected to be understood. This requires an explicit set of particular elements taken from the disciplinary corpora which could contextually provide complete (or desired) understanding. These sets are possible to be

discussed further in the terms of Local Contexts, quite conventional and evidently exposed in academic communication

The reader consequently decides on the LC elements whether they do or do not correlate with his/her own ideas of the disciplinary discourse. When both the author and the reader deal with distant (temporarily or geographically) communicative acts, the only completeness and commonness of the LC might minimize the misunderstanding and maximize the adequacy of understanding. In this connection we can state that supporting the text with the necessary LC refers not only to the author's motivation, but also to the strict systemic demands associated with the stereotypes in academic communication. When met these demands provide the adequacy of the academic dialogue in every particular case of production and perception of the text.

2. LC as a factor of the academic text adequate understanding

As far as every academic text is aimed at maximal explication of the relevant disciplinary notions one can positively predict the LC elements explicit, i.e. they might be actualized in the text by means of the language and therefore can be identified and analyzed. Actually, the texts of the above-mentioned communicative sphere contain the evidence that particular text fragments are targeted at providing the reader with the necessary (on the writer's opinion) preliminary knowledge or information:

> **(1)** Integrationism is a product of the structuralist legacy in modern linguistics. That legacy in turn has influenced current perceptions of integrationism, and is itself complex. ***Structuralism in what is sometimes called the "broad" sense (Crystal 1992, p. 370) is usually seen as a European phenomenon developing from the work of Saussure. Structuralism in the "narrow" sense is seen as an American phenomenon associated particularly with the work of Bloomfield and his followers: it is said to be "characterized by a general behaviouristic attitude and a rather restrictive conception of scientific method, inherited from neopositivism and based on the notion of verifiability" (Lepschy 1970, p.110).***
> (R. Harris)

Roy Harris (in his article: **Integrational linguistics and the structuralist legacy**) offers a kind of comparative analysis of two different approaches towards the understanding of 'integrationism' as a branch of the contemporary linguistics. While doing this the author employs quite a range of dialogical instruments of interrelating the convergent elements of the disciplinary knowledge: nominal definition (*Integrationism is a product of the structuralist legacy in modern linguistics*), plain allusion (*Structuralism in … "broad" sense (Crystal 1992, p. 370))*, quotation (*is said to be "characterized by a general behaviouristic attitude and a rather restrictive conception of scientific method, inherited from neopositivism and based on the notion of verifiability" (Lepschy 1970, p.110))*. As a result the author comes to a certain conclusion: ***Structuralism in the "broad" sense /Structuralism in the "narrow" sense.*** Such a thorough attention might evidently support the understanding of some definite statements which we see as the further text is unfolding:

> **(2)** These two structuralisms ***are about as close to each other as Chicago is to Geneva. In spite of superficial resemblances*** (in, for example, some areas of terminology or the analysis of particular examples) ***they have little but the name in common***. As is evident from his review of Saussure**'**s Cours (Bloomfield 1923), Bloomfield ***never grasped either the theoretical basis or the originality of Saussure's position***. Bloomfield**'**s conversion to behaviourism served only to widen the gulf separating his own from Saussure**'**s view of language.
> (ib.)

Obviously, the author's view of the state of this branch in Linguistics (expressed in such a critical and modal manner) would have been at least unclear without the previous clarifications of a kind. The reader, in his turn, receiving the text has got an opportunity to consult the primary source in order to approve or disapprove the Harris's statements; as far as there are the references to the above-mentioned sources in the text[viii].

In this connection we can state that the author of the text (while referring to some particular elements of the disciplinary context) involves the reader into a dialogue above the borders of the text itself and provides not only the context for comprehending and understanding, but also a certain contextual verification of that understanding. On the other hand, interpretation of the chosen explicit context, provided by the author, is also individual and can only be applied to this particular local textual situation. The reader has a choice whether to agree or disagree with this viewpoint and the disagreement will turn into a problem of anther kind and will be analyzed as a discursive rather than contextual phenomenon. We shall proceed along with the text as it goes on:

> **(3)** There could be no clearer testimony to this than that provided by Bloomfield's semantics, which appeals to laboratories and chemical science to establish the meaning of the word **salt** (Bloomfield 1935, p. 139). This is not structuralism in the European sense. At the very least, a Saussurean would say, *it confuses faits de langue with faits de parole*.
> (ib.)

