View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk
brought to you by CORE
provided by Universidade de Lisboa: Repositório.UL

Universidade de Lisboa
Faculdade de Letras
Programa em Estudos Comparatistas

ENGLISH ACADEMIC DISCOURSE: ITS HEGEMONIC STATUS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR TRANSLATION

KAREN BENNETT

Doutoramento em Estudos de Cultura
Especialidade: Estudos de Tradução

Professor Orientador: Professor Doutor João Ferreira Duarte

2008

Abstract

This research has emerged directly from my work as a translator of academic discourse and represents an attempt to answer some of the questions that have arisen during the course of my professional practice. It aims, firstly, to confirm my intuition that, in Portugal, there exists an academic discourse that is clearly distinguishable from the hegemonic one, as represented by English, and to make a start on the complex task of defining its parameters, tracing its history and exploring the ideology encoded within it; secondly, to study what happens to this discourse during the process of translation; and, finally, to examine some of the ideological and cultural issues arising from the translation process.

The research is based upon a Corpus of 408 academic texts (1,333,890 words) of different genres and disciplines that were submitted to me for translation over the course of a roughly ten-year period. The Portuguese texts were analysed for the presence of particular discourse features not usually found in standard English Academic Discourse (as determined by a survey of English academic style manuals, supplemented by reference to research in the fields of descriptive and applied linguistics) and the results interpreted in the light of discipline and genre. Strong correlations were found with discipline, leading to the conclusion that in Portugal there is a thriving humanities discourse that is based upon very a different epistemological framework to that underlying EAD.

Cultural reasons were then sought for this difference in orientation using a broad interdisciplinary approach. It was concluded that the distinction can be traced back to the Early Modern period, when Catholics and Protestants deliberately cultivated different rhetorical styles and epistemologies as a marker of their respective identities, and that the dichotomy has persisted into modern times as a result of particular political and social circumstances. Today, with the influence of Anglo-Saxon empiricism and French poststructuralism, Portuguese academics have several discourses at their disposal, though not all of them are readily translatable into English.

The final section of the thesis looks at the translator's role in bridging the gap between different paradigms of knowledge. Drawing upon Evan-Zohar's Polysystems Theory and Vermeer's Skopos Theory, it examines the options available to the translator in a variety of real-life situations and discusses the extent to which translation might contribute to the development of a new epistemological climate that blurs the boundaries between different forms of knowledge.

Keywords: academic discourse, translation, epistemology, English, Portuguese, Polysystems Theory, Skopos Theory.

Resumo

Esta tese representa uma tentativa de responder a questões que surgiram directamente da minha prática profissional como tradutora no âmbito 'académico'. Visa-se, em primeiro lugar, confirmar a existência em Portugal de um discurso 'académico' com contornos bastante diferentes do discurso hegemónico inglês, assim dando início ao trabalho complexo de definir os parâmetros, traçar a história e explorar a ideologia subjacente; segundo, estudar o que acontece a esse discurso durante o processo de tradução; e finalmente, focar as questões ideológicos e culturais que surgem no processo de tradução.

A investigação baseia-se num Corpus de 408 textos das ciências exactas, sociais e humanas (1.333.890 palavras), de disciplinas e de géneros diversos, que me foram apresentados para tradução durante um período de dez anos, sensivelmente. Os textos portugueses foram analisados para determinar a presença de características discursivas não habitualmente usadas em discurso académico inglês (segundo os manuais de estilo académico inglês e a investigação feita nas áreas de linguística descritiva e aplicada), sendo os resultados interpretados à luz de questões de delimitação disciplinar e de género. Encontraram-se correlações fortes com a disciplinaridade, levando à conclusão que, de facto, existe em Portugal um discurso das humanidades assentado num enquadramento epistemológico muito diferente do que subjaz ao discurso académico inglês.

No seguimento, procuraram-se, através de uma abordagem interdisciplinar, razões culturais para explicar tal diferença em orientação. Concluiu-se que a questão se remonta aos séculos XVI-XVII, quando católicos e protestantes, no contexto da Reforma/Contra-Reforma, cultivaram estilos retóricos e epistemológicos diferentes como marcadores de identidade, perdurando a dicotomia devido a específicas circunstâncias politícas e sociais. Hoje, com a influência do empirismo anglo-saxónico e do pós-estruturalismo francês, os investigadores portugueses têm ao seu dispor uma gama de discursos diferentes, nem todos facilmente traduzíveis em inglês.

Na secção final desta tese, aborda-se a questão do papel do tradutor como mediador entre paradigmas de conhecimento. Com base na teoria do polissistemas de Evan-Zohar e na Skopostheorie de Vermeer, consideram-se as opções translatórias disponíveis numa série de situações tiradas da vida real, discutindo-se a possível contribuição da tradução para o desenvolvimento de um novo modelo epistemológico em que as fronteiras entre as formas diferentes de conhecimento se tornem cada vez mais indistintas.

Palavras-chave: discurso científico/académico, tradução, epistemologia, inglês, português, teoria dos polissistemas, Skopostheorie

Contents

Acknowledgements 8

Introductory Note 9

Part I. General Overview

Chapter 1. Surveying the Field: Aims, Methods and Problems 14

Chapter 2. Theoretical Background 29

Part II. English Academic Discourse

Chapter 3. English Academic Discourse: the Hegemonic Style 58

Chapter 4. The Structure and Ideology of English Academic Discourse 70

Chapter 5. The Historical Roots of English Academic Discourse 104

Chapter 6. Challenges to English Academic Discourse 143

Part III. Academic Discourse in Portugal

Chapter 7. The Structure and Ideology of Portuguese Academic Discourses 182

Chapter 8. The Historical Roots of Portuguese Academic Discourses 208

Part IV. Translating Portuguese Academic Discourses

Chapter 9. Translating Portuguese Academic Discourses: the Issues 252

Chapter 10. Translating Portuguese Academic Discourses: the Practice 271

Conclusion 303

Bibliography 307

Appendices: 325

Appendix A: Corpus of Portuguese Academic Texts and their Respective Translations 1-65

Appendix B: Review of English Academic Style Manuals 1-54

Appendix C: Survey of Portuguese Researchers 1-49

Appendix D: Review of Portuguese Academic Style Manuals 1-18

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank above all Professor João Ferreira Duarte, who first got me interested in Translation Studies back in 1999 when I enrolled on the Masters programme at FLUL, and who has since been a constant source of both information and support. As my supervisor, he has always been available to offer advice and constructive criticism, and, in the final desperate phase, must often have put other commitments on hold in order to ensure that I was able to get the thesis in on time.

I would also like to thank Prof. Carlos Gouveia for his helpful comments and criticisms about Chapter 4, which gave me a much more solid basis from which to proceed, and also – at a much earlier stage in the process - for guiding me towards the most relevant authors in the fields of Critical Discourse Analysis and other branches of Linguistics.

My thanks also go to Prof. Fátima Nunes from the University of Evora, who responded to my solicitations for information in her area of research by sending me a large heavy package of books and journals at her own expense. This material has enriched my argument considerably, particularly as regards the development of science in Portugal during the 18th and 19th centuries (Chapter 8).

Finally, I would like to thank all my friends and family who, for years, have had to put up with me going on and on about translation and knowledge and paradigms, as I tried to work out my ideas by picking arguments with all and sundry. Hopefully now they will all get a bit of peace.

Introductory Note

This thesis has developed directly out of my professional activity as a teacher and translator of academic discourse in Portugal, activities which I have now been engaged in for some 15 to 20 years. It was in the EAP classroom and at the computer that the questions first began to form in my mind about the kind of prose that I was being presented with in Portugal and its relationship to the discourse that I was used to reading and writing in English. And it was in those contexts that I first started trying to work out solutions for dealing with some of the technical problems raised by the intercultural transfer of knowledge.

The kind of Portuguese prose that most perturbed me back then was radically different in all respects to the discourse that I had been brought up to expect in the academic context. There were sentences that stretched like pythons, heavy and languid, across whole pages, so intricately coiled that it was difficult to distinguish the point that was being made. There was massive redundancy and repetition, and strange inversions and deferrals of information. And the diction often seemed like something from the 18th century, pompous and antiquated, and peppered at intervals with obscure Greek and Latin terms. Yet this kind of writing was clearly highly valued within the culture, produced systematically at all levels of the university system in humanities areas and published in journals. Hence, there was clearly an ideological and epistemological dimension to the issue that could not be easily divorced from the merely technical one. That is to say, as well as wondering how I could best reformulate a particular sentence to make it acceptable to an Anglophone readership, I also found myself wondering whether in fact I *should*.

For several years I grappled alone with the problems of trying to render Portuguese scholarly prose into English. There were no books available on the subject, nothing that could guide me as to the best strategy for dealing with the situation. However, the more I thought about the issue, the more I became convinced that perhaps the English way of encoding knowledge was not necessarily the *only* way, that perhaps there existed other knowledges that we did not even know about because they never got translated. And from there, I started to wonder about the nature of knowledge itself, and its relationship to the discourse we use for communicating it, whether we can actually ever really *know* anything in the end or if it is not all just a language game where the referee is the culture that happens to hold all the trumps.

Thus I became embroiled in the quest that ultimately led to the production of this thesis. The more I investigated the matter, the more complex it seemed; and I soon learned that the apparently easy answers were not necessarily the right ones. I also learned that there was politics involved, and that one had to be very canny to get a translation past the various ‘gatekeepers' that decide what may or may not count as legitimate knowledge.

Some years later, after a great deal of reading and writing and discussion, I now feel I have a better grasp of the issues involved and that I can use this to inform my professional activity both as a translator and as a teacher. But I also feel that the subject is something of a Pandora’s Box, which, if wrenched open, could cause all manner of disruption. It calls into question not only the way knowledge is construed but also the very nature of knowledge itself, and with it, the legitimacy of a whole series of social institutions from the universities to industry and capitalism.

Hence, I have tried as much as possible to restrict the scope of this dissertation to the tangible problem of translating Portuguese academic texts into English. My explorations sometimes threatened to overspill the boundaries as the extent of the ramifications became apparent. But I have tried hard to ‘keep my eye on the ball’. The result is a study that takes in the structure and history of different English and Portuguese academic discourses en route towards its final goal of developing a coherent strategy for translating such texts in real life.

Thus, this dissertation represents an interface between the world of academic research and the world of professional translation. My Corpus is made up of texts that were submitted to me for translation over the years, together with their respective English versions; and the discussion that occupies Part IV is concerned above all with how to deal with such texts in the real-life marketplace.

Consequently, my research may ultimately contribute to lightening the load a little for other translators that face similar dilemmas, and for EAP teachers struggling to help their students overcome certain learning problems caused by first language interference. Even if that does not happen, at least I have the personal satisfaction of feeling that I now understand much better an issue that has been worrying me for almost two decades.

PART I

General Overview

Chapter 1

Surveying the Field: Aims, Methods and Problems

Back in the early '90s, when I first embarked on my career as a translator, the training available for professionals in the field was still at a very primitive stage, at least in the UK. It was narrowly prescriptive, based almost entirely upon abstract linguistic premises, and took very little account of *pragmatic* or *cultural* issues related to the real-life context of production, or to the problems raised by particular *genres* and *discourses*. Consequently, the most important aspects of our practice tended to be learned 'on the job' through trial and error, with translators forced to grapple alone with the thorny issues raised by particular cultural encounters.

Academic translation, in particular, was scarcely mentioned in the textbooks. Although academic discourse was already attracting a great deal of attention as a research topic in its own right, these studies were largely confined to the monolingual Anglophone framework, and very little was written about cross-cultural problems (surprisingly perhaps, considering the vast market for academic translation that was rapidly developing as a result of the growing hegemony of English). Even today, most cross-cultural approaches to academic discourse (such as Contrastive Rhetoric, discussed in Chapter 2) tend to start from the assumption that the source text author is working within the dominant paradigm, and consequently are concerned predominantly with minor linguistic differences rather than with far-reaching discrepancies in orientation.

In fact, nowhere have I come across any linguistic study which so much as acknowledges the possibility that another academic paradigm might exist. Yet my own experience as a translator of Portuguese, and to a lesser extent, French and

Spanish academic texts has consistently suggested that the Catholic countries of southern Europe do in fact partake of an academic tradition that is markedly different in its aims and procedures to the Anglophone tradition, and which manifests itself, amongst other things, in the kind of discourse that is produced. If this can be shown to be true, it raises immense problems of both a practical and ideological nature for the translator.

This dissertation is therefore an attempt to try to answer some of the questions that have arisen during the course of my professional practice. The aims are threefold:

i) to confirm my intuition that, in Portugal, there exists an academic discourse that is clearly distinguishable from the hegemonic one, as represented by English, and to make a start on the complex task of defining its parameters, tracing its history and exploring the ideology encoded within it;

ii) to study what happens to this discourse during the process of translation;

iii) to examine some of the ideological and cultural issues arising from the translation process.

In order to avoid the kind of stereotypical thinking that inevitably results from subjective impression, I have tried to be as systematic as possible and to draw all conclusions from the empirical observation of tangible data. That data consists primarily of a Corpus (***Appendix A***) of Portuguese academic texts with their respective English translations, supplemented by a bibliographic review of academic style manuals in English (***Appendix B***), a survey of Portuguese researchers' textual practices and their subjective impressions of the discourse used within their disciplinary areas (***Appendix C***) and a review of Portuguese academic writing manuals (***Appendix D***).

Although this project falls primarily into the field of Translation Studies (TS), it also draws upon published research from a number of related areas. These include: Descriptive, Historical and Applied Linguistics; Rhetoric; Contrastive Rhetoric; History and Sociology of Science, and Epistemology. As for the textual analyses performed in Parts 3 and 4, these have been influenced by precepts from Critical Discourse Theory, though I deliberately avoid the highly technical terminology and specific methods particular to Critical Discourse Analysis, preferring instead to employ the more accessible language employed in Literary Studies.

I also rely heavily on the notion of the *paradigm,* first introduced by Kuhn in 1962 within the context of the history of science, but which has since become a commonplace in culturalist approaches to all fields of study. Indeed, the main thrust of my argument is that much Portuguese academic writing is produced within an entirely different paradigm of knowledge to the hegemonic English discourse, and indeed rests upon a wholly different theory of language. To support this claim, I explore the historical origins of both discourses, identifying the roots of English academic discourse in the great paradigm shift of the 17th century that has come to be known as the 'Scientific Revolution' (see Chapter 5), which, for social, political and cultural reasons, did not occur in the profoundly Catholic countries of southern Europe (Chapter 8). The two paradigms are then confronted in the final part of this thesis, Part 4, when I discuss the problems raised by translation.

* * *

From the outset, a number of obstacles were encountered, which at one point looked like they might capsize the whole project. Some of these have since been overcome, while others remain as lingering weaknesses, liable to be pounced upon by an uncharitable critic. Grappling with them has, however, forced me to acknowledge aspects of the subject that might otherwise have gone unnoticed, and the work has been immeasurably enriched as a result.

The main problems are as follows:

1. The *Terra Incognita* of Portuguese Academic Discourse

With regard to the first of the stated aims, the first obstacle that loomed was the fact that, unlike English Academic Discourse, which has been intensely explored from a variety of different angles, Portuguese academic discourse is an entirely uncharted terrain. Not only has it not been studied by linguists, it is not systematically taught in schools and universities, and academic production in the humanities, though plentiful, is not usually refereed. This makes it difficult to identify any norm or standard that could be used to gauge quality.

In the absence of any background research or yardstick, the only course available to me seemed to be to attempt to undertake a descriptive study of the discourse that is actually being produced by Portuguese academics, and to investigate the historical roots and ideological implications myself. As my ultimate focus is the process of cultural transfer, I decided to base my conclusions upon the many texts that had been presented to me over the years for translation into English. This had the practical advantage of allowing me to pursue all three of my aims using the same body of texts.

The main drawback, however, is that my Corpus is clearly limited in its representativity. While I have managed to gather together a range of texts from a number of different disciplinary areas and academic genres, the client-based nature of the Corpus means that there are clusters of very similar texts in some fields (reflecting the production of a single author, research unit or journal), while other areas are scantily represented. This naturally undermines my conclusions, and restricts any generalizations that can be drawn.

Clearly, what is required is a systematic Corpus Linguistic study of different kinds of Portuguese academic text (the research article, dissertation, conference paper, abstract, etc) across different disciplines, similar to the kind of work that is amply available for English. Historical studies are also required in order to further our knowledge of its development over time and relationship with national/Iberian/Catholic culture generally. Hence, the present work should be perceived as a preliminary reconnaissance of a vast *terra incognita*, which needs to be explored more systematically by specialists.

2. Acquiring Translational Data

As regards the second aim, it had initially been my intention to undertake a descriptive study of *published* translational phenomena, following the guidelines laid down by Gideon Toury (1982) in his seminal article ‘A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies’. However, it soon became clear that this was not going to be possible. For one, published academic articles are almost never identified as translations (although, given the amount of translational activity that takes place in this field, a great many of them must be). Portuguese researchers, for their part, were also generally unwilling to make available various versions of their texts; while translators were equally reluctant for reasons of customer confidentiality. Consequently, this line of inquiry had to be abandoned at an early stage[1].

One of the ways in which I tried to glean information about translational practices amongst Portuguese academics was via a questionnaire sent by e-mail in 2002 and 2008 to all members of research centres in the humanities and social sciences listed on the website of the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (see ***Appendix C***). This yielded some interesting data about the habits and attitudes of Portuguese researchers. However, the inevitably small size of the sample has meant that the results would certainly be considered statistically insignificant by sociologists, which has led to the survey being allocated a subordinate role in the work as a whole.

In the end, I decided to base my research upon the large Corpus of translations that I myself had done over the years, and which cover a wide range of academic disciplines and genres. While this considerably facilitated research, it also raised the serious question of objectivity. That is to say, as the translations were all unpublished at the time of inclusion into the Corpus, and had therefore not passed the scrutiny of an editorial board or refereeing system, it could be argued that their *acceptability* in the target culture (see Toury, 1982:28-9) remains unestablished. This might be seen to weaken or even invalidate any conclusions drawn concerning changes introduced.

Fortunately for me, however, English academic discourse is highly norm-bound, as is illustrated by the remarkable uniformity of the advice given in the many style manuals on the market to teach it (see ***Appendix B***). Given this wealth of prescriptive material, not to mention the abundance of text models available on line and elsewhere, a translator is left in little doubt as to the norms operating in any concrete situation. Hence, while the cultural gatekeepers may not have pronounced upon these particular translated texts, I feel quite confident that those that are intended to become target system phenomena (i.e. to be published in English-language journals or be otherwise accepted by the international community) are up to standard and would not be rejected for linguistic reasons.

---

[1] It might be possible to undertake a descriptive study with a very restricted field, using samples from a Portuguese or Brazilian journal that produces English translations of its abstracts and/or articles in order to reach a wider public (as in Johns, 1991, discussed in Chapters 7 and 10). However, in these cases, the translations have often been produced by non-native translators and may not come up to the standards demanded by prestigious international English-language journals. They therefore do not offer much information about the different *norms* operating in the respective domain.

Indeed, when authors are hoping to publish abroad, it is my policy to warn them of potential problems and to request permission to implement all the changes necessary to ensure target system acceptability. In cases where this licence has been denied, or whenever I have thought it unlikely that such a standard could be achieved, I have sometimes refused to undertake the translation in order to protect my professional reputation and integrity.

Increasingly, though, Portuguese authors are aware of target system norms and modify their writing style accordingly (***Appendix C***: 19-22). Those that do not may have other purposes in mind for their texts. For example, many Portuguese journals and academic publications are now bilingual in an attempt to reach a wider public; and, given the different balance of power in the local system (not to mention ideological issues connected with national affirmation), they are often more interested in source-culture-oriented translations than in heavily domesticated versions. This too has implications for our conclusions, and is discussed in more detail in Chapter 10.

3. The Risk of Binarism

In contrasting texts and cultures in this way, there is an inevitable risk of falling into a simplistic binarism that may mask the true complexity of the field of study. In fact, Translation Studies itself is rife with binary concepts (eg. Original/Translation; Author/Translator; Source Culture/Target Culture, etc), which offer a somewhat misleading framework for a work such as this.

In practice, however, the inductive nature of the study has itself proved to be a safeguard against such pitfalls. The process of analysing the texts included in the Corpus has revealed many of the above dichotomies to be false: the boundary between translation and revision is not clearcut, for example, as heteroglossia is common in many so-called 'original' or 'source' texts; while the roles of author and translator are often blurred by collaborations that extend beyond the formal boundaries of source and target text. The survey of Portuguese researchers has also demonstrated that the multiple rewritings and revisions that frequently occur before the text achieves its final form may involve the intervention of a whole series of individuals, ranging from colleagues and supervisors to editors and proof-readers[2].

As regards the cultural relations underlying text production, Polysystems Theory (described in Chapter 2) has proved to be an essential tool. With its emphasis upon centres and peripheries, it enables us to transcend the somewhat simplistic concepts of Source Culture and Target Culture to perceive the inconsistencies that run through each of them, and also the ever-shifting nature of the relations between them. Hence, we find that it is not possible to speak of Portuguese and English academic traditions as monolithic entities; rather, they are heterogeneous phenomena with their own centres and peripheries, engaged in a constant dance with each other and with the rest of the world. Hopefully, some of the complexities of this situation will become clear during the analyses performed in Parts 3 and 4.

---

[2] This is supported by research into academic writing by multilingual scholars undertaken by Curry & Lillis, 2004, and Lillis & Curry, 2006a, 2006b.

4. Interdisciplinarity

Translation Studies is itself an interdisciplinary terrain, which has long drawn upon many different areas of study (see, for example, Snell-Hornby, 1998; Snell-Hornby et al, 1992; Duarte et al, 2006). Although this has generally been viewed as productive by most practitioners in the field, who argue that the various perspectives on offer are mutually enriching and complementary, concerns have been voiced in recent years about the discipline's lack of internal coherence and identity, the risk of ‘balkanization’, or of a descent into amorphousness through the incorporation of too many incompatible approaches (see Chapter 2 for a fuller discussion of these issues).

These criticisms become all the more pertinent when applied to an individual work, since a certain degree of integrity is clearly necessary to ensure credibility. This project, which took shape around a series of questions generated by my own practice as a translator, deliberately employs a multifaceted strategy; I have, in different sections of the thesis, mobilised techniques and *topoi* from areas as diverse as linguistics, sociology, history and philosophy. The risk, however, is of lack of coherence, and that the different disciplinary narratives may enter into conflict with each other, provoking undesirable clashes. In a worse-case scenario, the conclusions reached may even be annulled by internal inconsistencies resulting from such polyvalence.

A second drawback of this multifarious approach is that research conducted in this way can never be quite rigorous enough for the specialists of any given discipline. Each of the areas mentioned above has its own terminology, goals and methods, which in many cases involve minute distinctions and complex procedures deriving from the discipline’s own internal development. Disciplinary eclecticism, therefore, runs the risk of deteriorating into dilettantism, of being a 'jack of all trades' which ultimately has very little to say to serious practitioners in any field.

To my mind, however, it would have been difficult to have dealt with this particular topic in any other way. The discourses in question are so firmly embedded in their respective cultures with their own history, value systems and traditions, that only an interdisciplinary approach can adequately take account of the complexity of the phenomena. Furthermore, the reliability of a particular conclusion may in fact be reinforced by the fact of having arrived there from a number of different starting points. For one, the blind spots and weaknesses of any one approach may be offset by the strengths of others; second, a certain ingenuousness as regards the taken-for-granted assumptions of any given discipline may actually be a functional advantage for this type of study. In fact, Gideon Toury (2006:5-6) has recently urged the adoption of ‘a measure of assumed naivety’ in translation research:

> There is no real point in conducting research into translation to begin with, whether observational or experimental, unless it stems from a genuine "wish to understand", whereby all previously- "known" facts are reformulated as questions to be answered during research and on the basis of the available data. .

As regards the question of internal consistency, the various perspectives that I have drawn upon in this work (i.e. critical discourse theory, contrastive rhetoric, history and sociology of science, theory of knowledge) do in fact have something very fundamental in common, namely a *constructivist* approach to the question of knowledge. All of them have contributed in one way or another to the sea-change that has taken place in the last half-century or so with regards to the pretensions of Western science, undermining its claims to truth and universality, and presenting it as a contingent phenomenon that ultimately serves the interests of a particular social group (this issue will be discussed further in Chapter 2). Hence, though these approaches may use very different methods and terminology, they are clearly complementary, and ultimately converge at a very similar point.

As regards the second problem, that of a potential lack of rigour, this is unfortunately unavoidable in any interdisciplinary approach owing to the problems raised by *technicality*. In High or Late Modernity, academic disciplines have largely become 'expert systems' that are, to all extents and purposes, 'esoteric' (Giddens, 1991: 30); for example, the jargon employed by critical discourse analysts is unlikely to be intelligible to historians and philosophers, while the statistical analyses favoured by many sociologists are often too mathematically complex for scholars raised in the humanities. Hence, in order to create a comprehensive argument that does not exclude non-specialists, it has been necessary to employ a mostly non-technical language that will be accessible to all, even if this means 'bastardizing' concepts and methods precious to any one area.

Thus, it is indeed possible that sociologists may find the questionnaires and statistical analyses employed in the Appendices mathematically unreliable when judged against the rigorous standards of their own discipline, just as linguists may consider my textual analyses wanting for similar reasons. However, in response, I can merely assert once more that this work should be taken as a preliminary reconnaissance of what is largely a virgin terrain. Ultimately, it will be up to those specialists to take the issue further and compensate for any lacunae by conducting more profound and specialised studies of their own.

5. *Tu Quoque*

Possibly the single most devastating, and deserving, critique that could be levelled at this work is the accusation of reflexivity, or *tu quoque.* This has been defined by Ashmore (*cit.* Potter, 1996:228) as follows:

> This position (theory, argument) is incoherent (illegitimate, mistaken) because when reflexively applied to itself the result is an absurdity: self-contradiction (-refutation, -destruction, -defeat, -undermining).

Obviously a work like this, which systematically deconstructs English Academic Discourse from historical, sociological and linguistic points of view and yet makes use of that same discourse to assert its claims, lays itself open to such a charge.

In fact, much of Part II of this dissertation follows poststructuralist critiques in viewing academic discourse not as a transparent vehicle of objective fact, but as a socially-constructed and temporally-contingent tool that was created to serve the needs of a particular community. Indeed, the general thrust of my argument involves a deconstruction of the truth pretensions of this discourse, and an appeal for an opening-up to other ways of configuring knowledge. It could be argued, then, that in using that very discourse myself, I am effectively invalidating my own argument.

A number of abstract philosophical refutations of the *tu quoque* have been put forward by different thinkers (see Potter 1996: 228-230 for a summary). However, to my mind, the most effective way of countering it here would have been to have built some alternative discourse into my own text, thereby offering a concrete illustration of my claim that there exist multiple ways of configuring knowledge. This in fact is what I attempted to do in my article 'Epistemicide! The Tale of a Predatory Discourse' (Bennett, 2007b), which alternated a conventional academic presentation of this very issue with a narrative rendering of the same in the style of a folk tale or fairy story.

Unfortunately, however, given the nature of the power relations implicit in this particular academic encounter, that is not a possibility here. At doctorate level, one is being tested on one's ability to reproduce academic conventions as much as upon one's originality, and any departure from the norm is likely to be viewed as a defect rather than as a mark of sophistication. Indeed, one has to have the status of a Derrida or a Foucault before one can realistically hope to subvert established norms and get away with it.

Ultimately, then, my decision to present this thesis in utterly conventional English academic prose confirms rather than undermines my argument. For, as I point out several times during the course of this work, what allows this discourse to retain its hegemonic position in the world of academic production is not its capacity to reflect reality faithfully and neutrally, but rather, a network of power relations that determines who has the authority to make pronouncements about the world and who has not.

* * *

It is not only the discourse of this dissertation that is conventional, the structure of it is too. In organizing the work, I have closely followed the precepts laid down in all the academic style manuals (see Chapter 4) by ensuring that the text as a whole, and the sections within it, have an Introduction, Development and Conclusion, and that they proceed from the general to the specific and back out again. Hence, Part I provides a general overview of the subject, with an introduction to my aims, methods and assumptions (Chapter 1) and a description of the theoretical positions that have informed my investigative attitude (Chapter 2). Part II is dedicated to English Academic Discourse, which is approached from a structural, ideological and historical point of view. Chapter 3 argues (against the position taken by many descriptive linguists) that there exists a hegemonic academic discourse in English that is so ubiquitous and taken for granted that most people in the English-speaking world do not even know it is there. This discourse is described in Chapter 4, drawing upon both the prescriptive tradition (i.e. the many style manuals existing on the market for undergraduates and foreign students) and the descriptive (the vast body of linguistic research that exists into various aspects of it), with discussion of the underlying ideological implications. Chapter 5 then explores the historical roots of this discourse, based upon work carried out by linguists and historians of science; while Chapter 6 closes the section with a discussion of the extent of the hegemony and some of the alternatives that have arisen to challenge it within the Anglo-Saxon world.

In Part III, the attention is turned to academic discourse in Portugal. Chapter 7 launches directly into a discussion of the structure and ideological implications of the various academic discourses available, while Chapter 8 investigates the historical roots of this situation. The differences between the two cultural contexts are made evident in the section titles ('English Academic Discourse' versus 'Academic Discourse in Portugal'). For while the former has a clearly defined identity that has been extensively studied from many different aspects and is the object of teaching programmes all over the world, there is a dearth of information about the situation in Portugal, from both the descriptive and prescriptive points of view. Hence, the claims made in Chapter 7 are drawn entirely upon my own observations of the Portuguese texts in my Corpus (***Appendix A***), on the basis of which I have proceeded to a categorisation into three basic types of Portuguese academic discourse. These are: a) a 'modern' style (which is essentially calqued from English); b) a 'traditional' style (an elaborate opaque style characterised by heavy subordination and high-flown diction) and c) a ‘postmodern’ style (marked by deliberate ambiguity and word-play, non-standard syntax, and a high level of abstraction). Reference is also made to hybrid styles that contain characteristics from more than one type.

Part IV turns to the question of translation, using as a starting point some of the issues that I encountered during my real-life professional practice with regards to texts included in the Corpus. Chapter 9 looks at those issues in the abstract, relating them to prominent theories in the field of Translation Studies (particularly Evan-Zohar's Polysystems Theory and Vermeer's Skopos Theory), while Chapter 10 discusses particular linguistic problems and case-studies in context. The section closes with a brief reflection upon the potential offered by translation for overcoming the epistemological divide that continues to afflict the world of academic production.

It is hoped, therefore, that this dissertation will provide some kind of an introductory study into a potentially rich area for research but one which has been effectively neglected up till now, namely the hegemony of English Academic Discourse as a vehicle for knowledge, and the ideological and practical implications of this hegemony for translation.

Chapter 2

Theoretical Background

Although this dissertation draws upon many different areas of knowledge, as mentioned in the previous chapter, its main theoretical framework is provided by Translation Studies (TS), a subject which really began to take on the contours of a discipline in the late 1970s and '80s. Foundational papers by scholars such as James Holmes (1972), Gideon Toury (1982) and José Lambert (1985) plotted the coordinates of the new subject, and emphasised the need for TS to be approached as an empirical science, with descriptive research into translations as target culture phenomena, and theoretical explorations of the 'general principles by means of which these phenomena can be explained and predicted' (Holmes, 1994:71). This new focus effectively overturned the privileged role that had been held for centuries by 'original' texts in literary systems and recognised the role played by translations in cultural history, making them worthy of study in their own right.

This so-called 'cultural turn' arose as a reaction against linguistics-based notions of translation, which had seen the process as being no more than the transfer of stable units of text within an essentialist framework. The new paradigm, strongly influenced by Polysystem Theory (discussed below), focused not upon the translation's fidelity or otherwise to some hallowed source text, but rather upon the social-economic-cultural context of reception. It emphasised the *norms* and *constraints* operating upon a translator within a particular target culture (eg. Toury, 1978; Lefevere, 1985, 1992), and offered a *diachronic perspective* of the way in which values and approaches change through time (Bassnett, 1980, 1993; Venuti, 1995). This inevitably contributed to the relativization of canonical texts and text-types, and opened up the field for an exploration of non-literary genres, such as the 'technical' texts that concern me here.

Another consequence of this paradigm shift was a new emphasis upon *ideology* in translation. That is to say, if texts are no longer perceived in absolute terms as containers of information that can be transmitted wholesale from one culture to another, but rather as amorphous shape-shifters that inevitably take on a new form in a new setting, then clearly all kinds of ideologies will manifest themselves, overtly or covertly, in the translation. Indeed, a great deal of descriptive work in TS has been done in charting the ideological changes that take place when authors from one culture are appropriated by another - the role played by Shakespeare and other canonical authors in Communist regimes, for example; or the contributions made by translated texts in developing the national literatures of newly independent countries. In these cases, the translations are perceived as playing into the dominant myths of the host culture, a complicity that is laid bare by the analytical efforts of these translation scholars.

The 'ideological turn' (Leung, 2006) has also led to calls from some quarters (notably Venuti, 1995; Baker, 2006, 2007; Spivak, 2000) for more active intervention in texts on the part of translators, with a view to bringing about some concrete political outcome in the real world. Unlike Toury (1978) and Lefevere (1985, 1992), who insist that the translator is inescapably constrained by the norms of the target culture and has relatively little leeway with regards to the choices s/he makes, these authors argue that, on the contrary, translators enjoy a high degree of empowerment, and that their intervention in the text may contribute significantly to overcoming social power imbalances currently held in place by a web of misplaced belief. Hence, we have Lawrence Venuti (1995: 305-313) calling for a 'foreignizing' style of translation in order to avoid the ‘ethnocentric violence’ systematically perpetrated upon texts by conventional domesticating approaches; Mona Baker (2006:105-140; 2007) urging translators in conflict situations to systematically 'frame' their translations in order to avoid naturalising or subscribing to unacceptable ideological positions; not to mention radical translations of canonical or sacred texts that deliberately privilege a particular non-hegemonic viewpoint (such as feminist and black translations of the Bible, or homosexual versions of the classics).

A more pragmatic approach to the translator's role is offered by Hans Vermeer's Skopos Theory (1997, 2000), which takes account of the fact that most translations perform concrete actions in the real world and therefore have a definable purpose or goal ('skopos’); to him, it is this, rather, than abstract ideological issues, that will normally determine translators’ choices. In his use of terms such as ‘supplier', ‘purchaser’, 'commission’, etc (1997: 3, 6-7), he acknowledges the fact that the professional translator is subject to market forces, an important point which is often overlooked by 'ivory-tower’ theorists or ‘armchair’ translators. Indeed, I myself developed this theme further in my article ‘What has Translation Theory got to learn from Contemporary Practice?’, in which I argue that translation is above all a ‘*market-driven* activity, in which translators are neither *slaves* nor *prophets*, but rather elements in a supply chain and subject to the same kinds of market forces as operate upon all other goods and services’ (Bennett, 2004: 30). These issues, which are important to the overall conception of this dissertation, will be discussed further in Part IV, with regards to academic texts in particular.

Another important aspect introduced by Vermeer is his implicit focus upon ‘public’ texts (i.e. technical, legal, scientific or commercial documents), since it is these, rather than private poetic or expressive works that are most susceptible to ‘skopos’ analysis, as he himself effectively admits (2000:224-228). This is an important adjustment, as translation theory has, for most of its existence, been overwhelmingly concerned with the literary (no doubt reflecting the backgrounds of the theorists concerned). Yet, in the real world, literary translation probably accounts for a very small proportion of the actual translation activity that goes on every day. There are very few professional translators who make their living from literary translation; instead, most are occupied with technical, scientific, legal or commercial texts (i.e. impersonal discourses, for which issues such as author status and ideology are largely irrelevant) and despite all the theorizing that has taken place in TS in recent decades, there is still relatively little to orient professionals working in these technical areas.

Ironically, it is once more linguistics that has provided us with what has proved to be the most important tool for the translation of non-literary texts, namely the concept of *discourse*. Viewed as a form of social practice, a discourse has its own rules and conventions, and its own internal gatekeepers to ensure that these are met; and proficiency in a particular discourse will often be a prerequisite for acceptance into a given professional (or other) community. Hence, translators operating within any specialist area will need, above all, to have mastered the specific features of that discourse in the target language (and this will include not only technical terminology, but also recurrent syntactical structures and typical features relating to text organisation, genre and register). Inappropriate choices may result in a loss of credibility for the text's author, failure to achieve the hoped-for purpose ('skopos'), and, ultimately, the discrediting of the translator as a competent professional or linguistic ‘expert’ (Vermeer, 2000:222; Schäffner, 2002; Trosborg, 2002; Hatim & Mason, 1990, 1997).

Thus it would seem appropriate to begin my overview of the various theoretical perspectives that have influenced this work with a discussion of Critical Discourse Theory, since it is this that has proved most central to the aims pursued. This will be followed by a brief review of Evan-Zohar’s Polysystem Theory, which (to my mind) offers the most adequate explanation for how textual habits are transferred between cultural systems. Within the specific field of Academic Discourse (which will be explored in more detail in Chapters 3 and 4), I examine the contributions made by Descriptive, Historical and Applied Linguistics, Rhetoric, and Contrastive Rhetoric (an area that developed precisely to try to account for some of the textual differences noted by teachers of EAP). The broader historical framework will then be discussed with a look at work done in the area of History and Sociology of Science, which have provided important contributions to my Chapters 5 and 9. Finally, inevitably, I move into the philosophical sphere with a brief discussion of some of the more pertinent aspects raised in the context of Philosophy of Science and Philosophy of Language.

Critical Discourse Theory

The notion that discourses might encode ideology in their very structure lies behind the approach to texts known as Critical Discourse Theory[1], developed in the UK and elsewhere by authors such as Fairclough, Kress, Hodge, Wodak etc in the wake of work done by the French poststructuralists. According to this, discourse is perceived as a form of social practice, necessarily embedded in the value system of the culture that gave rise to it. Consequently, language is never innocent. The syntax and lexis of the simplest sentence will reveal value choices that relate it synchronically and diachronically to other texts, thus constructing a complex web of interconnections, which, when institutionalized, may form a coherent 'discursive formation' (Foucault: 2002b:41) with its own ideology, history and agenda.

---

[1] A brief mention should also be made of the alternative and overlapping concept of Narrativity, which has also been used to deconstruct different kinds of verbal action, including the political and scientific (see for example Nash, 1990; Toolan, 1998, and more recently, Baker, 2006). In many respects, their concept of ‘narrative' overlaps with ‘discourse’, especially in its concern with ‘the normalizing effect of publicly disseminated representations' (Baker, 2006:3), and indeed, I have in places made reference to some of its important tropes such as the 'grand narrative of progress'. However, to my mind, its applicability for my purposes is limited, first because of its emphasis upon *sequentiality* (*Idem*. 19, 51-55), which has little relevance in this context, and second, with its claims of that we (translators, scholars) are *irremediably embedded*, or trapped inside our own cultural and private narratives (*Idem*,

> Discourses are systematically organised sets of statements which give expression to the meanings and values of an institution. Beyond this, they define, describe and delimit what it is possible to say and not possible to say (and by extension – what it is possible to do or not to do) with respect to the area of concern of that institution, whether marginally or centrally. A discourse provides a set of possible statements about a given area, and organises and gives structure to the manner in which a particular topic, object, process is to be talked about. In that it provides descriptions, rules, permissions and prohibitions of social and individual actions.
> (Kress, 1985:7).

This is clearly very pertinent for technical translators, who frequently have to operate within tightly defined areas, and need to be fully aware of the conventions governing the way in which the material may legitimately be presented in the target culture. Indeed, one of the major problems that I have encountered in the translation of certain kinds of academic text in Portugal is the fact that, in the humanities, disciplinary discourses are not so clearly demarcated as they are in English. This sets up all sorts

---

128, 141) and are, by extension, unable to acquire new forms of discourse or take an objective stance upon our verbal/cultural inheritance. Such an extreme posture is clearly negated by the fact that translators who are not doctors, lawyers or businessmen translate medical, legal and commercial texts every day, acquiring these verbal habits with the ease of a professional actor. Public discourses, therefore, are eminently learnable, as Critical Discourse Theory clearly admits.

of tensions of both a practical and ideological nature that are not easy to resolve, as I discuss in Part IV of this dissertation.

