LEXICAL RELATIONAL STRUCTURE OF THE ENGLISH ACADEMIC DISCOURSE

Anotacija
Kalbai būdinga struktūra, kuri leidžia autoriui individualiai rinktis reliacines lingvistines priemones nustatant norimą neformalų santykį su tiksline auditorija arba siekiant subjektivyviai tiriamaįjį objektą. Šio straipsnio tikslas yra atskleisti anglų kalbos leksinės reliacinės struktūros vaidmenį kuriant akademinį diskursą ir jos pasiekiamą reliacinių efektą. Tyrimas parodė, kad ne tik vis populiariøjantis vienaskaitos pirmojo asmens įvardžio varstojimas akademiniame diskurse sukuria siekiamą santykį tarp tyrėjo ir jo auditorijos, bet ir pati kalba turi daug sudėtingesnę reliacinių struktūrų, tiek leksinę, tiek ir sintaksnę, kuri leidžia išreikšti norimą interaktyvumo lygį. Straipsnis skiriamas rašantiesiems kursinius, baigiamuosius bakalauro darbus bei mokslo straipsnius anglų kalba.
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Abstract
Language offers a structure that allows the author an individual option of relational linguistic means in order to establish a desired degree of informal relation to the target audience or to assume a more subjective stand towards the subject matter. The purpose of the present paper is to demonstrate the role of the lexical relational structure in creating the English academic discourse and the relation achieved. The study has revealed that it is not only the first person pronoun which is getting more popular in the academic discourse that may establish a relation between the scientist and the audience, but language possesses a far more diversified and complex lexical and syntactic relational structure which allows a
broad scale of desired degree of interactivity. The article is oriented towards those who are writing course and bachelor's degree papers and scientific articles in English. KEY WORDS: academic discourse, persuasiveness, emphasis, relational lexical linguistic means, clichés, transitions.

Academic and literary discourses comprise a generally accepted opposition to each other, thus, in order to define the characteristics of the linguistic means of the academic discourse, it is necessary to distinguish its most outstanding features, namely objectivity, abstractness and logic. Frequently the academic discourse is referred to as professional written (or oral) intercourse which differs from the literary one not only in the quantity and frequency of the occurrence of certain linguistic means but also in the communicative functions to inform and assert something essential about the subject. It can be stated that each type of discourse adheres to the norms of stylistic congruity which means that “what counts as stylistically marked in relation to what is stylistically neutral will vary according to the register that is appropriate for particular contexts” (Lyons 1990, 295). The term discourse can be defined as “the general domain of statements”, including “all utterances or texts which have meaning and which have some effects in the real world” (Mills 2003, 6). The structure of discourse may have a system of ideas, opinions, concepts, ways of thinking, and behaviour which are framed into one particular context (cf. Mills 2003, 15), that forms “a system of concepts modelled by the discourse construction process” (Schiffrin 2001, 266). It implies that a discourse cannot be construed separately from the morphological structures and outside the interrelation with the syntactical formulas in order to achieve a developed communication on the pragmatic level. A possibility to depict a discourse context lies in the revelation of the interaction between the genre unit, modality, polarity, and point of view, which might in separate cases verge on subjectivity, i.e. the feature of expressing or bringing into prominence the individuality of the author which can be discerned even in the most objective academic discourse.