Further critical detalization results in blaming Bloomfield on the invalid definition of the sign origin (arbitrary/non-arbitrary) (*appeals to laboratories and chemical science to establish the meaning of the word salt*). Finally, R. Harris comes to the conclusion that Bloomfield's linguistic position totally differs from the Saussurean[ix] one, and therefore defints the disciplinary branch of his (Bloomfield's) work:

> **(4)** Each structuralism left its own kind of legacy in the history of linguistics. Integrationism (Wolf and Love 1993; Harris 1998; Harris and Wolf 1998) is often seen as being an essentially neo-Saussurean enterprise. More surprisingly, however, it has also been seen as a reversion to Bloomfieldian behaviourism. **This paper comments on some aspects of those perceptions.**
> (ib.)

Then, in this previously formed local context, Harris puts the principal question of the work (*"Is integrational linguistics neo-Saussurean?"*), defining the main problem of the article:

> **(5)** Integrationism and the history of linguistics Since integrationists treat the importance of context as an article of faith, let us first try to contextualize the question "*Is integrational linguistics neo-Saussurean?*" It is a question most likely to arise, no doubt, in discussing the history of modern linguistics; and here straight away **a problem arises**.
> (ib.)

It should be pointed out that this way of criticism appears to be quite a seldom event in the academic (usually rather stylistically neutral) text. The works that contain such a number of elements "imported" from the other communicative registers (textual modality, colored

---

[viii] It might be pointed out that this address to the primary source mentioned in the text is optional as well as the agreement or disagreement with the authors' (both the writer him/herself and the cited ones) statements.

[ix] Coming to this conclusion Harris declares the inadequacy of the local context which Bloomfield had formed in his work, therefore arguing that one cannot understand the Saussurean ideas if that one follows that Bloomfield's logics.

lexemes, metaphorical comparisons, aggressive rhetoric, subjective judgments) are not typical of the disciplinary discourse. The LC is not usually associated with "hot" dispute. The LC more commonly guides the reader in the disciplinary corps of texts. In this regard we shall observe how the LC is formed in the article by Michael Toolan which is also exploring the problem of the integrational linguistics: «*Integrationist linguistics in the context of 20th century theories of language: some connections and projections*» (Toolan 1999).

> (**6**) It is implausible to imagine that out there in the literature, in the true history of western linguistics, there is some notional '**dream team**' of covert integrational-linguistic thinkers, a team which might include the later **Wittgenstein, parts of Dewey, Sextus Empiricus, Alan Gardiner and J.R. Firth. Rather**, the commentaries in this present volume draw our attention to ways in which aspects of the thinking of major philosophers and linguists, although not their main projects, suggest that they might have been sympathetic to an integrationist resistance to the segregationisim that predominates.
> (Toolan)

While defining the aim of the investigation Toolan mentions a number of names associated with the idea of Integrationalism. The texts that have these evaluating of critical or compilative character evidently give a very important role to the LC and therefore these texts possess a good deal of intertextual elements and have certain dialogical features.

> (**7**) With those qualifications in mind we can suggest, for example, that **Firth**, on occasion, approximated an integrational position. In '**Personality and Language in Society**' (**Firth 1957; p. 182**) Firth characterized his central *notion of 'context of situation' as a schematic interrelating of the following aspects of a language event: (a) the relevant features of participants, including their verbal and non-verbal action, (b) the relevant objects, and (c) the effect of the verbal action*.
> (ib.)