Another important aspect about discourses is that they are totalitarian in mission (‘discourses tend towards exhaustiveness and inclusiveness’, *Idem*) and imperialistic in reach, constantly aiming to explain and control as much area as possible:

> A metaphor which I use to explain the effects of discourse to myself is that of a military power whose response to border skirmishes is to occupy the adjacent territory. As problems continue, more territory is occupied, then settled and colonised. A discourse colonises the social world imperialistically, from the point of view of one institution. (*Idem*)

This aspect will be amply illustrated in my first historical chapter (Chapter 5), in which I show how a discourse that developed in 17th century England to serve as the vehicle for the new science gradually expanded its reach until it not only took over all academic production in English, including in the social sciences, humanities and arts, but eventually became what Halliday (1993b:84) calls ‘the discourse of modernity’, used whenever factuality is asserted and authority claimed. In Part IV, I also consider the question of whether professional translators (i.e. those working under market conditions) are not, by definition, agents in this imperialistic process, guards of the front line whose job it is to deal with those 'border skirmishes' that Kress so eloquently describes.

Finally, it is important to point out that discourses do not exist in isolation, but

> …within a large system of sometimes opposing, contradictory, contending, or merely different discourses. Given that each discourse tends towards the colonisation of larger areas, there are dynamic relations between these which ensure continuous shifts and movement, progression or withdrawal in certain areas. (*Idem.*)

This dynamic process, explored in detail in Fairclough's 1992 work, *Discourse and Social Change,* naturally intersects very well with Evan-Zohar's concept of the Polysystem, as shown below.

Critical Discourse Theory has given rise to an approach to textual analysis called Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) or Critical Language Study (CLS)[2], now commonly used across all areas of the social sciences and humanities (see Fairclough, 2003; Wodak & Meyer, 2001). In its terminology and methods, it draws heavily upon Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics (1994), and can thus be quite dense and technical. In my own analyses, though I have adopted the spirit and underlying assumptions of CDA, I have attempted to reduce technicality to a minimum, partly for identity reasons, though mainly to ensure that readers from literary studies or other branches of the humanities will not be excluded. Hence, I have used familiar rather than technical terms when analysing textual relations (eg. 'coordination/subordination' instead of 'parataxis/hypotaxis'; traditional names for verb tenses, etc), and when I have found it necessary to employ less accessible terms, I have tried to define them clearly first.

Thus, the conclusions that I have drawn about the ideological assumptions underlying Portuguese academic discourse(s) result from a procedure of close textual analysis of the various academic texts in my corpus. The relationships between these and the hegemonic discourse, represented by English, is explained with reference to Polysystem Theory, described below.

---

[2] There are, strictly speaking, several kinds of discourse analysis, as both Fairclough (2003:2) and Wodak (2001:8-13) point out. In this work, I follow Fairclough in '"oscillating" between a focus on specific texts and a focus on /…/ the "order of discourse", the relatively durable social structuring of language which is itself one element of the relatively durable structurong and networking of social practices' (2003:3)

Polysystem Theory

As Evan-Zohar (1990:9) himself points out at the beginning of his 1990 article on Polysystem Theory, the idea that semiotic phenomena (such as culture, language, literature, society) could be more adequately understood if regarded as *systems* rather than as conglomerates of disparate elements has become 'one of the leading ideas of our time', resulting in an emphasis upon the *relations* between elements, as opposed to mere registration and classification[3]. Evan-Zohar's own innovation was to recognise that literary/social/cultural systems are not closed static entities, but are instead dynamic and heterogeneous, engaged in constant struggle with other neighbouring systems. Hence, elements which at one moment in time might enjoy a *canonical status* at the *centre* of a given system, owing to the backing that they receive from a dominant social group, may at another moment come under *pressure* from the *periphery*[4], and be ousted from their privileged position, possibly leading in the more dramatic cases to a full-scale *paradigm shift*[5].

> These systems are not equal, but hierarchised within the polysystem. It is the permanent struggle between the various strata /…/ which constitutes the (dynamic) synchronic state of the system. It is the victory of one stratum over another which constitutes the change on the diachronic axis. In this centrifugal vs. centripetal motion, phenomena are driven from the centre to the periphery while conversely, phenomena may push their way into the centre and occupy it. However, with a polysystem, one must not think in terms of *one* centre and *one* periphery, since several such positions are hypothesized. A move may take place, for instance, whereby a certain item (element, function) is transferred from the periphery of one system to the periphery of an adjacent system within the same polysystem, and then may or may not move on to the centre of the latter (1990: 14).

---

[3] Polysystems Theory has it origins in Russian Formalism, as Evan-Zohar himself acknowledges (Hermans, 1999:103-112).

[4] This is a simplification. Evan-Zohar in fact goes into great detail about the various ways in which such shifts occur in different kinds of situation (1990:16-44).

[5] The notion of 'paradigm' was first introduced by Thomas Kuhn (1962) in his work on the procedure of scientific discovery. See 'Philosophy of Science' below.

This model is, to my mind, extremely useful for explaining the process by means of which the new plain style cultivated in England by the 17th century scientists gradually ousted all rivals and occupied the centre of first the English, then the whole of the Western system (see Chapter 5 below). It also accounts for the complex panorama of academic discourses in the Portuguese context (see Chapters 7 and 8 below), where there is an undeniable conflict (particularly in the humanities) between the kind of discourse that has traditionally been valued in the national system[6] and that which is hegemonic on the global scale.

In fact, I argue here that this conflict goes far deeper than a mere attitude to textual production and use of language; what is involved is ultimately a clash between two very different paradigms of knowledge, which can be historically traced and politically justified. These aspects will be taken up further in my discussions below of the theoretical contributions made by the History and Sociology of Science, and Theory of Knowledge.

Descriptive, Historical and Applied Linguistics

Many of my claims about the structure and history of English Academic Discourse (Chapters 4 and 5) have been drawn from the massive body of work that has been done on the subject within the fields of Descriptive, Historical and Applied Linguistics. Although the area is vast, and growing every day, it is worth highlighting here some of the most significant titles that have appeared over the years. Particular aspects will be described in more detail in the relevant chapters.

---

[6] In fact, this is probably part of a much broader system that spans most of the Catholic countries of southern Europe (and, quite possibly, their colonial offshoots). Certainly, my own translation experience points to similarities in approach between Portugal, Spain and France. However, further research would be needed before such a generalization could be made with confidence.

A relatively early landmark in the development of studies into Academic Discourse as a recognised entity (as opposed to earlier register studies or pedagogical approaches) was John Swales' 1990 volume *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*, which, as the title suggests, focused upon role of different academic genres (i.e. the research article, abstract, research presentation, grant proposal, dissertation, etc). The *public* nature of such writing is clearly emphasised, particularly in his discussion of the 'discourse community' (1990:23-32) as the body that determines what may be said, how and by whom. He even goes some way towards acknowledging the self-referentiality of the entire practice (*Idem*: 22), thus leaving the field open for critical approaches that challenge the claims to knowledge made in such texts. This will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 4.

This work was complemented by another that came out ten years later by Ken Hyland, which emphasised not genre but *disciplinary* differences within academic writing (*Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*, 2000). Together these two volumes have contributed to the current notion that there is not one monolithic Academic Discourse in English, but rather a number of different Academic Discourses, in the plural - a claim reinforced in the opening chapter of Flowerdew's 2002 volume, *Academic Discourse* (Bhatia, 2002:29) and which I discuss in Chapter 3.

Within the same current, there have been myriad studies published in journals (eg. *Applied Linguistics*, published by Oxford University Press, and *The Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, by Elsevier), as well as in volumes (such as Flowerdew, 2002: Candlin & Hyland, 1999) dealing with particular aspects of academic writing, such as the type and frequency of certain syntactical or lexical features, citation practices, rhetorical devices, etc. While some of this is pure descriptive research, a great deal of it is oriented towards teaching, as indicated by the titles of the periodicals mentioned above and some of the volumes (eg. Jordan, 1997). The result of this has been the development of a powerful *prescriptive* tradition in English academic discourse, aimed both at native-speaker undergraduates and at foreign scholars, leading to the development of EAP and academic writing courses in almost all major UK and US universities and the publication of literally hundreds of manuals aiming to teach the necessary skills. These have provided an important basis for my own somewhat normative claims concerning the nature and characteristics of English Academic Discourse (***Appendix B***).

A more socially-oriented exploration of scientific and technical writing is provided by the Australian systemic functional school in two volumes from the 1990s, *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power* (Halliday & Martin: 1993) and *Reading Science: Critical and Functional Perspectives on Discourse of Science* (Martin & Veel, 1998). These works have been particularly crucial for my project, in the sense that they go beyond a mere description of characteristics of the discourse in question to emphasise its *constructed* nature. As Luke (1993:x) points out in his introduction to the first of these volumes:

> Throughout these essays, science is not taken as a canon of ‘great' ideas and truths, nor as a corpus of universal procedures or methods, or, even more mystically, as the product of 'genius', specific mental dispositions and attitudes. Rather, science is conceived of as inter-organistic practice, a linguistic/semiotic practice which has evolved functionally to do specialized kinds of theoretical and practical work in social institutions.

Consequently, the essays in these volumes effectively *deconstruct* scientific discourse by exploring the way in which its grammar and terminology construe the world they claim to be describing. Some of them focus upon the structure of the discourse as it is used today (Halliday, 1993b; Martin, 1993a, 1993b, 1993c; Wignell, Martin & Eggins, 1993; Wignell, 1998a); others take a historicist approach, charting the way in which certain features have evolved over time (Halliday, 1993a, 1993b, 1998), while still others discuss the ideological implications for society and education (Halliday & Martin, 1993: 2-21; Rose, 1998; Bazerman, 1998).

Halliday's investigations into the development of scientific discourse over time (1993a, 1993b, 1998) have been complemented elsewhere by other important historical studies. Particularly noteworthy contributions have come from Atkinson's research into the language used in the Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London across a period of three hundred years (1998, 1999) and Ding's work (1998) on the historical development of the Passive in scientific texts. As regards the social sciences and history, Wignell (1998a:302-306; 1998b:221-331) and Martin (1993c, 2002) respectively have explored how these areas were colonised by the discourse of science, gradually adopting grammatical and lexical features analogous to those used in the hard sciences – though it should be pointed out that this issue is possibly not as straightforward as these authors suggest[7], as I discuss in Chapters 5 and 9.

Unfortunately, however, this range and depth of research into English Academic Discourse is not paralleled by similar studies into Portuguese. In fact, the only work that I have found to date that focuses specifically upon Portuguese academic discourse is a paper by Johns (1991), which discusses the issue of verbal fronting in Brazilian academic abstracts. This dearth may be partly to do with the fact that Linguistics in Portugal has traditionally been dominated by the Saussurean school, which has meant that the approach has been somewhat more abstract and decontextualised, with very little attention given to Discourse. This looks set to change, however, and it is to be hoped that in the near future, we will see a number of studies emerging into Portuguese academic discourse that will complement and extend (or even refute!) the preliminary work undertaken here by me.

---

[7] The History of Rhetoric provides an interesting perspective on this issue which, to a certain extent, enters into conflict with these accounts.

Rhetoric

A different, though overlapping, tradition that has made something of a dramatic comeback in recent years in Anglo-Saxon culture is Rhetoric. After centuries of marginalisation during the period when Science was forging its identity as the ultimate authority of knowledge about the world (see Chapter 5), the growing awareness that much of that authority is linguistically construed has led to a renewed interest in the art of persuasion. Indeed, in the United States, the Rhetoric of Science has become a fully-fledged discipline in its own right, generating not only descriptive and critical studies (eg. Simons, 1989; Roberts & Good, 1993; Taylor 1998; Johnson-Sheehan, 1998) but also hundreds of style manuals and educational programmes designed to transmit the art.

It is not always easy to distinguish the work done under the rubric of Rhetoric from that which is commonly known as Applied and Descriptive Linguistics. Both are concerned with the same object (in this case, academic discourse) and both have pedagogical and critical, as well as descriptive, aims; indeed, a simplistic analysis might suggest that they are merely American and British labels for the same entity. However, if we look a little closer, we find that there are differences in terminology and approach that belie their very different origins. For while Linguistics developed in the 20th century within the *scientific* paradigm, Rhetoric has its origins in a much earlier *humanistic* tradition that goes back to a Medieval and ultimately Classical source. This gives it a quite different ideological slant, and makes it a useful tool for discussing much of the discourse produced in the Portuguese academic context, where the humanities have traditionally played a much central role[8].

In the Anglo-Saxon context, the resurgence of interest in Rhetoric has come largely in response to the demise of the credibility of Science as a universal vehicle of objective truth (Good & Roberts, 1993). There is a new interest in 'the processes by which disciplines establish themselves and assert their credibility through the generation of "commonplaces"' (*Idem*: 1), in the 'power-play implicit in disciplinary discourses' and implicit 'constructivist procedures' (*Idem*. 8), in 'notions of agency, intention and narrative' (*Idem*. 9) and 'moral and political perspectives, of rights and obligations, power and subordination, reasons and excuses' (*Idem*. 10.) In short, Rhetoric concerns itself with the Interpersonal dimension of knowledge over and above the Factual, on the assumption that 'there can be no such thing as a true and complete description' (Simons, 1993:149) of any phenomena, but merely partial representations, filtered through the perception of human agency.

Thus, the area of study today known as the Rhetoric of Science systematically deconstructs Science's claims to objectivity, factuality, certainty, timelessness and disinterestedness by reframing these notions as 'commonplaces', perceiving them as part of a 'grand narrative' that has sustained and provided justification for the whole project of modernity (Simons 1993:150-151; Taylor, 1998; Johnson-Sheehan, 1998).

The history of rhetoric has also contributed considerably to our knowledge about the development of academic discourse, not only in England but also throughout the rest of continental Europe. According to its account (which conflicts to some extent with that provided by the Systemic Linguists), post-Elizabethan England saw the privileging of one particular rhetorical style (the Attic or Plain style, considered to be more appropriate for the new science) over the various others that, in the previous period, had co-existed as alternatives to be employed in appropriate circumstances (see Timmermans, 2002; Vickers, 1993; Moss, 1993; Croll, 1969a, b; Partridge, 1969; Conley, 1990). This change was not only stylistic; it implied a major epistemological shift, particularly as regards the relationship between language and reality, leading to a devaluing of the virtues of 'eloquence' and 'copiousness' that had been so highly regarded in the humanist tradition.

---

[8] Indeed there has been considerable interest in Rhetoric in Portugal in recent years, manifested by translations of texts on the subject by foreign authors and a certain amount of domestic production. See for example (Carrilho, 1994; Meyer, Carrilho & Timmermans, 1999; Meyer, 2007).

Catholic cultures, in the meantime, continued to cultivate the more elaborate Ciceronian or Baroque style, eschewing science and logic in favour of the humanities, poetry and rhetoric (Timmermans, 2002:123; Conley, 1990: 151-162). Associated with 'the virtues of distinction, elegance, nobility and classicism' (Timmermans, 2002:214) in direct opposition to the forces of socialism, liberalism and positivism, Catholic rhetoric naturally played a central role in Portuguese culture during the long years of the right-wing dictatorship in the 20th century. It is therefore unsurprising that vestiges of it should survive in academic writing produced today, despite the major changes that have taken place in outlook since the 'Carnation Revolution' of 1974.

Unlike Applied Linguistics and Discourse Analysis, then, which tend to be very Anglocentric in their approach, Rhetoric offers a much broader panorama of the range of discourses on offer in Europe today. Moreover, it provides some justification for my claim that Portuguese discourse of the humanities is based upon a whole different paradigm of knowledge to factual writing of any kind in English – a claim that will be explored in more detail in Part III.

Contrastive Rhetoric

Despite its name, the discipline that is today known as Contrastive Rhetoric has more in common (in terms of its terminology and practitioners) with Applied Linguistics than with Rhetoric as such. It is defined as 'the study of how a person's first language and culture influences his or her writing in a second language' (Connor, 1996: ix) and developed within the educational (ESL) context, though its findings are of undeniable interest for Translation Studies and other intercultural approaches.

The awareness that there may exist cultural differences in discursive or expository writing patterns was first suggested by Robert B. Kaplan in a seminal paper first published in 1966. In it, he suggested that many of the errors of text organisation and cohesion made by foreign students in their academic writing may be due to different cultural conventions and indeed 'thought patterns' encoded in their mother tongues.

> Logic (in the popular, rather than the logician's sense of the word), which is the basis of rhetoric, is evolved out of a culture; it is not universal. Rhetoric, then, is not universal either, but varies from culture to culture and even from time to time within a given culture. It is affected by canons of taste within a given culture at a given time. (Kaplan, 1980:400)

He went on to assert that the typical linear development of the expository English paragraph may in fact be quite alien to other cultures, and even suggested a series of diagrammatic representations of how a paragraph might develop according to Semitic, Oriental, Romance and Russian styles (*Idem*:403-411).

Although this initial approach was overly simplistic, Kaplan's work spawned a multitude of similar studies that explored discourse differences from a variety of cultural perspectives (eg. Smith, 1987; Ventola & Mauranen, 1996; Duszak, 1997), eventually culminating in the formal constitution of the discipline that is today known as Contrastive Rhetoric (Connor, 1996). Thus, English academic writing has been compared to ‘teutonic, gallic and nipponic’ styles (Galtung, 1981), German (Clyne, 1987a, 1987b, 1988), Indian languages (Kachru, 1987); Czech (Cmejrková, 1996, 1997), Finnish (Mauranen, 1993; Ventola, 1996), Polish (Duszak, 1994) and Russian/Ukrainian (Yakhontova, 2002) to name but a few[9].

Unfortunately, Portuguese academic discourse has been somewhat neglected amidst this plethora of contrastive rhetorical studies. There has been some work done into other Romance languages, particular Spanish, which has a certain relevance: for example, Kaplan (1980:408), in his initial article, observed that 'there is much greater freedom to digress or to introduce extraneous material is available in French, or in Spanish, than English’, while Grabe & Kaplan (1996:194), summarizing the work of several different researchers, report that Spanish writers prefer a more ‘elaborated’ style of writing, use longer sentences and have a penchant for subordination. All of these claims are in keeping with my own observations about Portuguese discourse (see Chapter 8).

There is, however, an ongoing project in the area of Corpus Linguistics which ought to shed some light upon many of these issues, namely PORTICLE, the Portuguese subcorpus of ICLE (the International Corpus of Learner English). This is a collection of argumentative essays written by Portuguese advanced learners, which will be systematically compared with native speaker equivalents in order to identify particular discourse features that would seem to be typical of this language group. In a preliminary study, McKenny (2003:3) has suggested that the Portuguese seem to give a greater attention to the interpersonal domain in contrast with the more argumentative 'Aristotelian approach' used by British and American undergraduates;

---

[9] Mention should also be made here of the somewhat more general, but nonetheless significant, intercultural communication studies undertaken by Hatim (1997) and Scollon & Scollon (2001), which compare English discourse patterns with Arabic and Chinese respectively.

they not only attempt to influence their readers' feelings more ("including writing in an enjoyable way, sometimes they use humour, other times moral indignation or poetic imagery") and make much greater use of personal references (such as personal pronouns, and references to the author and reader). This too coincides with my own observations (see Chapter 7).

Ultimately, Contrastive Rhetoric is useful for my project to the extent that it is predicated upon the assumption that cultural differences exist in academic writing style. However, in my view, none of the CR studies that I have yet encountered (even the ones dealing with remote languages such as Chinese, Indian or Finnish) go quite far enough in their claims. That is to say, although a great deal of attention has been given to identifying and analysing minor details of form and structure (such as sentence length and structure, personal pronouns, modality, argumentation strategies, etc), I have yet to find a single author who postulates that there may in fact be an entirely different paradigm underlying academic production in any other culture.

One of the reasons for this, of course, is likely to be that the starting point for all these studies is inevitably Anglocentric. That is to say, the data is mostly drawn from the errors made by foreign students in ESL or EAP situations, where the very situation imposes a norm and value; it is obvious, then, that the most significant cultural differences will already have been eliminated by authorial self-censorship. Another reason may be the lingering persistence in Anglo-Saxon culture of the 'myth of progress' or the 'grand narrative of science', which inevitably holds English scientific discourse as the pinnacle of linguistic prowess to which other cultures aspire. We see this in Halliday & Martin's 'General Orientation' to their 1993 book *Writing Science*, in which they claim that 'even between languages as geographically remote as English and Chinese it is hard to find truly convincing differences' -

something they explain as a natural consequence of cultural and linguistic evolution (1993:9)[10].

Consequently, forms of writing that are so different from the English norm as to be unrecognisable as academic discourse (such as some of the more extreme examples of Portuguese discourse of the humanities, given in Chapters 7 and 10) would probably be discounted altogether as falling 'beyond the pale' of what is minimally acceptable (that is, if they ever even reached the attention of the international discourse community). Indeed, it has only been with the development of counter-hegemonic studies in the area of sociology of science and epistemology (see below) that attention has finally fallen upon the knowledges and discourses being produced in peripheral and semi-peripheral parts of the system.

History and Sociology of Science

One of the greatest challenges to the authority of Science as a universal and objective fact-provider has come from social studies into the cultural and political circumstances that gave rise to this particular paradigm of knowledge. Today it is a vast area of research involving a number of approaches (see Potter, 1996:17-42 for an overview). However, there are certain landmark authors that need to be mentioned, due not only to their contributions to the area in question, but also to their importance for my particular project.

To my mind, one of the most important figures in this field is undoubtedly Robert Merton, recognised today as the 'father' of Sociology of Science, who set out in 1938 to try to understand the social dynamics underlying the emergence of the new paradigm in the 17th century. His classic work *Science, Technology and Society in Seventeenth Century England* (1938) identified Puritanism as a major driving force behind the new science and pointed out how its ethos, characterised by values such as utility, rationality, empiricism and individualism, ultimately paved the way for a revolution in knowledge, just as it had paved the way for the development of capitalism, as R.H.Tawney (1922) and Max Weber (1930) had already shown[11].

---

[10] It should be pointed out, however, that this universalist stance in *Writing Science* is redressed in the later volume *Reading Science* (Martin & Veel, 1998:4-5), which deliberately takes the line that 'scientific language is no unitary or stable thing' but rather 'is evolving and multiple, emerging in relation to the specialties, projets, methods, problems, social configurations, individual positionings and other dynamics that drive scientific activities' (Bazerman, 1998:16).

Another great classic author who has written in detail about the cultural and social background to the development of the scientific paradigm (though as a historian rather than sociologist) is Christopher Hill. He too discusses the relationship between Protestantism and Science in his famous 1965 work *Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution* (1997:15-76) and emphasises the democratising agenda of the proponents of the new knowledge, who would undertake translations and compilations in order to make scientific learning available to all who could read (*Idem*: 27). This introduces a political, as well as religious, dimension to the discourse that was developing as a vehicle of the new knowledge, a dimension which I claim is still present in the 'discourse wars' that are currently taking place in contemporary Portugal (in Chapters 7 and 8).

The classic picture, therefore, is of a major epistemological shift in 16th and 17th century England (see Dear, 2001, for a fairly conventional overview), that was ideologically powered by the Reformation and gave rise to a whole series of political, economic and social upheavals, ultimately resulting in the establishment of the 'modern' order as we know it today, based upon democracy, secularism (though with residual protestant values), capitalism and science.

---

[11] Indeed, science, technology, industry and business are inextricably related today, forming the 'pillars of power' of modern society.

However, the simple binarism that equates science with progress, democracy, rationality and freedom as opposed to backward religious regimes mired in obscurantism and political repression has recently been undermined from a series of different perspectives. Firstly, there is a strand of scholarship that strongly disputes the claim that there is any inherent antagonism between religion and science, and which is dedicated to revising our historical assumptions to take account of the many contributions made by Catholics to technical and social progress (see, for example, Dawson, 1991 [1950]; Lindberg, 1992; Ferngren, 2002; Woods, 2005). Other authors (such as Shapin, 1996) merely contest the implications of the term 'scientific revolution', asserting that there was in fact no radical break with the past at all, and that the whole notion of 'revolution' is merely a rhetorical device employed by scientific practitioners of the 16th and 17th centuries in order to give value to their own endeavours and define themselves as moderns in relation to their supposedly benighted predecessors (1996:5)[12].

Secondly, science has recently come in for a great deal of criticism for failing to live up to its promises to provide a juster better world. Instead, it is argued, it has become a new tool of imperialism, silencing alternative forms of knowledge, and resulting in the systematic oppression of groups on the periphery of the world system (see Nader, 1996; Santos, 1995, 2005, 2006, 2007), as well as subaltern elements at its centre (eg. Keller & Longino, 1996). I myself take up this argument in the final part of this thesis with regards to non-hegemonic discourses, which I argue are systematically silenced through a process of 'epistemicide' (a term I have borrowed from Santos, 2005).

---

[12] Gaukroger (2006), on the other hand, does not dispute the existence of a 'scientific revolution' of sorts, but argues that it was by no means a unified movement but rather an unstable field of different sometimes incompatible programmes. See also Hobsbawm (1962:277-296) on the emergence of scientific institutions throughout Europe in the 18th-19th centuries, and Nunes (1988, 2001, 2002), Carneiro et al. (2000), etc on the development of science in Portugal.

Finally, the whole scientific approach has come under fire from philosophers of science and language, who challenge the very epistemological bases upon which it rests. This opens up the way for a valuing of alternative paradigms, as we shall see.

Philosophy of Science

Early challenges to the empirical assumptions of science came from figures such as Karl Popper, who in 1935 highlighted the 'irrational element' in scientific discovery (2002: 8) and took issue with the Logical Positivists' claim that nothing was meaningful unless it was verifiable[13]; and Pierre Duhem who argued that the truth value accorded to a scientific claim depended upon its consistency with a prior body of accepted theory[14]. However, the most relevant figure for my purposes was Thomas Kuhn, who in his *Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962) introduced the notion of the 'paradigm shift' that has subsequently become so influential in so many fields.

Kuhn argued that science does not progress through a steady accumulation of knowledge, but rather undergoes periodic revolutions when the entire conceptual framework is forced to change. The shift occurs when the system of 'normal' or conventional science comes under pressure from 'revolutionary' research that does not conform to its parameters; that is to say, there is a build-up of anomalous results that can no longer be explained away as error, eventually forcing a change in the 'rules' of the game. This brings about an entire shift in worldview:

---

[13] The Logical Positivists held that all knowledge was derived by logical inference from observable facts, and that if a proposition could not be *verified* (i.e. tested for truth or falsity), it was essentially *meaningless*. In its strongest form, Logical Positivism rejected not only metaphysical and theological statements, but also ethical ones, and recognised no function of language beyond the representational. Popper rejected this, introducing instead the notion of *falsifiability* as a way of demarcating science from non-science (2002:57-73) and admitted the potential significance of non-scientific approaches such as psychoanalysis, thus making way for other forms of knowledge beyond the narrowly 'scientific'.

[14] Duhem's ideas about the interconnectedness of beliefs and the role of experience were developed by Willard van Orman Quine into the famous Quine-Duhem thesis on the 'web of belief'.

> …paradigm changes /…/ cause scientists to see the world of their research-engagement differently. In so far as their only recourse to that world is through what they see and do, we may want to say that after a revolution scientists are responding to a different world. (1970:111)

Moreover:

> Something like a paradigm is prerequisite to perception itself. What a man sees depends both upon what he looks at and also upon what his previous visual-conception experience has taught him to see. (*Idem*: 113)[15].

In implying that the underlying framework of the discipline effectively conditions what it is possible to 'know', Kuhn also seemed to be implying the relativism of knowledge, a notion that was eagerly seized upon and elaborated by opponents of the hegemonic culture of all backgrounds[16].

He also broached the question of language, in which he attempted to overcome the notion of the apparent 'incommensurability' of different paradigms (*Idem*: 198-204). Incommensurability, he claims, is a matter of how one uses words. As it is not possible for the defenders of different paradigms 'to resort to a neutral language which both use in the same way and which is adequate to the statement of both of their theories', the only way out is for the participants in a communication breakdown to 'recognise each other as members of different language communities and then become translators' (*Idem*.). This observation is clearly very pertinent to the overall thrust of this thesis.

The issue of incommensurability was also taken up in 1975 by Paul Feyerabend**,** who claimed that the whole progress of science is inevitably anarchic.

> Knowledge is not a series of self-consistent theories that converges towards an ideal view; it is not a gradual approach to the truth. It is rather

---

[15] This position is also not far removed from Michel Foucault's notions of the 'episteme' and 'discursive formation' (see Chapter 6).

[16] It should be pointed out that Kuhn himself denied charges of relativism in the 3rd edition of his book, and sought to clarify his views to avoid further misrepresentation.

> an ever increasing *ocean of mutually incompatible (and perhaps even incommensurable) alternatives*, each single theory, each fairy tale, each myth that is part of the collection forcing the others into greater articulation and all of them contributing via this process of competition, to the development of our consciousness. Nothing is ever settled, no view can ever be omitted from a comprehensive account. (1978: 30).

This rejection of unilinearity clearly owes much to Kuhn, while the demotion of scientific theory to the level of 'myth' echoes work that was being developed at around the same time in the field of history, in which the boundaries between 'fact' and 'fiction' were becoming increasingly blurred (White, 1978). ‘Science knows no “bare facts”,’ Feyerabend claims. 'The "facts" that enter our knowledge are already viewed in a certain way and are, therefore, essentially ideational’ (*Idem*: 19).

Feyerabend was viewed as a radical in his day, and his advocation of methodological and theoretical anarchism is still anathema to staunch defenders of the scientific paradigm. However, the growing trend towards *interdisciplinarity* would seem to vindicate his claim that no one approach alone is able to account for the complexity of experience, and that an eclectic pluralism is possibly a more adequate way of exploring a complex multifaceted reality.

Philosophy of Language

It is in the area of Philosophy of Language that the fundamental differences between the Anglo-American and the ‘Continental’ approaches to knowledge really make themselves felt. Indeed, they at times seem so far apart that I have considered them, in Chapters 9 and 10, as almost ‘incommensurable paradigms’. For while Anglo-American philosophy was dominated for most of the 20th century by the Analytic school, predicated on a *realist*[17] view of language that posited a direct connection between propositions and the observable world, France and Germany favoured an *idealist*[18] model that gave primacy to human consciousness. This later mutated into *constructivism* with the arrival of Structuralism and Poststructuralism, according to which our semiotic codes not only mediate our experience of reality, they also actively construct them (see Chapter 6 below).

Portugal, for cultural and historical reasons that are described in Chapter 8, inclines more naturally towards the latter view. It is this epistemological disjunction that underlies the discourse differences that I identified during the course of my professional practice and which makes much Portuguese academic writing so difficult to translate. Language is being used in a different way. While English academic prose presupposes some essential connection between words and things that allows language to function as a transparent window onto some independently-existing reality, Portuguese humanities discourse tends to construct meaning intra- and intertextually without recourse to referents in the outside world. English factual writing is predicated upon the ultimate separability of form and content, which enables the 'meaning' of any given text to be extracted, summarized, reformulated and translated, but in much Portuguese academic discourse, the 'meaning' is inextricably bound up with the actual words that are used. Thus, the distinction between 'fact' and 'fiction' that arose in the Anglo-Saxon world after the Scientific

---

[17] 'Realism I characterise as the belief that statements of the disputed class possess an objective truth-value, independently of our means of knowing it: they are true or false in virtue of a reality existing independently of us' (Michael Dummett *cit.* Rorty, 1991:3. See also p 22).

[18] In philosophical idealism, the so-called external, or real world as inseparable from consciousness, perception, mind, intellect or reason. Cf. Kant '... if I remove the thinking subject, the whole material world must at once vanish because it is nothing but a phenomenal appearance in the sensibility of ourselves as a subject, and a manner or species of representation' (*Critique of Pure Reason*, A383)

Revolution is not present to the same extent in Portugal, where knowledge (understood as philosophy) is frequently couched in emotive or figurative terms[19].

Despite important modifications to the Anglo-Saxon mindset introduced by Ludwig Wittgenstein's notion of 'language games' in 1956 and 'Speech Act Theory'[20] in the '60s, both of which profoundly influenced the discipline of linguistics, philosophy departments in England and the United States have continued contemptuous of Continental philosophy and constructivism, remaining, by and large, loyal to the basic precepts of the Analytic school[21]. Richard Rorty, in 1991, summarised the situation as follows:

> Philosophers in the English-speaking world seem fated to end the century discussing the same topic – realism – which they were discussing in 1900. In that year, the opposite of realism was still idealism. But by now language has replaced mind as that which, supposedly, stands over and against 'reality'. So discussion has shifted from whether material reality is 'mind-dependent' to questions about which sorts of true statements, if any, stand in representational relations to nonlinguistic items. Discussion of realism now revolves around whether only the statements of physics can correspond to 'facts of the matter' or whether those of mathematics and ethics might also. Nowadays the opposite of realism is called, simply, 'antirealism'. (1991:2)

Such philosophical entrenchment on the Anglophone side clearly makes life difficult for the academic translator, particularly in intercultural encounters where the power balance is weighted towards the hegemonic power. This will be discussed further in Chapters 9 and 10 below.

* * *

---

[19] The dichotomy described here is obviously a highly simplified account. This is refined and corrected during the course of this work.

[20] This derived from John Austin's *How To Do Things With Words* (1962), later systematised by John Searle in 1969.

[21] See, for example, the recent work by Paul Boghossian entitled *Fear of Knowledge: Against Relativism and Constructivism* (2006), which reiterates the arguments in favour of the scientific method.

As this chapter has shown, the argument that I am hoping to build in this dissertation draws not only upon Translation Theory, but also upon a wide range of other studies from neighbouring areas. Many of these fields are relatively new, themselves the product of the postmodern seismic activity that has undermined traditional disciplinary categories and thrown up a whole series of new approaches and tools. What they all have in common is skepticism about the epistemological bases of conventional science, and a tendency to value previously-overlooked cultural phenomena, whether these be social groups, discourses or entire paradigms of knowledge. These approaches mostly tend in the same direction and converge; and I hope that, in the few instances where contradictions arise, I shall be able to offer a convincing explanation that will enable me to get over the problem without seriously undermining my own argument.

But before getting embroiled in translation issues, let us take a look at English Academic Discourse - its structure, boundaries and the historical circumstances that contributed to giving it the hegemonic status that it enjoys today.

PART II

English Academic Discourse

Chapter 3

English Academic Discourse: the Hegemonic Style

When viewed from outside Anglophone culture - from the perspective of the foreign academic, EFL teacher or translator, say – English Academic Discourse appears to be a relatively easy entity to define. Compared to the plethora of alternative writing styles available to academics in some other cultures, it seems rigidly standardized and rule-bound, monolithic even. This impression is reinforced by the multitude of university courses and style manuals available to teach it, and the remarkable consensus that exists between them as to what constitutes good academic writing (see ***Appendix B***), not to mention the rigorous standards imposed by academic journals – the style guides that have to be adhered to, the refereeing procedures, the apparently endless editing process – all designed to ensure that submitted texts are in line with community expectations. The total effect is of a massive impersonal machine, where individual quirks are ironed out in the quest for uniformity and where there is no place for the 'personal voice' of the kind that prevails in more humanistic cultures.

From within Anglophone culture itself, however, the picture appears somewhat different. Indeed, this impression of homogeneity is largely undermined by the massive body of scholarship that has been undertaken by descriptive linguists into the way in which academics actually do write in real life. Their work, which includes corpus-based studies, genre analysis, disciplinary comparisons and contrastive rhetoric, suggests a wealth of variation between different academic genres and disciplines, and even between different approaches within a single discipline. Indeed, as Flowerdew (2002:29) points out, the indications from this direction are that academic discourse is so varied as to not constitute a single uniform entity at all.

The aim of this chapter, therefore, is to determine whether a hegemonic discourse can be said to exist within the Anglophone academic context as a useful concept for translation research. If so, I will attempt to define it and establish its boundaries, taking into account the contributions made by both the prescriptive and descriptive linguistic traditions.

* * *

According to Critical Discourse Theory (see Chapter 2 for overview), discourse is understood as a form of social practice, language used in context and subject to a series of norms and constraints established by the community. The notion of the *discourse community* is an essential one here, but one which also raises problems of definition. In Swales' (1990:21-32) extensive discussion of the issue in relation to academic discourse, he points out the essentially circular nature of the question. Discourse is understood as the kind of language used by a particular discourse community, and expertise in the manipulation of that discourse will therefore be essential for acceptance by that community. However, if the discourse community is defined as the social group that uses a particular kind of discourse, we arrive at the conclusion that we are in the presence of a tautology. Recognition of this fact has, on the one hand, undermined the authority of academic discourse as a vehicle for objective truth (a reputation it enjoyed through much of the modern period) and, to some eyes, reduced the academic community to a kind of priestly caste or elite that establishes the rules for admission into its own circles. On the other hand, it has also generated a new and productive rhetorical approach amongst descriptive linguists that not only values the interpersonal dimensions of the discourse but also acknowledges its role in constructing as well as transmitting knowledge.

If Academic Discourse is defined as the kind of language used in the Academy - that is, in research and higher educational environments – then it is also clear that its boundaries are not easily defined. Not only is there a vast array of different *disciplines* in the academy, with their own specialist terminologies, traditions and approaches, but there are also many different *genres*, each governed by specific norms and constraints. This fact supports the argument that there is not one Academic Discourse, but rather multiple discourses, each with their own distinctive characteristics.

If, on the other hand, we follow the prescriptive (EAP) tradition rather than the descriptive one, it does seem possible to identify a common core underlying all those varieties – a set of basic principles that covers all kind of academic production, a general attitude towards textual organisation, sentence structure and lexis, for example. But now we run into the opposite problem. We find that the kind of formal discourse that is used in the academy is not always distinguishable from that employed in other kinds of factual writing, such as in business, industry, politics and journalism. The category starts to seem too broad and unwieldy to be useful.

Before attempting to negotiate a midway between these extremes, I would like to look in more detail at some of the arguments put forward in recent years by both sides. Let us look first at the question of *disciplinary variation*.

Disciplinary discourses

Disciplinary Discourses is in the fact the title of a book by Ken Hyland, published in 2000, which argues convincingly for a more complex approach to the kind of language used in the academy than is usually presented in the EAP manuals.

> …while disciplines may be defined by their writing, it is *how* they write rather than simply *what* they write that makes the crucial difference between them. An article may discuss garlic proteins, motherese or the existence of truth without people, but we see more than differences of content when we start to tread them carefully. Among the things we see are different appeals to background knowledge, different means of establishing truth, and different ways of engaging with readers. Scholarly discourse is not uniform and monolithic, differentiated merely by specialist topics and vocabularies. It is an outcome of a multitude of practices and strategies, where what counts as convincing argument and appropriate tone is carefully managed for a particular audience. These differences are a product then of institutional and interactional forces, the result of diverse social practices of writers within their fields. (2000:3)

This view is centred upon the constructivist position that the persuasiveness of academic knowledge is not based upon the demonstration of absolute fact, empirical evidence or unquestionable logic, but that it is the result of effective rhetorical practices. These rhetorical practices, in their turn, are not absolute and monolithic but community-specific, embodying the social negotiations of the discipline as it develops through the years. They count upon a certain body of shared knowledge, of agreed ‘fact’, as methods and findings are coordinated and judged by means of peer review and public presentation, and this has considerable effects upon the development of the discourse.

It has been argued, therefore, that each discipline might be seen as an academic tribe (Becher, *cit.* Hyland, 2000:8), each with its own conventions. These conventions include norms, nomenclature, bodies of knowledge and modes of enquiry, not to mention differences of 'aims, social behaviours and power relations, political interests, ways of talking and structures of argument'. Sullivan (*cit* Hyland, 2000:10) argues for four central elements of disciplinary constraints: an ideological perspective of the discipline and the world; assumptions about the nature of things and methodologies; a system of hierarchical power relations; and a body of doctrinal knowledge of external reality.