On the other hand, a clear distinction has to be made between the text and discourse. A sentence in the language can be treated as a marginal unit: although it is the smallest communicative segment of speech, however, at the same time it functions as the largest constituent structure in the hierarchical system forming discourse. The latter is described by Schiffrin
as “a particular unit of language above the sentence” (1994, 20), and, according to Herman Wekker “sentences do not normally occur in isolation [...] they usually form part of a larger text (discourse)” (2009, 9). So, from this it becomes evident that frequently text and discourse are not so sharply distinguished from each other. However, at the same time, there exist opinions of the linguists who consider text as the theoretical construct that underlies discourse: Sanna-Kaisa Tanskannen presupposes that “discourse includes text” or more specifically, that “text means discourse without context, while discourse means text with context” (2006, 3). Cornish, for instance, explains further the interrelation between text and discourse by defining the domains of both: “The text is but a sequence of ‘hints’ or instructions to a) invoke a relevant context (or rather contexts), and b) to create discourse as a function to it or them.” Text is always incomplete and indeterminate in relation to the discourse that may be derived from the former with the help of a context- including knowledge of the world, the genre of which the text is an instance, and the social and communicative conventions that regulate the relevant language event.” (Cf.: Cornish 2010, 5). Robert De Beaugrande states that “it is essential to view the text as a communicative event wherein linguistic, cognitive, and social actions converge, and not just as the sequence of words that were uttered or written” (1997, 10), whereas discourse is described “as a set of interconnected texts” by the same author and in the same context (1997, 21). So, to summarize the above opinions of the linguists it can be emphasized that it’s namely the social and communicative conventions that build up discourse including, of course, the text itself; whereas relational linguistic structure lends its abundant inventory, both lexical and syntactic, to express the concrete social and communicative environment.

Some authors (cf. Robbins 2010) emphasize that the scientist’s assumed responsibility for the information imparted and the attitude towards it should be reflected in a more explicit way on the linguistic level of the academic discourse by a more extensive usage of the first person pronoun as the English academic discourse “is becoming more personal, more author- oriented” (Cumming 2006, 201). However, it should be noted, that languages possess a far more extensively developed and complex system which includes many more lexical and syntactic linguistic means that relate the scientist with his or her audience. Here belong the evaluative
gradable attributes and adverbs, logical connectors and transitions or parenthetical words, as well as certain grammatical forms, such as active voice of the verb, copulative verb which is part of nominal predicate, and the system of the modal verb. Concerning the syntactic relative structures emphatic constructions, inversion, repetition, suspense, gradation and others could be taken into consideration. So this broad linguistic option for expressing the relation towards the information and towards the audience comprises the whole relational structure of the academic discourse.

On the other hand, the academic discourse as a system of academic writing, which includes the rules and conventions of correct paper organization, language segmentation, evaluation and interpretation, aims at the logical formulation of the recorded data and should serve for the consistency of the scientific argumentation, objective presentation of the chosen problem, and elimination of any possible cases of ambiguity. That is why the academic discourse congruity is also a matter of text building and organization, which aims at the well-formedness of the presented data.

Furthermore, there exists an opinion that the academic discourse can be viewed as an “implicit dialogue” (Bitinienė 2001, 27), which means that the author intends to invite the reader to participate in a certain type of the communication process while sharing and discussing the available systemized information, and this process is to be perceived as not at all of a passive character. On the contrary, the author’s aim in the academic discourse is not only to impart the information, systemize it and correlate the results of empirical investigation with the broader theoretical generalizations but also to initiate the polemics of specialists in order to achieve an adequate understanding of the information and, ultimately, to gain reaction to it (cf. Bitinienė 2001, 27). Thus the level of formality or informality can be established due to the relational structure that is offered by any language according to the “environment and circumstances of the communication act, the purpose of the intercourse and, ultimately, the relation between the participants”. (Marcinkevičienė 2008, 35–36).

The functions of the text have been in focus of a number of modern studies on discourse published by M. A. K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan 1991, Stillar 1998, Crystal 1995, N. Fairclough 1995, and many others, moreover, these functions have been exhaustively and repeatedly summarized and generalized by subsequent studies, (Cf. Marcinkevičienė 2008, 33–38).
In this article I shall assume the term proposed by Stillar (1998, 19) *interacting or relational*, in other words, social-constitutional, which implies communication of participants in the speech act and which requires to associate the elements of the context namely with the type of the communicative act, thus building up discourse.

So the **object** of the present article is the lexical structure of the English language which performs the **interacting**, (in other words *relational*), function in the academic discourse and, ultimately, should be treated as an integral part of it, while expressing the author’s intentions, his or her attitude (modality) towards the object of the research and the attitude towards the participants of the communication act. No doubt, the author, though evidently forced to comply with the limitations of the written academic discourse, still has a certain degree of freedom to establish the desired level of informality and to assume a subjective stand by applying appropriate linguistic options.