Here and in the following extract Toolan focuses the reader's attention on the contribution of some particular authors into the development of the Integrationalism as a philological and philosophical branch and therefore provides the potential reader with the particular context. Doing this he quotes works of some authors (Firth) and only mentions the others (Wittgenstein, Dewey, Sextus Empiricus, Alan Gardiner) even without including them into the reference list:

> (**8**) Having mentioned *Firth*, let me draw a connection to a recent article by **Paul Hopper (1997)** – an article which begins, in effect, with a *Firthian* example. Although not writing or riding in integrationist colours, *Hopper is interested in the unravelling, even in such standardly segregationalist activities as dictionaryand grammarbook-writing, of such foundational segregational units as the Verb*.
> (ib.)

He also widens the base of the LC referring to both latest and fundamental investigations. These genetic ties are intensively explicit (*Having mentioned Firth, let me draw a connection to…, with a Firthian example…*) which shows its importance for the author and therefore (through his textual pragmatics) for the reader.

> (**9**) Recent systemicist contributions (**Matthiessen 1996; Martin 1992**) have commented extensively on the scope of elements such as the verb, the process, and so on. And a not dissimilar revision is emerging in some of the linguistic description of English emerging from the co-build, corpus-based, studies, where emphasis is placed on the diversity of varying patterns of collocation into which, in actual usage, words enter (**e.g., Sinclair 1991**). *Thus at the robustly empirical end of language studies, I would like to suggest, in the work of linguists who may not identify themselves as*

> *integrationist, new developments are emerging which are consonant with the integrational stance and which support its theses*.
> (ib.)

Further particularization and rethinking the contextual elements allows Toolan to presuppose that some modern investigations are still dialogically convergent and parallel to the ideas of integrationalism**(Matthiessen 1996; Martin 1992; Sinclair 1991).**

At the same time Toolan refers in his LC to the above mentioned work of R. Harris. He also touches upon those elements of the disciplinary LC in which the critical attitude to some particular statements of the Integrationalism proclaimed, and therefore he offers the reader to form the complete[x] viewpoint of the phenomenon itself:

> (**10**) I turn now, briefly, to some of the specific points made by the other contributors to this special issue. **Professor Harris***observes that integrationists can hardly be described as neo-Saussurean*, since all the key Saussurean principles and dichotomies are disavowed. Are we, instead, 'Saussure-transcending'? *Perhaps nearer the mark*, analogous to the ways in which postmodernism respects but differs from modernism, *would be to say that Integrational Linguistics is 'post-Saussurean'*.
> (ib.)

The LC fragments presented above (R. Harris vs M. Toolan) are illustrative as far as they are comparable. One can mention that these LCs, while reflecting one phenomenon (integrationism), are dialogically convergent and relevant for they are actualized in one dialogical field and form one dialogical situation. On the other side a certain authors' polarity is evident in their attitude towards the idea of the Integrationalism. For example this disagreement and other relations among the LCs can be observed through the analysis of the References (relevant fragments provided) that support every academic text:

R. 1	**R. 2**
….	…
Harris, R. 1981. **The Language Myth.**	**Harris, R**. 1995. Signs of Writing.
Harris, R. 1983. de Saussure, F., Course in General Linguistics.	**Harris, R**. 1996. Signs, Language and Communication.
Harris, R. 1987. Reading Saussure.	**Harris, R.** 1997. *From an integral point of view.*
Harris, R. 1990. On redefining linguistics.	…
Harris, R. 1993. Saussure, Wittgenstein and la regle du jeu.	Toolan, M. 1996. *Total Speech: An Integrational Linguistic Approach to Language.*
Harris, R. 1995. *Saussure, generative grammer and integrational linguistics.*	**Wolf, G., & Love, N.** eds. 1997. Linguistics Inside Out. Roy Harris and his critics.
Harris, R. 1998. *Introduction to Integrational Linguistics.*	
Harris, R., Taylor, T.J. 1997. Landmarks in Linguistic Thought. The Western Tradition from Socrates to Saussure,	
Harris, R., Wolf, G. 1998. *Integrational Linguistics: a First Reader.*	
…	
Saussure, F. de 1922. Cours de Linguistique Generale.	