It is to be expected, therefore, that these different orientations will be reflected in the kind of discourse used by different disciplines, and indeed, there is plentiful evidence from empirical research to suggest that this is the case. To quote just a few examples, Hyland finds substantial disciplinary differences in reporting practices (1999a; 2000:20-40; 2002), in manifestations of authorial stance (1999b) and the use of metadiscourse (2000:113-121); both Hyland (2000.63-84) and Samraj (2002) find disciplinary variation in the structure of abstracts (2000:63-84), Swales et al (1998) in the use of the imperative, while Chang & Swales (1999) come to similar conclusions about the use of informal elements. Other studies (*cit.* Hyland, 2000:146) have explored disciplinary differences in evaluative focus, patterns of tense and voice, and modal qualification, and have suggested epistemic reasons for the high incidence of particularised sentence subjects in literature, the hypothetical argument strategies of philosophy, distinctive theme choices in engineering, imprecision in economics and nominalisation in physics.

All this provides very compelling evidence for the argument that Academic Discourse as a monolithic entity does not have any existence outside the style manuals, a position that is further reinforced by studies carried out in the different though related field of Genre Analysis.

The Question of Genre

Genre is understood here as a class of communicative events with similar communicative purpose. Swales (1990), approaching academic discourse from this perspective identifies a large number of genres and sub-genres used in the academy, some of which are defined by purpose and some by occasion. These include: lectures (plenary, introductory etc), tutorials, seminars, articles (of different types), textbooks, conference papers, grant applications, to name but a few.

He goes on to identify the major differences between these genres as: complexity of rhetorical purpose; extent to which the text is constructed in advance; the mode or medium through which they are expressed (i.e. the oral or written channel); and the degree of reader-/audience-friendliness expected from the text (*Idem.* 62). Even within a single genre there is likely to be a considerable range of variation caused by audience expectations and knowledge (one addresses undergraduates differently to peers, for example), and institutional conventions regarding ideology or degree of formality to be adopted (a paper to be presented at a gathering of left-wing intellectuals at a summer convention in California is likely to have a different slant to a highly formal occasion at Oxford or Cambridge).

Then of course there is the important issue of how common genres behave in different disciplines, and there have been a great many corpus studies carried out to chart the frequency of certain features across different disciplines within a given genre. Swales (1990) provides an overview of such studies in genres such as the research article (131-176), abstracts (179-182), research presentations (182-186), grant proposals (186-187), theses and dissertations (187-189), and reprint requests (189-201); and, as we have already seen, other authors have continued this work in different areas.

The result of all this activity is to illustrate once more that there is an immense amount of variation in academic discourse, thus justifying the claim made by these analysts that there is not enough common ground to warrant consideration of Academic Discourse as a useful category at all.

I will now dispute this by looking at the opposing argument.

The Prescriptive Tradition (EAP)

As several descriptive linguists have pointed out, within the pedagogical tradition, academic discourse has been subject to a kind of reification, according to which the advice given tends to be 'rooted in implicit conceptions of what constitutes writing' and represented as 'transparent and "common sense"' (Lea & Street, 1999:63). Hyland (2000:4) explains this in historical terms:

> A purely formal view of academic writing tended to dominate early practice in English for Academic Purposes (EAP). This was a view which largely took for granted the academy's perception of its texts as objective, rational and impersonal, and set out to provide students with the generic skills they needed to reproduce them.

Flowerdew (2002:29) makes a similar claim, though noticeably using the present perfect rather than the past tense:

> The interesting thing is that although much of the research published in the area of discourse and genre analysis of academic discourse in recent years /.../ has consistently demonstrated academic discourse to be varied in terms of disciplines and genres, the EAP community have consistently taken it to be single and uniform entity, with a 'common core' across disciplines and often genres.

These criticisms are largely supported by my own findings (see ***Appendix B***). With a few exceptions, the general assumption in most of the manuals consulted is that there is indeed a common core that stretches across disciplines and genres, involving norms of text organisation, paragraph and sentence structure, cohesion, rhetorical strategy, etc, and, moreover, that these features have a status that is largely unquestioned and unquestionable.

One might argue, of course, from a purely practical perspective, that mastery of these basic elements must come before students can proceed to the acquisition of discipline- and/or genre-specific features. However, the question still remains as to whether the similarities between all these varieties is sufficient to justify the concept of a macro-discourse in Anglophone academia at all.

To my mind, establishing the boundaries of a particular category is always easier if it is contrasted with what it is *not*. It is obvious, for example, that mainstream academic discourse is very different from an informal conversation, a poem or novel, or from the language used in a religious or spiritual tract;[1] we might also expected a research article in sociology to have more in common with a conference paper in biology than either of them will have with those other genres. Hence, there are implicit assumptions about what is basically appropriate or inappropriate in academic discourse, irrespective of discipline or genre, which the descriptive linguists take entirely for granted. This fact in itself is interesting, as I shall discuss below.

These implicit assumptions become more obvious when we move outside Anglophone culture and look at the kind of academic writing that is produced elsewhere. As I will endeavour to show in Part III of this thesis, much highly-valued Portuguese academic writing contains aspects[2] which would be considered bad style, or even completely 'beyond the pale', in mainstream English academic prose, and it is reasonable to assume that even more marked differences might exist in culturally more distant environments. Research into the academic writing of multilingual scholars (Curry & Lillis, 2004; Lillis & Curry, 2006a, 2006b) confirms that journals often reject articles by foreign academics on linguistic and stylistic grounds, and that 'literacy brokers' (such as journal editors, reviewers, academic peers, etc) systematically intervene in texts of foreign authorship to bring them into line with target culture expectations. Such widespread mother tongue (L1) interference amongst trained foreign academics reinforces my claim that there are basic unspoken precepts underlying all academic disciplines and genres in English that are not necessarily common to other cultures.

---

[1] I am aware, of course that there are certain currents in the social sciences at present that promote not only the use of personal narrative in research, but also other forms such as poetry, performance and hypermedia texts (see Chapter 6). However, these alternative forms of academic discourse remain very peripheral in the English context, and have clearly not been taken into account by the descriptive linguists discussed above.

[2] These include: the systematic use of extremely long sentences with inordinately complex syntax; pompous high-flown diction; high levels of abstraction; verbless sentences; figurative language or other literary features, etc. These will be listed and analysed in Part III.

The cultural gatekeepers seem to have a very clear idea as to what those precepts are, as the research cited above indicates. They appear to include certain *general principles* (such as a preference for clarity, economy, restraint, rational argument, the incorporation of accepted theory through referencing and citation, etc); a particular kind of *text structure* (hierarchical on all levels, with the general preceding the particular); a consensus as regards *length and structuring of paragraphs and sentences*; and the use of *technical terminology*, amongst other things. All of these categories are also mentioned and discussed in varying degrees of detail in the style manuals (see ***Appendix B***)

Thus, to my mind, it is unequivocal that, when viewed from outside the culture, a macro-academic discourse exists in English that is distinct from academic discourses produced elsewhere, and that this notion may be effectively mobilised for translation research. This is not to deny that variations exist between different genres, disciplines, etc, or that these may well appear to be highly significant when subjected to microscopic scrutiny. However, when viewed from a broader cross-cultural perspective, they appear no more than nuances on the surface of a largely homogeneous discourse of global reach.

The fact that descriptive linguists seem entirely unaware that knowledge could possibly be configured in any other way indicates not only that there has been ‘a rejection of connections between language and its contexts in much of mainstream linguistics’ (Pennycook, 1994:25), but also illustrates the extent of these linguists’ immersion in this macro-discourse. The ‘authoritative plain style’ (Venuti, 1995:5), which developed in the 17th century to serve the new scientific paradigm, gradually spreading to all areas of knowledge[3], is now so prevalent that most people who have been brought up in the English-speaking world do not even consider it to be a style at all. As White (1997:22) has pointed out, proficiency in it is felt to constitute basic literacy; hence, an academic paper that is non-analytical, uses language in a non-referential way, or contains figurative and ornamental features, will be dismissed as hopelessly inadequate without any consideration of the fact that, elsewhere, this might be a perfectly acceptable way of presenting academic findings.

This rather blind ethnocentricity on the part of descriptive linguists also reflects the global hegemony of English as regards knowledge production (cf. Pennycook, 1994:20-21), a situation which is unfortunately, and perhaps unwittingly, reproduced by researchers working in the area of Contrastive Rhetoric (eg. Connor, 1996; Ventola & Mauranen, 1996; Clyne, 1987a, 1987b, 1988; Duszak, 1994, 1997; Cmejrková, 1996, 1997; Kachru, 1987). For although CR developed from the perception that ‘thought patterns’, and therefore paragraph organisation and sentence structure, may vary from culture to culture (Kaplan, 1980:400), none of the studies that I have encountered address the larger issue of competing epistemological paradigms. As I pointed out in Chapter 2, this is certainly due to the fact that the data used by these scholars is generally collated in ESL or EAP contexts, which are by definition Anglocentric.

---

[3] See Chapter 5 for a fuller description of the historical origins of this style.

Indeed, the greater problem, to my mind, is not whether the prose forms used by the different disciplines and genres in the academy have enough in common to constitute a coherent discourse (this, I have argued, seems self-evident when viewed from outside the culture), but rather how to distinguish academic discourse from other kinds of factual writing that exist in English. For the texts produced in many professional areas (such as business, industry, serious journalism, etc) are approached in a very similar way to those produced in the academy and generally share with them the characteristics listed above. Indeed, we might well say, with Halliday (1993b:84), that the discourse that started out life in the 17th century as the vehicle for the new science has now become ‘the discourse of modernity’, used whenever factuality is asserted and authority claimed.

Perhaps the answer to this problem is that the academy, far from being a rarefied space for the cultivation of pure knowledge, is, in our society, inextricably implicated in the worlds of business, industry and technology, and that training in its discourse may today be viewed largely as a kind of preparation for the big world outside. David Rose implies as much in his article ‘Science discourse and the industrial hierarchy’ in which he argues that certain discursive habits are prerequisites for entry into the industrial/capitalist elite:

> /…/the scientific construal is dominant in modern industrial society and is integral to the maintenance and development of its stratified social structure; the theories of natural reality it realises have evolved in tandem with the relations of production in industrial capitalism. It is the property of the class which benefits most from this system, and reflects the structures of institutional roles which its members occupy in the course of making their living and sharing control (1998:264).

Indeed, the fact that this discourse has evolved 'in tandem with the relations of production in industrial capitalism' (as I will describe in Chapter 5) goes a long way towards explaining its hegemonic status in the world today.

A whole host of other questions are begged by this situation. Why has the discourse developed certain features and not others? What are the values underlying them? Is this way of configuring knowledge in fact inherently better than other cultures' or is its hegemony merely held in place by structures of power and wealth? These are some of the matters that I hope to explore in the forthcoming chapters, which describe the structure, history and underlying value system of the macro-discourse that I call English Academic Discourse, but which in fact represents the prestige discourse of modernity in the western world.

Chapter 4

The Structure and Ideology of English Academic Discourse

This chapter starts from the premise that there exists an Academic Discourse in English that is distinct, in terms of structure and underlying ideology/epistemology, from others existing elsewhere, and that it is sufficiently coherent across genres and disciplines to constitute a useful entity for translation research. Despite the calques of EAD that have appeared in many other languages as a result of globalization, I will argue in Part III of this thesis that there exists an older humanities-based tradition that is still thriving in Portugal (and possibly in the other Catholic countries of Southern Europe), against which EAD can be profitably contrasted. This will form the basis for my assertions concerning the distinctive features of English, reinforced by data from the Review of English Academic Style Manuals (***Appendix B***) and studies conducted by other linguists of various persuasions.

I will begin by summarizing the characteristic features of English Academic Discourse as presented in the Style Manuals, illustrated with samples from different genres and disciplines. This will be followed by a discussion of the ideological implications of those features, with reference to the historical context in which they emerged. Drawing heavily upon the work of the Australian Systemic Functional linguists into the major linguistic 'reconstrual' of reality that took place in English in the 17th century during the epistemological upheaval that has come to be labelled the 'scientific revolution', I have divided the present-day characteristics of EAD into three categories: i) Primary Features (those which are central to the scientific reconstrual); ii) Secondary Features (those which have derived from the first or occurred as a result of other philosophical or ideological changes that took place at the same time); and iii) Rhetorical Features (aspects that have a specifically interpersonal or field-constructing function). The chapter closes with a brief discussion of the philosophical and ideological implications of this discourse and the extent to which it has effectively ‘colonised’ all kinds of factual writing in the English-speaking world.

Structure of English Academic Discourse

The Survey of English Academic Style Manuals, described in ***Appendix B***, reveals a remarkable consistency with regards to the features that are considered important in the pedagogical tradition. Despite criticisms from descriptive linguists that disciplinary and genre differences are glossed over or not mentioned at all (see Chapter 3), the manuals nevertheless provide a useful indication of the core principles underlying all forms of EAD, particularly as perceived by those approaching the subject from outside Anglophone culture.

These features might be summarized as follows:

a) General Principles:

- clarity and coherence;
- economy and precision of language (avoiding vagueness, verbosity, circumlocution);
- structured rational argument supported by evidence (avoiding dubious persuasive techniques);
- *generally impartial/objective with fact distinguished from opinion;
- caution and restraint about claims (use of hedging devices, etc);
- incorporation of theory through citation and referencing;

b) Text Structure:

- text organised into sections (Introduction / Development / Conclusion in the humanities and arts; Introduction / Method / Results / Discussion / Conclusion in the sciences);
- sections are organised into paragraphs, each of which deals with one particular idea;
- hierarchical organisation at all ranks, with general statement of theme followed by development;
- coherence created by thematic progression and made explicit through signposting;
- cohesion (through use of linkers, back- and forward referencing, ellipsis, etc);

c) Sentence Length and Structure:

- complete sentences, each containing one main point, with straightforward syntax;
- sentences relatively short or varied in length, rarely containing more than about 40 – 50 words;
- *predominance of impersonal structures (passive; impersonal verbs etc);

d)Lexis:

- technical terminology from discipline (nominalisations);
- lexis used denotatively (definition of key words);
- concrete terms rather than abstractions;
- *limited use of figurative language.

(NB. The asterisked features are controversial or discipline-dependent. They will be discussed further below).

We can see these features in operation in the extracts of EAD given in Fig. 1. Despite the range of disciplines and genres, each paragraph is organised in a similar way (with a topic sentence providing a general introduction to the theme of the paragraph, followed by a more detailed development), and they all contain a predominance of nominalizations, passives and other impersonal structures.

Although the latter features are noticeably denser in the hard sciences than in the social sciences and humanities, their presence in those texts would seem to support the argument that there is an 'essential continuity between humanities and science as far as interpreting the world is concerned' (Martin, 1993b:220), a situation which, according to the Hallidayan school, has resulted from the colonisation by the discourse of science of all areas of knowledge over the course of the last three hundred years (Halliday & Martin, 1993:16; Halliday, 1993b:80; Martin, 1998:10-11; Wignell, 1998a:302-306). This assertion is perhaps a little simplistic and requires qualification, as studies into individual areas and disciplines have shown (eg. Hyland, 2000, 1999b; Wignell, 1998b). Nevertheless, it offers a useful premise with which to begin our exploration of the core features characterising English Academic Discourse as a whole.

Fig 1) Examples of English Academic Discourse

Key: Shading – Topic Sentences; Italics – Nominalizations; Underlining - Passives

A. Physics (research article)

The *thermal properties of glassy materials at low temperatures* are still not completely understood. T*hermal conductivity* has a plateau which is usually in the range of 5 to 10K and below this temperature it has a *temperature dependence* which varies approximately as T^2 . *The specific heat below 4K* is much larger than that which would be expected from *the Debye theory* and it often has an additional term which is proportional to T. Some progress has been made towards understanding the *thermal behaviour* by assuming that there is *a cut-off in the photon spectrum at high frequencies* (Zaitlin & Anderson, 1975a,b) and that there is *an additional system of low-lying two-level states* (Anderson et al., 1972; Phillips, 1972). Nevertheless, more experimental data are required and in particular it would seem desirable to make experiments on *glassy samples whose properties* can be varie*d slightly from one to the other*. The present investigation reports attempts to do this by using *various samples of the same epoxy resin which* have been subjected *to different curing cycles*. *Measurements of the specific heat (or the diffusivity) and the thermal conductivity* have been taken *in the temperature range 0.1 to 80K* for *a set of specimens which covered up to nine different curing cycles.*

B. Geology (abstract)

Igneous intrusions were emplaced prior to and contemporaneous with *horizontal shortening of the crust in the Late Cretaceous to late Eocene magmatic arc in north Chile* (*21°45'–22°30'S*). *Temporally changing major and trace elements of magmatic rocks from this paleo–arc system* chronicled *gradual crustal thickening prior to and substantial crustal thickening contemporaneously with crustal shortening. Balanced structural cross sections* indicate a *minimum of 9 km of arc-normal shortening* that occurred simultaneously with *dextral arc-parallel movements* accounting for *orogen-parallel lengthening of 10 km.* This shortening produced 5.4 *km of tectonic crustal thickening* and resulted in *a minimum of 42 km late Eocene Andean crustal thickness*. *Temporal and spatial geochemical changes diagnostic of crustal thickening* indicate that the remainder (2.6 km) was accommodated by *basaltic underplating at or near the base of the arc crust prior to and during transpression. The ratio of tectonic to magmatic crustal thickening* is 2:1. *Whole-crustal magmatic addition rates during the 12 m.y. duration of arc transpressio*n are 35 km^3 per kilometer of *model arc length per million years*. *Mafic underplating* may have thickened the Andean crust considerably, but most *pre-Neogene crustal thickening* was due to *discrete episodes of tectonic shortening*.

C. Biochemistry (research article)

A growing body of evidence suggests that *the distribution of CFTR between the plasma membrane and endosomes* is at *dynamic equilibrium*. *The rapid internalization of CFTR* seems to be mediated by *clathrin-coated pits in both polarized and non-polarized cells*. Accordingly, *the expression of CFTR* was detected in *isolated clathrin-coated vesicles*. *Endocytosis of CFTR* was inhibited by *PKA-dependent and protein-kinase-C-dependent phosphorylation* and caused the diminution of *the internal CFTR pool*. As a corollary, the *cell-surface density of CFTR* was increased in both *polarized and non-polarized cells on stimulation with PKA,* as detected by *immunofluorescence microscopy*..

D. Psychology (student textbook)

Psychologists have studied *the role of experience in perception* by controlling the *type of visual stimulation* an animal receives during its early development. For instance, *single cell recordings taken from newborn kittens* have shown the same types of *feature detector cells* that are found in adult cats (Hubel and Wiesel, 1963). This result suggests that the *neural structure for perception* is largely available at birth. However, the *visual experience* of the animal determines how well that structure will function.

E. Linguistics (reference book)

A *non-finite clause*, on the other hand, is by its nature dependent, simply by virtue of being non-finite. It typically occurs, therefore, without any other *explicit marker of its dependent status*. Hence when *a non-finite clause* occurs without a *conjunction*, there is no doubt about its *hypotactic relation in a clause complex*; but there may be no indication of its *logical-semantic function*. Here therefore the same question arises.

F. Culture (abstract)

This essay explores *the relationship between Israeli public and educational discourse* and, in particular, how, by implementing various *pedagogical strategies* aimed at inculcating *a typology of national heroism* during the state's first three decades, *the state sponsored curriculum* “translated” *ideological discourse* into *educational text*, integrating *the state's ideological value-system* into a *series of educational messages*. *The mapping of heroic prototypes in the national curriculum* was conducted along *the classic time-axis of Jewish history*. *The earliest prototype* was the *ancient Hebrew hero of the Bible* and the most recent *the “soldier as redeemer”* of *the Six Day War*. At the same time, specific values constantly shifted to reflect *changing perceptions and definitions of the heroic,* including, eventually*, the heroism of the Holocaust “survivor.”* What remained invariable was *the symbolic importance* Israeli children living in a society accustomed to wars and continuously threatened violence were taught to attach to *the ideal of the national hero and heroism* itself.

G. Education (conference paper)

Although *the use of career dilemmas* constitutes a technique still in its infancy, its use has revealed encouraging results. Therefore, a *more systematic analysis of its potentialities* is necessary, namely through recourse to samples with characteristics different from those which we have used and other forms of presenting dilemmas, namely through the use of *dramatizations* or *films*, which allow for *a more rapid involvement* with *the situation under analysis.*

H. History (monograph)

Systems of patronage differ. It may be useful to distinguish five main types. First, *the household system*: a rich man takes the artist or writer into his house for some years, gives him board, lodging and presents, and expects to have his artistic and literary needs attended to. Second, *the made-to-measure system*: again, a personal relationship between the artist or writer and his patron, but a temporary one, lasting only until the painting or poem is delivered. Third, *the market system*, in which the artist or writer produces something 'ready-made' and then tries to sell it, either directly to the public or through a dealer. This third system was emerging in Italy in the period, although the first two types were dominant. The fourth and fifth types had not yet come into existence: *the academy system* (government by means of an organisation staffed by reliable artists and writers), and the *subvention system* (in which a foundation supports creative individuals but makes no claim on what they produce).

I. Literary Criticism (article in specialist journal)

There is, of course, a significant role-reversal in this story, in the sense that Robalo, the guardian of the law, is portrayed as the outlaw, the character who is out of step with the rest of the community and who is unable to live within the law of the land (as opposed to the law of the State). This point is reinforced by *the references in the text* to God. Firstly, as part of *the narrator's preparation of the reader* for the change in Robalo's outlook, he writes "o Diabo põe e Deus dispõe" (30), thus relativising *the traditional roles of God and the Devil;* and then, when Isabel, the criminal in the eyes of the patriarchal state, appeals to Robalo for mercy when he catches her crossing the border, she appeals to him as an "homem de Deus" (35). These references deepen the significance of her plea to him: effectively by using these words, Isabel asks Robalo to abandon his *previous self-appointed role of quasi-divine authority* in favour of *a recognition of their shared status as imperfect human beings*, conscious of their own fallibility. To be able to continue living in Fronteira, therefore, Robalo must reject the role which he originally accepted (symbolically that of the father) and submit himself instead to the will of the mother, that is, the land.

J. Dance Therapy (abstract)

The author presents *a theoretical, literature-based study of the body image concept. Conceptualizations of body image in philosophy, psychology, psychiatry, and dance/movement therapy* are briefly reviewed. A *tripartite model for the concept of body image* is proposed in order to clarify the meaning of *body image.* The author differentiates body image into three interrelated aspects: *image-properties, body-self,* and *body-memory. Image-properties* refer to one's *perceived appearance of the body* and to *societal and cultural attitudes regarding the body. Body-self* is *the body-based interactive, experiencing, and emotional core self. Body-memory* stores the lived experiences and serves as *a background for evaluating present experiences. The tripartite model* is then discussed in relation to *conceptualizations of treatment goals and intervention* in dance/movement therapy.

References:

A. Kelham and Rosenburgh. 1981. *J.Phys.C. Solid State Physics* 14. (*cit.* Swales, 1990:214)

B. Huschke & Günther, 2003. 'Balancing crustal thickening in arcs by tectonic vs.magmatic means' in *Geology,* Vol. 31, No. 11. (http://www.gsa journals.org)

C. Hu, Howard and Lukacs, 2001, 'Multiple endocytic signals in the C-terminal tail of the cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator' in *Biochemical Journal, No.* 354 (http://www.biochemj.org)

D. Seamon & Kenrick, 1992. *Psychology* p.151. (Prentice Hall, New Jersey)

E. Halliday, 1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar,* p.240. (Arnold, London)

F. Shimony, 2003, 'The pantheon of national hero prototypes in educational textbooks, understanding curriculum as a narrative of national identity', in *Jewish History,* Vol. 17 Issue 3.

G. Santos, 2001 'The Discussion of Career Dilemmas in Career Counselling Groups: Theoretical and Practical Issues', presented at the World Congress of the I.A.E.V.G, Paris, Sept.2001.

H. Burke, 1972. *The Italian Renaissance: Culture and Society in Italy,* p.88 (Polity Press, Cambridge)

I. Frier, 1998.'Living on the edge: borders and taboos in Torga's "Novos Contos da Montanha"' in *Portuguese Literary and Cultural Studies,* Vol.1 (Univ.Massachusetts, Dartmouth)

J. Pylvanainen, 2003, 'Body image: a tripartite model for use in dance/movement therapy' in *American Journal of Dance Therapy,* Vol. 25 Issue 1 (http://www.kluwer on line.com)

i. Primary Features

According to the Australian school of Systemic Functional Linguistics, all English factual writing ultimately derives from the discourse of science, which developed in the 17th century to serve as a vehicle for what was then a new kind of knowledge. In two important volumes from the 1990s, *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power* (Halliday & Martin, 1993) and *Reading Science: Critical and Functional Perspectives on Discourses of Science* (Martin & Veel, 1998), these linguists explore the way in which the new grammar[1] effectively reconstrued reality, and discuss some of the political, social and educational implications arising from it.

These volumes focus almost exclusively upon *nominalization* as the central feature of this reconstrual, a device by means of which complex processes are rendered static and thing-like. However, equally important for the construction of the scientific world view are *Impersonal Verb Structures*. Despite appearing much later than nominalizations (there is ample evidence to show that these only became a common feature of scientific discourse at the end of the 19th century[2]), they continued and reinforced the cognitive shift begun by the earlier form by removing the active agent from the picture altogether, effectively creating world devoid of subjectivity. Both changes (the crystallization of processes and the removal of agency) have had immense consequences upon the way in which knowledge is configured in English, with profound ideological implications.

---

[1] In systemic functional linguistics, grammar is a *theory of experience* (Halliday, 1998:186-188). It effectively construes the world for us in a way that we assume to be entirely natural until confronted by some change in it or some alternative to it. The fact that this reconstrual did not take place in all languages at the same time has important implications for the process of translation, as I shall attempt to show during the course of this thesis.

[2] See Atkinson (1998:144-147; 1999:xxiii-xxv); Ding (1998:121-123).

a) Nominalizations

For the Australian SF school, the central distinguishing feature of scientific discourse, and by extension all academic discourse in English, is the *nominalization*, a grammatical metaphor by means of which processes are reconstrued as things.[3] These are often complex noun phrases built around a main noun or compound noun (the 'head'), qualified by a series of adjectives, prepositional phrases or relative/participle clauses. Once established as a concept within the individual text or discipline,[4] the nominalization will be perceived as a single grammatical entity that occupies noun positions in the clause. Thus, sentences in scientific writing tend to be syntactically very simple; the whole of the semantic content transported by nominal elements, while verbs are limited in semantic and syntactic range and merely express the relationship between these nominalised processes (Halliday, 1993a:63). The following examples (from Fig. 1) illustrate this feature. The nominalizations are given in italics:

> *The thermal properties of glassy materials at low temperatures* are still not completely understood. (Extract A).
>
> *Temporally changing major and trace elements of magmatic rocks from this paleo–arc system* chronicled *gradual crustal thickening prior to and substantial crustal thickening contemporaneously with crustal shortening* (Extract B)
>
> *Balanced structural cross sections* indicate *a minimum of 9 km of arc-normal shortening* that occurred simultaneously with *dextral arc-parallel movements* accounting for *orogen-parallel lengthening of 10 km.* (Extract B).

---

[3] A grammatical metaphor is 'like metaphor in the usual sense except that, instead of being a substitution of one *word* for another /.../, it is a substitution of one grammatical class, or one grammatical structure, for another; for example **his departure** instead of **he departed**. Here the words (lexical items) are the same; what has changed is their place in the grammar.' (Halliday, 1993b:79). See Halliday (1994: 342-367) for a fuller explanation.

[4] Halliday (1998: 222-223) distinguishes three time scales in which this linguistic reconstrual takes place: the *logogenetic* dimension, which is the time of the unfolding of the individual text; the *phylogenetic* dimension, involving the development of the system (i.e. the discipline); and the *ontogenetic* dimension of the linguistic maturation of the individual human being. Obviously it is the first two that interest us here.

> *The rapid internalization of CFTR* seems to be mediated by *clathrin-coated pits* in both *polarized and non-polarized cells*. (Extract C).

Nominalizations serve two important functions in scientific writing (Halliday, 1993a:60). Firstly, by compressing complex phenomena into a single semiotic entity, they enable the construction of technical taxonomies, which are of course central to the architecture of disciplines.[5] Secondly, they permit information that has already been presented in clausal form to be concisely repackaged in order to create a discourse that moves forward by logical and coherent steps, each building on what went before. This has had important implications for the development of *rational argument* (Halliday, 1993a: 60, 63) and also for the *thematic progression* (internal organisation) of the text as a whole (Martin, 1993c: 241-155). Ideologically, the result has been a wholesale shift in the experience of reality:

> Where the everyday ‘mother tongue’ of commonsense knowledge construes reality as a balanced tension between things and processes, the elaborated register of scientific knowledge reconstrues it as an edifice of things. It holds reality still, to be kept under observation and experimented with; and in doing so, interprets it not as changing with time (as the grammar of clauses interprets it) but as persisting – or rather, persistence – through time, which is the mode of being of a noun. (Halliday & Martin, 1993:15)

Martin (1993b, 1993c) and Wignell (1998a, b) argue that today, the same phenomenon is visible across all disciplines, with the *technicality* function of science being replaced by *abstraction* in the ‘softer’ subjects. There is some evidence of this in the samples in Fig. 1. All extracts contain examples of nominalizations, and some of the social science texts (notably Extracts D - G) are scarcely indistinguishable from the hard sciences in this respect.

---

[5] See Wignell, Martin & Eggins (1993) for a detailed description of this process in action in the field of geography.

> *The mapping of heroic prototypes in the national curriculum* was conducted along *the classic time-axis of Jewish history*. (Extract F)
>
> *Body-self* is *the body-based interactive, experiencing, and emotional core self.* (Extract G)

However, in the humanities, the issue of nominalization is more problematic. Martin (1993b:213) claims that 'literary criticism and historical interpretation may in fact be much more heavily nominalized than scientific writing', but that, in these subjects, nominalizations play a somewhat different role. As 'disciplines like English and history are not very technical' (Martin, 1993b:213; 1993c:226), their function is not to create technical taxonomies but rather to facilitate the construction of argument within the individual text. Just like Newton in the earliest examples of scientific discourse (Halliday, 1993a:60; 1998:202), historians will first present a new idea in clausal form, but will repackage it as a nominalization in subsequent references (Martin, 1993b:214-5, 1993c:235, 2002:91-101; Schleppegrell & Oliveira, 2006:262). This then enables the creation of thematic development, contributing to the *coherence* of the text.

Of course, nominalizations are often used when they are not required for any functional purpose, merely to create an illusion of objectivity and factuality (Martin, 1989:21). They may also be used as markers of status, since 'nominalized language is /…/ a symbol of literacy and thus education and thus power in our culture', (Martin 1993b:217):

> /…/ whereas this nominalizing was functional in the language of science, since it contributed both to technical terminology and to reasoned argument, in other discourses it is largely a ritual feature, engendering only prestige and bureaucratic power. It becomes a language of hierarchy, privileging the expert and limiting access to specialized domains of cultural experience.
> (Halliday & Martin, 1993:15)

This may be one of the reasons why so many authors of academic style manuals (***Appendix B***: 22-25) urge the use of plain English rather than jargonistic, excessively abstract or pompous terminology. For, as we shall see, *clarity of exposition* remains one of the most sacred values of English academic discourse, frequently compromised by the excessive and unnecessary use of nominalizations outside specific domains.

b) Impersonal Verb Structures

A second kind of grammatical metaphor that has been important for the scientific reconstrual of reality is the *Passive*, whereby the active agent in a process is suppressed to allow the focus to fall upon what would otherwise be the grammatical object[6]. As Ding (1998) has pointed out, this transformation serves a number of different functions in scientific discourse. On the primary level, it has the rhetorical effect of allowing the discourse to sound *objective and impersonal*, which is of course central to the way in which the scientific paradigm represents the world. By making the object of study into the subject of the sentence (and in English, the grammatical subject determines the unmarked theme or topic), the focus is shifted away from the individual subjective observer to the world outside.

> It represents the world in terms of objects, things and materials. Thus, it appears to be more "object-oriented" and "thing-oriented" than subject-oriented and human-oriented. (Ding, 1998:118).

---

[6] Atkinson's studies of *The Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London* (1998:144-147; 1999:xxiii-xxv) show that that the agentless passive only made an appearance at the end of the 19th century. Research articles in the 17th and 18th centuries exhibited a strong 'authorial persona', with the common use of first-person pronouns and active-voice verbs. These findings are supported by Ding's corpus studies into the use of personal and impersonal subjects in scientific articles from different periods (1998:121-123).

This object-orientation can be seen clearly in the following example from Fig. 1, where the focus is entirely upon processes occurring in the physical world without any obvious agency:

> Igneous intrusions were emplaced prior to and contemporaneous with horizontal shortening of the crust in the Late Cretaceous to late Eocene magmatic arc in north Chile. (Extract B)

The Passive also has a *universalising* function by removing idiosyncrasy or doubt from results or observations (Ding, 1998:120). This means that matters that are generally accepted by the community can be presented as *fact*.

> /…/ feature detector cells that are found in adult cats (Extract D)

When used to present the methods and results of particular experiments, the Passive *enhances authority* (*Idem*: 130) by implying that the result of a study does not depend upon the individual, but is replicable by any qualified scientist under similar circumstances[7].

> /…/ the expression of CFTR was detected in isolated clathrin-coated vesicles (Extract C)
>
> Endocytosis of CFTR was inhibited by PKA-dependent and protein-kinase-C-dependent phosphorylation… (Extract C)

Finally, the *communality of the scientific project* is emphasised by usages such as the following:

> The thermal properties of glassy materials at low temperatures are still not properly understood. (Extract A)
>
> Some progress has been made towards understanding the thermal behaviour… (Extract A)

---

[7] Of course, in the early days of the Royal Society, scientists were expected to physically replicate their experiments before their peers. Gradually, however, this became replaced by a detailed description of the process, which Shapin (*cit.* Swales, 1990:111; Scollon, 1994:34) calls 'virtual witnessing'.

… more experimental data are required… (Extract A)

…its use has revealed encouraging results. (Extract H)

The Passive is, of course, not the only way in which objectivity is realised in modern scientific discourse. The *Impersonal Active* (consisting of an Active Verb with an impersonal subject) is also extremely common, as a number of corpus studies have shown (*cit.* Ding, 1998: 118-119)[8]. Examples from Fig. 1 include[9]:

Thermal conductivity has a plateau… (Extract A)

Mafic underplating may have thickened the Andean crust… (Extract B)

… single cell recordings /…/ have shown the same types of feature detector cell… (Extract D)

This essay explores the relationship between… (Extract F)

Another common impersonal device in scientific discourse involves the *Anticipatory Pronoun 'It'*. Impersonal Projection is a particularly common device (eg. 'it has been shown / can be proved /seems that…'); while the following examples from Fig. 1 are ways of making recommendations without assuming individual responsibility:

…it would seem desirable to make experiments on… (Extract A)

---

[8] Ding (1998: 118-119) defines the Impersonal Active as involving 'grammatical subjects that refer to objects, things, and materials' rather than to humans (researchers). Amongst other studies of scientific prose mentioned by him, Rodman (*cit. idem*. 119) found that 73% of active structures had subjects that refer to 'materials, research processes, products and the discourse' and only 27% had human subjects, while Master (*cit. idem*) found that 60% of active verbs either take inanimate subjects or abstract subjects.

[9] While the first three of these examples have nominalizations as a subject, the last one is a different usage, involving the effective 'anthropomorphization' of the text. Clearly, further work is needed in this area to determine the different kinds of subject that are used in this kind of structure and the types of processes that are generally collocated with them.

> It may be useful to distinguish five main types (Extract I)

Finally, *Existential Structures* have also an important role to play in scientific discourse, where they are used to make bald assertions of fact concerning the existence or occurrence of phenomena:

> …there is a cut-off in the photon spectrum at high frequencies (Extract A)
>
> When a non-finite clause occurs…. (Extract E)

Modern scientific discourse has, therefore, a number of resources at its disposal for construing objectivity and reinforcing the impersonal nature of its project. All the examples given above have a functional role to play in scientific discourse and, to some extent or another, reflect one or more of the institutional imperatives of science, as articulated by Robert Merton in 1942[10].

In the 'softer' subjects, however, their use is more controversial. In Extract F (which classifies itself as a work in the field of Cultural Studies), all the information is presented in an impersonal form:

> The mapping of heroic prototypes in the national curriculum was conducted along the classic time-axis of Jewish history (passive)
>
> …the state sponsored curriculum "translated" ideological discourse into educational text (impersonal active)
>
> …specific values constantly shifted to reflect changing perceptions and definitions of the heroic (existential)

In Extract G (an abstract in the area of Dance Therapy), the Passive is used for *signposting*:

---

[10] These are: *universalism*, *communism*, *disinterestedness* and *organized skepticism*. (Merton, 1973:267-278).

> Conceptualizations of body image in philosophy, psychology, psychiatry, and dance/movement therapy are briefly reviewed.
>
> A tripartite model for the concept of body image is proposed…
>
> The tripartite model is then discussed…

These are all less easy to justify in functional terms and probably have a predominantly rhetorical objective, namely the creation of an authorial voice that is *emotionally detached* and *rational* (Ding, 1998: 129) thereby situating the research within the scientific paradigm and, by extension, acquiring some of its prestige. However, this kind of usage is now very controversial. As the Survey of Academic Style Manuals shows (see ***Appendix B*** pp. 18-22), many pedagogues now prefer the Active to the Passive, and advocate the use of the personal pronoun when referring to the authorial persona. Brown (2006: 96-7 **Bibl. *App.B***) explains this in terms of an epistemological shift:

> When social science first emerged, the dominant model was that of the natural sciences. These disciplines mostly used quantitative methods, and research was written up from the perspective of an objective, impartial researcher, emotionally distant from the research.
>
> Using expressions like 'the research was conducted' or 'the analysis confirmed the hypothesis' suggested that the research had been undertaken in a rigorous manner and that decisions about what to do and what the date revealed were precise and clear. The implication is that the researcher followed defined procedures and protocols, and was able to separate personal values from the activity of researching. When less positivistic research philosophies were developed, and when it was accepted that the totally objective researcher is an ideal rather than a reality, interest moved from the numerical analysis of data to the interpretation of the meaning of the data. The continuous choices needed while undertaking research highlighted the more subjective nature of researching people rather than natural phenomena like light or heliium.

The use of the Impersonal Active has also been challenged on the grounds that it results in the reification of abstract concepts and ultimately leads to the creation of 'absurd propositions':

> 'Reification' converts an abstraction into a thing to which you then ascribe agency, the power to act (eg. 'society can exact a price for non-conformity'). It is a short step from there to 'anthropomorphism', where you ascribe human capacities or attributes to non-human entities, as in 'a learning organization always wants to look after itself'. /.../ Each of these conceptual slips creates a broad pathway to writing absurd propositions. (Dunleavy, 2003:18 **Bibl.** ***App.B***)

If the social sciences are now having doubts about the use of impersonal structures, we may wonder about their presence in the humanities. The history extract given in Fig. 1 (Extract I) contains no explicit passives, but makes ample use of other impersonal forms:

Systems of patronage differ (existential).

It may be useful to distinguish five main types (anticipatory 'it')

This third system was emerging in Italy in the period (existential)

The passage of literary criticism (Extract J) also uses impersonal forms systematically in its metalanguage:

Robalo, the guardian of the law, is portrayed as the outlaw… (passive)

This point is reinforced by the references in the text to God. (passive)

These references deepen the significance of her plea to him… (impersonal active)

These examples support the argument that the humanities, like the social sciences, have been heavily colonised by the discourse of science. The fact that many of the style manuals explicitly criticise the overuse of impersonal structures, technical jargon and abstractions merely emphasises the fact that these features have become commonplaces in all kinds of academic discourse.

Halliday (1998:228) says of the scientific reconstrual that it brought into being not only a new kind of knowledge but also a 'new ideology':

> There are two aspects to this: in metafunctional terms, the ideational and the interpersonal. Ideationally, the nominalising grammar creates a universe of things, bounded, stable and determinate; and (in place of processes) of relations between the things. Interpersonally, it sets itself apart as a discourse of the expert, readily becoming a language of power and technocratic control. In both aspects it creates maximum distance between technical scientific knowledge and the experience of daily life.