Language in its broadest conceptualization is not a “disorganized mass of sounds and symbols, but is instead an intricate web of levels, layers and links [...] which are interconnected: they interpenetrate and depend upon each other, and they represent multiple and simultaneous linguistic operations in the planning and production of the utterance” (Simpson 2010, 5), moreover, that those utterances are produced in real contexts of use. It’s namely the academic discourse that requires great responsibility on behalf of the writer whose ultimate goal is most effective comprehension of the imparted message. There exist numerous linguistic – lexical and syntactic – means which help the writer become more “accessible, candid or impersonally aloof, trustworthy or deceitful” (Williams 2007, 215), and namely these linguistic means form the basis of **the relational structure** of the academic discourse. Thus, the ambiguity of the academic discourse which arises from the request to preserve a high level of objectivity, on the one hand, and the need to achieve accessibility on the reader’s or listener’s part by subjectively establishing a certain degree of informality, on the other hand, form the **motivational basis** of the present research.

**The purpose** of the research is the identification of the most characteristic lexical relational linguistic means in the recent English academic discourse regarding their functional and stylistic aspects.

**The tasks** of the research are as follows:
1. to classify the lexical means and identify the relational background that they create in the academic discourse;
2. to study the role of the functional words and their stylistic aspects;
3. to regard the functional aspects and stylistic effects of the lexical relational linguistic means in the English academic discourse.

The analysis based on different types of the academic discourse (19 articles from humanities, medicine, and social sciences from the year 1998 to 2011) in some languages (Lithuanian, Russian and English), was accomplished with the group of the third year students. The empirical and analytical methods have been applied: the above enumerated lexical linguistic means (the evaluative gradable attributes and adverbs, clichés, logical connectors and transitions or parenthetical words, as well as certain grammatical forms, such as copulative verb which is part of nominal predicate, and the system of modal verb) have been accumulated, observed, verified and evaluated. The examples selected were representational and not occasional as they were chosen from different places of the articles and from a variety of genres in order to get the most typical data. Another stage of analysis applied is classification: the examples were grouped according to the principle of analogy, i.e. due to the identity of the features and functions, for example, 1) register, i.e. formal/informal, 2) connotation, 3) syntactic, and 4) stylistic features. The purpose of such classification bears rather a cognitive character. The generalized research results are presented in the below part of the article.

Lexical Relational Means

Scientific English has become the international discourse of science, which involves not only a specific language but also a set of stylistic features (Gross 2006, 18), which include sentence structure, citations and above all specific words, terms, abbreviations, etc. But still, a certain degree of informality is admitted in even such restricted boundaries as professional discourse. On the other hand, humans are not machines, and it becomes oppressive while trying to take in completely formal writing. Therefore, several informal words will merely break the monotony, however, it shouldn’t be so much enjoyed because, as Grabarczyk puts it, “style and beauty is not the prominent goal” when presenting a scientific paper where language is treated just as “a tool to achieve a certain goal” (1989,
Yet the author’s task includes his/her decision as to “[...] how much information you will include, what language you will use, who the audience will be, and how much you will present yourself to the audience in the writing” (Woodson 1986, 60). Besides choosing the right lexicon and style, other requirements exist, such as tone. For instance, Nigel Warburton states that “the tone or register of what you write can be as important as its content” (2006, 65), that is to say that incorrectly selected tone may effect the audience in the opposite way than it was intended to. According to Joanne Buckley “the words you choose depend partly on the role you mean to play in relation to the reader” (1998, 15).

The relational linguistic means are common and effective and are widely resorted to in diverse fields of science: “It is customary, in writing scientific papers in English, to avoid active sentences with first person subjects and to make extensive use of impersonal passive sentences. The effect that is achieved by the deliberate use of a stylistically marked expression or construction depends upon its being stylistically marked for the register of context in which it occurs, not for the language-system as a whole” (Lyons 1990, 295).