---

[x]This completeness is not a plain and one meaning phenomenon, but a unique and local notion as far as this completeness is defined by the author, and as far as the elements of the LC are chosen, formed and designed according the pragmatics of each particular text.

…
Wolf, G., Love, N. 1993. *Integrational linguistics: an introductory survey.*

Even the first glance upon these References shows that they are rather different than similar. In fact there is no complete identity there are common authors (marked **bold**) and thematic or title similarity (marked ***italic bold***). This fact proves the idea of locality of every particular explicit context and shows that the choice of every LC element rather follows the individual (for each author) interpretation of the disciplinary text corps than any text-producing rule or tradition.

Meanwhile, the further investigation shows that the more texts on Integrationalism are observed the more similarities and identities appear in their LCs:

R. 3	R. 4	R. 5
Harris, R. 1980. The Language-Makers. …	… **Harris, R. 1981. The Language Myth.** … **Toolan, M. 1996. Total Speech: An Integrational Linguistic Approach to Language.***	… **Harris, R. 1980. The Language Makers.** **Harris, R. 1981. The Language Myth**. … **Saussure, F. 1972. Cours de linguistique generale.*** … **Toolan, M. 1996. Total Speech: An Integrational Linguistic Approach to Language.** … **Wittgenstein, L. 1953 Philosophical Investigations.***

The References of the following articles: "***Quine and the segregational sign***» by Woolf, "***Searle on language***" by Love, "***Wittgenstein, integrational linguistics, and the myth of normativity***" Daniel.R. Davis contain the sources which are common not only within these three works (**R. 3-5**), but also with the articles by Harris s and Toolan (**R. 1**-**2**). This fact focuses upon the convergence of the LCs which is coming from the commonness of the disciplinary text corps. If we combine these five References we can result in a kind of textual dialogical base for these five articles – a portion of the disciplinary text corps which would limit the combined explicit LC. The other question is to decide which portion of this combined LC forms the context necessary for exact or adequate understanding.

We shall analyze from this angle the article "***Searle on language***" by Nigel Love. The article may be structurally viewed as containing three parts. The first part is mainly providing the LC of the article. It contains the majority of the intertextual elements (76% of the authorized references in 30% of the volume of the article in whole) and therefore might be called referential. It seems reasonable that among the 29 references of this first part 28 refer to the works of Searle. The other authors mentioned in the References are quoted only 4 times (of 39 authorized references in the whole). The locality (or particularity) of the LC is quite evident: even a plain statistical view shows the unique choice of the elements of the disciplinary text corps involved into the LC building. And, which is more, of all the works by J. Searle (that are numerous) N. Love chose for his investigation only three which is proclaimed in the beginning of the article:

> (**11**) The following discussion of J.R. Searle**'**s theorising about language draws **mainly on three works:** Speech Acts (1969), Expression and Meaning (1979) and The Construction of Social Reality (1995).
> (N. Love)

LC elements are introduced into the text in quite various ways. Some conceptual moments are presented in the form of **paraphrase** or "**close-to-the-text-retelling**" as well as in form of *quotation* mainly *authorized*:

> (**12**) *According to Searle, speaking a language is a matter of performing speech acts according to systems of constitutive rules.* **Constitutive rules are distinguished from regulative rules, as follows**: *. . .we might say that regulative rules regulate antecedently or independently existing forms of behavior; for example, many rules of etiquette regulate interpersonal relationships which exist independently of the rules. But constitutive rules do not merely regulate, they create or define new forms of behavior. The rules of football or chess, for example, do not merely regulate playing football or chess, but as it were they create the very possibility of playing such games.(Searle 1969, pp. 33-34).*
> (ib.)