He is referring here only to nominalised grammar of course, although, as I have argued, impersonal verb structures have also played an important part in this ideological change. In the section that follows, I hope to show that most of the other features of modern academic discourse listed at the beginning of this chapter derive directly or indirectly from this linguistic reconstrual or from other aspects of the broader epistemological shift that initially got under way in the 17th century.

ii. Secondary Features

a) Text Structure:

The structure of an academic text is possibly the least controversial aspect of EAD, as the Survey of Style Manuals shows (***Appendix B***: 11-13). Almost all the books reviewed give attention to it, and the advice is uniform across genres and disciplines: namely that a text should have an Introduction, Development and Conclusion[11]; the Introduction’s role is to inform the reader in general terms of the argument that is to follow, and the Conclusion’s is to summarise it afterwards.

Moreover, this pattern is repeated on all levels of the text. That is to say, chapters, sections and even paragraphs are expected to be organised in a similar fashion, with an introductory statement of general theme (which, on the level of the paragraph, takes the form of a *Topic Sentence*) followed by a more detailed development. In fact, as Halliday (1994:54) and Martin (1993c:244-251, 2002:106-109) point out, this macro-structure is actually a reflection of what takes place on the level of the clause; for in English, the Theme (the starting-point of the message) is always placed in initial position.

---

[11] In the hard sciences, the Development section is customarily expanded to include Methods and Materials, Findings and Discussion.

It would seem that nominalization had an important role to play in the historical development of this feature of English texts. As Halliday & Martin (1993:15) describe, the repackaging of information that has already been presented in clausal form allows that information to become the starting point, or Theme, of a new clause. This creates a foregrounding/backgrounding effect that enables the text to move forward in logical steps with New information building upon what is already Given. In a study of the *thematic development*[12] of four academic texts (two descriptive and two explanatory/expository, one each from science and history), Martin (1993c) concludes that, despite differences in function and purpose between the disciplines and the genres, the process is basically the same – and in all cases, dependent upon the linguistic resource of nominalization.

This thematic structuring of English factual texts has further implications. For one, it seems frequently to determine *sentence length*. Northedge (2005: 327, **Bibl. *App. B.***), analysing a model article, found that shorter sentences were generally used at the beginning and end of paragraphs to set up the topic and summarise it afterwards, while longer ones were used to develop the central idea at more length. (The same pattern appears to be repeated at other ranks, with shorter paragraphs generally introducing and concluding sections, chapters and entire texts; while, on the level of the clause, it may also be manifested in the stylistic rejection of the *'top-heavy' sentence.*[13])

---

[12] Thematic structure, which organises the text as message, is not quite the same thing as the ideational structure of Given/New, although the two often overlap. For a more detailed explanation of how thematic development operates in scientific discourse, see Halliday (1993a: 60-62; 1993b:81; 1993c:90) and Whittaker (1995). On thematic development in English texts in general, see Halliday (1994:37-67), and Ghadessy, 1995.

The hierarchical structure also implies the need for *prior planning* of texts. As the content of each unit (text, chapter, section or paragraph) is systematically summarized in the introduction at all levels, the author needs to have an overview of the whole argument before embarking upon the writing process. Hence, the style manuals generally devote a considerable amount of time to instructing their readers about how to 'brainstorm' ideas, and then select and organise points into a coherent form *before* encoding them into language proper (see ***Appendix B***: 11-13). Hence, English academic prose does *not* reflect the inductive procedure commonly used in research itself, but rather presents the findings and conclusions of that research in a finished polished form[14]. That is to say, the subject is explored not during the act of writing itself, but at a preliminary planning stage.

The hierarchical structuring also brings benefits of a practical nature. For, once a reader knows to expect a summary of the main content at the start of any unit of text, it is very easy to process large quantities of text and locate information that is of interest. However, it cannot be taken for granted that other cultures organise their texts in the same way, as all EAP teachers know. Foreign students usually have to be taught how to *read* English factual prose (for example, by identifying the different sections, highlighting the Topic Sentences of paragraphs and using the hierarchical organisation to rapidly locate specific pieces of information in the body of a large text, etc)[15], and there is sometimes resistance amongst students towards producing frontal statements of topic or purpose in their own writing. This naturally has implications for the process of translation, as I discuss in Part IV.

---

[13] i.e. Where there is too much information between the grammatical subject (usually the Theme) and the verb.

[14] Sociologists of science have highlighted the discrepancies between the messy realities of scientific research and the polished presentation of that procedure in the form of the research article. Cf. Knorr-Cetina (1981); Latour & Woolgar (1986); Gilbert & Mulkay (1984).

b) Rational argument supported by evidence:

A considerable number of the style manuals consulted in the survey (***Appendix B***:10-11 and Table 2a) emphasise the need for *rational argument*, and it is interesting to note that particular attention is given to this aspect in manuals aimed at the humanities. This indicates not only the clear separation of factual writing from literary writing in English, but also that history and literature students may need special reminding of it (perhaps suggesting that the matter is not quite as clear cut as one might suppose).

This emphasis on rationality is manifested in a number of different ways in the style manuals. As well as providing help in structuring arguments (sometimes going into a great deal of detail about techniques and types of logic), the manuals frequently advise their readers to *distinguish between fact and opinion* (eg. Fairbairn & Winch, 1996:174; Cottrell, 2003: 179, **Bibl. *App. B***) and to *avoid dubious persuasive techniques*, including amongst other things, *emotive language* (eg. Fairbairn & Winch, 1996:180; Hennessy, 2002:90; **Bibl. *App. B***) and *value judgments* (eg. Macmillan & Weyes, 2007a: 113, **Bibl. *App.* B**). Although this last aspect is now coming under attack from some directions, the fact that such advice still persists in mainstream style manuals indicates that it is an enduring feature of the English academic mindset.

---

[15] It is true that native speakers have to be taught how to read and write factual prose too, as a number of linguists working in the SF tradition have pointed out (for example, Martin, 1989, 1993c; Christie, 1998, 2002; Columbi & Schleppelgrell, 2002; Schleppelgrell & Oliveira, 2006). However, the difference is that, in Anglophone contexts, this usually takes place at primary or secondary school level, thus reinforcing the claim (White, 1997:22; Halliday & Martin, 1993:11) that mastery of it constitutes basic literacy in our culture.

It is also noticeable that the manuals aimed specifically at the social sciences and humanities systematically emphasise the need to base the argument upon *evidence* or *facts*. The two books from the Survey directed at literature undergraduates stress the need for *close observation of the text* (Pirie, 1985:109; Fabb & Durant, 2005:77-89; **Bibl.** ***App. B***), while Storey (2004:2, **Bibl.** ***App. B***), writing for history undergraduates, insists that a good historian 'uses *sources* to make inferences about events in the past, and develop sustained arguments' (my italics). This too reveals the influence of the scientific paradigm, since in both cases, the object of study is being treated empirically.

Of course rationalism and empiricism ultimately derive from the broader Enlightenment project, which obviously has a great many philosophical and cultural ramifications far beyond the scope of this study. However, their discoursal manifestations (in the form of, respectively, an absence of subjectivity/emotivity, and a focus upon the extralinguistic world) emerge quite naturally from the scientific reconstrual described by Halliday and his collaborators. For both nominalizations and impersonal verb forms remove the human agent from the picture, placing the object of study into central position. This not only creates a worldview that consists entirely of things, as we have seen, it also limits the opportunities for expressing attitude, creating an impression of neutrality and emotional detachment[16].

This emotive denuding is further reinforced by the fact that, in EAD, lexis tends to be used *denotatively*; that is to say, meanings are tightly controlled, with the suppression of connotative or figurative dimensions. In the sciences and social sciences, this is manifested through the use of *technical terminology* (most which is formed through the process of nominalization, as we have seen). In the humanities, where the language is much less technical, writers are urged to *define their terms* at the outset in order to avoid ambiguity (see ***Appendix B***: 24). Hence, even in subjects like history and literary criticism, persuasion is expected to take place exclusively through rational means, without recourse to emotional manipulation of any kind (*Idem*: 10).

---

[16] Of course there are many ways that academic writers can surreptitiously 'smuggle in' their value judgments into apparently neutral objective prose. These will be discussed below under 'epistemic modality'.

Indeed, the fact that emotive or figurative language is still considered inappropriate by most mainstream style manuals (in some, even condemned as an underhand method of persuasion) bears witness to the persistence of Enlightenment values in English Academic Discourse. For, although it is now generally acknowledged by linguists that objectivity is unattainable in language and that covert rhetorical devices abound in even the positivist-empiricist discourse of the hard sciences (see below), the pedagogical tradition continues to perpetuate the myth that academic knowledge is attained and transmitted solely through rational means. This discrepancy will be considered in more detail in Chapter 6.

c) Clarity, Economy, Precision

These three qualities are given great emphasis in the style manuals (see ***Appendix B***: 10, 17, 23, 26, 29), and are frequently presented as important general principles that should never be compromised. They are achieved in various ways:

- clear textual organisation, pre-planned to ensure that there is nothing extraneous to the argument;

- simple sentence structure without too much subordination obscuring the main clause[17];
- lexis that is carefully chosen to avoid redundancy and circumlocution; definition of key terms to avoid ambiguity; the use of technical terminology where functionally necessary[18], but the avoidance of pretentious or pompous diction;
- a preference for concrete terms over abstract[19] ones.

As I shall show with reference to Portuguese academic discourse in Part III of this dissertation, these qualities are not necessarily so prized in other cultures as they are in ours. Elsewhere, they may be subordinated to the quest for elegance and grace of expression, to a philosophical desire to avoid the perceived reductionism of the scientific approach to knowledge or to the creation of a register of erudition. Hence, it cannot be taken for granted in translation situations that the source text is necessarily pursuing the same ends as its English counterpart as regards the value given to the unambiguous communication of referential content.

Indeed, the qualities in question, far from being unquestionable absolute virtues, as some of the style manuals perhaps suggest, can be shown to have emerged from a very particular sociohistorical context that was present in England in the 17th century. As I describe in Chapter 5, the epistemological shift that has come to be known as the Scientific Revolution was embedded in a much broader sociocultural 'revolution' that affected every level of life; and amongst the various circumstances that influenced this change, an important element was clearly the Protestant Reformation, with its doctrine of 'the priesthood of all believers'. Hence, the continuing emphasis on clarity, economy and plainness in academic discourse may be seen as a product of early Protestant culture from which science, like capitalism, emerged[20].

---

[17] Dunleavy (2003: 114-115, **Bibl.** ***App. B***) points out that the inner core of an English sentence is the Subject-Verb-Object unit, and that these three components need to be closely bonded together if ambiguity is to be avoided. Thus, 'qualifying or subordinate clauses are always best placed at the beginning or ends of sentences, never in the middle, which should be reserved for the core'; and, in order to keep the SVO unit clearly visible, sentences 'should not get too long and they should have the simplest feasible grammatical structure'. As a guide, he suggests 'you should never write a sentence longer than 40 words, and you should aim for an ideal sentence length of around 20 words'

[18] Technical terminology 'does specialist things, has more precise meanings and allows expositions to quickly reach targeted subjects, which would be hard to reach or cumbersome to define in other ways' (Dunleavy, 2003: 117 **Bibl.** ***App.B*****)**

[19] See ***Appendix B***: 24 / Table 2b. The generalised distaste for abstractions in English may result from the empirical orientation of English culture, which distrusts concepts that appear to lack a concrete referent in the outside world. This issue is discussed at more length in ***Appendix A*** (34-39).

Indeed, plain writing not only reflected the general Puritan distrust of ornament and ostentation of any kind, it also embodied a particular attitude to knowledge. The assumption was that a prose style shorn of any rhetorical device or adornment offers a transparent window onto the world outside and is thus inherently more 'truthful' than more elaborate approaches that obfuscate the issue or manipulate the reader.

The plain style also served a democratising agenda in the 17th century (it meant that the new knowledge could be disseminated to anyone who could read in the form of popularizing texts and translations)[21], and to a certain extent, this attitude is still in evidence today. It is clear from the style manuals reviewed that 'obscure, jargonistic, pompous, excessively abstract or pretentious' prose (***Appendix B***: 24) is considered an affectation, entirely inappropriate to the fundamental objectives of academic investigation. And although much peer-directed academic writing today may seem hermetic and inaccessible to the outsider, this tends mostly to be due to the high levels of technicality rather than to any syntactical complexity or spurious markers of erudition. In fact, if we take a closer look at the extracts in Fig. 1 (and all the passages except D are aimed at specialists in the field), we realise that the language is in fact as economical and precise as the level of knowledge will allow.

---

[20] See for example Robert Merton (2001 [1970]) on the connections between puritanism and science; R.H. Tawney 1938 [1922] and Max Weber 1992 [1930] on puritanism and capitalism; and Christopher Hill (1997 [1965]) for an overview of all these influences in the 17th century. These connections will be explored in more detail in Chapter 5.

[21] Cf. Hill, 1997:21-31.

Even so, there are calls from some directions[22] to reduce to a minimum even nominalizations and impersonal structures in the interests of clarity, despite the fact that these have both been shown to be central to the scientific reconstrual. Many style manuals now urge the avoidance of technical jargon in favour of short everyday words (see ***Appendix B*****:** 23-24) and advocate the use of the Active voice rather than Impersonal structures (*Idem*. 18-21). This may be a reaction against the use of these features in disciplines and genres where they are functionally unnecessary, as Halliday & Martin (1993:15) have pointed out. But it may also be an indication of the deeprootedness of the naïve Anglophone belief that (one's) language reflects things as they are, and that plain prose is inherently more truthful than any other, thus providing a justification for the continued hegemony of EAD in the world.

iii. Rhetorical Aspects

Factual writing in English is today very clearly demarcated from literary writing, even in the humanities[23]. Following the separation of 'literature' and 'literacy' in the 19th century, when art in general was deprived of any cognitive authority or practical utility (see White, 1997:22-23), personal style ceased to be cultivated for academic purposes and instead, writing was valued for its communicative function, its ability to transmit information. Consequently, the desirable mode was one that was largely transparent, neutral and objective.

---

[22] The various challenges to mainstream academic discourse will be discussed in Chapter 6.

[23] Postmodern discourses are, of course, seeking to reverse this trend (see Chapter 6).

This kind of writing has variously been called 'writing degree zero' (Roland Barthes)[24], 'windowpane prose' (Golden-Biddle & Locke, *cit.* Woods, 2006:43, ***Bibl. App. B***), ‘the rhetoric of anti-rhetoric’ (White, 1997:27) and the ‘authoritative plain style’ (Bernstein, *cit.* Venuti, 1995:5). Based upon a philosophy of language that is termed ‘realist'[25], it posits the existence of a world ‘out there’ that can be perceived, analysed and discussed in absolute terms, irrespective of the subjective position of the observer or the cognitive tools that are used for the purpose.

But this apparent neutrality is a construct, as we have already seen. It is largely achieved through the systematic use of nominalizations and impersonal verb forms, which remove the subjective observer from the picture and focus upon the world outside; by simple sentence structures and clearly defined lexis, which create an illusion of a basic correspondence between words and things, and by a careful reasoning process that uses ‘logical’ devices such as entailment and consistency to create a watertight argument.

> The art of the matter, as far as the creation of facts is concerned, lies in deceiving the reader into thinking that there is no rhetoric, /.../ and that the facts are indeed speaking for themselves. (Swales, 1990:112)

With the privileging of the referential or ideational function of language, we might expect less attention given to the interpersonal dimension in academic prose. But, as Swales implies in the above quotation, this too is an illusion. In fact, all kinds of interpersonal devices have been identified in academic texts in recent years, as revealed by a spate of articles that focus upon (amongst other things): the construction of writer stance (Hyland, 1999b; Martin, 2002:101-105), expert identity (Hyland, 2000:104-129) and the reader-in-the-text (Thompson, 2001); the rhetorical consequences of audience awareness (Burgess, 2003); self-promotion devices, resulting from market economics (Hyland, 2000:63-84; Yakhontova, 2002: 216-232); narrative dimensions (Nash, 1990)[26] and disciplinary rhetoric (Roberts & Good, 1993). As Hyland (1999b: 107-8) says:

---

[24] Although Barthes himself was not referring to English Academic Discourse in his description of a kind of writing that is ‘amodal’, ‘neutral’, ‘a style of absence which is almost an ideal absence of style' (1967 [1953]: 77), the term has (with some appropriacy, in my view) been applied to EAD (Swales, 1990: 112).

[25] ‘Realism I characterise as the belief that statements of the disputed class possess an objective truth-value, independently of our means of knowing it: they are true or false in virtue of a reality existing independently of us’ (Michael Dummett *cit.* Rorty, 1991:3. See also p. 22)

> /…/published academic writing is not the faceless discourse that it is often assumed to be /…/ among the specialist terms, dense lexis, passives and nominalisations, there are conventions of personality.

Those personality conventions include a number of devices such as *attitude markers,*[27] *relational markers,*[28] and *person markers*[29] (cf. Hyland, 1999:104). Here, however, I would like to concentrate upon two that are considered by the Style Manuals to be essential features of academic discourse, namely the phenomena of *epistemic modality* and *citation and referencing.*

a) Epistemic modality

Many of the style manuals examined express the need for caution or restraint when making claims in academic writing (see ***Appendix B***: 11). This is manifested mostly through the use of *hedging devices* ('epistemic possibility'), which allow the writer to be tentative and to avoid sweeping generalizations that could be easily disproved (eg. 'it is possible that...', 'perhaps', 'it may be', instead of the more categorical 'it is').

---

[26] See in particular Harré (1990) on scientific writing as narrative, McCloskey (1990, 1993) on the use of metaphor and storytelling in economics; and Myers (1990) on the narrative of discovery in science.

[27] These convey the writer's affective attitude to propositions and include attitude verbs (eg. 'I agree'); necessity modals ('should', 'have to', 'must'); sentence adverbs ('unfortunately', 'hopefully') and adjectives ('appropriate', 'logical', 'remarkable').

[28] Devices that explicitly address the reader or invoke reader participation. They include 2nd person forms ('we find here', 'let us now turn to'); questions forms ('why accept?' 'where does this lead?'); imperatives ('consider', 'recall that') and direct addresses to the audience ('this will be familiar to those…').

[29] The use of personal pronouns and possessive adjectives to present propositional, affective and interpersonal information.

However, this is just one aspect of a range of epistemic devices available for expressing the level of commitment that writers bring to their claims. At the other end of the spectrum, we have *boosters* or *emphatics* (‘epistemic necessity’), which express certainty and emphasise the force of a proposition (eg. ‘it is obviously’, ‘definitely’, 'of course'). Epistemic modality therefore offers an important outlet for subjectivity and opinion in even the most positivistic kind of academic text.

The classic manifestation of epistemic modality in English is through modal verbs (such as 'may’, ‘might’, ‘could’, ‘must’). However, there are also many other epistemic expressions that use different parts of speech: adverbs ('possibly', 'perhaps', 'obviously', 'in fact', 'of course', etc); lexical verbs ('appear', 'believe', 'claim', 'doubt', ‘suggest’ etc); nouns (‘assumption’, ‘evidence’, ‘estimate’, ‘fact’, ‘possibility’, etc), and adjectives (‘clear’, ‘obvious’, 'possible’, ‘general’, etc).[30] Examples from Fig. 1 include:

> Mafic underplating may have thickened the Andean crust… (Extract B)
>
> This result suggests that the neural structure for perception is largely available at birth (Extract D)
>
> There is no doubt about its hypotactic relation in a clause complex (Extract E)

Historically, the use of epistemic modality in academic discourse goes back a long way. Robert Boyle employed hedging devices in his scientific treatises, a decade or so prior to the publication of the first *Transactions of the Royal Society* in 1665 (Shapin, *cit.* Swales, 1990:111-112), and even reflected explicitly about this practice:

---

[30] An extensive list of the most common forms found in academic writing is provided by McEnery & Kifle in an appendix to their article on the subject (2002:194).

> …in almost every one of the following essays, I /…/ speak so doubtingly, and use so often *perhaps, it seems, it is not improbable* and other such expressions, as argue a diffidence to the truth of the opinions I incline to... (*Idem*)

Hedging may thus be considered as central to the scientific worldview as nominalization, a reflection of the *organised skepticism* that is one of the cornerstones of the scientific ethos[31]. Indeed, by carefully distinguishing between fact and opinion, it effectively reinforces claims to objectivity - which may be why it is by far the most common of all the interpersonal markers used in academic writing, comprising half of all the interpersonal forms used in textbooks (Hyland, 2000:114) and over half in articles (Hyland, 1999b:106).

Epistemic modality is thus an important rhetorical tool in its own right:

> In academic discourse, the balancing of reporting objective data and signalling subjective evaluation is critical, and the writer's assessment of the reliability of knowing can be a powerful persuasive factor. (Hyland, 1999:101)

It has a stance-creating function[32], projecting authorial honesty and modesty (or, conversely, assurance and conviction), demonstrating respect for colleagues' views and readers' face needs, or indicating involvement with the topic and solidarity with readers (Hyland, 1999:101, 2000:112; Swales, 1990:175). Moreover, in the hands of a competent writer, hedging and boosting devices may be deftly manipulated to reinforce one's own argument and undermine an opponent's, a rhetorical strategy that is far more common than we might expect even within the positivist-empirical epistemological framework of the hard sciences[33]. Today, this can hardly be viewed with moral approbation. For if we understand that 'facts' are merely linguistic constructs that have been canonised by a particular discourse community, then modalised claims are those that have not yet been taken on board by the community as a whole. That is to say, the exact epistemic device chosen (ranging from highly tentative forms such as 'it would seem…' to the categorical assertion of the universalising present 'it is') may provide an indication of the claim's precise status within the discourse community at a particular moment in time.

---

[31] This was defined by Robert Merton in 1942 as 'the temporary suspension of judgment and the detached scrutiny of beliefs in terms of empirical and logical criteria', which is 'both a methodological and an institutional mandate' (1973:277). Although the term is normally applied to the practice of peer review by means of which bogus results are weeded out, the use of hedging devices by authors implies internalisation of the skepticism principle and systematic self-criticism, in anticipation of the judgments to be passed by the community.

[32] Stance refers to 'the ways that writers project themselves into their texts to communicate their integrity, credibility, involvement, and a relationship to their subject matter and their readers' (Hyland, 1999:101).

b) Citation and Referencing

The process by means of which academic claims are gradually turned into fact is described by Hyland (1999a:342) as follows:

> The construction of academic facts is a social process, with the cachet of acceptance only bestowed on a claim after negotiation with editors, expert reviewers and journal readers, the final ratification granted, of course, with the citation of the claim by others and, eventually, the disappearance of all acknowledgment as it is incorporated into the literature of the discipline.

Citation, therefore, like epistemic modality, plays an important role in the construction of disciplinary knowledge. It allows writers to situate their work within a broader narrative, display allegiance to a particular community or orientation, and create a niche for their research (*Idem;* Hyland, 2002:115).

As such, it reflects the scientific imperative of *communism* (Merton, 1973: 273-275), a means of expressing one's indebtedness to others and recognising 'the essentially cooperative and selectively cumulative quality of scientific achievement'. Indeed, the centrality of intertextuality to the scientific project is demonstrated by the relatively early appearance of referencing and attribution in the scientific writings of the Royal Society. Atkinson (1998:149-150) reports that primitive literature review sections were evident in scientific articles as early as 1825, and that by 1875, they had become relatively common and were typically exhaustive[34].

---

[33] Gilbert & Mulkay (1982) show how "experimental results" are used rhetorically in discussions of the belief-worthiness of putative claims to knowledge.

The conventions concerning citation are today firmly established, as is shown by the general consensus on the subject in the style manuals (***Appendix B***: 25). Academic texts in the sciences and social sciences will generally contain a literature review, usually in the introduction or as a separate section near the beginning, in which preceding and related research on the subject is systematically acknowledged; and the works cited will of course be fully referenced at the end or in footnotes/endnotes. Within the body of the text, the work of others may referred to using *direct quote* (which may be incorporated into the author's own sentence or blocked for emphasis)*, paraphrase* (giving the cited author's name and date of research but not using his/her words) or *summary* (general references that do not name a particular predecessor, eg. 'Generative grammarians have recently…' [Jacoby *cit.* Swales, 1990:150]).

There has been a lot of work conducted into the implications of different referencing procedures. For example, Swales (1990:148-154) distinguishes between *integral* and *non-integral* forms of citation[35], the use or absence of *reporting verbs*

---

[34] According to Bazerman (*cit.* Swales, 1990:114-5), in a study of research articles from the journal *Physical Review* from its founding in 1893 to 1980, references were quite common in the early years (about 10 per article) though rather general. By 1910, they had become sparser, though more relevant and more recent, thereafter increasing dramatically in both number and relevance.

[35] *Integral citations* show the name of the researcher as subject (eg. Brie [1988] showed the moon is made of cheese), as passive agent (eg. 'The moon's cheesy composition was established by Brie [1988]), as part of a possessive noun phrase (eg. 'Brie's theory [1988] claims that the moon is made of cheese' or 'Brie's [1988] theory of lunar composition has general support) or as an 'adjunct of reporting' ('According to Brie [1988]. In *non-integral citations*, the researcher appears in parenthesis (eg. 'Previous research has shown that the moon is made of cheese [Brie, 1988]') or is referred to elsewhere by a superscript number or some other device (eg. 'It has been established that the moon is made of cheese.$^{1\text{-}3}$'). The use of one form over another appears to reflect the amount of emphasis the author chooses to give to the reported author or reported text.

(eg. ‘X showed/established/claimed’); and the different *tenses* used when making attributions[36]; while Hyland (2002:118-121) analyses the different functions of reporting verbs (divided into Process[37] and Evaluative[38] functions), and disciplinary differences between the amount of citation used (1999:346) and the form it takes (*Idem:*347-352, 2002:123-129). Other studies have concentrated upon syntactical features, such as the effect of thematic position, tense and voice upon the reported information (Malcolm, Oster, Shaw *cit.* Hyland, 1999a:344, 2002:116).

Perhaps the most interesting findings for my purposes here are the disciplinary differences between referencing procedures. Hyland (1999a:346) found clear differences between the extent to which writers rely on the work of others in presenting arguments, with the softer disciplines (in this case, sociology, marketing and philosophy) employing many more citations than the hard sciences. He explains this as a consequence of the fact that hard knowledge is characterised by a relatively steady cumulative growth (which means that writers can presuppose a certain amount of background, procedural expertise, theoretical understanding and technical lexis on the part of their target readers), while in the humanities and social sciences, new knowledge tends to be more reiterative and recursive, with writers drawing on a literature that displays greater historical and topical dispersion and which is open to greater interpretation (*Idem*: 352-353).

---

[36] The most common tenses used for referencing are the *Past* (eg. 'Brie [1988] showed that...'), used mostly for references to specific studies or experiments; the *Present Perfect* (eg. ‘It has been shown that….[Brie, 1988]’), used mostly for references to areas of inquiry; and the *Present* or a *Modal*, used mostly for generalizations (eg. ‘The moon is/may be made of cheese [Brie, 1988]’). The progression from Past to Present Perfect to Present (eg. ‘X pointed out.. / has pointed out…/points out…) may also indicate some kind of increasing proximity.

[37] These are divided into *Research (Real-World Acts)*, which represent experimental activities or actions carried out in the real world and generally occur either in statements of findings (eg. 'observe', 'discover', ‘notice', ‘show’) or procedures (eg. 'analyse', 'calculate', 'explore'); *Cognition Acts*, concerned with the researcher’s mental processes (eg. 'believe’, ‘assume’, ‘conceptualise’, ‘view’), and *Discourse Acts*, which involve linguistic activities and focus on the verbal expression of cognitive or research activities (eg. ‘ascribe’, ‘discuss’, ‘hypothesize’, ‘report’, ‘state’).

[38] These indicate the author's stance towards the reported claims. They may be supportive (eg. ‘show’, ‘demonstrate’), critical (eg. ‘fail to show’, ‘ignore’) or neutral (eg. ‘believe’, 'dispute', ‘urge’).

> Writers therefore often have to pay greater attention to elaborating a context through citation, reconstructing the literature in order to provide a discursive framework for their arguments and demonstrate a plausible basis for their claims. The more frequent citations in the soft texts therefore suggest greater care in firmly situating research within disciplinary frameworks and supporting claims with intertextual warrants. (*Idem*: 353)

It will be interesting to see if this same disciplinary difference as regards citation and referencing is evident in Portuguese academic discourse. For ultimately its presence is a sign of colonization by the discourse of science, since it was in that domain that the whole notion of communism arose. In a culture where writing in the humanities is viewed in more mystical terms, where other features of communism (such as peer reviewing or criticism) are notably absent and where individual authors tend to have a more oracular status, we may well find that the practice of citation and referencing is much less common.

* * *

As we have seen, then, mainstream English Academic Discourse, which developed initially as a vehicle for science, encodes the scientific worldview in its very structure. It is predicated upon a philosophy of language that assumes that statements have an objective truth-value in function of an independently-existing reality. Consequently, content and form are perceived to be entirely separate; that is to say, the ‘meaning’ of a message may be extrapolated, summarized, reformulated or translated without any essential loss or alteration of meaning. Indeed, in the hard sciences and social sciences, verbal discourse is often supplemented or even replaced by graphs, charts, diagrams, equations, etc, which reinforces this perception of the ultimate separability of sign and referent[39].

All the main characteristics extolled by the Style Manuals and listed at the beginning of the chapter have a structural role to play in this representation. Nominalizations and impersonals remove the human agent from the picture and shift the attention to an outside reality that is presented as static and unchanging, unaffected by subjectivity or the cognitive tools that are used to access it. Technical terminology (or the denotative use of lexis in nontechnical subjects) harnesses meaning, preventing any undesired ambiguity from creeping in. The argumentation process, achieved through simple sentences, each building on what came before, ensures that the conclusions appear eminently reasonable, even commonsensical; while the hierarchical text structure, in which nothing is extraneous and all loose ends are properly finished off, packages the author's claims in such a way as to present them as a reliable statement about the way things are. Even the ostensibly interpersonal devices of epistemic modality and citation effectively reinforce the authority of this worldview by presenting it as the 'discovery' not of a single fallible individual but of a whole community of worthy scientists, all working together in a disinterested fashion to unlock the secrets of the natural world. Thus, EAD may be considered a verbal manifestation of those four institutional imperatives that comprise the scientific ethos (Merton, 1973:267-278): *universalism, communism, disinterestedness* and *organized skepticism.*

Given the authority of science in the modern world, and its connections with capitalism, business, industry and technology, it is hardly surprising that this discourse appears to have colonized the English-speaking world. For even outside the academy, claims have to be couched in this form to be taken seriously; indeed, proficiency in the 'authoritative plain style' is now felt to constitute basic literacy, as Hayden White (1997:22) and Halliday & Martin (1993:11) have pointed out. In Part II, I will compare this with the situation in Portugal, where the Scientific Revolution never really took place and where, as a consequence, the older humanities-based tradition retained its central position for much longer. First, however, I would like to examine in more detail the specific historical circumstances that led to the development of scientific discourse in 17th century England and the process by which the 'authoritative plain style' was eventually canonised as the accepted way of configuring knowledge in the English-speaking world.

---

[39] See Lemke (1998:87-113) on the visual and verbal semiotics in scientific text.

Chapter 5

The Historical Roots of English Academic Discourse

Modern factual discourse is, as we have seen, far from being the neutral vehicle of objective truth that it long purported to be. Rather, it is a construct that systematically contrives to give the *appearance of neutrality* in order to *legitimise its claims to universality*, a principle still assumed by scientific bodies today.[1] However, sociologists and historians of scientific discourse or rhetoric[2] have repeatedly demonstrated the hollowness of this claim; for not only did the epistemological and methodological attitude that we know as 'science' develop within a specific historical context upon the impulse of a particular sociocultural group, the discourse that serves as its vehicle (today the default discourse of factuality, as we have seen) was deliberately cultivated by proponents of the new paradigm in response to perceived deficiencies in the existing discourse.

This chapter aims to give an overview of that historical development, looking first at the attitudes to knowledge and language that prevailed in England prior to the Scientific Revolution of the 17th century, and then tracing the emergence and expansion of scientific discourse, with reference to some of the philosophical currents and key writers that shaped it.

---

[1] See, for example, the document 'The Universality of Science in a Changing World', published by the International Council for Science, which defines 'universality' as the capacity to transcend national boundaries (http://www.icsu.org/Gestion/img/ICSU_DOC_DOWNLOAD/567_DD_FILE_Universality.pdf - accessed 18/01/08).

[2] The terms 'discourse' and 'rhetoric', when collocated with 'scientific', refer essentially to the same object. However, underlying them are two different approaches. In the present context, the former tends to be used by practitioners operating within the *scientific* discipline of *linguistics*, while the latter is the province of scholars from the *humanities*, often with a background in *literary studies.* These distinctions are discussed in Chapters 2 and 6.

The Medieval and Early Modern Periods: 'Logos', the Divine Word

EAD, like all mainstream factual discourse in English, is predicated upon the belief that there exists an external reality that is independent of human perception and sign systems, which can be observed, analysed and discussed in an entirely objective fashion. Indeed, this attitude (known to philosophers of language as 'realism') is today so deeply engrained in Anglophone culture that it appears to most people as entirely commonsensical, a perspective which has undoubtedly been reinforced by a certain cultural selfcentredness and monolingualism engendered by hegemony. Hence, postmodern constructivist views of language, which seem to go against commonsense (and which, of course, ultimately undermine that hegemony by deconstructing some of its most dearly-held myths) are generally received with a certain amount of skepticism by all aside of a few more progressive university departments.

But this view has not always been with us. In the medieval period, the focus of all learning was not the physical world as separate from man, but rather man's symbolic systems, the work of his spirit. Knowledge, conceived as philosophy, resided above all in words ('logos'), and was acquired by the exegesis of authoritative texts (not only the scriptures, but also those classical texts which had been assimilated into the system) and by training in the use of language. Even the 'Book of Nature' was conceived as a symbolic code of non-verbal signifiers, to be interpreted by readers skilled in perceiving similitudes (Foucault, 2002a:19-32; Moss, 1993:52)[3]. The educational curriculum naturally reflected this focus, and in schools, the tripartite study of language occupied a central role (the so-called Trivium of Grammar, Rhetoric and Dialectic, of which Dialectic, or the art of argumentation, held pride of place); while in the Universities, Logic, alongside Theology, was the leading discipline. Indeed, words were considered to be manifestations of divine power, and as such, had immense metaphysical and religious importance (cf. Timmermans, 1999:83-90; Vickers, 1993: 25-28).

---

[3] Moss (1993:50) points out that 'language was necessarily and emphatically prior to knowledge' given that, up to the 16th century, the language of education all across Europe was Latin.

In the Renaissance period, with the arrival of Humanism, the arts of verbal expression were given an even bigger role to play, but with a slightly different emphasis. Now rhetoric, or the manipulation of words in order to persuade, took centre stage, regaining much of the importance that it had once had in classical times. According to Christian humanists like Erasmus, language was a civilizing force, a God-given faculty, which could move men to virtue and bring about good, justice and liberty. Hence, eloquence was cultivated as an educational discipline and literary ideal, and abundant speech was valued as an indication of inner worth - "a magnificent and impressive thing, surging along like a golden river, with thoughts and words pouring out in rich abundance"[4].

Indeed, "copiousness", was one of the main aims of the humanist rhetoricians. There was a delight in multiplicity and diversity, and meaning was not perceived as something fixed and immutable, but rather as a variable that would change according to collocation and circumstance. As the objective was not to achieve certainty beyond rational doubt (that was the domain of logic and mathematics) but rather to win the agreement of the particular reader or listener, the interpersonal dimension of language was highly valued and students were trained to adapt arguments and style to their audiences. To achieve this goal, they would naturally be expected to make use of the full gamut of figures and tropes[5] at their disposal. In a society in which the divorce between matter and spirit had not yet taken place, these rhetorical figures were not perceived as mere ornament, but rather as an intrinsic and essential part of the discourse. Like the columns and peristyles on Elizabethan houses, they contributed to the perfection of the whole.

---

[4] The opening sentence of Erasmus' *De deplici copia verborum ac rerum* (1512), transl. B.I. Knott, *Collected Works of Erasmus,* XXIV, Toronto, Buffalo and London. University of Toronto Press, 1978: 638.

This was, then, a highly self-referring universe (Foucault, 1970:32; Moss, 1993:55). Knowledge meant having the key to the network of references and allusions contained in texts and being able to use them elegantly in one's own writing. It was, moreover, a very elitist knowledge, since it was entirely inaccessible to those unversed in Latin. Indeed, this fact may well have contributed to the demise of ‘logos’ in post-Reformation England, as we shall see.

17th Century: ‘Things not Words’

a) Philosophers and Men of Letters

Accounts of the Scientific Revolution and the emergence of the new prose style usually begin with ***Francis Bacon***, whose *Advancement of Learning* (1605) and *Novum Organum* (1620) offered an important challenge to the traditional knowledge. However, as Hill (1997:16) and Croll (1969a:196) point out, the ideas put forward in these works were not in fact new. Aristotelianism, medieval scholasticism, Platonism, etc had already been exposed to the critique of reason prior to Bacon, as had Ciceronian rhetoric; while ‘most of the fruitful ideas of science that were popularly associated with the work of Bacon in the seventeenth century were already part of the publically avowed creed of English scientific workers throughout the latter half of the sixteenth century’ (F.R. Johnson, *cit.* Hill, 1997:16).

---

[5] These included amplification, diminution, similitude, comparison, example, conversion, exclamation, etc.

Indeed, the seeds of the epistemological shift that came to be known as the 'Scientific Revolution' had probably been sown much earlier with the controversy over universals and particulars that split Scholastic thought between the 12th and 14th centuries. The British Franciscans, Roger Bacon and William of Ockham, who argued that reality lies in particular manifestations rather than Platonic essences[6], have been seen as important precursors of modern epistemology, and both made important contributions to the development of empirical science. Indeed, Roger Bacon distinguished between '*experientia*' (the distinct knowledge of singular things) and '*experimentum*' (a science of principles based upon experience)[7], a distinction that has persisted in English into the modern day.

As for prose style, the Elizabethan taste for over-elaborate complex diction had found detractors some time before Francis Bacon made his mark. Early attacks came, amongst others, from Bishop John Jewell, whose *Oratio contra Rhetoricam*, delivered at Oxford in 1548, argued that language ought to enlighten by exposition, not obscure by functionless ornament; Thomas Wilson (1553)[8], who, despite being the most accomplished English exponent of logic and rhetoric in the 16th century, railed against the obscurantism of 'outlandish English' and advised speakers to 'speak as is commonly received: neither seeking to be over fine, nor yet living over-carelesse…'; and Thomas Nashe (1589)[9], who strongly criticised both Ciceronian Latin and the ornate vernacular style of Lyly and his school. Then there were the translators, men like William Tyndale and John Florio, who, in championing the vernacular over Latin, contributed indirectly to what would eventually prove to be the demise of that language as a *lingua franca*, and of humanistic learning in general[10].

---

[6] The English distaste for the 'archetypal singular', as a manifestation of some abstract universal essence, and the preference for concreteness over abstractions (see ***App.B***: 21; ***App.A***: 38-39) may well derive from this ancient philosophical preference. See Spade (2006) on nominalism.

[7] See Hackett (2007: 4.2).

[8] *Arte of Rhetorique*, Ed. G. H. Mair. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909.

[9] 'Preface to Green's *Menaphon*', *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, Ed. McKerrow, R. B. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958 [1904-10].

However, while many of the early criticisms of Elizabethan rhetoric seem to have been motivated by democratic or nationalist concerns, Francis Bacon's objections went deeper. In his *Advancement of Learning* (1605), he attacked the very philosophy of language upon which the rhetorical and scholastic tradition was based, criticizing as "the first distemper of learning" the tendency to "study words, and not matter".

> It seems to me that Pygmalion's frenzy is a good emblem or portraiture of this vanity, for words are but the images of matter, and except they have life of reason and invention, to fall in love with them is all one as to fall in love with a picture.