Furthermore, the texts are written for others to be read or presented orally to those whose minds are different from the one who is writing. According to Robert A. Harris (2003), the reader does not necessarily make the same connections, he does not see the world exactly as the writer sees it. If the writing is to get to him – it must be interesting, clear, persuasive, and memorable, so that he will pay attention to, understand, believe, and remember the ideas it communicates.

**Clichés.** The vocabulary of the scientific discourse is notably formal and complex, and lexical items are used mainly in their primary, logical meaning. Diction is precise, concrete, and unambiguous. The bulk of the discourse is formed on the basis of the scientific terms presented in unemotional and impersonal contexts. On the other hand, the stylistic devices that occur in the text, do not serve the aesthetic aims, but their only prerogative is to make the text more interesting and persuasive, and keep the reader’s attention. The most widely used stylistic devices in the discourse in question are of the syntactic character, i.e. repetition, enumeration, parenthesis, rhetoric questions, suspense, linking and reporting words and
phrases, which first of all indicate the logical sequence of the sentences and accentuate their interrelation and interdependence. The objectivity of the discourse is comprehensible, as it is based on the facts rather than on the author’s personal opinion.

A particular attention should be drawn to the usage of set expressions, idioms and clichés for which the academic discourse seems to be not quite an appropriate environment, as they very often refer to the colloquial level of language. However, used in an unexpected context, being easily understandable and recognizable they add expressiveness and emphasis, demonstrate the scientist’s attitude towards the issues in question, and establish the emotional relation with the audience by keeping or directing the reader’s or listener’s attention.

It is interesting to note that clichés and idioms are two different things: on the one hand, idioms can become clichés because of their overuse and triteness. An idiom is an expression the meaning of which is not predictable from the usual grammatical rules of a language or from the usual meanings of the expression elements, whereas a cliché, on the other hand, is a word or a phrase that has been used so much that it is no more as effective, because it already lacks freshness and vigour. Besides, words and phrases become popular as they function as a tool to affect the addressee, i.e. familiar phrases with slight changes in a text, moreover, in the unexpected contexts such as academic discourse, serve as a good attention-seeking device. A change made to the original idiom or its accompaniment by additional commentaries adds creative stylistic effect, thus making the whole serious academic text more comprehensible and humanly attainable. Furthermore, a cliché is a phrase that conveys a picturesque and more emotional treatment of a serious scientific message by imparting an unexpected personal turn in the objective lexical structure of the academic discourse. However, the choice of clichés in such contexts is rather predictable: on the one hand, on the other hand, in case of, face-to-face communication, fresh evidence, fill the gaps, profound analysis, a step forward, catches one’s eye, shift position, primary source, subsume under the label, idiosyncratic differences, systematic differences, confronted with the opportunity to investigate, direct more attention to, there is some evidence, evidence confirms, factors have effect on, differences in motivation, as a result, the question arises, an analytical framework is proposed, increase awareness
and knowledge, get a sense of communion, a feeling of belonging, shared interests, in triggering sth., to slow down one’s pace, part and parcel, march of science, growing awareness, rising expectations, etc.

The clichés of similar type include the elements of informal lexis and the occurrence of everyday vocabulary in highly formal contexts allows merging two opposite – formal and informal – registers. The expressiveness of the phrases, no matter how hackneyed they may seem from the stylistic point of view, produce the effect of breaking the monotony of the formal register and refreshing the reader’s or listener’s attention by attracting him into the more informal one.

Moreover, some colloquialisms (for instance: to put it mildly, in short, lend me your ears, hand in hand, on top of that, apart from this, then, anyway, for a start, to tell (you) the truth, it goes without saying, at least, at first, at the same time, on the whole, so, etc.) may also find their place in academic contexts as persuasive means with the purpose of causing some active involvement in the process of delivering and sharing the information.

In general, clichés are part of our everyday informal speech, and their usage in the academic contexts is a means of creating an individualized dimension of a well known environment to the audience; the function of clichés being to get closer to the addressee, and more easily appeal to the emotions eventually convincing the listener’s or reader’s final decision making.