In addition, the author reflectively applies the chosen LC element to **himself** providing a kind of experiment which would show the efficiency of Sealre's models:

> (**13**) He offers by way of analogy the fact that **I know that in baseball after hitting the ball fair, the batter runs in the direction of first base, and not in the direction, say, of third base or the left field grand stand**. Now what sort of knowledge is this? On what is it based? How is it possible? Notice that it is a general claim and not confined to this or that instance of baserunning behavior. I have never done or even seen a study of baserunner behavior, and I have never looked the matter up in a book. Furthermore I know that if the book, even if it were a rule book, said anything to the contrary it would be mistaken or describing a different game or some such.
> (ib.)

N. Love provides the reader with both the LC and the ways of its most effective reflexive application which he (N. Love) considers important for the adequate understanding of his work. One might find such an approach targeted at least at two aims: to have the LC element completely transparent and to make this LC element focused upon.
This LC elements focus turns explicit *(One point worth emphasising is that…; It might be thought that…)*in the article:

> (**14**)**One point worth emphasising is that** the semantic rules of a language specify a *'literal meaning'* for sentences. An extended discussion of this notion (**Searle 1979, pp. 117-136**) is concerned to dispel a possible misconception. **It might be thought that** the *literal meaning of a sentence* can be construed as the meaning it has independently of any context whatever, but Searle denies this: *'the application of the notion of . . . literal meaning . . . is always relative to a set of contextual assumptions'* (**Searle 1979, p. 120**).
> (ib.)

The use of linguistic reptition enforced by a kind of gradation: *literal meaning - literal meaning of a sentence - the application of the notion of…literal meaning…is always relative to a set of contextual assumptions,* with gradual authorization (Searle 1979, pp. 117-136 - Searle 1979, p. 120), positively concentrates the reader's attention upon the explicit context .

Searle's works under analysis are also supplied with some LC:

> (**15**) Searle analyses speech acts in terms of at least four general kinds of act: utterance acts, propositional acts, illocutionary acts and perlocutionary acts. The utterance act (**cf. Austin's 'locutionary act'**) is the act of uttering certain words, etc.
> (ib.)

Further Love comes to the conclusion that the main statements of Searle's works and those by Austin are dialogically convergent:

(16) In **Searle's view**, as **in Austin's,** the core of any speech act is the illocutionary act. (ib.)

We can follow the development of one LC element through the whole article. For instance, while quoting the following:

(17) …As a native speaker of English I know that … *"The* **cat** *is on the mat" is a sentence*, etc. (Searle 1969, p. 11).
(ib.)

N. Love launches a particular textual exploratory chain starting with the claim that *"The cat is on the mat" is a sentence*. Statistically there are 24 references to this statement and the form of the references fluctuate from exact authorized citation to a nominative implication like:

(18) We lack a metalanguage with which to distinguish the case where **the cat** in question is a blue-point Siamese from the case where it is a leopard, for instance.
(ib.)

The number of the references itself shows the degree of the author's concentration upon the Searle's idea. This concentration so far appears to be both the tool and the result of some textual pragmatic. It turns evident when we see that this statement (*"The* **cat** *is on the mat" is a sentence.*) becomes the main focus of the criticism in the article:

(19) Perhaps Searle means that knowing such facts is an automatic concomitant of being a native speaker. But that is unlikely: **there must be many native speakers of English who are either altogether unacquainted with words like 'sentence', or whose classification of certain expressions as 'sentences' would radically fail to match Searle's.** So maybe the claim is that native speakers of English know whatever it is about the *cat is on the mat* that leads those whose use of the metalinguistic term 'sentence' conforms to Searle's to call *thecat is on the mat* a sentence. **If so, it would appear to be important to know what Searle's criteria of sentencehood are. But Searle makes no bones about refusing to provide any.**
(ib.)

N. Love uses this contextual starting point to blame Searle for calling the structure *'thecat is on the mat'* a sentence without making much effort to provide any criteria of the Sentence. Here Love straightforwardly shows the conceptual gap which he detects (according to his viewpoint and the explicit LC) in Searles works. Then using this start-point Love builds his own tentative textual exploratory chain "for Searle":

(20) …why **he does not say when discussing** *the cat is on the mat* **that whenever a linguistic expression consists of a subject and a predicate, he will call it a sentence**. On the face of it, **there seems to be** no more reason for Searle's choices here than the fact **that the sentence is a concept belonging to linguisticsand as such is to be treated** in the way deemed appropriate by proponents of those doctrines **within linguisticsthat for Searle's purposes are to be taken on trust**.
(ib.)