In *Novum Organum* (1620), he took this further, laying out his programme for a new approach to knowledge that would shift the emphasis from textual exegesis to the careful observation of the outside world. Combining rationalism and empiricism, this urged induction as the correct way of investigating nature, in opposition to the Aristotelian system of deduction that was still the basis of university education at that time, and gave a more central role to natural science. In *New Atlantis* (1626), he even outlined a (fictional) project for a scientific research institute[11], a vision which has been credited with providing the impetus for the foundation of the Royal Society in 1660.

In the Renaissance, three rhetorical styles had been taught in schools and universities from which an orator could choose according to his theme, line of thought and audience. However, from the 17th century onwards, the plain style started to be viewed as the only valid vehicle for 'truth'. In a supplement to the *Advancement of Learning*, added when the work was translated into Latin and published as *De Augmentis Scientiarum* in 1622, Bacon describes some of the characteristics of the prose style that he considers preferable to grand Ciceronian rhetoric:

---

[10] See Partridge (1969: 45-49) for an overview of these early proponents of the vernacular plain style.

[11] 'Solomon's House' is an institute where scientific experiments are conducted to conquer nature and apply the collected knowledge for the betterment of society. Samuel Hartlib, the Protestant merchant and educator, invited Comenius to England in 1641 with the express purpose of making 'Solomon's House' a reality, but unfortunately Civil War broke out before this could happen (see Merton, 2001:117-118, Hill 1997: 90-98).

> Somewhat sounder is another form of style /…/, which is likely to follow in time upon this copious and luxuriant oratorical manner. It consists wholly in this: that the words be sharp and pointed; sentences concised; a style in short that may be called "turned" rather than "fused".

His call for a clearer more precise use of language was echoed by other men of the age on a variety of different grounds. ***Ben Jonson***, in *Timber: Or, Discoveries* (1640)[12], emphasises the importance of content over form:

> I would rather have a plaine downe-right wisdome, then a foolish and affected eloquence. For what is so furious, and *Bet'lem* like, as a vaine sound of chosen and excellent words, without any subject of *sentence*, or *science* mix'd? (ll.343ff)

Jonson not only demands that the choice of words be dictated by the meaning, he also now equates elegance of style with clarity of expression, a value judgment that has persisted till the present day (see ***App. B*** 29-30):

> We should therefore speake what wee can, the neerest way, so as wee keepe our gate, not leape; for too short may as well be not let into the memory, as too long not kept in. Whatsoever looseth the grace, and clearenesse, converts into a Riddle; the obscurity is mark'd, but not the valew. That perisheth, and is past by, like the Pearle in the Fable. Our style should be like a skeine of silke to be carried, and found by the right thred, not ravel'd, and perplex'd; then all is a knot, a heape. (ll.1982-99)

This illustrates the extent to which tastes had changed. As Moss (1993:57) points out, in the 17th century, good taste was the mark of an educated man (now grown into a

---

[12] In *Ben Jonson*, Vol.VIII, C.H.Herford, Percy and Evelyn Simpson (Eds.), Oxford: Clarendon, 1947.

‘gentleman’ or ‘honnête homme’), and gentlemen of good taste ‘fastidiously eschew pedantry and ostentation'.

Thomas Hobbes also takes a swipe at traditional text-based learning in Chapter 4 of *Leviathan* (1651). Having affirmed the importance of the god-given faculty of language for man’s social intercourse (‘…the most noble and profitable invention of all other was that of speech /…/without which there had been amongst men neither Commonwealth, nor society, nor contract, nor peace, no more than amongst lions, bears, and wolves), he nevertheless criticises the tendency to value empty words. In a famous passage that is reminiscent of Bacon, he voices the distrust of established authority typical of the age:

> For words are wise men's counters; they do but reckon by them: but they are the money of fools, that value them by the authority of an Aristotle, a Cicero, or a Thomas, or any other doctor whatsoever, if but a man.

For Hobbes, the language of knowledge aspires to the condition of geometry (Book 5), according to which clearly defined concepts are used as the starting point for a tight reasoning process. Failure to pin down the meaning of words therefore constitutes an abuse of language (Book 4). He urges writers to define their terms in order to avoid misunderstandings and faulty reasoning, and also condemns the use of metaphor and other rhetorical devices designed to manipulate or deceive the reader. Both of these prescriptions are remarkably in tune with the advice given in modern style manuals, as we have seen (cf. ***App. B.*** 10, 24).

John Locke, in Book III of *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690), also turns his attention to language. In Chapter X, he too presents a list of common abuses of language, which includes using words without a proper concern for their meaning, failing to define one’s terms and ‘affected obscurity’, and once more, the traditional humanistic education bears the brunt:

> Logic and dispute have much contributed to this. This is unavoidably to be so, where men's parts and learning are estimated by their skill in disputing. And if reputation and reward shall attend these conquests, which depend mostly on the fineness and niceties of words, it is no wonder if the wit of man so employed, should perplex, involve, and subtilize the signification of sounds, so as never to want something to say in opposing or defending any question; the victory being adjudged not to him who had truth on his side, but the last word in the dispute. (§7)

The purpose of language is, he claims, 'to convey our ideas' (§23), to do it with quickness (§24), and 'therewith to convey the knowledge of things'' (§24), a perspective which privileges the referential function of language above all others and sets the tone for the development of modern 'windowpane' prose. This vein seems to continue in Chapter XI §3:

> /…/ methinks those who pretend seriously to search after or maintain truth, should think themselves obliged to study how they might deliver themselves without obscurity, doubtfulness, or equivocation, to which men's words are naturally liable, if care be not taken. [13]

Bacon, Jonson, Hobbes and Locke were not the only men of their age to explicitly call for a change in linguistic habits (whether out of 'taste' or epistemological necessity), but they were perhaps the most influential. However, this influence was mostly exerted in the field of ideas for, as prose writers, they remained tied, for the most part, to the humanistic tradition that they were ostensibly seeking to break with. Wignell (1998b), analysing extracts by Bacon, Hobbes and Locke from a systemic functional perspective, concludes that only Hobbes shows any signs of influence of the new discourse of science that was already being developed by their contemporaries (see below). Indeed, Wignell specifically uses Bacon (*Idem*: 224-

---

[13].However, although Locke here appears to be associating the plain style with the pursuit of unmediated 'truth' in the Baconian tradition, we should perhaps hesitate about seeing in him a prefiguration of full-blown linguistic realism. Elsewhere, he expresses notions of language that would seem to suggest the contrary, an ambivalence which has led to a lively debate amongst Locke scholars about the philosopher's true beliefs as regards language and its relationship to reality. For a further discussion of these issues, see Uzgalis (2007: 2.3); Ott (2004); Ferreira (2005:126-133).

226) and Locke (*Idem*: 248-252) to exemplify *humanistic* discourse of the 17th century, concluding that neither writer shows any evidence of technicality (i.e. no terms are defined and no taxonomies constructed), while grammatical metaphorization is scarce.

Bacon's writings, however, have also been analysed from another perspective, which yields a very different result. The work of Morris W. Croll, dating from the early 20th century, suggests that, while operating within the paradigm established by the humanities, Bacon did actively contribute to the development of a prose style that radically broke with the classical model of rhetoric, paving the way for what would eventually become the form that we know today. Croll shows how the 'Attic' prose style[14], which aimed above all at naturalness, cultivated not only a plainer more precise diction, but also seemed to enact Bacon's 'method of induced knowledge' in its very syntax. In its 'loose' version, the progression of a period[15] 'adapts itself to the movements of a mind discovering the truth as it goes along, thinking while it writes' (Croll, 1969b:221); it is characterized by a slack episodic structure, with the various members (clauses) linked by coordinating conjunctions (*and, but, for, whereas, nor*, etc) or absolute participles[16], expressing the order in which an idea presents itself when it is first experienced. The following extract from Bacon's *Advancement of*

---

[14] This is the term used by Croll (1969a) to describe the anti-Ciceronian prose style that became fashionable after the Renaissance and of which Bacon was an important proponent. Elsewhere (1969b), he uses the adjective 'Baroque' to refer to the same. However, I find this term misleading, as both of its variants (the 'curt' and 'loose' styles) in English are very different from the extravagant florid rhetorical style that the Portuguese usually intend when they apply the word '*barroco*' to prose.

[15] '*Period* names the rhetorical, or oral, aspect of the same thing that is called in grammar a *sentence* and in theory, the same act of composition that produces a perfectly logical grammatical unit would produce at the same time a perfectly rhythmical unit of sound. But in fact no utterance ever fulfils both of these functions perfectly, and either one or the other of them is always foremost in the writer's mind /…/ In general, we may say that before the eighteenth century rhetoric occupied much more attention than grammar in the minds of teachers and their pupils.' (*Idem*: 231).

[16] An absolute participle is a participle that operates as an autonomous clause, not clearly linked to a main clause as we might expect today. The grammatical relationship expressed may be cause, consequence, attendant circumstance, justification or concession; it may summarize or supplement the preceding clause, express an idea related to the whole of the period in which it occurs, or one related only to the last preceding member. An example is given in the extract from Bacon cited below. (*Idem*: 221-222).

Learning is used by Croll (*Idem*: 221-222) as an example of this (note the absolute participle in the final member):

> For as knowledges are now delivered, there is a kind of contract of error between the deliverer and the receiver: for he that delivereth knowledge desireth to deliver it in such form as may be best believed, and not as may be best examined; and he that receiveth knowledge desireth rather present satisfaction than expectant inquiry; and so rather not to doubt than not to err: glory making the author not to lay open his weakness, and sloth making the disciple not to know his strength.

Hence, unlike the tight subordinated construction typical of the oratorical period, the loose period is structured like a chain, with each member trailing on from the last, often dependent not upon the general idea or the main word of the preceding member, but upon its final word or phrase alone.

There was also another form of Attic style popular in the 17th century amongst anti-Ciceronians, which was known as the 'curt style' or ‘stile coupé’. In this, a typical period would consist of a series of short members, typically separated by semi-colons without any linking devices. The first member frequently stated the whole idea of the period in self-contained form, to be followed by other members that essential repeated the same thing with new tone or emphasis. Thus, the period did not move anywhere, but instead rotated around a given idea, showing it off from a series of contrasting angles. For example:

> ‘The world that I regard is myself; it is the microcosm of my own frame that I cast mine eye on: for the other I use it but like my globe, and turn it round sometimes for my recreation.’ (Sir Thomas Browne, *cit.* Croll, *Idem*:211)

Although both the loose and the curt styles contain aspects that are valued today by modern academic prose manuals (particularly the simple syntax, short clauses and directness of message), it is clear that such casual disjointed sentences would not be acceptable in modern academic contexts. As Croll points out in the final pages of his essay (*Idem*: 232-233), the process of disintegration could not go on forever and a new formalism or correctness was necessary before English prose was able to metamorphose into the form that it has today. This he attributes to the effects of Cartesian philosophy, when 'the intellect became the arbiter of form'.

> To this mode of thought we are to trace almost all the features of modern literary education and criticism, or at least of what we should have called modern a generation ago: the study of the precise meaning of words; the reference to dictionaries as literary authorities; the study of the sentence as a logical unit alone; the careful circumscription of its limits and the gradual reduction of its length; the disappearance of semicolons and colons; the attempt to reduce grammar to an exact science; the idea that forms of speech are always either correct or incorrect; the complete subjection of the laws of motion and expression in style to the laws of logic and standardization – in short, the triumph, during two centuries, of grammatical over rhetorical ideas.' (*Idem*:232)

However, more recent work in the field of Systemic Functional Linguistics identifies another source altogether for what was ultimately to develop into modern academic prose. For Halliday (1993a:57-62; 1998: 194-5), it was the writings of Newton and the scientists that were now operating under the auspices of the newly formed Royal Society that marked the true birth of modern factual discourse. This is what we shall turn our attention to next.

b) Scientists

Although Bacon is often credited with being the prophet of the new science, it appears that the 'scientific revolution' was well under way by the time he wrote *The Advancement of Learning* in 1605. Hill (1997: 16-22) describes how England moved from being a scientifically backward country to one of the most advanced between 1560 and 1640, largely due to the efforts of merchants and craftsmen operating from

London, rather than dons at Oxford and Cambridge[17]. In 16th century England, there was a 'greedy demand for scientific information' that led to the publication of numerous scientific textbooks 'consciously aimed at a public of merchants, artisans, mariners, gunners, surveyors' (*Idem*: 17). Thus, these publications were mostly in English rather than Latin, and couched in an accessible style that such people would understand[18]; those that were not were translated or rewritten by popularizers such as Edward Worsop, William Bourne and Thomas Hill.

There were also early attempts at adult education programmes, which culminated in the formation of ***Gresham College*** in 1597 at the bequest of the merchant and financier, Sir Thomas Gresham (*Idem*: 33-56). Consciously designed to supply the teaching in modern subjects which universities failed to give, the college was controlled by merchants, rather than clerics, and offered lectures to the public free of charge. Its professors were specifically instructed to make use of analytical teaching methods and practical demonstration, rather than merely commenting on set texts as in the Universities, and their lectures would be followed by a general discussion. Instruction was given in both English and Latin (for the benefit of foreigners).

The College's services to popular education were also complemented by the publication of cheap almanacs, which circulated widely amongst lower class households in the 17th century. With pages on astronomy, cosmography and the tides, as well as astrology, these have been generally credited with extending knowledge of heliocentric theory amongst the public at large (*Idem*: 45-6) and would also clearly have contributed to the spread of the plain style in discourse.

---

[17] Oxford and Cambridge remained resistant to the new science for years, continuing to foster the traditional humanities, taught in Latin for the edification of young gentlemen. See Hill, 1997: 16-18, 48-51.

[18] For example, Robert Recorde, John Dee and Thomas Digges, 'scientists of the highest standing', whose vernacular works were deliberately intended to help 'mechanicians' to educate themselves (*Idem*: 17-20).

Although Gresham College was primarily a teaching institution, it also functioned as a central meeting place for scientists, a kind of clearing-house for ideas. In 1660, this role was taken over by the ***Royal Society*** ('The Royal Society of London for Improving Natural Knowledge'), whose founding members included a number of Gresham men, together with the ‘Oxford Scientists’ (Boyle, Hooke, etc) and others. From the outset, the Society concerned itself not only with the development of scientific knowledge, but also with the question of language. Thomas Sprat, in the *History of the Royal Society* (1667)[19], tells us that it specifically rejected ‘amplifications, digressions, and swelling of style’ in favour of ‘the primitive purity, and shortness, when men delivered so many things, almost in an equal number of words’:

> They have exacted from all their members, a close, naked, natural way of speaking; positive expressions clear senses; a native easiness: bringing all things as near the Mathematical plainness, as they can: and preferring the language of Artisans, Countrymen, and Merchants, before that, of Wits or Scholars. (Part 2 Section XX)

1665 saw the emergence of the first scientific periodical, *The Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*, and with it the embryonic research article. According to Atkinson (1998:146-149; 1999:xxiii), the genre of the research article developed out of the informative letters that scientists wrote to each other; thus, many of the early contributions to the *Transactions* were couched in the form of the polite letter, which typically began with “Sir/s” or “Dear Sir/s”, had introductions and closings sometimes honouring the addressee, and took the first person descriptive narrative form. They also tended to be short and somewhat miscellaneous in content, with a tendency towards digression. As the *PTRS* and other journals took on the role of providing a regular arena for discussion, these aspects were gradually eliminated. However, the first person pronoun persisted well into the 19th century, either because the experimenter played a much more central role (Ard, *cit.* Swales 1990: 114) or because the word of an 'honourable gentleman' was itself a powerful assertion of the validity of a claim (Atkinson, 1998:158; 1999:xxvii).

---

[19] Sprat, a young clergyman, was enlisted to defend the Royal Society against claims from the church that its concerns with nature might lead to the neglect of God, who had created nature.

Another influence on the early scientific article came from the existing tradition of published scientific treatises, particularly from the efforts of ***Robert Boyle*** and other experimentalists to establish a proper foundation for scientific knowledge in the decade before the appearance of the *Transactions* (Shapin, *cit.* Swales, 1990:111; Atkinson, 1996:42). In order to transform claims and speculations into generally-accepted knowledge, the early scientists were at first required to replicate their experiments before an audience at the Royal Society, with members signing a register to prove that they had in fact witnessed the event. Gradually, real-life replication gave way to a rhetorical strategy that Shapin (*cit.* Swales, 1990:111) calls ‘virtual witnessing’, which involved using words and diagrams to produce an image in the reader's mind of the experimental scene. Boyle was scrupulous about the accuracy of such accounts, writing detailed descriptions of everything that happened (including failed experiments) and making sure that illustrations of apparatus were realistic and exact. The aim of all this was to encourage the reader to believe that he was getting a full and honest account.

Boyle also avoided philosophical speculation and was very cautious about all his claims. A decade or so prior to the publication of the first *Transactions of the*

Royal Society in 1665, he was employing hedging devices in his scientific treatises (Shapin, *cit.* Swales, 1990:111-112), and even reflected explicitly about this practice:

> …in almost every one of the following essays, I /…/ speak so doubtingly, and use so often *perhaps, it seems, it is not improbable* and other such expressions, as argue a diffidence to the truth of the opinions I incline to... (*Idem*)

This indicates the importance of personal modesty and honesty for the early scientists, qualities that probably had as much to do with asserting their status as 'gentlemen' as with their mission to uncover the truth about the natural world.

According to Halliday (1993a:57-62), however, the real birth of scientific discourse came with ***Isaac Newton*** and the appearance of the nominalization, which, as we have seen, forms the core of modern academic discourse across disciplines. In an analysis of Newton's *Treatise on Opticks* (published 1704; probably written 1675-1687), he identifies what he believes to be some of the earliest examples of complex nominalization (marked in italics by me):

> Eg. 1) *The Excesses of the Sines of Refraction of several sorts of Rays above their common Sine of Incidence when the Refractions are made out of divers denser Mediums immediately into one and the same rarer Medium, suppose of Air,* are to one another in a given Proportion.
>
> Eg. 2) *The Proportion of the Sine of Incidence to the Sine of Refraction of one and the same sort of Rays out of one Medium into another,* is composed of *the Proportion of the Sine of Incidence to the Sine of Refraction out of the first Medium into any third Medium,* and of *the Proportion of the Sine of Incidence to the Sine of Refraction out of that third Medium into the second Medium.*

The paragraph from which these sentence were taken contains a lot of technical terms of the kind that were already common in earlier scientific texts (such as Light, Colour, Proportion, Refraction, Prism, Lens, Theorem, etc)[20], all printed with a capital letter;

---

[20] Halliday (1998:227) claims that the first major reconstrual of experience took place 'in the languages of the iron age cultures of the Eurasian continent (of which classical Greek was one), which evolved discourses of measurement and calculation, and ordered sets of abstract, technical terms – the registers

but, as Halliday points out, the extract also contains some other nouns that are not capitalized. Upon close inspection, these are revealed to be processes that have been reconstrued as nouns in a process of grammatical metaphorization (as in 'diverging' and 'separation' in the following quotation):

> Eg. 3) Now those Colours argue *a diverging and separation of the heterogeneous Rays from one another by means of their unequal Refractions...*

By nominalizing in this way, Halliday explains, Newton achieves two important discoursal effects. Firstly, he packages a complex phenomenon into a single semiotic entity, making it one element of the clause structure; this in turn allows its rhetorical function (i.e. place in the unfolding argument) to be rendered fully explicit. In the paragraph as a whole, therefore, he is able to achieve a foregrounding/backgrounding effect that allows him to proceed in logical steps, expressing relationships between complex processes by turning those processes into nouns. It will be noticed that the verbs in the examples given above are in fact very simple and straightforward ('are', 'is composed of' and 'argue' in Egs 1, 2, and 3 respectively), just as in the examples of modern scientific discourse given in Chapter 4 Fig. 1.

Thus, by the end of the 17th century, the foundations were laid for what would eventually become the 'academic discourse' that we know today. The extravagant rhetorical devices of the Elizabethans had largely been swept away in favour of a terse clear prose style that eschewed ornamentation and complexity, and focused on content at the expense of form. The general principles of modern EAD, outlined at the beginning of Chapter 4, were now almost all in place, and a start had been made upon the grammatical reconstrual that would eventually result in the tight sentence and

---

of mathematics and science. This grammar was carried over through classical and medieval Latin, and also with a significant detour via Syriac and Arabic, into the national languages of modern Europe' textual structure typical of the discourse today. These would gradually consolidate over the course of the next three centuries, and as the scientific paradigm gained prestige, would be taken up by other areas of knowledge (Halliday & Martin, 1993:16, Halliday, 1993b:80; Martin, 1998:10-11; Wignell, 1998a:302-306).

* * *

It perhaps goes without saying that this remarkable discourse shift did not occur in isolation. It was firmly bound up with a host of other changes taking place on the social, political and economic planes, an upheaval which later came to be known as the ‘Scientific Revolution’. And although today the appropriacy of this term is hotly disputed by scholars seeking to emphasise the continuity of the scientific project with the medieval and Renaissance past[21], on the level of discourse at least, there is ample evidence of a major epistemological shift that had far-reaching repercussions.

There were a number of important dimensions to this. Firstly, the linguistic changes that were introduced by these philosophers and scientists were not just superficial cosmetic changes; they implied a radically new way of approaching knowledge and of viewing the relationship between language and reality. No longer was human knowledge to be mediated by ancient texts and authorities. Now, it could be achieved by anyone that was prepared to use his senses and reason in systematic observation of the outside world. The new emphasis on ‘things not words’ meant that ‘truth’ was no longer understood to be generated within the confines of a sign system, but rather was to be found outside language, in the natural world. Consequently, discourse had to be as transparent as possible in order to more accurately convey that information without leaving traces of human manipulation[22].

---

[21] For example, Shapin (1996) opens his book entitled *The Scientific Revolution* by stating roundly that ‘there was no such thing as the Scientific Revolution’, and goes on to say that this term arose from the efforts of 17th century scientists to present themselves as 'moderns', set against 'ancient' modes of thought and practices. For other similar critiques, see Wilson, 2002; Lindberg, 1992, 2002; Davis & Winship, 2002; Wood, 2005.

This also implied an important shift in values. The *vernacular* came to be prized over Latin, revealing a growing national self-confidence (obviously not unrelated to events taking place in the political and economic spheres); the emotions were denigrated, as *rationalism* took centre stage (Cartesianism was of course influential here); a new emphasis on *utilitarianism* meant that knowledge was no longer valued for its own sake, for the glorification of God, but started to be seen as a means to an end, a way of furthering human wellbeing; and of course the new associations between *plainness* and 'truth' meant that highly ornamented styles, in discourse as in other areas of life, began to be viewed with suspicion, as evidence of dishonesty and moral dissipation.

Why did these changes come about? As Wignell (1998b:22) points out, they were undoubtedly motivated in part by the rediscovery of Classical science that took place between the 12th and 16th centuries and which gradually led to the worldview of the Schoolmen being turned on its head. Over the course of two hundred years or so, the old anthropocentric cosmology was replaced with a heliocentric vision that inevitably destabilised the old authorities and led to the reconstrual of the universe as a 'clockwork' entity that ran in accordance with timeless universal laws[23].

However, there were also social, economic and political factors involved, as the old feudal order began to crumble and capitalism emerged. The ascendant merchant class, whose wealth was based upon the production and distribution of commodities rather than the ownership of land, had direct interests in the development of both democracy and capitalism, and these in turn generated a need for education and technology (both of which contributed to the drive for a new style of discourse that was functional, utilitarian and accessible to the common man). The new science served all these interests; and, as we have seen, its proponents and patrons tended to be from the middle classes rather than from the landed aristocracy, who long remained associated with the old humanistic learning.

---

[22] See Foucault (2002a:70-74) for an analysis of the development of the notion of semiotic transparency and its preclusion of a theory of signification.

[23] Some of the major landmarks in this cosmological revolution were: Copernicus (1473-1543), who displaced the earth as the centre of the universe, replacing it with the sun, though still retaining the notion of circular motion and crystalline spheres; Kepler (1571-1630), who deduced that the planetary orbits were elliptical, not circular, and Galileo (1564-1642), who postulated that motion, not rest, was the natural state of things. These paved the way for the achievements of Newton (1643-1727), who famously acknowledged in a letter to Robert Hooke (15 February 1676), 'if I have seen further, it is by standing on the shoulders of Giants'.

Although it is difficult to determine which came first, social or ideological change, it seems clear that an important engine in all this was the Reformation, which provided ideological endorsement of the attitudes espoused by the ascendant social class. The doctrine of the 'priesthood of all believers' not only sanctioned spiritual independence, it also liberated the common people from intellectual and worldly authorities, encouraging scientific exploration and republican ideas[24]. The 'Protestant Work Ethic', which resulted from the Calvinist doctrine of predestination[25], made mundane toil into a sacrament and the accumulation of wealth a virtue, thus providing the impulse for the development of modern Capitalism. And the Puritan distrust of passions reinforced rationality as the means by which all good could be achieved, leading to an emphasis upon method and discipline in all areas of life.

---

[24] See Hill (1997); Tawney (1938: 202-204).

[25] See Weber (1994 [1930, 1904-5]) and Tawney (1938 [1922]). Calvin taught a doctrine in which, from the beginning, God chose some people for salvation and others for damnation. Grace could not be achieved through good works or contemplation, and so early Protestants were desperate to find 'signs' that they were amongst the saved. As the notion of a 'calling' became extended to include the pursuit of a profession or trade, worldly success became viewed as sign of salvation, and work was glorified as a spiritual pursuit in its own right. However, the fruits of that labour could not be squandered on luxuries (which were sinful) nor be given to poor (which would encourage laziness) or the church (which had limited need of donations, given the prohibition on icons). This actively encouraged *investment* and led to the development of the 'spirit of Capitalism', according to which economic wealth is actively and rationally pursued as an end in itself.

The connection between Puritanism and science, hinted at by Weber (1994: 113), is properly developed by Merton (2001 [1938]) in a seminal work which earned him the title of the 'father of sociology of science'. Describing how the Puritans felt bound to remake the evil world through ceaseless unflinching toil (*Idem*: 58) and how they enlisted science in the service of individual, society and deity[26], Merton goes on to affirm the importance of the Puritans in early scientific endeavour, not least in the formation of the Royal Society (*Idem*: 112-136).

Although the 'Merton Thesis', as this has come to be known, has been accused of being, amongst other things, overly simplistic[27] and of pandering to the 'Whig interpretation of history',[28] modern English Academic Discourse, to my mind, still bears many indelible marks of the Puritan mindset. *Clarity, conciseness* and *economy* are all good Protestant values, as is implicitly acknowledged by Greetham (2001: 215 **Bibl.** ***App. B*.**) in his invocation of the Reverend Samuel Wesley (see ***Appendix B***: 29-30); while the emphasis upon *rational argument supported by evidence* (*Idem*: 10-11) reflects the Protestant's inherent distrust of emotive language and 'dubious persuasive techniques'. We could also perhaps see the grammatical pull towards *nominalization* (the 'historic drift towards thinginess', as Halliday [1998:211] termed it) as reflecting the Protestants' preoccupation with the material world and their historic preference for 'things not words'.

Most of all, though, the Protestant mindset is revealed in the implicit philosophy of language that still underlies mainstream academic prose today. As we saw in Chapter 4, there are implicit connections made in the modern-day style manuals between the use of a 'neutral' ‘transparent’ prose style and the truth value ascribed to a writer’s claims. Despite the fact that linguistics and semiotics, not to mention philosophy of language and poststructuralism, have revealed language, like other sign systems, to be embedded in cultural systems and to be therefore wholly historical and contingent, the style manuals do not appear to be far removed from the 17th century Puritans in their implicit assumptions about discourse. For them, in the words of Sacvan Bercovitch (1975:29), ‘to speak plainly was not primarily to speak simply, not at all to speak artlessly. It meant speaking the Word’.

---

[26] 'Natural philosophy was instrumental first, in establishing practical proofs of the scientist's state of grace; second, in enlarging control of nature and third, in glorifying God.' (Merton, 2001:85).

[27] See, for example, Davis & Winship, 2002:125-128; Mulligan, 1980; Greaves, 1969.

[28] This phrase, coined in 1931 by the English historian Sir Herbert Butterfield, denotes a perspective that views the past through the lens of the present and sees history as moving progressively towards the ideas and institutions of a later age. The historians in question were largely Protestant in religion and Whig in politics, and liked to divide the world into friends and enemies of 'progress'. See Wilson (2002:17); Ferngren (2002:xi).

The 18th and 19th Centuries: ‘Useful Learning’

Over the course of the 18th and 19th centuries, the features that had been introduced into English prose style during the upheaval of the previous century were gradually refined and consolidated. In a context in which the bourgeois capitalist/merchant was replacing the aristocratic landowner as the economic force in society, the technological potential of science was being harnessed in the service of the new capitalism, and Utilitarianism was becoming a driving concern in all domains of life, the functional plain prose style of the scientist was naturally valued for its capacity to rapidly transmit essential information.

Meanwhile, the new ‘thing’-based orientation grew ever more marked in both social life and discourse. As society became increasingly mercantile and rationalistic, contracts replaced patronage and relationships of trust as the primary mechanisms of social organisation, and the 'gentleman' with his code of honour and politeness was largely superseded by a new social type that had no time to waste on elaborate interpersonal rituals. This was reflected in scientific texts, where the referential component gained precedence over the interpersonal, the dialogic and narrative dimensions receded, and ‘objectivity’ became the desired goal, achieved above all through grammatical metaphorizations that focused on things rather than processes or people.

The process of nominalization begun by Newton gradually consolidated and became more widespread over the course of the 18th and 19th centuries (Halliday, 1993a, c). By the 1760s, in Joseph Priestley’s *History and Present State of Electricity with Original Experiments*, nominal elements in the clause were taking over the whole of the semantic content, leaving the verb to express the relationship between the nominalized processes (1993a: 62-64); this not only contributed to the thematic development of the text by allowing the summarizing or ‘backgrounding’ of what had gone before and the consequent highlighting or 'foregrounding' of new information, but it also affected the way in which logical-semantic relations were expressed. The result was a gradual lexicalization of those relations (1993c:90-91). For example, as regards the expression of causality, a shift took place between the 17th and 19th centuries from process-based forms in which the events are expressed as clauses connected by a conjunction (‘*a* happens; so *x* happens'; 'because *a* happens, *x* happens') to a nominalised form in which the relationship between the two nominalized processes is lexicalised (‘happening *a* causes happening *b*’) (1993a: 67); this stimulated the appearance and proliferation of verbs like ‘produce’, ‘arise from’, ‘depend on’, lead to’ etc, which are notably scarce in Newton but much more profuse half a century later in Priestley. By the time of James Clerk Maxwell's *An Elementary Treatise on Electricity* (1861), there were hundreds in current use (1993c:90-91)[29].

---

[29] Halliday (1993c:91 Table 5.3) provides an extensive list of verbs used to lexicalize Logical-Semantic Relations, estimating (*Idem*: 92) that there are somewhere around 2000 in modern scientific writing. However, he also points out that in the early 20th century, a countertendency arose, whereby the relationship is relexicalised as a noun, taking the nominalization tendency a step further (as in '*a* is the cause/the result of/the proof of *x*').

Not only did the nominalized grammar become more prevalent within the physical sciences, it also began to spread to other areas of knowledge as the scientific paradigm gradually acquired prestige. In the General Orientation to their 1993 volume *Writing Science*, Halliday & Martin suggest a crude chronology for this process, according to which physical systems were interpreted in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, biological systems in the nineteenth, and social systems in the twentieth: the natural strategy, they claim 'was to map the more complex system on to a kind that is well understood' (1993:16). Although the chronology may be disputed[30], this discursive expansion would have followed quite naturally from the drive to establish the equivalent of physical laws for animal and human populations (Hobsbawm, 1962:283), and also from the spread of scientific methodology to other areas. For example, **David Hume** called his *Treatise of Human Nature* (1739-40) 'an attempt to introduce the experimental Method of Reasoning Into Moral Subjects', using an inductive method based upon observation and calling attention to this procedural distancing from the deductive techniques of earlier moral philosophers[31].

In the 18th century, with the application of empirical techniques to the study of documents and relics from the past, history was created as an academic subject[32] and brought into the service of burgeoning nationalisms (Hobsbawm, 1962: 284). It in turn influenced other areas, such as law, theology and the new science of philology, and, more controversially, biology and geology (where an evolutionary perspective naturally led to clashes with the Church and conservative establishment). Later, social anthropology, prehistory, sociology and psychology were born from a similar impulse (*Idem*: 285-290).

---

[30] Wignell (1998a: 302-304; 1998b: 226-248) claims that the political sciences may already have developed the capacity for nominalization as early as Hobbes (1651), which suggests there may have been a certain amount of independent phyllogenesis going on.

[31] David Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, 2nd ed., ed. L.A. Selby-Bigge (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978) xi. However, as Valenza & Bender (2003:32-33) point out, Hume ultimately ended up deconstructing his own premise, demonstrating that we have no way to prove that our sense organs give us facts about the world. Moreover, his readers were largely unable to follow his argument, which may have prompted the reflections in the 1742 essay 'Of Simplicity and Refinement in Writing' (in which he argues for a 'medium' style between the two extremes), and the adoption of a more accessible discourse in the *Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* (1748) and *Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals* (1751). Cf. Ferguson (2003:17-19).

[32] In a 1761 lecture, Joseph Priestley used an analogy from the experimental sciences to describe the advantage of 'true history' over fiction: 'works of fiction resemble those machines which we contrive to illustrate the principles of philosophy, such as globes and orreries, the use of which extend no further than the views of human ingenuity; whereas real history resembles the experiments by the air pump, condensing engine and electrical machine, which exhibit the operations of nature, and the God of nature himself' (cit. Valenza & Bender, 2003: 32).

By the mid 19th century, factual discourse, predicated upon a principle of transparency, had become clearly demarcated from the fictional or literary (White, 1997:22-23; Foucault, 2002a:48). Not only was this difference marked by the presence in factual prose of certain features designed to create an appearance of neutrality and impersonality, as we have seen, it is also revealed in the English language generally by a semantic split that took place in certain key words. During the transition from the medieval to the modern periods, terms like 'history', ‘science’ and ‘education' acquired much more specialised meanings than they had had in the Medieval period, becoming distinguished from, respectively, ‘story’ (i.e. fictional account), ‘non-science’ (arts, humanities, myth etc) and 'child-rearing' or ‘upbringing’. Although it is difficult to establish exactly when the modern meanings took over, Williams (1983 [1976]) suggests in all cases that they were probably in place by the late 18th century. Interestingly for the translator, these semantic shifts did not take place in the Romance languages, an issue that I shall explore in more depth in Part III.

Meanwhile, the genre of the Research Article continued to develop, gradually gaining the contours that are familiar to us today. Atkinson (1998:147-150; 1999:xxiii-xxiv) describes how the polite letters that were used to transmit research in the early years of the *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* grew to resemble reports over the course of the 18th century, becoming longer and less miscellaneous in content and organisation. By the early 19th century, the epistolary form was less common as a vehicle for research, dropping out of the generic repertoire altogether by the second half of the century.

The narrative dimension in scientific articles also declined over this period, a feature which seems to be related to the growing depersonalization (*Idem*:xxv). Although the strong authorial persona persisted throughout the 18th century and well into the 19th, detailed descriptions of scientific methods, instruments and the objects of investigation began to be foregrounded at this time, and by the end of the 19th century, the 'author-centred' norm had been largely replaced by the 'object-centred' approach, with the appearance of the agentless passive and impersonal subjects (Atkinson, 1999:xxiii-xxiv and 1998:144-147; Ding, 1998:122-123) .

As for the practice of citation and referencing, Atkinson (1998:149-150) reports that primitive literature review sections were evident in articles published in the *PTRS* as early as 1825, and that by 1875, they had become relatively common and were typically exhaustive. Bazerman (*cit.* Swales, 1990:114-5), in a study of research articles from the journal *Physical Review* from its establishment in 1893 to 1980, also found that references were quite common in the journal's early years (about 10 per article) though they were rather general by today's standards.

By the 19th century, then, the scientific paradigm had become established as the dominant paradigm in British society. Its effects were felt not only in the fields of industry and commerce, where technology was bringing rapid gains in productivity and wealth, but also now in the universities, which had traditionally been opposed to utilitarian learning. This happened first in Scotland, where figures such as ***Francis Hutcheson***, ***David Hume*** and ***Adam Smith*** made the Universities of Glasgow and Edinburgh into centres of Enlightenment thought, recognised from the mid-18th century for their academic rigour and progressive teaching methods[33]. Then, in 1826-8, the University of London was founded as a secular alternative to Oxford and Cambridge, with the mission of providing a primarily scientific and vocational training to students from more ‘middling’ and/or non-Anglican backgrounds, exempting them for the first time from religious tests upon admission (Hobsbawm, 1962:279).

The ideology underlying the University of London was essentially that of ***Jeremy Bentham***, whose educational project *Chrestomathia* (1816) was centred around the concept of ‘useful learning’, systematised and made available to as many students as possible. This was Utilitarianism at its height. Bentham’s day school project, like his famous prison, was to be architecturally organised on the Panopticon principle to enable the master to survey all students without being visible himself, and it required a specific educational methodology in order to be successful. Based entirely upon rational lines, this methodology envisaged a series of exercises and examinations by means of which the student would progress through a number of stages – notions which have of course been very influential in the development of the modern educational system[34].

The theory and methodology underpinning Bentham’s educational project are presented at the beginning of the book in the form of fold-out tables, designed to be taken in at a single glance. This way of presenting information, pared down to the basics and visible on a single page, has also had a considerable influence upon modern academic discourse[35], for tables, charts and overviews (textual Panopticons!) are now very prevalent throughout academia and beyond. They are clearly an effective way of presenting a large amount of information in a reduced space, bringing practical and economic benefits of the kind so admired by the Utilitarians. This is goal-oriented discourse at its most distilled[36].

---

[33] Not only did the Scottish Universities give a greater emphasis to the natural sciences and medicine in their curriculum, they also fostered links with specialised schools where graduates could receive vocational training for careers in medicine, law or the church. See Faria (2003:39-40); Readings (1996:34).

[34] Foucault (1979:133-228) famously highlighted the power issues underlying the utilitarian approach to education, dimensions that are visible in the vocabulary of Academia. Hence, *discipline* is simultaneously a way of moulding the individual to be a cog in the machine and a means of enclosing, partitioning and hierarchising knowledge (141-148); the *examination* qualifies, classifies and punishes, and in doing so constitutes both the individual as analysable object and the comparative system that makes such overall measurement possible (184-192); while academic *investigation*, in its commitment to establishing factual truth by a number of regulated techniques, is essentially arrogating to science a procedure that has its origins in judicial and political systems (225-226).

It would be wrong to think, however, that English attitudes to education in the 19th century were limited to this. 'Useful learning' also had its detractors, who, from the beginning of the 19th century, called for a return to a 'liberal education' based upon a more holistic approach to knowledge. Looking to German idealism for their inspiration[37], thinkers such as ***Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Thomas Carlyle, John Henry (Cardinal) Newman*** and ***Matthew Arnold*** urged a return to a kind of knowledge in which literature, philosophy and religion were fused in a broad notion of 'culture'. All opposed the spiritual bankrupcy and loss of erudition which, they felt, inevitably resulted from the democratization of knowledge, and advocated the need for an elite class of intellectuals[38], capable of restoring the civilised values that had been corrupted by utilitarianism and pragmatism.

---

[35] The same cannot be said for Bentham's own discourse, which was anything but clear and concise, as we can see from his justification of the tables: "But in the view taken of the matter by the Author, it being impossible to form any tolerably adequate judgement on, or even conception of the whole, without the meanings of carrying the eye, with unlimited velocity, over every part of the field, - and thus, at pleasure ringing the changes upon the different orders, in which the several parts were capable of being surveyed and confronted, - hence the presenting them all together upon one and the same plane - or, in one word, *Table-wise* - became in his view a matter of necessity." (*Chrestomathia* p.xx)

[36] See Foucault (2002a:81-84) for an exploration of the table as a way of organising knowledge.