**Reporting words and phrases** which very much resemble clichés, are also freely employed in academic contexts. Some resources for writing present lists of recommended reporting phrases, (cf. Swales and Feak. 1994. 186–189), where we can find such examples as: recently there has been a spate of interest in how to..., the possibility to... has generated interests in..., a central issue in... is the validity of..., it should be noted, it should be emphasized, it is worth noting that..., it can be inferred, it deserves attention, no doubt, it’s obvious that, namely, according to, as it was mentioned above, the following examples denote, according to the above examples, etc. These phrases are in the capacity of directing the attention of the audience to the desired parts of the text, demonstrating references or drawing generalizations and relating the available information with the reader or listener. On the other hand, the reader is prepared to the key moves that the text might
take, i.e. to indicate the turning points in the structure of the presentation or the written paper.

**Modification by adjectives**: adjectives appear in the academic discourse but very sparingly, and if the adjectives are classified as gradable and non-gradable (cf.: Valeika and Buitkienė 2006), gradable type appears to be used even more rarely. The most frequently referred to are the non-gradable attributes of a more neutral semantic meaning which express the qualities that can not be subjectively scaled, such as: **various, selective, current, standardized, diverse, divergent, empirical, virtual, individual, minimal, propositional, factual**, etc. What concerns gradable attributes that occur in the academic contexts they are of moderate evaluative character: **potential, interesting, dramatic, dynamic, increasing, passive, responsive, productive, prominent, experienced, abundant, important, complex, rational, extreme, similar, practical, false, straightforward, powerful** etc. Still, though the attributes are rather restricted in their semantics, their usage allows to establish a certain desired degree of relation to the objective facts under analysis, especially if the attribute has a positive or negative connotation (**dramatic, abundant, potential, complex, dominant, false, powerful**, etc.).

**Parenthetical words or phrases**: which serve as powerful persuasive means of relating the author and the audience by giving an additional explanation, by confirming the personal attitude, by providing a personal standpoint and position, and thus directing the reader’s or listener’s trail of thought: **but it would be a mistake to conclude, even then, thus, in relation to the aforesaid, insofar as it concerns..., perhaps accounted for by..., presented apart from..., these are more likely than..., although all developing receives a minimal level of..., between and within..., which suggests that..., in addition to..., respectively, additionally, according to individual preferences, still the question remains, theoretically, also, for example, as were many of the ideas challenged, as we saw in an earlier chapter, it is worth looking at this question again, actually, in this second sense, in this sense of the term, in the sense that has just been identified, technically, theoretically, as far as language is concerned, whether or not this is so, there is no doubt that, indeed, arguably, the point should be born in mind, that..., and it may very well be that..., it is no longer possible to think that..., etc.
The lexical linguistic means which are presented above are most frequently referred to as transitions which fulfil the main function of reflecting “a change in the structure of ideas” (Avants, Benhnia 2003, 44), i.e., they distinguish the major landmarks of our coherent perception of a text. In other words, they assure that information will be understood and connected, as the semantics of linking devices allows making explicit intuitive distinctions based on their meaning. Transitions function as text connectors, and the author has enough freedom to place those signals when and where he/she sees it logically necessary to direct the reader’s attention to or to guide his trail of thought. Thus, linking devices can be treated as relational linguistic means which connect words, phrases, clauses, and sentences in order to achieve completeness of thought of the sentence and utterance. Ultimately, by connecting ideas they establish a desired relation between sentences which results in coherence and logic of the whole text.

Linking devices can be classified into conjunctions, transitions and copula (or, in other words, copulative verb which is part of nominal predicate: for ex. to appear virtual, to seem dramatic, to look rather complicated, etc.). The latter also can render a desired personal attitude of the author establishing a relation and directing the audience’s opinion towards the goal to be attained. Copulative verbs and conjunctions should be classed as syntactic relational means as they serve to express the grammatical relationship between the linguistic units in the language continuum and have the functional purpose to form sentences according to the text building coherence needs. However, structural and semantic properties of conjunctions are interdependent because, being the structural part of a sentence, they create the meaning of the whole utterance.