Here the author appeals to the wider categories that refer to functional linguistics and refers the notion of the sentence to the ideas of **utterance** and **speech act**:

(21)It is trivially true that *the cat is on the mat* **cannot become a sentence of English unless at least one speech act (one utterance act) is performed.** But there is no institutional context that makes that speech act an utterance of the sentence *the cat is on the mat*. The relevant speech act just is, in and of itself, an utterance of that sentence. If you say *'the cat is on the mat'*, then you have uttered the sentence *the cat is on the mat*.
(ib.)

All these explications on the whole result into a definition which can be considered a conclusion (or the conclusion):

(22)'***The cat is on the mat***'**is already a formula that classifies indefinitely many unique utterances in a particular way.**
(ib.)

So far having read these fragments (17-22) as they are sequenced here we can observe a kind of intratext (a text inside the text) which possesses all the distinguishing textual parameters (completeness, coherence, cohesion, modality, unique pragmatic, informativity, etc.). The LC elements (here playing an important role for the main critical point) are designed into this intra-text and therefore this LC element might be considered as constituent for this article. The other question is whether this LC meets the readers' demand and how efficient its explanatory potency is. This question is to be addressed to each reader and no final answer might be expected until we have known all the responses (past, present and future) which is extremely difficult either theoretically or practically. This comprises the uniqueness of each particular LC both from the author's (who is forming this LC in his text) point of view and from the reader's (who is applying this LC to the text) point of view.

Of cause not every contextual element is the same completely explicit. There are some LC elements that are considered so well-known that are not supplied with any explication:

(23) Searle**'**s marriage of **an early-Chomskyan linguistics** to his own version of an Austinian philosophy of language causes various problems and mystifications, … But what it is to utter a **Chomskyan 'sentence'** is a tricky question.
(ib.)

Comparing the positions of Searle and N. Chomsky, Love does not bother to particularize the source of the above mentioned positions. Chomsky's works are not even mentioned in the References of the article (see **R.4** above). This fact seems quite surprising as far as N. Chomsky and the disciplinary notions related to him have been 10 times referred to (in comparison with Toolan – quoted 2 times, Austin – 6 times, Harris – 2 times, etc.). It is possible that some references do not have any highly contextual character, but those to Chomsky are supported by no explanation at all. The question of the reason of this textual situation is to be addressed to the author, yet we can suppose that it must be connected with the fundamentality and popularity of the works by Chomsky that do not need any additional explanation or explication. Although I evidently lack at least one in the following case:

(24) The whole discussion of rules, for instance, is confused by the attempt to put a philosophical gloss on the ***early-Chomskyan notion of 'rules of grammar'***, in the form of the distinction between **'constitutive'** and **'regulative'** rules.
(ib.) 89261111829

N. Love has certainly made a decision on the certain readers' awareness of the Chomskyan linguistic inheritance. And this decision matters not only to Love himself, but to the potential reader as well.

It must be pointed out that the authors position at forming the LC is not limited or distinguished by any "unified standard or rule" and therefore the LCs are variously formed. N. Chomsky for instance does not use authorized references or quotations in his «Language and Thought». He prefers to paraphrase or just mention the author leaving it to the readers whether they would accept the LC as it is or refer to the original (including the search for the latter). The LC is supported with Chomsky's comments that provide its cohesion and adaptation in the text.