[37] German reflections on knowledge and society (notably in the works of Schelling, Schiller, Schleiermacher and Fichte) culminated in the foundation of the University of Berlin in 1810 upon lines projected by Wilhelm von Humboldt. Essential to this tradition were the notions that teaching and research should be independent of vocational or utilitarian function; that they should also be free of any ideological control by the state, and that the true aim of both was 'Bildung durch Wissenschaft' for which purpose the Faculty of Philosophy was allocated a central unifying role. (Cf. Reading, 1996:64; Hobsbawm, 1962:279; Faria, 2003:53-66).

[38] Coleridge, punning on the semantic connections between 'clergy' and 'clerk', called his intelligentsia 'the clerisy' (*On the Constitution of Church and State, According to the Idea of Each,* 1829); for Carlyle, they were 'men of letters' (*On Heroes, Hero-worship and the Heroic in History*, 1837-40)

The concept of ‘liberal education’ was most fully developed by Newman in the series of speeches compiled in 1853 into the volume entitled *The Idea of a University*. According to him, true ‘knowledge’, unlike mere ‘learning’ (which is no more than an accumulation of information to serve a practical goal) is an end in itself, necessary for the development of the ‘whole man’. It has spiritual and social components, as well as intellectual, and is to be achieved primarily through the study of philosophy, theology and the humanities, rather than through manual or mechanical activities, which are improper to a gentleman. Moreover, the approach should be holistic, since all branches of knowledge are related; indeed, the fragmentation of knowledge into disciplines was much lamented by these authors as a symptom of civilizational decline and loss of integrity.

The discourse used by these ‘sages’, as they have come to be known, is also worthy of mention, since it stands in marked contrast to the discourse of science which, as we have seen, was in the process of colonizing all areas of knowledge. John Holloway, in his famous work *The Victorian Sage: Studies in Argument* (1965 [1953]:1-20), identifies certain characteristics that define the prose of all these authors (with the exception of Coleridge, who is not covered for obvious reasons), and which ultimately, he suggests, caused them to fall out of favour in the 20th century. These include *dogmatism* (Carlyle, in particular, was given to making 'arbitrary and unproved assertions'), an *oracular pose*, a marked use of *figurative language*, and a tendency towards *mysticism*, all of which are, of course, anathema to the scientific worldview. The sages were also *impossible to summarize*, which would have led scholars brought up in the utilitarian tradition to suspect them of a certain vacuity.

---

while the term used by Arnold was ‘men of culture’, contrasted with ‘philistines’ (*Culture and Anarchy*, 1869). Newman, while retaining the basic elitism of the idea, insisted that a liberal education was a necessary training for a 'gentleman', defined as one ‘who never inflicts pain’ (*The Idea of a University*, 1852).

However, as Holloway explains (*Idem*: 9-10), this was a natural consequence of their philosophy of life. Wisdom for these sages was not about discovering and presenting new realities; rather, it lay in 'an opening of the eyes, making us see in our experience what we failed to see before', achieved by a deft use of language, which appealed to the imagination as much as to the intelligence. Hence:

> /…/ when the outlooks of most of these sages appear in the bald epitomes of literary histories, they lose their last vestige of interest. They provoke only bored surprise that anyone could have insisted so eagerly on half-incomprehensible dogmas or trite commonplaces. This suggests that what gave their views life and meaning lay in the actual words of the original, in the sage's own use of language, not in what can survive summarizings of their 'content'. (*Idem*: 10)

What is interesting here is not only the extent to which sage discourse differs from the discourse of science, but also the fact that John Holloway, writing in the 1950s, so clearly felt he needed to justify and explain it to an audience that clearly had other values[39]. These issues will be explored further in Chapter 6.

20th Century: Globalization

The story of academic discourse in the 20th century largely coincides with the inexorable onward march of the scientific paradigm, and the rise of globalization, with which it is inextricably enmeshed. The discourse's links with industry, technology and business meant that it rapidly acquired prestige in relation to rivals, and began to be exported, not only to other disciplines and areas of knowledge, but also to other parts of the globe (cf. Pennycook, 1994; Hyland, 2000:155-178; Martin, 1998:10-12). Its main features have been standardized with the appearance of style manuals and undergraduate writing programmes, while the teaching of it to foreigners in the form of EAP has become a lucrative business activity. Today it functions as a 'gatekeeper to positions of prestige', becoming ‘one of the most powerful means of inclusion into or exclusion from further education, employment, or social positions’ (Pennycook, 1994: 14).

---

[39] He refers several times to these writers' 'unfashionableness' and to elements in their style that are likely to 'disturb' a modern reader (*Idem*: 2, 3).

However, this growing hegemony has been accompanied by the rise of a number of counter-currents that have challenged EAD, and the scientific paradigm in general, from a variety of different perspectives. There have been philosophical and epistemological attacks on science’s claims to monopolise ‘truth’; ethical complaints about the abuses resulting from the subordination of value to utility and profit; and political vindications from social groups clamouring against the ostensible ‘universality’ and ‘neutrality’ of the scientific project. Alternative discourses have been proposed, including a revitalised discourse of the humanities (under the rubric of New Rhetoric or New Historicism), postmodernist experimental discourses drawing upon the work of the French poststructuralists, and discourses that claim to encode the specific worldview of a subaltern group (such as feminist, ‘queer’ or postcolonial discourses). These, and the extent of the threats that they pose to the hegemonic discourse, will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 6.

Here, however, I would like to finish the story of how the Baconian plain style that focused on ‘things not words' evolved into the mighty global giant that it is today. This I shall do by looking at the more recent stages in the development of those features of EAD that are listed at the beginning of Chapter 4 and traced throughout the course of the present chapter.

The core grammatical features of EAD (nominalizations and passive/impersonal verb forms), having become very widespread across all disciplines in the first half of the 20th century when the scientific paradigm was at its height[40], have in recent years become the focus of debate amongst linguists and arbitrators of ‘good style’. There are now calls from some quarters for a return to a clearer less technical form of communication that is more congruent with a ‘commonsense’ view of the world (see ***App. B*** 15-21 and 22-25).

As regards *nominalization*, there are various dimensions to the debate. The first has to do with its use in contexts where it is functionally unnecessary. As Martin (1993b:217) points out, nominalized language has become 'a symbol of literacy and thus education and thus power in our culture', and so it is frequently employed ‘as a form of ritual, a way of claiming status’ (Halliday, 1993b: 84). This means that it may act as a kind of smokescreen for dubious or empty reasoning, which obviously undermines its legitimacy in a discourse that puts a high value upon clarity and precision.

Secondly, even when it is functionally necessary, nominalization has the effect of creating a distance between writer and reader, of removing the issue at hand from the domain of commonsense experience and transporting it into an abstract realm that is not readily intelligible. Halliday (1993:21) suggests that there is now a need for ‘more democratic forms of discourse':

> The language of science, though forward-looking in its origins, has become increasingly anti-democratic: its arcane grammatical metaphor sets apart those who understand it and shields them from those who do not. /…/ There are signs that people are looking for new ways of meaning - for a grammar which, instead of reconstructing experience so that it becomes accessible only to a few, takes seriously its own

---

[40] In science, Bazerman (cit. Swales, 1990:115) reports an increase in nominalizations in subject position between 1893 and 1980, while Ding (1998:118-120) and Atkinson (1998:145-147) chart a rise in the use of the Passive and Impersonal Active from the end of the 19th century. In the social sciences, the prevalence of nominalizations is analysed in Wignell (1998a, b) and in the humanities by Martin (1989, 1993a/b/c, 2002), Christie (1998, 2002) and Schleppelgrell & Oliveira (2006). I have not found any diachronic or synchronic studies into the use of passives and impersonal verb forms in these areas, but the pronouncements in the academic style manuals on the subject (***App. B*** 18-22) would suggest that they have become very common in recent years.

> beginnings in everyday language and construes a world that is recognizable to all those who live in it.

However, Martin (1989; 1998; 1993a; 1993b; 2002) and others operating within the SF paradigm, while implicitly recognising the truth of this claim, have taken a different line in response to it. Working on the premise that ontogenetic and phyllogenetic development follow the same course[41], they argue that the answer lies not in remaking the discourse but in training young people to be able to process and use it in order to gain access to the power structures of society. This pedagogical goal has led to the mounting of 'advanced literacy' programmes in various parts of the globe, such as the pioneering work in Australian schools reported in the second part of *Writing Science* (Halliday & Martin, 1993) and the various American projects described in the volume edited by Schleppelgrell & Oliveira (2006).

The final issue related to nominalization, and possibly the most important, derives from the perception that the nominalized grammar may be inadequate to deal with new forms of knowledge that have emerged in the 20th century. While Newtonian science 'has to hold the world still, to anaesthetize it, so to speak, while dissecting it' (Halliday, 1993e: 131-2), modern physics requires a language that expresses the reality of 'undivided wholeness in flowing movement' (David Bohm*, cit.* Halliday, 1993d: 108). As events in the quantum world are explained not in terms of causality but in terms of communication (the exchange of information), the future, Halliday claims, may lie in a return to a more dynamic process-based mode, perhaps the clausal grammar of everyday language (1993d:114-117; 1993e:132). This suggestion has interesting implications for the humanities, as we shall see in Chapter 6.

---

[41] See Martin (2002: 110-111) for a schematic representation of the 'learner pathway' in History.

As regards *Impersonal Verb Structures,* the situation is parallel. During the early part of the 20th century, the dominance of the positivist model meant that passives and other impersonal structures proliferated in all areas of knowledge. As Brown (2006, **Bibl.** ***App. B***) points out, the use of such forms suggested that the researcher had been rigorous about following established procedures and protocols, and was able to separate personal values from the activity of researching. Today, however, their excessive use outside the hard sciences is viewed with suspicion by many (***App. B*****:**18-22)[42]. Not only has the ideal of achieving objectivity in the social sciences and humanities been largely discredited, the forms are also criticised on stylistic grounds for generating ambiguity and producing a prose that lacks in vividness and immediacy (see Dunleavy, 2003, **Bibl.** ***App. B***).

The rise and decline of the positivist/empiricist paradigm is interestingly reflected in the centrality accorded to experimental research in scientific articles, traced by Atkinson (1999:xxiv) in the *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London* between 1675 and 1975. He reports that accounts of experiments (comparatively rare in the 17th and 18th centuries, but frequent in the 19th, both as regards length and numbers of experiments recorded) began to be de-emphasised by the 20th century, with a corresponding increase in observational or mathematical/theoretical accounts. The rhetorical focus now shifted away from descriptions of methodology and statements of results to theoretical discussion[43].

---

[42] Banks (1994:23) points out that even journals and writing committees in the hard sciences are now recommending avoidance of the passive, though he adds ‘it is a recommendation which the majority of scientists choose to ignore’.

[43] This is likely to bring consequences for other stylistic features. Banks (1994) points out that features such as the passive (14-16) and hedging devices (106-7) are not evenly distributed throughout science articles, but concentrated in certain sections. The passive (14-16), for example, is found predominantly in the Methods section (i.e. description of experiments), while hedging devices (106-7) are more common in the Discussion and Conclusion. A greater focus on theoretical discussion at the expense of empirical description may well result in a style that is more similar to that of the social sciences or humanities.

This shift from description to explanation in science is corroborated by Bazerman (cit. Swales, 1990:114-115) in his survey of spectroscopic articles in the *Physical Review* from its founding in 1893 to 1980. Amongst other things, he found a rise in causal subordinate clauses and a more abstract use of lexis in subject position (i.e. nouns of process or quality such as ‘ionization’ and ‘correlation’, rather than concrete subjects such as 'substance', 'apparatus', etc), which also suggests 'that the finding or theory has increasingly been brought into the central grammatical position’.

Bazerman (*Idem*) also found a similar pattern as regards citation and referencing. Although references had become more selective by 1910 (sparser, more recent and more relevant), they increased again in number after that, indicating that ‘new work becomes increasingly embedded in the spectroscopic literature’[44]. All these features (the rhetorical shift away from experimental research, the growing abstraction, and deepening integration of present work within the relevant literature) would seem to support Halliday’s assertion that science is drawing closer to the humanities and becoming progressively more discoursal. This issue will be taken up again in Chapter 6.

On the other hand, science continues to be marked off from the humanities by conventions such as the use of section titles and headings[45], the presence of non-verbal material (such as graphs, tables, equations, etc)[46] and the practice of co-authorship[47]. Indeed, these features seem to have been expressly adopted by certain branches of the social sciences in order to explicitly signal their ‘scientificity’ (i.e. rigour). Swales (1990: 116-117), in a study of the main articles in the first 20 years of the *TESOL Quarterly* (the flagship publication of the US-based association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages), found an increase in all of these features, which he attributes to the need felt by authors in the ‘embryonic’ field of ESL to ‘professionalize’ (‘a particularly pressing and understandable concern given the folkloristic belief that anybody who knows a language well can teach it’).

---

[44] It should be pointed out that Atkinson (1999:xxv) got a different result in his survey of *PTRS* articles. He claims that, by the mid 20th century, they were displaying much less concern for exhaustive literature reviews, but instead focused on tightly defined research problems for which literature was selectively cited; indeed, in some areas, such as theoretical physics, little if any previous research was cited. The discrepancy between these findings and Bazerman’s is probably due to differences in the nature of the research described in the two surveys.

[45] Both Atkinson (1999:xxiv) and Bazerman (cit. Swales, 1990:115) report that the use of section headings has increased dramatically since 1950, having made an appearance in the *PTRS* at the end of the 19th century. Up to 1930, if sections were used, they usually ended with Results, thus implying that the findings could stand alone without further comment. Since then, Discussion and Conclusion sections have not only become much more common but they have also greatly increased in length and complexity, while the proportion of space given to Method and Apparatus sections has declined.

The preoccupation of the social sciences to appear scientific may also in part account for the development in some areas of an excessively abstract jargonistic kind of prose that is dense and difficult to read[48]. This has inevitably bred reactions in the form of calls for transparency and precision, one of the earliest of which was ***George Orwell***’s famous essay 'Politics and the English Language' (1946), which attacked slovenly writing in terms that were remarkably similar to those used by Bacon, Hobbes and Locke in the 17th century. Like them, Orwell based his argument upon the philosophical premise of the ultimate separability of sign and referent (‘What is above all needed is to let the meaning choose the word, and not the other way around’), and his criticisms of the use of Latinisms, pretentious diction, complex sentences and abstractions recall the essentially Protestant nature of this particular attitude to good style.

---

[46] Bazerman (cit. Swales, 1990:115) reports that, between 1893 and 1980, there was a decrease in the number of apparatus drawings and in the number and size of tables, but an increase in the number and complexity of graphs and equations.

[47] On co-authorship in science articles and the problems this raises for linguistic studies, see Banks (1994:8-9).

[48] Of course Continental poststructuralism, with its emphasis upon theory as opposed to pragmatic concerns, has also been influential here. See Chapter 6.

Although Orwell was not concerned with academic discourse as such, most of his recommendations[49] have since been incorporated into mainstream academic style manuals (see ***Appendix B***). In the latter part of the 20th century, the torch was taken up by organisations such as the ***Plain English Campaign***[50], a pressure group founded in 1979 primarily to fight 'gobbledygook' in public administration (though its struggle has extended to academia) and highly mediatized events like the ***Bad Writing Contest***[51], which was directed at academics. In the latter case, the awards were mostly attributed to writers working in the fields of poststructuralist theory (winners have included Fredric Jameson, Judith Butler and Homi Bhaba), which illustrates the essentially ideological nature of this linguistic debate. This subject will be discussed further in Chapter 6.

What is clear from all this is the extent to which plain prose is still perceived in many Anglophone circles as somehow congruent with reality (i.e. to coincide with how things essentially are[52]). Quite apart from the associations with the power structures of modernity, as identified above, this belief gives the supporters of English plain prose an almost messianic belief in the essential *rightness* (understood both epistemologically and morally) of their worldview. In the present context of globalization, this is proving to be a very dangerous idea indeed.

---

[49] i.e. Never use a long word where a short one will do; if it is possible to cut a word out, always cut it out; never use the passive where you can use the active; never use a foreign phrase, a scientific word, or a jargon word if you can think of an everyday English equivalent

[50] See www.plainenglish.co.uk. Its actions include the annual presentation of the Golden Bull Award for bad prose (won in 2006 by Germaine Greer, who of course is a prominent academic) and the provision of a computer tool known as the 'Drivel Defence', which screens samples of writing for unacceptable features. It presently employs 40 full-time staff and its founder has been honoured with an OBE (cf. Wikipedia).

[51] Sponsored by the scholarly journal *Philosophy and Literature* (John Hopkins University Press), this ran between 1995 and 1999 with the aim of publically shaming writers of 'stylistically awful' prose. See Dutton (1999), Myers (1999) and Christiansen (2007) for a discussion of some of its principles; Romano (2003) for a description of the controversy that it provoked, and Culler & Lamb (2003) for the academics' response.

[52] In his discussion of 'everyday language as a theory of the natural order', Halliday (1993d: 114-116) points out that 'ordinary languages in their everyday, commonsense contexts embody highly sophisticated interpretations of the natural order' and, unlike scientific discourse, are 'metafunctional', i.e. 'committed to meaning more than one thing at once'. However, quoting Prigogine and Stengers , he also asserts the need for a plurality of languages on the grounds that 'the wealth of reality…overflows any single language, any single logical structure. Each language can express only part of reality'.

* * *

In this chapter, I have attempted to highlight the historically contingent nature of English academic discourse by focusing upon the particular cultural conditions that gave rise to it and fostered its development over the course of four centuries. As we have seen, it has been associated throughout with the worldview of a particular social group, a class which is residually Protestant in its outlook and which has strong links with industry and capitalism. Indeed, it was this close association with the sources of power in modern society that allowed it to flourish and to colonise other areas of knowledge, thereby imposing its values upon other social groups in a process of 'cultural imperialism'.

The hegemonic growth of the scientific paradigm has been accompanied by the spread of a legitimizing discourse that seeks to portray this group’s version of reality as the 'Truth' and its values as uncontrovertibly ‘right’. Thus, we have seen the proliferation of myths, such as notions of ‘universality’ and ‘neutrality’, linked to broader political goals of human progress, freedom and equality. It has also been associated with a particular account of history, which pits the proponents of this worldview against a series of benighted rivals in a contest which (in its rhetorically simplified form) is reduced to truth vs. delusion, good vs. evil, darkness vs. light.

Today, though, the grand claims of science are under attack from a variety of sources. Its discourse has been revealed to be a construct, rather than the transparent window on the world that it has purported to be, and consequently a number of rival discourses have sprung up, challenging its assumptions with alternative knowledges and new forms of expression. It has been suggested that we may now be on the brink of a new paradigm shift, similar to that which shook England in the 17th century (Prigogine & Stengers, 1985; Capra, 1983; Santos, 1995; Luke, 1993; Halliday, 1993d). Yet there is a formidable array of financial, political and ideological forces underpinning the hegemony, forces that are unlikely to be easily toppled by the apocalyptic murmurings of a few radical academics.

In Chapter 6, I look at some of the alternative philosophies and discourses that currently co-exist in Anglophone academia, and attempt to assess the extent to which they (individually or collectively) pose a threat to the hegemony of the one whose history has been traced over the course of this chapter.

Chapter 6

Challenges to English Academic Discourse

As I have already pointed out, it would be misleading to suggest that the hegemony of EAD is such that knowledge is never construed in any other way in Anglophone academia. Despite its prominence, there are nevertheless a number of alternative discourses existing on the fringes of the system that offer a serious challenge to the epistemological and political assumptions of the hegemonic one and which cannot be overlooked in a study such as this. This chapter therefore surveys the various challenges to the scientific paradigm that appeared during the course of the 20th century, from both outside and inside Anglophone culture, and examines some of the alternative discourses that have arisen as a result. It closes with an assessment of the relative status of those discourses with regards to the dominant one.

The Continental Challenge

Michel Foucault, in his 1966 exploration of knowledge and representation entitled *Les Mots et les Choses* (translated into English as *The Order of Things*), identifies two major moments when the 'episteme'[1] of Western culture underwent a dramatic reconfiguration – moments of rupture or 'discontinuity' which we might today term 'paradigm shifts' after Kuhn (1962). The first of these corresponds to the 'Scientific Revolution' of the 17th century that I have already described, the moment when the old medieval code of 'similitudes' and 'resemblances' gave way to the scientific attitude, according to which language was perceived as a transparent tool with which the outside world could be accurately represented (Foucault, 2002a: 51-85). The second of Foucault's 'discontinuities', however, is unrecognisable within the Anglo-Saxon context. He claims that it took place at the beginning of the 19th century and was sufficiently dramatic to cause beliefs that 'less than twenty years before had been posited and affirmed in the luminous space of understanding to topple down into error, into the realm of fantasy, into non-knowledge' (*Idem*: 235).

---

[1] In the *Archaeology of Knowledge* (2002b:211), Foucault defines an episteme as 'the total set of relations that unite, at a given period, the discursive practices that give rise to epistemological figures, sciences, and possibly formalized systems of knowledge'.

Although Foucault does not explicitly name the philosophical currents he had in mind, it is clear that he was writing from a perspective that is (or has been until relatively recently) quite alien to anyone brought up in the mainstream Anglo-American tradition[2]. He is obviously referring to movements such as German idealism, phenomenology and hermeneutics, which emphasise the role played by consciousness and interpretation in processing knowledge about the world, and their offspring, existentialism and structuralism. The latter in particular seems to be alluded to when he claims, 'in the Classical age, languages had a grammar because they had the power to represent; now they represent on the basis of that grammar' (*Idem*: 259); that is to say, meaning is understood to be generated not by the word's capacity to represent the outside world, but within the linguistic system itself, through the contrasts set up by the language's internal structure.

All these approaches, which Anglo-Saxons have traditionally lumped together under the label 'Continental Philosophy', have in common a profound skepticism as regards the human capacity to escape from the confines of our own consciousness, and it is this that constitutes the major epistemological shift that Foucault is describing. These philosophies emphasise the role of codes in not only *mediating* but also *constructing* our knowledge of the outside world, going as far as to suggest, in their more extreme forms, that objective knowledge is ultimately impossible. As such, they stand in direct contrast to the epistemology of science, and indeed to the Logical Positivism favoured by the Anglo-Saxon analytical school of philosophy, which long remained stubbornly 'realist' in its attitudes to language and knowledge, concerned for most of the 20th century with establishing the truth value of propositions by virtue of their relationship to the outside world.

---

[2] Berman (1988: 179) is quite disparaging about Foucault's 'modern' episteme. 'Foucault attempts to create a coherent "modern" episteme where none exists. /…/ His modern episteme seems, at root, an attempted integration, a harmonizing, on French territory of disparate importations. From the Anglo-American perspective, the model is inapplicable. The British empiricism of the beginning of the eighteenth century remains the fundamental philosophical disposition in England and America'. However, Prigogine and Stengers (1984:87), writing from a Francophone perspective, also acknowledge the occurrence of a major epistemological shift in the late 18th/early 19th century and employ the term 'Copernican revolution' to describe the effects of Kant's transcendental idealism upon the dominant worldview.

For our purposes, a convenient, if arbitrary, starting point for this very brief foray into Continental philosophy[3] might be Structuralism, of which ***Ferdinand de Saussure*** (1857-1913) is generally considered to be the founding father. His *Course in General Linguistics* (1916) challenged the epistemology of science by focusing upon language itself, no longer viewed as a transparent window onto some pre-existing reality. On the contrary, Saussure emphasised the *arbitrarines*s *of the sign* and its correlative, the formal structure of the code as a *system of differential elements*, according to which words were now seen to acquire their meaning from their relationship with other terms in the system, rather than from any direct correspondence with any extralinguistic reality:

> …in language there are only differences *without positive terms*. Whether we take the signifier or signified, language has neither ideas nor sounds that existed before the linguistic system, but only conceptual and phonic differences that have issued from the system. The idea or phonic substance that a sign contains is of less importance than the other signs that surround it. (1959:117-118).

---

[3] I have opted to concentrate upon French philosophy here, because it is this that has had more the most direct influence upon both English and Portuguese academic production. However, the German influence should not be overlooked; indeed, much poststructuralist French thought can ultimately be traced back to German sources (such as the Frankfurt School and, before that, the tradition of German Idealism).

This shift in focus was fundamental to the new 'episteme'. The interposition of a signifying code that was an entirely cultural phenomenon effectively reversed the transformation that Bacon and his contemporaries had wrought in the 17th century, shifting the attention away from 'things' and back to 'words'. Moreover, verbal language was not the only code operating in human society. After Saussure, the model was modified and applied to a wide range of different disciplines (psychoanalysis by Lacan, anthropology by Lévi-Strauss, etc) and practices (Barthes on fashion, wine-drinking and photography, for example), paving the way for the perspective that we now know as social constructivism.

Indeed, by the late 1960s and early '70s, the French academic scene was markedly different in nature and approach to the Anglo-American. The language-based epistemology that had been instituted with Structuralism was now being explored and applied in texts that ranged freely across disciplinary boundaries (with no concern for scientific rigour, according to detractors[4]); its discourse was dense and opaque, creating meaning intra- and intertextually rather than through reference to any concrete outside world. Empiricism, which underpins all intellectual endeavour in the Anglo-American world[5], was viewed as limiting and passé[6]; and by 1979, ***Jean-François Lyotard*** was striking at the heart of the scientific paradigm by asserting that

---

[4] Sokal & Bricmont (1998:13) identify two distinct phases in French intellectual life. 'The first phase is that of extreme structuralism, extending through the early 1970s: the authors try desperately to give vague discourses in the human sciences a veneer of "scientificity" by invoking the language of mathematics /.../ The second phase is that of poststructuralism, beginning in the mid-1970s: here any pretence at "scientificity" is abandoned, and the underlying philosophy (to the extent that one can be discerned) tends towards irrationalism or nihilism'.

[5] As Berman (1988:7) points out: 'The philosophy of empiricism has provided for English-speaking thinkers, including critics of literature, a clear and powerful methodology. In the physical and social sciences it has yielded so imposing an array of assertions about the world and its inhabitants that no discipline, from physics to theology, has been able to ignore its presuppositions'.

[6] 'Empirique' is defined in the *Robert Dictionnaire de la Langue Française* (1998) in perjorative terms : 'Qui ne s'appuie que sur l'expérience, qui reste au niveau de l'expérience spontanée ou commune, n'a rien de rationnel ni de systémique' ('That is supported only by experience, that remains on a spontaneous or common level of experience, that has nothing rational or systematic').

'scientific knowledge is a kind of discourse' (1984:3) or a 'language game' (*Idem*: 9-11), which, unable to provide proofs for its proofs, resorts to 'grand narratives', such as progress, emancipation or wealth creation to legitimise its claims.

Many of epistemological issues raised by the Structuralists and Poststructuralists were taken to their logical extreme in the writings of ***Jacques Derrida*** (1930-2004), whose famous remark 'Il n'y a pas de hors-texte' (1967:158), usually translated as 'there is nothing outside the text' or 'there is no "outside-text"', is frequently cited as an example of the radical epistemological skepticism that mainstream Anglo-Saxon philosophers have found so unpalatable. Like Barthes (1978 [1967]), Derrida makes the point that the writer has no control over the meanings generated in his/her text, since meaning is an effect of language, not a prior presence merely expressed through it. Taking as a starting point Saussure's claims that 'in language there are only differences' and that 'language has neither ideas nor sounds that existed before the linguistic system' (1959:118), Derrida combines the two in his neographism 'différance', which encapsulates the notion that 'the sign /…/is deferred presence', both temporally and spatially (1991a: 61).

> In a language, in the *system* of language, there are only differences. /…/ these differences *play*: in language, in speech too, and in the exchange between language and speech. On the other hand, these differences are themselves *effects*. They have not fallen from the sky fully formed, and are no more inscribed in a *topos noētos*, than they are prescribed in the gray matter of the brain /…/ What is written as *différance*, then, will be the playing movement that "produces" – by means of something that is not simply an activity - these differences, these effects of difference. (*Idem*: 64).[7]

---

[7] Although I have chosen to quote Derrida in English in order to maintain a certain consistency, it must be pointed out that his work actively resists translation, particularly its performative or interventive aspects. Moreover, many of the concepts that he mobilises from the French intellectual tradition are not properly encapsulated by the English 'equivalents' that are often chosen to translate them. An example from this quotation would be Saussure's famous pair 'langue' (language as an abstract system) and 'parole' (language as it is used in the particular instance), inadequately rendered here as 'language' and 'speech'.

This fundamental instability of meaning is what allows Derrida to develop the interventive strategy that has come to be known as 'Deconstruction'. Given the impossibility of escaping from the totalizing discourses in which the subject is inscribed, Derrida uses neographisms and wordplay to explore the various dimensions of meaning that might be present in a given text and bring to light connections that might otherwise have remained unperceived.

Deconstruction was eagerly received by different subaltern groups, who saw in it a way of subverting essentializing hegemonic discourses that imprisoned them in Otherness. For example, the French feminists, ***Hélène Cixous***, ***Luce Irigaray*** and, to a lesser extent, ***Julia Kristeva***, followed Derrida in their 'language-centred' approach to discourse, developing a style that was 'consciously focused on the power of the signifier and on the strategies of performative rhetoric' (Simon, 1996:96). This gives their writing a literary feel that transports it away from the realm of expository prose towards the domain of the poetic and mystical. Indeed, these feminists, and many that came after them, frequently reflect upon their need for a more open-ended language that would enable the release of some of a meaning potential that had so long been silenced by the hegemonic discourse:

> We haven't been taught, nor allowed, to express multiplicity. To do that is to speak improperly. Of course, we might – we were supposed to ? – exhibit one 'truth' while sensing, with-holding, muffling another. Truth's other side – its complement? its remainder? – stayed hidden. (Irigaray, 2000 [1977])

> Nearly the entire history of writing is confounded with the history or reason, of which it is at once the effect, the support, and one of the privileged allies. It has been one with the phallocentric tradition. It is indeed that same self-admiring, self-stimulating, self-congratulatory phallocentrism.
>
> With some exceptions, for there have been failures /.../ in that enormous machine that has been operating and turning out its "truth" for centuries. There have been poets who would go to any lengths to slip something by at odds with tradition /…/

> But only the poets – not the novelists, allies of representationalism. Because poetry involves gaining strength through the unconscious and because the unconscious, that other limitless country, is the place where the repressed manage to survive: women, or as Hoffman would say, fairies. (Cixous, 2000 [1975])

Elsewhere, Cixous engages in elaborate wordplay, such as the passage from *Vivre l'Orange* (1979) in which she explores her own multiethnic identity using Derrida-esque techniques that subvert not only French, but also English, Spanish, Portuguese and Italian:

> La question des juifs. La question des femmes. La question des juifemmes. *La question della donnarance. A questão das laranjas.* The question: Juis-je juive ou fuis-je femme? Jouis-je judia ou suis-je mulher ? Joy I donna ? ou fruo filha? Fuis-je femme ou est-ce que je me ré-juive ?
>
> The question of Jews. The question of women. The question of jewomen. *A questão dans laranjudias. Della arancebrea.* Am I enjewing myself? Or woe I woman? Win I woman, or wont I jew-ich? Joy I donna? Gioia jew? Or gioi am femme? Fruo.
> (*cit*. Simon 1996:97)

Vivre l'Orange is actually a bilingual text in which both versions, the French and the English, are signed by Cixous herself[8]. For most of it, the English echoes the French quite closely, using an estranging translation technique that results in unexpected vocabulary or grammatical structures ('a writing came'; 'whose voice that like a flame lowers'), with the occasional presence of an unmarked French word ('but where are the amies', 'by a fine vibration in the toile') and polysemic effects ('How to call oneself abroad?', 'I am foreinge'). In the passage quoted above, however, the sudden explosion of languages emphasises the incapacity of any one of them to singlehandedly express the plenitude of experience. It also reminds us that the notion of equivalence between languages is now unsustainable. According to Simon

---

[8] For a fuller exploration of this text, and Cixous' other experiments with language, see Simon (1996: 95-101).

(*Idem*:98), it is this perception which provides much of the dynamic for Cixous' writing, whose mission is now ‘to create meaning in the spaces between words, in the interplay between them’ .

These kinds of discourses are clearly a world away from the hegemonic EAD that has been the subject of this dissertation up to now. They are difficult to translate and difficult for the English mind to process, since they derive from an entirely different philosophy of language to the ‘windowpane’ prose that Anglophone scholars have been brought up to expect in the Academy. Meaning is now generated textually through the interplay of echoes and references, in a way that has more in common with literary writing than with expository prose. It is therefore unsurprising that a readership unversed in the tradition to which it refers (and which, moreover, has been resolutely monolingual) should have had difficulties in coming to terms with such an approach.

When Deconstruction first arrived in America, with Derrida’s 1966 lecture at John Hopkins University on ‘Structure, Sign and Play’, most members of the audience would have been entirely unprepared. He launched into a critique of Structuralism, announcing that the whole concept of structure was undergoing a radical de-centring (“there is no transcendental or privileged signified and /…/ the domain or the interplay of signification has, henceforth, no limit”). However, as Art Berman (1988: 114) and Rachel Comay (*cit.* Simon, 1996:92) point out, Structuralism itself had scarcely penetrated American soil by that time. Taken out of context, his ideas would have seemed like empty abstractions, or at best, an invitation to unrestrained iconoclasm.

It is therefore no wonder that Derrida met with a very mixed reception in the Anglophone world. Philosophers accused him of nihilism[9] and intentional obfuscation[10], and when the University of Cambridge decided to award him an honorary doctorate in the early 1990s, it caused an uproar. The philosophy department, together with a number of prominent academics from other institutions, prepared a letter of protest, in which they claimed that Derrida's work ‘does not meet accepted standards of clarity and rigour’ and described Derrida's philosophy as being composed of ‘tricks and gimmicks’[11].

In American literary departments, on the other hand, he was effectively apotheosized. The “Yale School” of literary criticism developed around his ideas, involving prominent critics such as Paul de Man, Geoffrey Hartman, J. Hillis Miller and Harold Bloom[12]; while subaltern groups of all kinds found in Deconstruction an intellectual justification for their various discontents, as well as a means for challenging hegemonic thought. There resulted an ‘“uncontrolled fever” of appropriations, domestications and displacements' (*Idem*), which was followed by a violent backlash in the 1980s and early 1990s, when the traditional paradigm, with its emphasis upon plain language and concrete references, attempted to reassert itself. The Bad Writing Contest, mentioned in the previous chapter, was one of the symptoms of this reaction against ‘Theory’.

---

[9] Derrida was charged with undermining the ethical and intellectual norms of the academy, and even of Western civilization itself. See, for example, Richard Wolin’s accusation that the ‘deconstructive gesture of overturning and reinscription ends up by threatening to efface many of the essential differences between Nazism and non-Nazism’ (1993: xiii).

[10] See Noam Chomsky (1995). ‘Quite regularly, “my eyes glaze over” when I read polysyllabic discourse on the themes of poststructuralism and postmodernism; what I understand is largely truism or error, but that is only a fraction of the total word count.’

[11] It went on to state: ‘Academic status based on what seems to us to be little more than semi-intelligible attacks upon the values of reason, truth, and scholarship is not, we submit, sufficient grounds for the awarding of an honorary degree in a distinguished university’ (Smith et al: 1992).

[12] See Lentricchia (1980) for an account of this influence. It should be pointed out, however, that Harold Bloom later distanced himself from this association.

This conflict that deconstruction, and poststructuralism generally, produced at the heart of Anglophone culture perhaps sheds some light upon the question that I began to broach in the previous chapter, namely the extent to which the scientific paradigm, and the discourse that had emerged from it, holds sway over academia as a whole. The eager espousal of French theory by American literary departments suggests that the humanities, at least, had never been totally convinced by the positive-empirical mindset that had dominated mainstream culture for so long, and that practitioners felt somehow vindicated by this unexpected swing back to a text-based epistemology.

Deconstruction, then, strikes at the heart of that discourse that was forged back in the 17th century to enable the intellectuals of that age to focus upon 'things not words'. Denying the presence of any stable signified or referent behind the sign, it removes the last vestiges of control that the (no longer sovereign) human subject may once have had over his/her words. And if that subject is himself inscribed in and by language, if every word used resonates of its own accord with a multitude of others stretching back and forth throughout the culture much further than the mental eye can see, then the exhortations to clarity, coherence, precision, objectivity and rationality that form the backbone of mainstream English Academic Discourse become functionally useless. The whole scientific paradigm shrivels up and collapses as if it had been touched by a fairy's wand.

Homegrown Challenges

The fact that the Anglo-Saxons missed out on the second of the epistemological shifts described by Foucault in *Les Mots et Les Choses* was certainly due to the immense importance attributed to the scientific paradigm in Anglophone culture. For, while

Continental Europe was developing currents such as German Idealism and phenomenology, which emphasised the role of consciousness, the English and Americans were busy reaping the technological and economic rewards of empirical science, and exporting them around the world. The consequence of this was (and still is) an engrained inclination towards epistemological realism that leads large swathes of the academic population to view constructivist positions with a great deal of suspicion.

However, in the last fifty years or so, there have been homegrown developments in a number of different areas that have challenged the scientific paradigm from within[13]. Some of the objections raised have been theoretical, highlighting inconsistencies in the epistemology of empiricism and positivism; others are historical and social, focusing upon the essentially contingent nature of the supposedly ‘neutral’ and ‘universal’ claims made by science; while still others take an ethical stance, denouncing the human and environmental costs of scientific practice. In many cases, they seem to have developed quite independently of the currents emanating from the Continent, although there was a considerable amount of cross-fertilization from the ‘60’s and ‘70s, resulting in some interesting developments on the level of Academic Discourse, as we shall see.

---

[13] These include: (within Philosophy of Language), Wittenstein’s notion of Language Games, and the Speech Act Theory of Austin and Searle; (Philosophy of Science) the Quine-Duhem Theory about the ‘web of belief', Kuhn’s concepts of the 'paradigm shift' and the ‘incommensurability of paradigms’, and Feyerabend’s denunciation of the lack of method and unilinearity in scientific progress; (Sociology of Science) the Merton Thesis on the protestant origins of science, and the ethnographic work carried out by Latour & Woolgar, Knorr-Cetina and Gilbert & Mulkay, etc into the way science is actually produced and reported; (Social Sciences) ethnography in Anthropology, ethnomethodology and conversation analysis in Sociology, and humanistic approaches in Psychology; (History) the erosion of the fact/fiction distinction by Hayden White and the development of the notion of temporality to replace the classic linear conception of chronological time; (Geography) postmodern attempts to introduce value and criticism into the study of the landscape by Harvey and Soja. Many of the principles underlying the traditional scientific paradigm have also been undermined by developments in modern physics (such as the theory of relativity, quantum mechanics, Gödel's theorem, the thermodynamics of nonequilibrium systems, Chaos theory, etc), which appear to bring the scientific worldview closer to that of the humanities (see Prigogine & Stengers, 1984; Capra, 1983).

In most cases, these 'postmodern' currents have remained on the fringes of their disciplines, while the mainstreams continue loyal to the tenets and practices of empiricism. However, in one field, postmodernism has had a much more wide-reaching influence. This is the discipline that is variously known as English Literature, English, Literary Criticism, or Literary Studies (the name changes are significant!), which takes texts as its object of study. With its roots in a much earlier holistic tradition (the tradition of Humanities scholarship, which was in existence long before empirical Science ever appeared and against which the scientific paradigm sought to define itself back in the 17th century), this was originally based on a quite different philosophy of language (see Chapter 5). As such, it has perhaps never ceased to present a challenge to the scientific paradigm, a challenge that has ebbed and flowed in accordance with changing sociocultural circumstances.

Even after the Scientific Revolution had wrought massive changes in the conception of ‘knowledge’ in England, the humanities tradition continued unabated in Oxford and Cambridge and the ‘public schools’, thereby becoming associated with the prestige education of the upper classes (Collini, 1998:xii). With the invention of ‘English literature’ in the 18th century[14], the moral dimension that had formerly accrued to the study of Latin and Greek texts in the Early Modern period (Moss, 1993:56) was transferred to the national canon, which was entrusted with the task of preserving and transmitting national identity and culture. Thus began the famous split between the ‘two cultures’, most famously articulated by C.P.Snow in his 1959 Rede lecture in Cambridge, which posited the existence of a ‘gulf of mutual incomprehension’ between scientists and literary intellectuals (1998:4).