Transitions (sometimes referred to as discourse markers or linking adverbials), on the other hand, are to be treated as lexical relational means as they are just lexical words or phrases (Rundell 2007, 119) that can make only semantic links by connecting a sentence with previous or subsequent sentences of the text. For instance a transition can be: 1) a single adverb or adverbial ‘again’, ‘yet’, ‘then’, ‘moreover’, ‘furthermore’, ‘likewise’, ‘alongside’, ‘meanwhile’, etc.; 2) a prepositional phrase ‘as a matter of fact’, ‘on the other hand’; 3) a conjunction ‘however’, ‘whereas’, etc.; 4) a clause ‘insofar as’, ‘now that’, ‘owing to this’, etc.; 5) an ordinal numeral, etc. They are not prescribed to any particular word class, and they function as sentence ele-
ments which relate not only to syntactic and semantic levels but also to the text linguistics level. According to Cutting (2002, 13), transitions are “repeated words or word phrases that thread through the text” and build up the logical cohesion. As Zamel denotes, “they have semantic weight, but not a grammatical function” (1983, 22). Semantically transitions can be classified by their functional purposes, (Cf. Tuomaite, Zindziuviene 2002, 32), i.e., those that express: antithesis and contrast; addition, demonstration and illustration; concession and attitude; order and sequence; equivalence and similarity; etc.

The choice and frequency of transitions is, however, influenced by the type of scientific text, (whether it is an educational manual, popular science article, a precise written scientific article or an oral presentation in the professional conference), as they are in the capacity to display what kind of relation the author wishes or is able to establish with his/her readers or audience by selecting the linguistic options that reflect the logical sequence of thought. No doubt that the selection of the linguistic relational means is largely predetermined by the target addressee and, of course, the individuality of the author himself, i.e. the age, level of education even the psychological motivation of the audience, and, ultimately, whether its oral or written form of presentation, and other factors. However, these issues can become the focus of some further sociolinguistic or psycholinguistic studies of the academic discourse.

The structure of the academic work may be similar or even the same as required by a standard; yet every author has their own choice not to mention the vocabulary, but also the arsenal of persuasive means which express the writer’s approach to the material under analysis and even establish the desired relationship with the reader.

Conclusions

1) Lexical relational linguistic structure should be treated as an integral part that adds in building up the academic discourse because it assists in relating the objective linguistic message with the social environment of the definite and concrete psychological situation of the speech act.

2) So far only lexical relational structure of the English academic discourse has been reviewed leaving the syntactic aspects of the
sentence structure issue for the continuing research. Analysis has shown that the English language possesses a highly complex lexical relational structure where practically all parts of speech can function as a medium of relating the scientist and the target addressee; at the same time they serve equally well for expressing the author’s attitude towards the issues in focus. Here a scientist usually does not restrict himself just with the usage of the first person pronoun, which mainly emphasizes the personal opinion, merit and contribution to the field of research and fits in well to define the tasks of the analysis. Other personal pronouns, the inclusive we and direct address you, happen to be used even more frequently.

3) Such parts of speech as the adjective, the numeral, the conjunction and especially the adverb also play a relevant role in relating the subject matter to the audience: though sparsely used gradable adjectives allow the scientist to assume and express a certain personal attitude and the evaluation of the subject under analysis and to assert his/her positive or negative connotative subjectivity and at the same time to leave space for discussion. What concerns numerals, certainly, the ordinal numerals express the order of the arrangement of facts, demonstrate the scientist’s responsibility for establishing a degree of their significance and contribute much to the organization of the text.

4) The adverb deserves a particular attention in relational structure as it mainly functions as a transition which signals not only the changes in the structure of ideas but also functions as the major landmark in the coherent perception of the text.

5) The verb, and especially the copulative link verb of the nominal predicate, can perfectly render the desired attitude of the author and direct the reader’s or listener’s opinion towards the intended goal.