A similar situation can be observed in «An Introduction to Discourse Analysis» by M. Coulthard:

(25) Although ***Firth urged linguists to study the total verbal process in its context of situation*** he did not do so himself, choosing rather to concentrate on phonology. ***In the period up to the late 60s there were only two isolated attempts to study suprasentential structure, one by Harris (1952), the other by Mitchell (1957).***

> ***Harris's article***, although it has the promising tide **'**Discourse Analysis**'**, ***is in fact disappointing****. Working within the Bloomfieldian tradition he sets out to produce a formal method 'for the analysis of connected speech or writing' which 'does not depend on the analyst's knowledge of the particular meaning of each morpheme'.*
> (M. Coulthard)

The LC is textually enriched by additional evaluating factor (***Harris's article… is in fact disappointing***) that plays a double role as far as it reflects the author's attitude towards the LC elements and divides the LC into two segments: the segment of adequate and complete knowledge (relevant to the authors position), and the segment of the disciplinary gap (irrelevant to the authors position, or not yet existing at all) – according to which the new text might contain the new knowledge. These "gap segments" are intensively marked and focused in dissertation papers:

> **(26)***A second criticism of the social perspective is that it isolated discourse from the world. Its guiding metaphors of community and conversation treat social systems as single, cohesive communities* (***Harris; Kent; Spellmeyer***). Yet within the military, one cannot consider the struggles for meaning as phenomena that occur within a single cohesive community, especially when power relations are concerned.
> (B. Orbell)

The disciplinary LC shows these gaps (from the author's viewpoint) segments or proves the author's position on the adequacy or inadequacy of this or that theoretical model (see: M. Northcut):

> **(27)***Current theories for analyzing images in technical communication are inadequate* to handle the complex and rhetorically powerful images with which technical communicators work. Illustrations are "**diverse and situationally specific**" **(Brasseur, 2003, p. 49**), and the same applies to sites for empirical research into illustrations.
> (M. Northcut)

The authors' pragmatics of the LC completely determines both formal and cognitive characteristics of the LC appearance in the text. On the one hand the LC is considered unique for each text, on the other hand it possesses features common with the majority of the academic texts.

3. Conclusion

As the analysis shows the English academic communication has a number of these stereotypical characteristics:

- The author, while forming particular LC for a particular text, chooses those elements of the convergent disciplinary text corpora that can fulfil this particular unique textual pragmatics.
- The author follows standard dialogical procedures of operating with the disciplinary text corps that are conventional for this particular communicative register.
- The reader has a right to decide whether he or she will or will not take this particular LC into consideration and follow the author in his argumentations and evaluations.
- The LC possesses its particular pragmatics and depends on it. This pragmatics belongs to the main textual pragmatics and systemically depends on it.
- The forms of the LC vary in the borders of the whole paradigm of intertextual and dialogical stereotypes of the English communicative register.

About the author

Svoikin Konstantin B., Doctor of Philology, Head of the English Philology Chair, Ogarev Mordovia State University, Russia

Conflict of interest: The author confirms that this article content has no conflict of interest.

References

Bazerman, Charles. (2000). *Shaping Written Knowledge: The Genre and Activity of the Experimental Article in Science*. WAC Clearinghouse Landmark Publications in Writing Studies: http://wac.colostate.edu/books/ bazerman_shaping/ Originally Published in Print, 1988, by University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, Wisconsin.

Beaugrande, R. de (1991) *Linguistic Theory: The discourse of Fundamental Works.* London: Longmans. P. 605

Duszak, A. (Ed.) (2011). *Culture and Styles of Academic Discourse.* Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. P. 362

Coulthard M. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. – London: Longman, 1995. P. 216

Harris, R. (1999) *Integrational linguistics and the structuralist legacy*. Language & Communication,19 pp. 45-68

Northcut M. *The Making Of Knowledge In Science: Case Studies Of PaleontologyIllustration.*– TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY PhD. 2004. P. 193

Love, N. (1999) Searle on language. Language & Communication 19 pp. 925

Orbell B. *Discourse, power, and social rupture: An analysis of Tailhook 91.*– TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY PhD. 1997.- P. 216

Toolan M. *Integrationist linguistics in the context of 20th century theories of language: some connections and projections*// Language & Communication 19 (1999)- pp. 97–108