---

[14] According to Williams (1983: 183-188), the notion of a ‘nation' having a 'literature’ appeared in the 18th century, in Germany, France and Italy, from where it passed to England. See also Readings (1996: 70-77).

The relative status of those two cultures in Anglophone society was and still is difficult to determine. Snow claimed that it was 'the traditional culture, to an extent remarkably little diminished by the emergence of the scientific one, which manages the western world' (*Idem*:11), an idea that has recently been echoed by the applied linguist Ken Hyland[15]. However, these assertions are remarkably at odds with the analyses offered by the SF linguists, according to which all areas of knowledge have been effectively colonised by the discourse of science, as we have seen, leading to an 'essential continuity between humanities and science as far as interpreting the world is concerned' (Martin, 1993b:220). It is worth lingering a little longer on this question, as the relationship between the sciences and humanities in Anglophone culture is a complex one – as well as being central to the theme of this thesis. Has the discourse of science in fact managed to colonise the world of Literary Studies?[16] Or has that discipline remained a world apart, as Snow and Hyland suggest, secretly preserving and cultivating an older paradigm of knowledge in defiance of the philistines, much as the medieval monasteries protected Classical learning from the onslaughts of the barbarians after the fall of the Roman Empire?

The question is complicated by the fact that the discourse of Literary Studies seems to have passed through a number of different phases depending upon the broader intellectual climate. When Utilitarianism was at its height, for example, the Victorian sages assumed a posture of deliberate defiance. Dogmatic, mystical, couched in figurative expressions and utterly impossible to summarise, their discourse had much more in common with literary writing than with the pared-down prose and tables of the scientists. On the other hand, in the 1930s and '40s, when it was felt that 'given enough time /…./ science would fully explain whatever there might be to know about the universe and humankind, and would bring, beside this knowledge, equitable government, prosperity, health and general well-being' (Berman, 1988: 29), the New Critics were positing a notion of the poem as a *self-contained independent object*, which could be scrutinised analytically, much like a material object in the world[17]. The close reading procedure that they developed, and the technical vocabulary that they used for the purpose, took Literary Studies much closer to science. The discourse of the 'critic' was now clearly distinguished from that of the authors that he studied; it was 'factual' rather than 'literary' prose, consistent in most respects with that produced elsewhere in the Academy.

---

[15] In an essay on 'the two Englishes', Hyland (2006:34) distinguishes between the scientific (linguistic) and literary approaches to texts, and lists as differences epistemological approach, tools used, and attitude towards 'ideas such as universals, cumulative knowledge-making and the unmediated representation of the phenomenon under study'. Hyland also reiterates Snow's claim that scientists are perceived as somehow inferior to literary scholars ('Applied linguists, in fact, have generally been seen as inhabiting the less glamorous, low rent neighbourhoods of the academy…').

[16] It is significant that the SF linguists seem to have based all their claims about the discourse of the humanities on the texts taken from the domain of History, whose mainstream has been heavily influenced by the epistemology of science. As far as I know, there have not been any in-depth analyses of the discourse used by Literary scholars from the SF perspective.

With the arrival of structuralism, the scientific paradigm encroached even further on the domain of Literary Studies. This is paradoxical for, as we have seen, in Continental Europe, Structuralism was anti-realist in its epistemology, and therefore undermined the philosophical structure upon which empiricism rested. However, in America (and by extension, Britain), its skeptical and idealist ramifications were not recognised by its proponents (*Idem*: 144). Instead, the *elimination of value* from inquiry, which Structuralism entailed, was seen 'as a solution to the separation of science, philosophy and criticism' (*Idem*: 93); and with the rise of linguistics, a truly 'scientific' criticism was felt to be possible, a criticism that would reveal the timeless unchanging laws governing literary systems and the formal patterns underlying individual works.[18] The discourse of literary critics now became indistinguishable from that of scientists, even to the extent that their texts often included elaborate charts and diagrams filled with numbers and symbols (as, for example, the prose of Scholes, 1974)[19].

---

[17] Berman (1988: 61) sums up the New Criticism thus: 'The New Criticism is founded upon a scientific methodology, itself grounded in empiricism, which attempts to account for the formulation, in literature, of a non-scientific cognition. The resultant theory is an inconsistent imposition of Romantic notions upon a purportedly scientific procedure, which occurs because there is, for the New Critics, no theory of language and self that can bring an encompassing coherence to their criticism.' For an extensive discussion of the New Criticism and its relationship to the dominant empiricism of American culture, see *Idem*: 26-59.

Given the pervasiveness of empiricism in Anglophone culture and the pressures upon Literary Criticism to prove its scientific credentials, it is scarcely surprising that the metadiscourse used by Literary Studies scholars should have come in this way to resemble so closely the discourse of factuality produced in other departments. It is this that is still taught today on academic writing courses, as illustrated by the style manuals aimed at literature students (see ***Appendix B***), and exemplified in Extract J of Fig. 1 (Chapter 4). To the extent that it still occupies the mainstream in Anglophone Literary Studies suggests that the SF linguists were right in their claim that the discourse of science has effectively colonized all areas of knowledge.

However, this is to ignore a counter-current that has always been present in this discipline, according to which many of the aesthetic and emotive resources of language (the tools of the poet or imaginative writer) are also mobilised by the critic in his discussion of other authors' work. Indeed, even when literary studies was at its most scientific, figurative language never entirely disappeared from critical metadiscourse, just as humanistic notions of 'higher' or 'intuitive' knowledge continued to linger beneath the surface. Berman (1988: 1) attributes this to a cyclical dynamic derived from fundamental contradictions present in the philosophical foundations laid by Locke and Hobbes, causing Anglo-American literary theory to veer back and forth between empiricism and skepticism throughout the course of its evolution. I would suggest that the ambivalence can be traced back even further; given the discipline's origins in the holistic humanities tradition of the Early Modern period, it is likely to have a built-in bias towards a language-based or 'rhetorical' epistemology, which would render it inherently antagonistic to the dualisms erected by the scientific paradigm. Hence, it would tend, wherever possible, to blur distinctions between subject/object, fact/fiction, reason/emotion, etc, and to favour a scholarly discourse that inclined towards the literary.

---

[18] See Berman (1988:127): 'The structuralist approach is called a science because it is believed by structuralists that linguistics is an empiricism /.../ and that literary scholarship can be founded upon it.'

[19] See also Lentricchia (1983: 102-154) for an alternative account of Structuralism's influence on Anglo-Saxon literary criticism.

This might explain, then, why Deconstruction was so eagerly received in America, following Derrida's initial lecture in 1966. Derrida basically reinstated language to the central role that it had held in the Medieval and Early Modern era, and in doing so, elevated textual study to the position it had enjoyed before Rhetoric was discredited by Science. Literary Studies thus gained a whole new importance as the produce of all the other disciplines fell into its sphere of scrutiny (for if there is nothing outside the text, then the discipline whose mission is the study of texts effectively holds the key to all Knowledge!)

One of the major effects of Poststructuralism generally has been the erosion of the classic disciplinary divisions set up during the Enlightenment and the emergence of a plethora of new disciplines and inter-disciplines. Literary Studies has been particularly affected by this process. Its traditional mission as torchbearer of the national culture collapsed as the literary canon came under attack, and as a result, a whole range of new academic areas have emerged, initially under its auspices, but then gradually gaining autonomy as independent areas of the study in their own right. Some of these (such as Women's Studies, Queer Studies, Postcolonialism, etc) are committed to recovering and revaluing authors and works that were marginalised or silenced by the dominant paradigm, and exploring identity issues resulting from the new constructivism. Others (like Film Studies, Media Studies, Translation Studies, etc) focus upon text-types traditionally considered unworthy of academic attention. Still others (such as Cultural Studies, Comparative Literature, Inter-Arts Studies, etc) have broadened the field, transcending boundaries of class, nation or medium to explore issues of ideology and identity encoded in any kind of representation, often from a comparative perspective[20].

All of the new subjects listed above have, in different ways, subverted the traditional hierarchies set up during the modern era by focusing upon subaltern social groups or non-canonical modes of expression, and providing a critique of conventional modes of thought. Many of these currents have now converged with others emanating from the Social Sciences, yielding broad movements such as Critical Theory, the New Historicism and Cultural Materialism that challenge the hegemonic episteme from a variety of different perspectives. This often involves the cultivation of new forms of academic discourse designed to subvert 'windowpane prose' by deploying deliberately estranging tactics, as we will see below.

Finally, we should not omit to mention the revival that has taken place in recent years of the older humanities tradition of Rhetoric, which, as Vickers (1993:26) imaginatively describes, had been forced underground like a stream, only to rise again as a fountain 'in unexpected places and unpredictable times'. Today framed as the *New Rhetoric*, this current is concerned not only to expose 'constructive procedures common to all the human sciences' but also to 'recover the "person" in disciplines which have largely been dominated by positivistic natural science paradigms', reveal the 'emancipatory or critical dimension' inherent in the human sciences, and develop a reflexive awareness of its own practices in the knowledge that ‘every intellectual construction in the human sciences is historically and culturally enmeshed’ (Good & Roberts, 1993: 8-10). Hence, while sharing some objectives and justifications with Linguistics-based approaches such as Critical Discourse Analysis, the New Rhetoric also looks backwards to a much more ancient Classical and Renaissance tradition in the search for a form of knowledge that is above all *holistic*[21].

---

[20] For an overview, see Greenblatt & Gunn (1992).

This connection between premodern and postmodern epistemologies will be explored further in Part II of this thesis.

* * *

It appears, then, that there is a formidable array of forces challenging the scientific paradigm at this moment. As we have seen, they derive from a wide variety of cultural and epistemological backgrounds and are motivated by different aims. What they all have in common, however, is a fundamental skepticism about the scientific paradigm’s claims to explain reality and improve the human condition, and a profound dissatisfaction with the consequences of its hegemony in the present world.

As we have seen, English Academic Discourse is tightly bound up with the paradigm of classical science and encodes its epistemology and values in its very structure. It is not surprising, then, that challenges to the paradigm should have been accompanied by attempts to introduce changes on the level of language. Some of these have involved appeals for a return to a ‘new commonsense’, that is to say, for an academic discourse that is more congruent with our perceptions of reality and less socially divisive than the highly impersonal and nominalized discourse that currently holds sway[22]. Others have gone in the opposite direction, with the development of opaque and abstract forms of writing that have a primarily performative function[23]. Still others mobilise the resources of narrative and poetic prose in order to emphasise subjectivity or blur the fact/fiction divide, thereby providing a resource for the expression of personal and emotive meanings.

---

[21] For an overview of the various currents that have led to the revival of Rhetoric in the 20th century, see Roberts and Good (1993), Meyer (1999), Conley (1990: 285-303).

Let us look at some of the most significant of those in more detail, before going on to assess their relative status within the Anglophone world as a whole.

Alternative Academic Discourses

The various alternative discourses that have emerged in Anglophone academia in recent decades are highly interconnected and as such, are not easy to categorise effectively. All have an epistemological aspect and a moral/critical aspect, and are underpinned by the some or more of the theoretical currents described above. Nevertheless, for the sake of clarity of exposition, I have divided them into two broad groups: a) those discourses that were initially developed as part of a broad attempt to offer an alternative epistemological framework more suited to the needs of the Social Sciences; b) discourses that developed in transdisciplinary settings with a primarily emancipatory or political motive.

---

[22] Halliday (1993d:114-117; 1993e:132) suggests that the clausal grammar of everyday language may be more appropriate than a highly nominalized discourse to express the reality of 'undivided wholeness in flowing movement' perceived by the New Physics. Santos (1995: 46-55) also calls for a 'new commonsense', whose rhetoric will be above all practical and pragmatic, committed to bringing about social change.

[23] This is writing 'that does not simply transmit a thought or a content but performs an action, takes up a stance./…/ instead of self-effacingly conveying information, difficult writing puts itself forward, seeks to act on the reader, providing an experience as it structures experience.' (Culler & Lamb, 2003: 3-4)

a) Discourses of Qualitative Research

The Social Sciences became aware quite early on that the quantitative methods and positivistic language of the hard sciences were inadequate to explore and express many aspects of the human experience that formed its various objects of study. Hence, it was in these areas that the notion of 'qualitative research' developed, a blanket term for a series of approaches that include case study, life history, biography, documentary analysis and community studies[24]. Despite being shunned by the mainstream during the '50s and '60s when the scientific paradigm was at its height in the Anglophone world, qualitative research has today gained respectability throughout the social sciences as an alternative to the quantitative research, and its methods are used in a wide range of different disciplines.

This new respectability no doubt derives from the postmodern recognition that objectivity and neutrality, so central to the scientific paradigm, are impossible to attain. This has been reflected in language in a number of ways. In mainstream academic discourse (which, as we have seen, remains generally attached to the empiricist/positivist paradigm), the use of impersonal and passive forms is now acknowledged by many to be problematic (see ***Appendix*** **B**. 18-22). Hence, some researchers and tutors now promote the use of the Active voice above the Passive, and encourage the use of the first-person personal pronoun to emphasise the subjective nature of the observation or remark.

Others take this principle further by deliberately introducing elements of their personal autobiography into the text in order to provide a framework for the value judgments that are made during the course of the work and mark their epistemological limitations. Many social science texts, therefore, now begin with a narrative-style introduction, in which the researcher describes the events in his/her own life which led to their interest in the topic and account for their assumedly biased approach. Other texts are entirely constructed as *personal narratives*[25], using emotions and inner experience as prime data. Hence, literary forms of language[26] are preferred to the categories, theories and concepts of classical social science, and there may be a focus upon the actual means of textual construction, with attempts to engage and move the reader, and make him/her feel what it was like to have been really there (Woods, 2006: 45-46).

---

[24] Qualitative research developed in the field of Anthropology with Ethnography, and that approach remains the most prominent and influential. However, as Woods (2006: 2) points out, the terms are not synonymous: 'You can use qualitative methods (e.g. simply by using unstructured or semi-structured interviews) without doing an ethnography (which involves field research on a way of life).'

Another reader-centred narrative approach is the *impressionistic tale*, which deliberately leaves gaps in order to allow the reader to construct his/her own reading of the events recounted (*Idem*: 44). The human beings that are the object of study may also be encouraged to create their own first-person narratives that express their experiences in their own voice; thus, a common technique is the recording and wholesale *transcription* of extensive interviews or monologues, with no attempt to interfere with or standardise the subject's language in any way.

The most extreme experimental approaches include *polyphonic texts*, and texts that transcend conventional verbal media altogether. In the case of the former, fragments of poetry, letters, speeches, emails, etc may be introduced into the work (sometimes interspersed with narrative accounts and commentaries, at other times, presented in different visual frames on the page) in order 'to counter the "comfort text" producing the “romance of knowledge as cure”’ (*Idem*: 49). The latter include *performative texts*, such as plays or drama of various kinds, spoken poetry or prose, ethnodramas, natural texts and improvised texts,[27] and *hypermedia texts*, which are computer-mediated and contain authored ‘links’ that create associations between different elements in the hypertext[28] (*Idem*. 53-59).

---

[25] Woods (2006: 45) lists, in the area of personal narrative alone, the following 'genres': first-person accounts, narrative ethnographies, personal narratives, personal ethnographies, authoethnographies, 'new biographies', autobiology, autobiographies, critical autobiographies, fictional autobiographical ethnographies, mystories, self stories, narratives of the self, memoirs, personal essays, stream of consciousness novels, reflexive and recursive life stories, sociological introspection, social autobiographies…

[26] Eg. metaphor, irony, parody, humour, imagery, immediacy, scene setting, unusual phrasings, cadence, plot, innuendo, dramatic tension and constructions, fleshed-out characters, puns, subtexts, allusions, flashbacks and flashforwards, tone shifts, synecdoche, dialogue and interior monologue. (Richardson, *cit.* Woods, 2006: 45)

These approaches draw upon many different theoretical and technical resources; in the techniques listed above, we can see, for example, the influences of poststructuralism, creative writing, drama, psychotherapy and information technology, to name but a few. However, despite their diversity they are all linked by a common desire to overturn hegemonic modes of thought and blur conventional dualisms, whether for epistemological or ideological motives or both.

Many of the techniques and approaches developed in the Social Sciences in the last few decades have proved very influential in other areas. The narrative technique of ‘thick description' introduced by Clifford Geertz in anthropology, for example, has strongly influenced both postmodern History and the *New Historicism* trend in Literary Criticism[29]. In both of these areas, anecdotes are deployed both to emphasise the object-text’s embedment in a complex web of symbolic phenomena, and also as a deliberate strategy of cultural and historical estrangement[30].

---

[27] These seek to ‘give the text back to informants and readers in a kind of co-production' and are dynamic, fluid and open to audience discussion at the end and through other means. They all involve action of some kind, and are embedded in language. (*Idem*: 54)

[28] The term ‘hypermedia’ is applied to hypertexts that incorporate other media such as video, photographic images, sound, graphics, etc. The key feature of this approach is that it is multilinear. By clicking on buttons, the reader can go to different points in the data, find similar instances, cross-refer among different kinds of data, tune in to extracts of related literature. Thus, they enable readers to ‘become in a sense authors of their own reading' (*Idem*: 57).

[29] The question of who influenced who becomes particularly complex at this point, because narrative has long been considered a *literary* form of writing. It is curious that it had to pass through the Social Sciences before becoming an acceptable form of discourse in Literary Studies, which, for most of the 20th century was dominated by the quasi-scientific New Critical approach.

[30] For examples of the New Historicism in operation, see the various essays collected in Greenblatt's 1988 work, *Shakespearian Negotiations.*

b) Critical/Emancipatory Discourses

Some new approaches to discourse have arisen within the context of 'subaltern' studies, of which there are today many varieties on offer at British and American universities. Here I plan to concentrate on two areas that developed roughly in parallel, and which have played a particularly significant role in raising awareness of the socially-constructed nature of Identity. These are Feminism and Postcolonialism (now expanded to the broader categories of Gender and Ethnicity, respectively).

In both cases, the awareness of how the Self is moulded by language seems to have appeared first in Francophone culture, where the intellectual climate was more propitious to constructivist arguments than in the empirically-inclined Anglo-Saxon environment, as we have seen. In 1949, Simone de Beauvoir wrote 'on ne naît pas femme, on le devient' ('one is not born a woman, one becomes one'), thereby marking the all-important distinction between biological sex and socially-constructed gender; while in 1952, Franz Fanon identified the role played by language in creating ethnic stereotypes, hinting at its potential for subversion[31]. By the 1960s, similar ideas had begun to make their appearance in the Anglophone world. The notion that language is not only a means of communication but also a manipulative tool was raised by some of the early American feminists, such as Kate Millett, Mary Daly and Adrienne Rich, while movements like *Black Power* and *Black is Beautiful* in the United States, and *Black Consciousness* in South Africa, drew attention to the overwhelmingly negative connotations accruing to the word 'black'.

---

[31] 'Yes, the black man is supposed to be a good nigger; once this has been laid down, the rest follows of itself. To make him talk pidgin is to fasten him to the effigy of him, to snare him, to imprison him, the eternal victim of an essence, of an *appearance* for which he is not responsible. And naturally, just as a Jew who spends money without thinking about it is suspect, a black man who quotes Montesquieu had better be watched. Please understand me: watched in the sense that he is starting something' (Fanon, 2000:424).

The move from awareness and critical analysis to affirmative action required only a short step. By the late ‘60s and '70s, subaltern groups had begun to engage in an activity that has come to be known as ‘semantic engineering’ (Hughes, 1988: 220-250), involving conscious intervention in the language in order to purge it of unwanted meanings. Hence, there were attempts to recuperate[32] words or modify[33] them to get rid of ideological content, and to coin new terms that were supposedly value-free[34] or assumedly positive[35] to replace older pejorative ones. Despite initial resistance from mainstream culture and scorn from some professional linguists[36], most of the changes listed above have now been implemented as official policy in the public sphere[37], indicating that linguistic intervention may indeed be a valid way of bringing about social reform.

In the meantime, ideological probings into language, discourse and textual phenomena intensified. Robin Lakoff (1975) and Dale Spender (1980) published sociolinguistic studies of sexism in the English language, while, on the level of ethnicity and social class, nonstandard varieties of English started to be valued with the work of Labov (1972) and Bernstein (1971)[38]. Work also continued into the way in which the supposedly neutral discourse of the academy creates and perpetuates social stereotypes. A particularly significant milestone in this area was Edward Said's *Orientalism* (1978), which took issue with the conceptual framework deployed by Western Orientalists in their representations of Asia[39], paving the way for a whole host of other similar studies within different postcolonial environments.

---

[32] For example, words like ‘black’ and 'woman' were systematically used in contexts where one might once have expected ‘euphemistic’ alternatives ('coloured' or 'lady'), in order to neutralise their negative charge. This was particularly successful in British English, where both words are now perfectly acceptable neutral terms. Americans, however, still avoid using 'black' and prefer the euphemistic expression 'African Americans'.

[33] Jobs or social positions that used to include the word ‘man’ (such as ‘chairman’, ‘fireman’, ‘policeman’, ‘postman’) have now been officially reformulated to avoid reference to gender (‘chairperson’, ‘fire fighter’, ‘police officer’, ‘postal worker’). Other more radical changes (such as attempts to rewrite ‘women' as ‘wimmin’ or 'wymin', or to change 'history' to 'herstory') have not yet found their way into the mainstream.

[34] For example,‘Ms’ was coined to replace both ‘Mrs’ and ‘Miss’, and the common-gender pronoun ‘s/he’ was introduced to avoid presenting the unmarked human as inevitably male.

[35] For example, ‘gay’ as a deliberate reframing of ‘homosexual’ (though Hughes [1988:246] suggests that the word may have had this meaning in underground contexts for many years).

[36] Hughes (1988:246), referring to *The Handbook of Non-Sexist Writing* by Casey Miller and Kate Swift, calls this kind of manipulation ‘distortion and propaganda’. He writes: 'The fact that the language has evolved through communal use certain forms of linguistic sexism and become an instrument of subtle (and obvious) discrimination is not going to be altered by proffering fictions of wish-fulfillment of the kind quoted.’

[37] Within the specific field of academic discourse, publishers’ guidelines now routinely include cautions against the use of sexist or discriminatory language, and specify more acceptable formulations.

In the Anglo-Saxon world, both Feminism and Postcolonialism were initially concerned with overcoming *essentialism*, an understandable impulse in the light of the culture's all-pervasive tendency towards linguistic realism. In feminism, this took the form of de-emphasising gender differences (Von Flotow, 1997:6), which brought the American branch of the movement onto a collision course with the French, whose glorification of the feminine was perceived by many as a mirror-image mystification of the symbolic structures of patriarchy (Simon, 1996: 88). Hence, when Hélène Cixous, Luce Irigaray and Julia Kristeva first made their appearance in the United States in the mid-'70s, they met with a very mixed response. According to Alice Jardine (*cit.* Simon, 1996: 89), the American feminist found herself 'caught between two contradictory imperatives':

> While American feminism enjoins the feminist to "know thyself!" (that is, to make contact with your *true* self, beneath the false images which patriarchy has created) French feminism claims that there is no self to know. For Jardine, the most important aspect of French feminism is its

---

[38] This culminated in the 1996 debate about the introduction of Ebonics into the American curriculum. See Collins (1999).

[39] In a famous passage about Karl Marx's experience of Asia, Said points out how the observer's responses are inevitably conditioned by pre-existing linguistic categories: 'That Marx was still able to sense some fellow feeling, to identify even a little with poor Asia, suggests that something happened before the labels took over… It is as if the individual mind (Marx's in this case) could find a precollective, preofficial individuality in Asia – find and give in to its pressures upon his emotions, feelings, senses – only to give it up when he confronted a more formidable censor in the very vocabulary he found himself forced to employ. What that censor did was to stop and then chase away the sympathy /…/ The vocabulary of emotion dissipated as it submitted to the lexicographical police action of Orientalist science and even Orientalist art. An experience was dislodged by a dictionary definition…' (1995: 155)

> link to the epistemological crisis of modernity, a crisis which insists on the opacity and difficulty of language - in contrast to the American valorization of plain speaking. Can this distance be measured in Elaine Marks' suggestion that the appropriate French equivalent for "male chauvinist pig" would be "phallogocentrique"? (*Idem*: 89)

This translation problem, amusing as it is, exemplifies the clash of discourses that forms the core subject of this thesis. For although the hegemony of the dominant (‘patriarchal’) paradigm was now being attacked from within and without, the key protagonists were approaching the issue from very different standpoints. Anglo-Saxon feminists, who were as imbued with the spirit of empiricism as their ‘oppressors’, and whose background lay in the social movement rather than in academia (Wiegman, 2003:75), initially found it difficult to come to terms with the much more theoretical approach offered by the French.

> While Anglo-American feminists had highlighted the linguistic consequences of oppression (in particular empirical investigation into the nefarious effects of naming what is inferior and other derogatory linguistic conventions) the focus of French feminism lay in deconstructing the symbolic structure of patriarchy. Language was not to be considered a mere system of names and labels, but the means through which meaning and value are expressed, a condition for the production of subjects within an anti-humanist framework of subjectivity. (Simon, 1996:90)

However, Continental ideas on language were also seeping across the English Channel and the Atlantic through other conduits. The Social Sciences soon realised the potential offered by Foucaultian notions of discourse, as did certain branches of Linguistics, while semiotics began to play an important role in Cultural Studies. In particular, after Stuart Hall took over from Richard Hoggart as director of the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at Birmingham in 1968, the focus of British Cultural Studies shifted to the critical analysis of ‘signifying practices’ and forms of representation, drawing heavily upon Barthes' concept of 'myth', amongst others[40]. By the 1990s, when many of the new academic areas that had arisen in the previous decades came of age (Readings, 1996:97), constructivism was no longer such an exotic notion and had begun to be routinely invoked in many different fields.

One of the consequences of this was a radicalization of approaches to academic discourse[41]. For, once the hegemonic discourse had been identified as the language of the oppressor, a moulder of minds and instrument of cultural control, many subaltern writers felt it to be inadequate to express their own ethnic or gendered meanings. Hence, there were attempts not only to intervene in the hegemonic discourse with a view to highlighting some of the underlying assumptions and connections that would otherwise have gone unperceived, but also to construct whole new discourses that could better express the particular meanings of a group whose voice had been silenced[42].

Once again, feminism was a pioneer in both these areas. Following the appearance of anthologies and periodicals devoted to French feminist writing in English translation in the early '80s (Simon, 1996: 88-90), there were attempts to reproduce in English the '*écriture féminine*' of writers such as Cixous and Irigaray. Defined as 'the inscription of the feminine body and female difference in language and text' (Showalter, 1986:249), this involved a deliberate overturning of the conceptual categories set up by the hegemonic discourse in order to create a voice that is perceived as being specifically ‘female’. For example, Rachel Blau du Plessis, in *The Pink Guitar: Writing as Feminist Practice* (1990), deliberately collapses distinctions between subject/object, fact/fiction, poetry/prose and genre (within the same ‘article’, she includes fragments of dictionary definitions, ‘philosophical’ propositions, lists, poems and babytalk, alongside expanses of stream-of-consciousness style narrative). She also upsets the very syntax of the language; the piece entitled ‘Pater-Daughter: Male Modernists and Female Readers’ (1990: 41-67) begins with a conjunction, uncapitalized, presumably to create an idea of ‘flow’:

---

[40] See Hall (1980, 1997) and Turner (1996:11-37; 83-88).

[41] Von Flotow (1997:8-9) identifies two distinct currents in feminist approaches to language, the 'reformist' and the 'radical'. The first, she says, views conventional language as a symptom of the society that spawned it and acts by creating 'handbooks' of non-sexist language, organising language education workshops and training courses, and by generally engaging in language planning. With the second approach, 'women located themselves in the role of the individual that is excluded, insulted and trivialized by conventional patriarchal language. From this perspective all of conventional language becomes a danger to women's confidence, self-esteem, psychological development and creativity, precisely because it is controlled and manipulated by "malestream" institutions.' Hence, radical feminists not only criticize and change existing language to make it less damaging to women, but also look for new discourses and literary forms better able to express female realities.

[42] Within postcolonialism, there were also calls to reject the language of the colonizer altogether in favour of native languages. See, for example, Ngugi Wa Thiong'o (1986).

> and if she falls into it; there is no behind or in back of. The eye she has sees as yet no behind or in back of. The mouth sees it eyes-mouths and wants either to fall full into and eat it or to have it fall into her and eat her, and the falling is into surface which is eating or fall so the surface enters her

The same text ends by temporally situating the writing of the article within the context of Du Plessis’ own life:

> I want writing.
> Writing, as feminist practice.
>
> Summer 1984
> when stamps were 20c and
> baby was not 1
>
> revised June 1989
> when stamps were 25c
> and “baby” was 5
> (*Idem*: 67)

The implicit claim that unstructured sense-impression and outbursts of feeling (not to mention the blurring of private and public discourses) are somehow intrinsically female is clearly highly controversial in the light of the Anglo-American feminist crusade against essentialism. Moreover, this supposedly ‘female’ mode of writing bears many resemblances to counter-discourses employed by other subaltern groups, suggesting that its main force might be iconoclastic rather than recuperative.

Agrammaticality is a central feature of many ethnic or postcolonial texts, for example. It is used to suggest spontaneity and orality (thereby setting up a fundamental opposition with the highly structured rational discourse of the 'oppressor') or to reflect the thought-patterns of a mind that is working primarily through another language. Foreign, creole or dialect terms may also be incorporated as identity markers. In the English postcolonial context (as opposed to the French), this kind of linguistic subversion has been manifested more obviously in fiction and poetry than in academic discourse, which may illustrate the resilience of the fact/fiction divide or the pressure of the hegemony upon authors from the periphery. However, there is evidence of some blurring of genre boundaries in works such as Ngugi wa Thiong'o's *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature* (1986), which has a strong autobiographical narrative component and a prevalence of very short simple sentences that give the writing a thrusting oral quality.

A different though no less subversive tendency is visible in the dense abstract prose used in that area of the humanities known today rather vaguely as 'Theory'. Influenced strongly by both the Frankfurt School and by Derridean Deconstruction, this writing rejects the transparency of the hegemonic discourse and instead aims to elucidate the structure of symbolic representation itself. Hence, it is deliberately opaque, using new coinages (eg. 'a presencing', 'a worlding', 'unhomed') and devices such as brackets and hyphens that draw attention to etymology (eg. 'ex-centric', 'en-closure'[43]) in order to intervene in the symbolic order:

---

[43] All these examples are taken from Bhabha (1994), though they are not exclusive to this author.

> Hybrid hyphenations emphasize the incommensurable elements – the stubborn chunks – as the basis of cultural identifications. What is at issue is the performative nature of differential identities: the regulation and negotiation of those spaces that are continually, *contingently*, ‘opening out’, remaking the boundaries, exposing the limits of any claim to a singular or autonomous sign of difference - be it class, gender or race. Such assignations of social differences - where difference is neither One nor the Other but *something else besides, in-between* - find their agency in a form of the 'future' where the past is not originary, where the present is not simply transitory. It is, if I may stretch a point, an interstitial future, that emerges *in-between* the claims of the past and the needs of the present. (Bhabha, 1994: 219)

Such writing is also highly intertextual, gaining its meaning from references to other discourse rather than to the outside world. This has meant that it is largely unintelligible to the uninitiated, leading to charges of obscurantism and lack of content. Indeed, all the recipients of the Bad Writing Award, mentioned in Chapter 5, were practitioners of Critical Theory.

Despite the fact that Theory’s most famous proponents still command impressive fees on the lecture circuit, there are signs that interest in this approach to knowledge and discourse may have waned, at least in the Anglophone world. Since the turn of the millennium, articles have appeared that explicitly or implicitly question the usefulness or validity of this approach[44], while a review in the *Times Literary Supplement* of April 2008 describes an example of such discourse in a recently published volume as ‘so old-fashioned, so locked in the critical indulgence of the late twentieth century, that it makes the work seem dated even as it comes fresh from the press’[45]. Similarly, Kirchhofer (2004), questioning the direction in which Theory is heading in the light of the many debates on the issue, wonders whether ‘this future may already be over’; and Holsinger (2005:10) appears to provide an answer, by listing titles such as *After Theory*, *Reading after Theory, What's Left of Theory?*, *Shakespeare after Theory,* etc,.

---

[44] For example, Marzola (2001:53) describes how she arrived at the conclusion ‘that theory was yet another master narrative, a hegemonic metadiscourse often intertwined with literary discourse, which it often effectively validated and authorised’.

[45] Jonathan Bate (‘Dampit and Moll’, *TLS* April 25 2008, 3-7). The discourse in question is exemplified by the following extract: ‘The metaphor of castration foregrounds not the literal status of censorship but its (dis)figurative status; that is, castration figures an originary (and paradoxically productive) lack rather than the loss of an originary plenitude . . . . what looks like defetishism (multiple, small differences constituting a clitoral criticism opposed to the single, big difference of a phallic criticism) from another perspective looks like fetishism masquerading as its opposite.’

Does this mean that the great epistemological paradigm shift that so many writers had been hoping for in the closing decades of the millennium has simply fizzled out? Or are statements like this merely one more strategy by means of which the dominant hegemony defends itself against attack. This is the issue that I shall turn to next in an attempt to evaluate the relative status of these alternative discourses with regards to the hegemonic EAD.

The Extent of the Challenge

The sheer volume of written material that has been produced under the auspices of the new disciplines and interdisciplines outlined above suggests that the scientific paradigm is now under sustained attack from all sides. Indeed, a glance at the libraries kept by research institutes in any of these 'alternative' fields might even give the impression that the hegemony has already been defeated, and that all worthwhile academic production is now 'postmodern' to some extent or another. However, as I suggested at the end of the previous section, this may be something of an illusion. If we move outside the confines of those trendy research institutes to take in the broader panorama, a quite different picture starts to emerge. Indeed, I shall argue here that the hegemony has a such formidable range of defences at its disposal that the great ‘paradigm shift’ forecast by authors such as Prigogine & Stengers (1984), Capra (1983), Santos (1995) and even Halliday (1993d) looks set to come to nothing.

The main weapon used by the dominant paradigm in this struggle for control of minds is, of course, *finance*. The close connections between science, technology, industry and capitalism mean not only that much research is now carried on under the auspices of multinational corporations, committed above all to the generation of profit, but also that public funding bodies give priority to research programmes that have practical applications and which might directly or indirectly enhance the wealth of the nation. Moreover, universities are now expected to function almost as bureaucratic corporations committed to the pursuit of 'excellence'[46], and central government financing of departments is dependent in the UK and elsewhere upon 'performance indicators'. Hence, the creation and transmission of knowledge is now almost entirely subordinated to the logic of the market, which perpetuates the hegemonic paradigm as it effectively silences opponents.

As regards the proliferation of EAD, *education* is also a fundamental tool. As we have already seen, there are literally hundreds of style manuals promoting it on the market, aiming at a range of different publics, and most universities now offer writing courses to foreign students and undergraduates as a matter of course. In comparison, the alternative discourses get very short shrift. In the survey presented in ***Appendix B***, only one book made mention of experimental approaches used in qualitative research (Woods, 2006), while the emancipatory discourses of the humanities were not represented at all. Hence, the overwhelming impression is that mastery of the hegemonic discourse is a prerequisite for academic success.

---

[46] Readings (1996: 21-43) points out the nebulousness of this concept imported from the language of management. In practice it is generally assessed by the quantification of factors such as the makeup of the student body, staff-student ratio, research reputation, graduate opportunities, fiscal health, etc, which are then used in the preparation of 'league tables' to enable potential students (now perceived as 'consumers') to make their choice. See for example the 'Good University Guide Rankings' at http://extras.timesonline.co.uk/gug/gooduniversityguide.php.

Concomitant with this is the huge body of *linguistic research* that has been carried out into various aspects of English Academic Discourse (see Chapter 4), paralleled by an almost utter blindness to the existence of any alternatives. While great attention is given to subtle variations within EAD (eg. Swales, 1990; Hyland, 2000), the massive differences between it and the discourses discussed in this chapter are scarcely alluded to. In fact, the only reference that I found was highly dismissive. Martin (1993c:259-266) discusses the discourses of Ethnomethodology and Poststructuralism under the heading ‘Anti-Discourses’, and concludes that they are not so much subversive as pathological[47]. Moreover, his treatment of Derrida (*Idem*: 262-265) is based upon an English version, revealing an astounding ignorance of the processes involved in translation. For although Martin is mindful of Derrida’s aim of foregrounding the texture of his own text in order to block ‘readings which treat texts as transparent and unproblematic formulations of transcendental signifieds’, he has completely overlooked the fact that this very feature means that the English translation is by no means equivalent to the original and is therefore not susceptible to this kind of analysis. Such an oversight coming from a professional linguist is a worrying indicator of the extent of Anglophone insularity[48].

---

[47] Based on an analysis of an extract by Sachs, Schegloff & Jefferson, Martin concludes that the discourse of Ethnomethodology is highly abstract yet resists distilling its elaborate classifications into technical terminology through definition. Instead, the 'semantic history' of category is retained by means of compounds (eg. 'the turn-taking rule-set'; ‘the non-use of “current selects next” techniques’). In addition, actions are realised as nouns with empty verbs used as processes (i.e. 'the minimization of gap and overlap is accomplished’ is preferred above 'speakers minimize gap and overlap'). These two features together mean that the discourse is ‘next to impossible to read’ (*Idem*: 259-261). As for Poststructuralism, he claims that Derrida’s rhetorical strategy in the given extract is to ‘quote from Saussure and then to paraphrase aspects of these quotations in his own words’, presenting Saussure’s words in strongly attitudinal terms and often out of context, and exaggerating their original force. The issue of projection he finds particularly problematic ‘as it is not always clear when Derrida is speaking, when he is paraphrasing and when he is quoting Saussure’; while the lack of a recognisable Topic Sentence (instead of which Derrida uses a ‘contradictory Macro-New’) makes this kind of writing highly disconcerting (*Idem*: 262-265).

[48] It should be pointed out, however, that Martin does take some account of postmodern trends in his later work. In a table showing ‘Learner Pathways’ in genres of history (2002:110-111), his last category deals with what he calls 'postcolonial' history, which he describes as 'avoiding reductive temporal and clausal linearization into grand narrative/effacing voices of the 'other'…’

It would seem, then, that one of the main strategies adopted by the dominant paradigm with respect to alternative discourses is to generally *disregard* them in research and teaching programmes. This has the effect of relegating them (and the epistemologies that they represent) to the 'loony fringe' of the academy[49]. In established disciplines, postmodern currents continue to be marginal[50] or have already been dismissed as a late 20th century fad (see the quotation from the TLS above), while the new interdisciplines that appeared in the last quarter of the 20th century continue to spark both dismay and scorn from many quarters[51].

The same strategy of disregard has also been used with respect to unpalatable ideas that have developed abroad. Only when foreign works have made such an impact that they can no longer be ignored are they translated into English (leading to a significant time lapse between publication dates of the original and the translation[52]); and even then, a careful strategy of *containment and assimilation* is employed to ensure that the challenge remains under control. We can see this in action in the translation and editing of two important French works that have already been cited in this chapter, *Les Mots et les Choses* (1966) by Michel Foucault, and *La Nouvelle Alliance* (1979) by Prigogine & Stengers. It is interesting, and significant, that the English titles of both of these works include the word 'order', although neither of the originals do (respectively, *The Order of Things* and *Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature*). In the first case, this title shifts the attention away from the true subversive subject of the book (the relationship between words and things) towards the elements of the outside world that are the scientific paradigm's priority[53]. With the work by Prigogine & Stengers, the original title actually focuses upon the split between the science and humanities, which the authors discuss at length in Chapter 3, implying that the time may be ripe for a whole new vision of reality that will heal the rift and bring wholeness back to the world. By changing 'La Nouvelle Alliance' to 'Order Out of Chaos' (a phrase which, in this case, does appear in the work, though only once and in a very specific technical context, on page 292), the English translation evokes the determinism/randomness debate[54], seeming to privilege the former[55]. Hence, in both cases, the French works have been partially assimilated into the dominant Anglo-Saxon epistemology and their subversive message attenuated by the provision of an alternative interpretative framework.

---

[49] Sokal and Bricmont (1998: xiii), discussing the impact that postmodernism had on the French intelligentsia, point out that 'their Anglo-American counterparts are still an embattled minority within intellectual circles'. See also Berman (1988: 179, 110, 7).