6) Especially extensive linguistic option is available in the field of nominal prepositional phrases and clauses which are known as clichés, or even colloquial idioms. Being used as parenthetical words or phrases and even sentences they perform the function of the transition to a more personal and emotive way of presenting the facts by providing additional explanation, confirming the personal attitude, standpoint and position, or directing the audience’s trail
of thought. Whereas reporting words and phrases serve to persuade the audience by giving illustration, making generalization, keeping attention, and signalling the turning points in the structure of the text of the presentation. Semantically transitional phrases are capable of expressing a diversity of semantic relations that hold between the separate parts of logical proposition, such as: antithesis and contrast, addition, demonstration and illustration, concession and attitude, order and sequence, equivalence and similarity, etc. The semantics of the transitional phrases enables the explicit judgment on the author’s part, on the one hand, and the involvement of the audience, on the other hand. Eventually, due to the relational structure of the English language the mutual communication and exchange of scientific message in academic intercourse is accessible on a relatively informal basis.

7) The choice of relational linguistic options is largely predetermined by the target addressee and by the type of the scientific discourse: whether it is a popular science magazine article or a teaching manual, on the one hand, or a scientific article in the professional edition or its oral presentation.
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Liolita Bernotienė

LEKSINĖ RELIACINĖ ANGLŲ AKADEMINIO DISKURSO STRUKTŪRA

Santrauka

Grožinis ir akademinis diskursai sudaro opoziciją vienas kito atžvilgiu lingvistinių priemonių vartojimo požiūriu. Pagrindiniai pastarojo lingvis-
tiniai siekiniai yra objektyvumas, apibendrinimas ir logika. Nors stilis ir kalbos estetika nėra patys saulė akademinio diskurso tikslas ir autorių dažnai privalo paklusi griežtai apibrėžti mokslinio teksto organizavimo bei turinio reikalavimams, vis dėlto pati kalbos struktūra leidžia pasirinkti reiliacines lingvistines priemones individualiai nustatant norimą neformalų santykio su tiksline auditorija lygi ir prisiimant atsakomybę dėl požiūrio į tyrimo objektą. Būtent tokios lingvistinės priemonės, tiek leksinės, tiek ir sintaksinės – viena vertus, laipsniuojamieji būdvardžiai, prieveisnės konstrukcijos, išvardijimas, gradacija ir kt. – sudaro reiliacines akademinio diskurso struktūrą.

Šio straipsnio tikslas yra pademonstruoti leksinės reiliacines struktūros funkcionalumą anglų akademiniam diskurse ir paanalizuoti tą reiliacinių efektą, kuris pasiekiamas šiomis priemonėmis.

Analizė parodė, kad ne tik pirmojo asmens įvardžio vis dažnesnis varstomas akademinės diskurse leidžia reikšti subjektyviai nustatomą neformalų objektyvios mokslinės medžiagos ir jos tyrimo eigos bei rezultatų vertinimą, bet ir tokios kalbos dalys, kaip laipsniuojamieji būdvardžiai ir kelintiniai skaitvardžiai, atskleisdami autoriaus subjektyvų tyrimo objektų vertinimą bei jų gradaciją pagal svarbą, parodo autoriaus atsakomybę ir kartu organizuoja tekstą. Prieveiksmai ir kitos jungiamieji žodžiai ne tik žymi minties sekos kaitą, bet ir vadovauja teksto suvokimo eiga, įtraukdami tikslinę auditoriją į mąstymo procesą ir padarydami ją aktyvų mokslinio diskurso dalyviu. Netgi vardažodinio tarinio jungiamasis veiksmažodis, tiesiogiai perteikiamas asmenų požiūrį į tiriamuosius objektus ir jų individualų vertinimą, nukreipia auditorijos nuomonės formavimą kalbamuoju klausimu autoriaus norima linkme. Klišės, įterpiniai ir netgi šnekamosios kalbos idiomos, netikėtai pavartotos joms nebuodingame moksliniame registre, suteikia ekspresyvumo visam tekstui, dažnai sukuria glaudų emocinį ryšį su auditorija, fokusuoją jos dėmesį ir reguliuoją mąstymo kryptį.