[50] The linguist James Martin, who has worked extensively with the discourse of History, admitted to being completely unaware of Hayden White (private conversation, January 2008).

[51] See Readings (1996:89-116) on the 'Culture Wars' in the Anglo-American academy.

[52] Toffler (1984: xli) mentions that Prigogine & Stengers (1984) was published in twelve languages before the English version came out.

Another weapon frequently employed by the dominant paradigm to belittle its detractors is *ridicule*. There are so many instances of this that it is impossible to list them all here, but amongst the most significant we may mention the numerous parodies of postmodern discourse[56], the Bad Writing Contest (see Chapter 5), and of course the famous Sokal Hoax[57], with its various offshoots. There have also been serious attempts to expose the supposed hollowness of postmodern epistemology using *carefully-constructed rational argument supported by evidence* (the traditional cognitive tool of the scientific paradigm). Of these, one of the most widely divulged was the book published by Sokal & Bricmont (1998) in the wake of the hoax, which systematically dissects passages by Lacan, Kristeva, Irigaray, Latour, Baudrillard, etc, in order to expose the meaninglessness of the scientific terms and arguments employed. The authors conclude that this kind of writing is a form of 'secular mysticism'[58] in which scientific terms are mobilised purely to give a veneer of erudition.[59]

---

[53] Not only has the reference to language disappeared, but the title also suggests that there is an implicit order in nature (a fundamental tenet of the scientific worldview) and implies that this is what the book is about. Hence, English readers approaching this work will have their expectations misleadingly conditioned, a situation which is compounded by the fact that no translator is named or referred to.

[54] In the mechanistic Newtonian worldview, every event was determined by initial conditions and chance played no part. This has since been challenged by theories from thermodynamics (which introduced the concept of 'entropy') and Chaos Theory (where unpredictable outcomes may result from similar initial conditions). See Toffler (1984: xli-xv) and Sokal & Bricmont (1998:138-142).

[55] This reading is reinforced not only by the subtitle, where 'nature' is given an emphasis that is not in the original, but also, particularly, by the image on the cover, which shows a void being filled with classic symbols of scientific culture (a clock, a molecular structure diagram, a satellite, a bee, a binary printout, a key in an ignition, etc). Once again, no translator is cited and in this case the original French title is not mentioned on the jacket flap.

[56] See, for example, the website 'How to Talk like Jacques Derrida' (accessed 13/10/08). http://everything2.com/e2node/How%2520to%2520talk%2520like%2520Jacques%2520Derrida

[57] In 1996, the fashionable American cultural studies journal *Social Text (No.46/47)* published an article entitled 'Transgressing the boundaries: Towards a transformative hermeneutics of quantum gravity', a work of postmodern science criticism couched in a typical (though not radical) postmodern style. In a subsequent article entitled 'A physicist experiments with cultural studies', published in *Lingua Franca 6(4)* (May/June 1996), the author, Alan Sokal, admitted that the first had been a hoax, perpetrated deliberately to expose the hollowness of such discourse. 'Like the genre it is meant to

What all of this illustrates is how the 'two cultures' are perhaps further apart now than they have ever been in Anglo-American academia (Sokal, 2008:93). Dialogues that have taken place between scientists and humanities scholars[60] in the wake of the Sokal Hoax and the Bad Writing Contest (see Chapter 5) reveal an utter lack of mutual comprehension, perhaps even an 'incommensurability' of paradigms. Defenders of the scientific worldview[61] take empiricism entirely for granted[62], leading

---

satirize – myriad examples of which can be found in my reference list – my article is a mélange of truths, half-truths, quarter-truths, falsehoods, non sequiturs, and syntactically correct sentences that have no meaning whatsoever/.../ I also employed some other strategies that are well-established (albeit sometimes inadvertently) in the genre: appeals to authority in lieu of logic; speculative theories passed off as establishment science; strained and even absurd analogies; rhetoric that sounds good but whose meaning is ambiguous; and confusion between the technical and everyday senses of English words' (Sokal, 1980: 93-94). For fuller descriptions of the hoax and its aftermath, see Sokal (2008: 5-166) and Sokal & Bricmont (1998: 1-16; 212-280).

[58] '…mysticism because the discourse aims at producing mental effects that are not purely aesthetic, but without addressing itself to reason; secular because the cultural references (Kant, Hegel, Marx, Freud, mathematics, contemporary literature…) have nothing to do with traditional religions and are attractive to the modern reader. Furthermore, Lacan's writings became, over time, increasingly cryptic - a characteristic common to many sacred texts - by combining plays on words with fractured syntax; and they served as a basis for the reverent exegesis undertaken by his disciplines. One may then wonder whether we are not, after all, dealing with a new religion' (1998: 37).

[59] See also Boghossian (2006) for an attack on constructivism and relativism from the perspective of analytic philosophy.

[60] We should be careful to distinguish here between the mainstream in the humanities, which continues to be resolutely empirical, and postmodernist currents, which are still relatively marginal (though 'well-entrenched in some strongholds'; Sokal & Bricmont, 1998: xiii).

[61] This is defined by Sokal [2008:106] as 'a respect for evidence and logic, and for the incessant confrontation of theories with the real world; in short, for reasoned argument over wishful thinking, superstition and demagoguery'.

them to understand 'knowledge' exclusively as belief that is justified 'beyond reasonable doubt' by evidence or facts (Sokal, 2008:109; Sokal & Bricmont, 1998:60).[63] This shows a remarkable ignorance of the mediating role of language, an ignorance which is no doubt partly caused by the notorious monolingualism of the English and American scientific community.

Many postmodernists, for their part, are indeed often guilty of the kind of 'sloppy thinking' (Sokal, 2008:108) and obscurantism of which they stand accused. Moreover, by attacking reason and science in such uncompromising terms, these left-wing radicals have inadvertently played right into the hands of right-wing fundamentalists eager to replace the Enlightenment legacy with faith-based prejudice. Indeed, the situation in America has become so dire that the sociologist of science, Bruno Latour, now laments the ammunition given to the Republican right.

> While we spent years trying to detect the real prejudices hidden behind the appearance of objective statements, do we now have to reveal the real objective and incontrovertible facts hidden behind the *illusion* of prejudices?... dangerous extremists are using the very same argument of social construction to destroy hard-won evidence that could save our lives (Latour, *cit.* Sokal, 2008:xvi).

Although I do not plan to pass judgement upon the ethical virtues of the two paradigms, the connection that Sokal and others have made between postmodernism and mysticism is interesting in the light of the overall aims of this thesis. It has been suggested (Holsinger, 2005) that the postmodern mindset may ultimately derive from a residual medievalism still permeating the French education system as a result of its

---

[62] Berman (1988: 110) points out that all controversies in America take place'customarily *within* empiricism'.

[63] 'Fact' for its part is defined as 'a situation in the outside world that exists irrespective of the knowledge we have (or don't have) of it – in particular, irrespective of any consensus or interpretation' (Sokal & Bricmont, 1998: 102). As I point out in Chapter 10, the Romance language cognates do not have this strong empirical charge due to their still-obvious etymological links with the verb 'to make/do' (in Spanish, the noun is identical with the Past Participle, implying that a more fundamental dimension of meaning is 'things made/done').

connections with Catholicism. If this were true, then it would not be surprising if other countries with a strong Catholic tradition, such as Portugal and Spain, were to display a stronger affinity towards the postmodern paradigm than towards the empirical rational model preferred by England and America.

Certainly, the scientific paradigm does not have anything like the centrality in Portugal, France or Spain that it enjoys in Anglo-American culture. This naturally has implications for the kind of discourse that is produced in the Academy, as we shall see in the forthcoming section.

PART III

Academic Discourse in Portugal

Chapter 7

The Structure and Ideology of Portuguese Academic Discourses

Despite the presence of several alternative discourses on the margins of Anglophone academia, there seems no doubt that there exists a hegemonic English Academic Discourse, which has not only been named and described by linguists, but which is also systematically taught. In Portugal, however, the situation is very different. Not only is there no clearly dominant academic writing style, the very concept of 'academic discourse' is problematic and difficult to translate (***Appendix C*****:** 23-24; ***Appendix D***: 5).

There are other indicators that a different attitude might prevail in Portuguese culture towards this issue. Until recently, there appears to have been no pedagogical or prescriptive tradition associated with academic discourse in Portuguese, perhaps in the belief that it is not susceptible to standardization (see, for example, Ceia, *cit*. ***Appendix D***: 5). Articles submitted to Portuguese academic journals (in the humanities, at least) are rarely peer-reviewed or linguistically altered by editors, suggesting a lingering deference towards the concept of ‘authorship’. More significantly for my purposes, it remains almost entirely unstudied by linguists, a situation that contrasts dramatically with the abundance of descriptive and analytical material available about EAD.

Given this lack of research, almost all the information about Portuguese academic discourse(s) presented in this chapter is derived from three empirical studies conducted by me between 2002 and 2008. The most important is a stylistic analysis of a Corpus of 408 Portuguese academic texts (1,333,890 words), submitted for translation over a period of some ten years (***Appendix A***), which forms the basis of most of my claims about Portuguese academic discourse. This is supplemented by a survey of Portuguese researchers from the humanities and social sciences, designed primarily to assess their perceptions of Portuguese and English academic discourse in their respective fields (***Appendix C***), and a review of the academic style manuals on the Portuguese market (***Appendix D***). Together, these three studies offer a fairly coherent picture of academic discourse in Portugal today and support my basic hypothesis that there exists a significant difference between much of the discourse produced in Portugal and what would be expected by the Anglophone community in the same areas.

* * *

The Survey of Portuguese Researchers (***Appendix C***) clearly shows that Portuguese academics in the Humanities and Social Sciences perceive a difference between Portuguese and English academic discourse in their respective fields. 89.1% of researchers acknowledged some degree of difference, while 46.9% assessed that difference as considerable or great. Similarly, 91% of the 117 researchers that write academic papers directly in English claimed to consciously alter their written style to bring it into line with target culture expectations, and when asked to specify the differences, the responses were remarkably consistent. English was inevitably described as more concise, precise, objective, pragmatic, concrete, etc, with shorter sentences, less subordination, tighter text or paragraph structure and a more restricted vocabulary, while Portuguese was considered to be more poetic or philosophical, emotive, elaborate and verbose, with a more complicated syntax, richer vocabulary and a tendency to be ‘rhetorical’ (***App. C.*** pp.8-9, 20-22; *Annex II.* Nos. 55-92 and 94-126).

These perceptions are in line with the findings of ***Appendix A***, which indicate important stylistic deviations from the EAD model in Portuguese texts within the Arts, Humanities and some Social Sciences (***App. A*: **46-51). However, the analysis also shows that more scientific subjects, such as Medicine, Engineering and Economics, commonly use a style that is very similar to EAD. This has led to the conclusion that there is no single hegemonic academic discourse in Portugal at present, as in the English-speaking world, but rather three different discourses (*Idem*: 56-59), at least two of which seem to vying for dominance. The Corpus also contains a number of hybrids (i.e. texts bearing features of more than one discourse), which are perhaps an inevitable result of this complexity.

The three main discourses have been labelled ‘modern’, ‘traditional’ and ‘postmodern’ in order to give some indication of their sociocultural orientation. They will each be described in turn below.

I. The ‘modern’ style

This style, which predominates in the more 'scientific' subjects in Portugal, corresponds to EAD in almost all respects. That is to say, its main goal is clearly communication of referential content, and so the discourse is transparent, objective and concise, with short simple sentences, clearly-defined vocabulary and rational argumentation. It has been termed ‘modern’ on the grounds that it reflects the ‘modern’ (rationalistic, democratic, Capitalist) mindset that developed after the Scientific Revolution in England (see Chapter 5) - although, as I shall argue in Chapter 8, it appears to be a more recent import in Portugal.

Despite the fact that this discourse is essentially calqued from EAD, many of the texts that represent it in the Corpus nevertheless make use of two features that are listed in ***Appendix A*** as Distinguishing Discourse Markers (i.e. characteristics that would not normally be found in EAD). These are the Reflexive voice and certain uses of the Gerund (***App. A***: 20-21 and 23-25). Their role as DDMs has been effectively discounted here on the grounds that they are such pervasive features of Portuguese that they may be considered part of the language; indeed, a brief glance at the database associated with ***Appendix A*** will show that very few of the 408 texts included in the Corpus do not contain examples of these features.

However, it is worth giving a little more attention at each of these, partly because the situation is not quite as simple as it may at first appear, and also because of the difficulties that these structures bring for the translator.

i) Reflexive

The Reflexive voice, constructed with the reflexive clitic *–se*, has no formal equivalent in English. It is, however, extremely common in Portuguese, particularly in academic discourse. Superficially, it indicates an action that is both performed and undergone by the subject(s), alone or reciprocally[1], and there are also many common verbs (such as '*tornar-se*' - 'become'; '*tratar-se de'* -'deal with'; *'referir-se a'* - 'refer to') that take the reflexive form as a matter of course on the grounds that this relationship is implicit. However, for our purposes, the most important use of the Reflexive is its passive function (Mateus et al, 1989: 225-6; Cunha & Cintra, 1985: 268), since this makes it an important resource for expressing impersonality/objectivity. Along with the other Passive (known as the '*ser*' Passive as it is formed, as in English, with the verb 'to be' + the Past Participle), it is extremely common in scientific texts, used to describe processes and observed phenomena in much the same way as the agentless passive is used in English:

---

[1] This is the function that is given priority by Cunha & Cintra (1985:167) and Estrela et al. (2003: 75).

> a) *O resto da energia dissipa-se como calor no ânodo.* ('The rest of the energy is dissipated as heat in the anode') (MED-96Art-Anon1)
>
> b) *A elasticidade mostra-se mais fraca para os utentes do combóio do que para os utentes dos autocarros* ('Elasticity is shown to be weaker for train passengers than for bus passengers') (ECON-02Art-AM)

There is, however, a characteristic associated with the use of both Passives in Portuguese that sets it apart from English and which may cause considerable difficulties for the translator. This is a phenomenon known as verbal fronting, in which the traditional SV word order is inverted[2]. It may be exemplified by the following sentences from the Corpus (many of which, we note, cannot be translated literally into English, given the impossibility of beginning an affirmative sentence with a verb):

> c) *Com este trabalho pretende-se analisar e avaliar as condições higrotérmicas de um museu sem sistemas de climatização permanente* ('[With this work *is aimed] This work aims to analyse and assess the hygrothermal conditions of a museum that is not equipped with permanent air-conditioning') (ENG-08Abs-CF)
>
> d) *Descrevem-se três casos clínicos de crianças de apresentação invulgar* ([*Are described]'Three clinical cases are described of children with unusual symptoms') (MED-00Abs-IA)
>
> e) *Para todos os modelos com implante (a), (b), (c) e (d) comparou-se o pico da tensão principal mínima, nos compartimentos medial e lateral na interface osso/cimento, com o mesmo da tíbia intacta* ('For all the models with implants (a), (b), (c) and (d), [*were compared] the peak of minimal main stress in the medial and lateral parts of the bone/cement interface was compared with that of the intact tibia' (MED-05Art-AC)
>
> (f) *...no nosso estudo constatou-se que os homens referem significativamente em menor percentagem a presença destes sintomas do que as mulheres* ('in our

---

[2] As Johns (1991) points out, although Portuguese, like English, is basically a Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) language, it also allows the structure (Adjunct)-Verb-Subject: (A)VS, particularly in Passive structures.

> study, it was found that men mentioned these symptoms considerably less than women') (PHA-05Frag3Art-SS1)
>
> (g) *Conclui-se, por exemplo, que existe uma associação forte e positiva entre áreas e populações desfavorecidas/vulneráveis e a autoavaliação negativa do estado de saúde.* ('It was concluded, for example, that there is a strong positive association between deprived areas with vulnerable populations and negative self-assessed health status') (GEOG-07Abs1-PS4)

In one of the few linguistic articles that exist about academic discourse in (Brazilian) Portuguese, Johns (1991) analyses this phenomenon in depth, comparing the frequency of fronted and non-fronted Passives in abstracts from a scientific journal and texts from a general-interest magazine. Given the much higher frequency of fronted Passives in the scientific abstracts, he concludes that fronted Passives have a genre-specific function:

> …in Portuguese academic abstracts the fronting of passive indicative and informative verbs act as a signalling system which 'exposes the bones' of the abstract, and places the information with the highest degree of CD [Communicative Dynamism] - that is to say, exactly what is in the paper or what was done in the research - in its most natural position at the end of the clause. For example, in the following (complete) abstract the four fronted informative verbs articulate a stereotypical argument in scientific papers and abstracts alike of **Purpose** (*Estudou-se* . . .), **Materials and Methods** (*Foram constituídas* . . .) and **Results** (*Observou-se* . . ., *observou-se* . . .) and throw into dynamic prominence the context-independent information in the weighty non-fronted subject noun-phrases as to what was studied, what was constituted, and what was observed.

Although my Corpus contains no abstracts that are as rigidly standardized as the one that he proceeds to quote, there are certainly many examples in it of fronted Passive structures. Moreover, they do seem to occur particularly when the authors are stating their aims (see example *c* above), signposting (*d*), describing methods (*e*), reporting results (*f*), drawing conclusions (*g*), etc, thereby supporting Johns' claim of a genre-specific function.

It is also possible that such structures are used in Portuguese as a marker of 'scientificity', since humanities texts tend to prefer more personal forms, such as the 1st person plural (see below). Certainly in areas such as Archaeology, where a range of different discursive approaches is possible in Portuguese, a text such as ARLG-02Art-SOJ, which has a predominance of fronted reflexive passives and very few other Distinguishing Discourse Markers, comes across as being much more 'scientific' than others in the same field (cf. ARLG-01Art-MP1; ARLG-06RP-CL2 - p.10 onwards).

ii) Gerunds

The verb form the Portuguese call the '*gerúndio*'[3] is very widespread in written discourse of all types and can be used to express a wide range of syntactical relationships (see ***App.A***:23-25). Like the Reflexive, it is so common in written Portuguese that we might almost consider it a feature of the language; indeed, in practice, it often seems to be used almost as a marker of written register, offering a more formal and cultured-sounding alternative to the straightforward syntactical structures and conjunctions typical of oral discourse.

In the Portuguese 'traditional' style, the gerund contributes significantly to the effect of rhetorical effusiveness by providing a flexible alternative to the subordinate clause, enabling sentences to be compounded and meanings to proliferate. In the 'modern' style, however, it is used with more restraint. Those texts in the Corpus that seem to be aiming for a 'scientific' style in Portuguese mostly use the gerund in a way that is analogous to English. For example, in the Archaeology text mentioned above

---

[3] Most of the uses cited below would strictly speaking be termed 'Present Participles' rather than Gerunds in English. However, I have felt it appropriate to retain the Portuguese classification in this analysis.

(ARLG-02Art-SOJ), there are relatively few gerunds and almost all are readily translatable:

> *... a segunda fase construtiva, tendo-se iniciado por volta de 2900 A.C., possa ter atingido os inícios do 2º milénio A.C.* ('…the second phase of construction, having begun in around 2900 BC, may have gone on into the early years of the 2nd millennium AD')
>
> *Concentração de carvões /.../ interpretados como correspondendo à camada 4* ('Concentration of carbons /.../ interpreted as corresponding to Layer 4')
>
> *Depressão contendo muito carvões, localizada no quadrado D'13.* ('Depression containing many carbons, located in Square D'13')
>
> *Examinando-se mais pormenorizadamente a Fig. 5 observa-se que...* ('Looking more closely at Fig. 5, it can be seen that…')

A similar strategy seems to have been followed by many of the Medical texts, such as MED-07Art-VG.

> *No Grupo A, a idade média foi de 71,1 anos (variando de 25 a 105 anos).* ('In Group A, the average age was 71.1 years, varying from 25 to 105').
>
> *No presente estudo, foi feita análise comparativa entre osteossíntese convencional e minimamente invasiva utilizando parafuso de fixação dinâmica* ('In this study, a comparative analysis was performed between conventional and minimally invasive osteosynthesis using a sliding hip screw system')
>
> *No Grupo B, foi realizado mini-acesso lateral da anca, medindo em média 3cm.* ('In Group B, a lateral hip mini-approach was used, measuring 3cm on average).
>
> *... seguindo as mudanças introduzidas pelas...* ('…following the changes introduced by....')
>
> *A outra maneira de se utilizar o parafuso de fixação dinâmica de forma minimamente invasiva foi realizando modificações no material de introdução ou no desenho do implante* ('The other minimally-invasive way of using the sliding hip screw system was by modifying the material or design of the implant')

However, there are a few instances in both of these texts where the gerund has to be reconstrued using a clausal structure, often because the verb in question does not lend itself to this usage in English or because the sentence would otherwise sound too intricate and complicated:

> ARLG-02Art-SOJ
> *Quanto às datas ICEN-882 e CSIC-1656 /.../, não nos permitem colocar a hipótese de ocupação nestes períodos, sendo de esperar que novas datas ajudem a ajuizar da eventual verosimilhança destes dados.* ('As for the dates ICEN-882 and CSIC-1656 /…/these do not sustain the hypothesis of occupation in these periods [*being to hope] and it is hoped that new dates will help to judge the accuracy of this data').
>
> MED-07Art-VG
> *Para minimizar a agressão ao músculo tensor da fascia lata, colocou-se a broca alargadora bem na ponta da broca-canulada para realização do orifício mais largo na cortical lateral do fémur, sendo depois retirada para a realização do resto da perfuração* ('To minimize aggression to the tensor fascia lata muscle, the widening reamer was attached to the point of the cannulated reamer to widen the hole in the lateral cortex of the fémur [*being then removed for the rest of the perforation]. It was then removed and the rest of the perforation /…/was performed using the cannulated reamer alone').
>
> *Apesar disto, o implante de dois orifícios não é o padrão para os fabricantes de SPFD, havendo a necessidade de encomendá-los.* ('Despite this, the two-hole implant is not the standard model for SHSP manufacturers, [*there being the need to order them] and needs to be specially ordered')

The prevalence of this kind of structure in even the most 'scientific' of Portuguese texts would seem to suggest that there is a fundamental resistance in the language to joining clauses with simple coordinating conjunctions, as preferred by English. Indeed, this might be an interesting topic for a Corpus Linguistics study in future and would provide useful data for anyone working at the interface of the two languages.

To sum up, then, the 'modern' style of Portuguese academic discourse tends to be employed in genres and disciplines where 'scientificity' needs to be asserted, and is similar to EAD in almost all respects. The only differences lie in the prevalence of the Reflexive and Gerund, which often require extensive reformulation in translation. This issue will be dealt with in more detail in Chapter 10.

II. The 'traditional' style

The discourse dubbed the 'traditional' style is the one that all the Portuguese academics are referring to when they claim that the Portuguese discourse in their field is more complex, elaborate, erudite, rhetorical, poetic, subjective, etc than its English counterpart (see ***App.C***, 9-11, 20-22, *Annex II* Nos. 94-126). This description is largely borne out by the textual analysis undertaken in ***Appendix A*** (42-48), which shows that much of the academic writing produced across a wide range of humanities disciplines may accurately be described in such terms. Hence, there seems to be sufficient evidence to enable us to assert the existence of a well-entrenched Portuguese discourse of the humanities that is markedly different from EAD in its fundamental orientation.

Indeed, none of the general principles governing EAD (see Chapter 4) appear to be shared by the Portuguese 'traditional' style. Clarity, precision and economy are clearly not major goals, for sentences tend to be very long and syntactically complex; lexis is not always used denotatively and is rarely defined; and there is a general taste for 'copiousness' at all levels. Persuasion is achieved less through structured rational argument supported by evidence than by the use of poetic or rhetorical techniques designed to appeal as much to the senses and emotions as to the intellect. Objectivity and impartiality are not systematically pursued; and instead of caution and restraint, these texts are often characterised by hyperbole and effusiveness.

All of this would seem to indicate the presence of a quite different approach to knowledge to that underlying EAD. But before exploring the ideology encoded in this discourse, let us look in more detail at its characteristic features, exemplified by texts from the Corpus.

i) Syntactical Complexity:

Very long sentences are common in this style of Portuguese academic writing. It is not unusual to find extensive tracts of text consisting predominantly of sentences each with more than 70 words (SOC-07AbsPhD-SM13; MED-06ChapMono-CRC:5-8; LIT-04Art-HB2), and there is even the odd sentence over 300 words in length (such as the 358-word sentence in PHIL-99Art-HRI:3-4 and the 322-word one in MED-05Art-MID1:6). However, it is not the sentence length *per se* that most differentiates this style from EAD. A more important distinguishing factor is the intricately-subordinated structure typical of this kind of writing. Let us look more closely at several examples of this phenomenon.

In the following example from an archaeological research proposal abstract, the complexity is due to a number of factors. The main clause, highlighted in grey, is constantly interrupted by supplementary information presented in the form of participle phrases[4] ('*confeccionadas...*', '*dado....*', '*tendo...*'), which are themselves complicated by more subordination, parentheses and lists. There is also deferral of the grammatical subject through the positioning of circumstantial information at the beginning of the sentence, creating a suspense effect; while the point of the whole sentence (the relevance of this pottery for the research project as a whole) is left to the end.

---

[4] It should be pointed out here that Portuguese uses the terms '*particípio*' and '*gerúndio*' for those parts of speech that are in English known as the 'Past Participle' and 'Present Participle' respectively. The phrase beginning '*confeccionados'* would therefore be considered in Portuguese as an '*oração reduzida de particípio'* and that beginning with *'tendo'* as an '*oração reduzida de gerúndio'* (Cunha & Cintra, 1985: 411-413; Mateus et al. 1989:313).

Extract 1) ARLG-06RP-CL2 (p.11. On pottery in Brazil.) [5]

> *Dos simples gestos dos rituais no serviço de mesa até aspectos mais complexos, como os que representam o contacto interétnico nos primeiros momentos de formação brasileira, quando se incorporam no âmbito das residências, estes objectos confeccionados com técnicas ceramistas que misturam tradições portuguesas (semi industralizadas nos séculos XVI, XVII e XVIII) e indígena e africana (artesanais) demonstram a intensidade e frequência da convivência interétnica e, ao mesmo tempo, dado o modo como estas produções evoluíram até à actualidade, e tendo em conta que são um produto que fornece informações sobre comercio internacional, intercambio regional, hierarquização dos espaços dos núcleos urbanos, incorporação e abandono de alguns lugares de moradias, mudanças dos gostos e apreciações estéticas e até hábitos alimentares, particularidades técnicas, apresentam-se como um exemplo singular de obtenção e interpretação de dados de índole histórica e social.*

Rather than communicating its content as clearly as possible, this sentence would seem to be aiming for a particular rhetorical effect. The SVO structure of the main clause is not inverted, as with fronted passive, but each part is deferred through the insertion of circumstantial information, creating not only an effect of accumulation and abundance, but also a deliberate building-up and relaxation of tension.

The second example, this time from a history article, highlights another sentence-complicating device that is also very common in the Portuguese 'traditional' style, namely the habit of embedding referential information in a main clause that emphasises the interpersonal dimension (see Framing Devices in ***App. A***, 25-26). In this case, the 'facts' are not only introduced by a formula that is, in referential terms, semantically empty ('*seja-nos permitido relevar*' - 'let us be permitted to point out'), but they are also deferred by a form of rhetorical signposting that also highlights the interpersonal dimension (‘*ainda antes de avançarmos*’ - ‘before we go on’). Thereafter, further complexities are introduced with the ‘*por um lado/por outro’* (‘on the one hand/on the other’) structure, which in turn contains further subordination and circumstantial information.

---

[5] A translation of this passage may be found in the Corpus (Translation Corpus → English Texts→ Archaeology→ ARLG-06RP-CL2:10).

> Extract 2) HIST-93FragArt-JMS[6]
> *E, ainda antes de avançarmos, seja-nos permitido relevar, por um lado, a dimensão do modo de vida dos que não só em Lisboa, como no Porto e em outras cidades e vilas litorâneas, se dedicavam ao serviços da fretagem naval, bem como ao transporte de encomendas e ao comércio marítimo, a ponto de uma outra carta régia, também de 1414, para evitar burocracias excessivas, aceitar como prova dos direitos alfandegários o juramento dos mestres do navios reinóis e dos mercadores que fretassem navios estrangeiros; por outro, registe-se a já crónica dependência nacional em relação ao trigo de fora, designadamente ao do Noreoeste Europeu e do Mediterráneo.*

We should also note in this extract the use of the first-person plural in the opening lines to introduce the author’s claims, and the historic present to refer to an event in the past in ‘*registe-se já*’. Both of these features are extremely common in this style (***App. A:*** 22, 32-33) and are also explicitly endorsed by some of the Portuguese academic style manuals (***App. D***: 12, 14).

The third example is from a linguistics article, which, despite its technicality, contains many syntactical features typical of the ‘traditional’ style. Near the beginning of the article, the author makes deliberate use of the rhetorical devices of inversion, parallelism and ellipsis (note the absence of the main verb in the second sentence):

> *Difícil se torna, por isso, identificar os seus sentidos e funções. E mais difícil ainda explicá-los.*

---

[6] The translation of this passage is discussed in Chapter 10.

There are also a number of instances of syntactical complexity in this text. The extract that concerns us here, reproduced below, is taken from the Conclusion in which the author is listing the results of his study. The first point to note is that, despite the punctuation, this is not, strictly speaking, a complete sentence. As the author is presenting the results in the form of a list, the main 'clause' is no more than a noun phrase. The complexity of the ensuing sentence results firstly from a top-heavy subject (highlighted in grey), involving a list of items that are themselves subdivided and exemplified; and secondly, from the weighty direct complement following the verb, in which an appositional phrase is complicated by a 'not only…but also' structure.

> Extract 3) LING-02Art-AS1 (p.15-16)[7]
>
> *Segundo, o alcance da semântica cognitiva na descrição da polissemia dos marcadores discursivos: conceitos como a projecção metafórica entre domínios, a convencionalização metonímica de implicitações conversacionais, os "image schemas", a subjectificação, a rede de domínios conceptuais e comunicativos envolvidos numa situação de interacção verbal; princípios como a natureza enciclopédica do significado; e métodos interpretativos com base no uso efectivo das unidades linguísticas permitem explicar o que falta em muitos estudos sobre marcadores discursivos: não só os factores que determinam os diferentes significados contextuais de um marcador e todo o espectro de funções que este pode desempenhar, como também o modo como esses factores interagem na produção e interpretação desse marcador e como esses diferentes sentidos e funções se associam coerentemente numa mesma categoria.*

---

[7] The translation of this passage can be found in the Corpus (Translation Corpus → English Texts→ Linguistics→LING-02Art-AS1:17).

The presence of such a high degree of syntactical complexity in this text, alongside verbless sentences, inversions and parallelisms, mean that it cannot be categorised under the ‘modern’ style, despite its apparently ‘scientific’ orientation. Instead, the technical vocabulary of the field has been inserted into a syntactical structure that is essentially derived from the humanities tradition, making this text something of a hybrid in terms of style.

Thus, syntactical complexity seems to be actively pursued in traditional academic Portuguese, presumably to create an effect of verbal sophistication and eloquence. As we have seen, a number of devices may be mobilised for this purpose, such as intricate subordination, interpersonal framing devices, the deferral of key information for rhetorical effect, etc. However, all are quite alien to EAD and have thus been categorised as Distinguishing Discourse Markers in the Corpus study (see ***App. A***: 20-40).

ii) Poetic, Figurative or High-Flown Diction

High-flown or poetic diction is perhaps the lexical equivalent of syntactical complexity in the sense that its main function seems to be interpersonal rather than referential (i.e. designed to stir or impress rather than communicate content). It is a recurrent feature of the ‘traditional’ style and one of the most difficult aspects to translate.

In some cases, authors seem deliberately to choose high-register alternatives for banal or everyday concepts, as in the use of ‘*confronto bélico’* for ‘war’; *'peças escultóricas'* for ‘sculptures’; ‘*espaço musealizado’* for ‘museum’ or even ‘*notação cromática*’ for ‘colour references’ (in the context of a literary analysis). This practice often verges on hyperbole, as when we find the city of Coimbra referred to, quite unironically, as *'Lusa Atenas'* ,'*ilha de sabedoria*' or in Latin as '*Locus amoenus de sabedorias'* (ART-08Art-VS2); or its university described as '*instituição mater cujo corpo ilumina o tempo com as luzes do saber'* (MUS-07Art- JC).

There is often personification of inanimate objects, such as the books that "*na sua fala eloquente com os seus amigos e leitores, ganham nesse diálogo permanente aspectos afectivos a que o saber, a curiosidade e o conhecimento dão modulações de indefinível empatia"* (LIT-07Art-APC); or the organ described as the "*cantor-mor vestido de preciosa caixa que lhe emoldura o poder expressivo das vozes para as erguer às alturas infinitas do rosto de Deus*", which, at its birth lets forth *'...o grito de madeiras feridas, mordidas pelo impiedoso ferro e adoçadas pelo artífice'* (MUS-07Art- JC).

Indeed, figurative language may appear unexpectedly in all kinds of texts, such as the following extended metaphor in a sociology article on trade unionism: '*Nascida do silêncio das margens, a voz da estrutura sindical apoia-se nas vibrações ocultas da comunidade «localizada» para se erguer em sonoridade amplificada nos centros de contestação «cosmopolita»'* (SOC-01Art-EE1). Similarly, a musicology article, which is largely an analytical discussion of the effects of different kinds of musical notation (MUS-06Art-VN), uses strongly emotive language in its introduction: *'o termo "estilo" rasga um vertiginoso campo aberto'; '...por despertar, enquanto 'palavra-faísca', intensas lembranças de experiências contrastantes...'; 'reacendendo o processo, inserindo-o numa busca infindável',* etc.

It is noticeable that a number of authors in the Corpus, like this one, seem to vary their style over the course of their text. The more effusive moments tend to occur either in the introduction as here, or, more commonly, at the end (eg. HIST-07Art-

MJAS; HIST-06Art-JB; LIT-07-APC; ARLG-01Art-MP1), with middle sections that are considerably more sober and informative. This may well reflect the influence of Classical rhetoric, as argued below.

Clearly, then, the Portuguese 'traditional' style is aiming to do something quite different from EAD. Subjectivity is actively fostered, not only through emotive vocabulary but also in the abundant use of personal verb forms and pronouns (see ***App. A***: 22-23) and interpersonal framing devices (***App. A***: 25-26). Meanings are not tightly controlled, but instead left vague in what appears to be a deliberate quest for polysemy, and complexity seems to be highly valued. Finally, there is a clear rhetorical orientation to this discourse, evident not only in the stylistic variations across different parts of the text, but also in the self-conscious use of figures of speech, such as inversion, deferral, ellipsis, paradox, metaphor, hyperbole, personification, etc (and others listed in ***App. A***: 31-33, such as Verbless Sentences, Multiple Negatives, Historical Tenses and Rhetorical Questions).

Indeed, it would seem that classical rhetoric has retained a centrality in Portuguese culture that it does not have in the UK. Many of the general writing guides produced in Portugal during the course of the 20th century were essentially handbooks of rhetoric[8] and schoolchildren are still systematically taught to recognise and use classic figures of speech in their Portuguese lessons[9]. Even the academic writing guides on the market today often present their recommendations within a rhetorical framework (***App. D***: 6-7, 12).

---

[8] Although Fernandes (1972: 31) claims that the teaching of rhetoric largely disappeared in Portugal in the 20th century, most of the writing guides that I have found are clearly framed within the rhetorical tradition. *Noções de Estilística* by Fernandes Agudo (Lisbon: Jorge Fernandes, s/d) and *Noções de Estilo* by José Agostinho (Oporto: A. Figueirinhas, s/d) are pure rhetoric manuals, both of which begin with Aristotle's famous assertion that 'Man is a rational animal'; while *Linguagem e Estilo* by Eduardo Pinheiro (Oporto: Tavares Martins, 1942) draws heavily upon the same source. Even more recent works such as *As Técnicas da Comunicação e da Informação* by Adriano Duarte Rodrigues (Lisbon: Presença, 1999) and *Saber Escrever, Saber Falar* by Edite Estrela et al. (Lisbon: Dom Quixote, 2003), while ostensibly based upon modern studies in linguistics and communication theory, contain lists of traditional figures of speech (pp. 61-64 and 180-184 respectively), as does the influential Portuguese grammar Cunha & Cintra (1985: 414-423).

For this reason, it seems reasonable to assert that the Portuguese 'traditional' style may reflect the rhetorical approach to discourse that was effectively ousted in England by the Scientific Revolution in the 17th century. As described in Chapter 5, this is based on a quite different epistemology to that perpetrated by the scientific paradigm. The discourse is *holistic*, appealing to the emotions as well as the intellect (the interpersonal dimension is overtly cultivated as much as or more than the referential) and the *aesthetic* aspect of the text is very important. *Verbal complexity and copiousness* are valued, as signs of mental sophistication, and the discourse is generally more *theoretical*, with less recourse to empirical evidence in support of claims.

Ideologically, then, this discourse occupies a different universe to EAD. In its more extreme forms, it may be opaque and self-referential, which makes it undemocratic, accessible only to the 'initiated'. In the next chapter, I will try to suggest some historical reasons for why this discourse developed as it did in Portugal. But first, let us look at the last of the three styles of Portuguese academic discourse - the 'postmodern' style.

III. The 'postmodern' style

While the 'modern' style is fundamentally different from the 'traditional' style in basic orientation, the 'postmodern' style differs from the 'traditional' only by a matter of degree. That is to say, it shares many of the characteristics of the 'traditional' style, but in a more pronounced or radical form (this has led me to posit a basic continuity between the two, an argument that I shall develop further in Chapter 8). At its most extreme, it is found mostly in Art and Architecture, though there are attenuated examples in Literary Studies and Music (***App. A***: 42-46). There are also two texts from Psychology that have been placed in this category, though for different reasons, as I will explain below.

---

[9] For example, a 12th year Portuguese textbook, commonly used by students on the Science and Technology course (*Abordagens*, by Zaida Braga, Auxília Ramos & Elvira Pardinhas, Porto Editora, 2007) requires knowledge of terms such as 'hiperbato', 'apostrofe', 'oxímoro', 'pathos', etc.

The postmodern text often presents an unconventional appearance on the page, sometimes with a loose fragmented structure (eg. ART-06Art-FL2; ART-03MA-CG4), at other times ordered into short sections or numbered points (PSY-95ChapMonog-JPA1; ARCT-06Art-AAC). It is often interrupted by passages of autobiographical (or pseudo-autobiographical) narration, dialogue, or quotations from poets or philosophers, and it may be ornamented visually with the use of different fonts and graphic styles.

On the level of syntax, we find both great complexity and great fragmentation. The more complex sentences often follow the principles of the 'traditional' style (i.e. with much subordination, deferral, embedding, etc), but may be complicated further by poststructuralist-style wordplay, unusual punctuation, etc. The more fragmented texts display a proliferation of verbless sentences, with little apparent cohesion or coherence.

As for lexis, what is most noticeable about this style is the level of abstraction. In addition to a certain poststructuralist lexicon inherited from the French tradition, there is a tendency to create highly abstract terms by adding Latinate suffixes to existing roots (see ***App. A***: 36). This has the effect of making the discourse even more opaque and erudite-sounding than the 'traditional' style.

Let us begin by looking at an example from a genre that we might expect to be straightforward and informative, but which (given the discipline involved) is mostly couched in a highly elaborate style. The text concerned is a prospectus from an Architecture Faculty (ARCT-03CP-FAUP), which, in addition to a general introduction about the institution and various degrees on offer, also provides a detailed syllabus for each course ('*cadeira*'), giving standard information about aims, teaching methods, forms of assessment, etc.

Most of the course descriptions are presented in an extreme version of the 'traditional' style, with long elaborate sentences and a highly inflated tone (notably '*Antropologia do Espaço'*, p.9; '*Project III'*, pp. 21-24; '*Urbanística Contemporânea'*, p. 27; *'Economia Urbana'*, p. 46; *'Seminário II'*, p. 67), and it is this that has justified the overall attribution of a Deviance Factor of -3 (see **App. A**: 18-20)[10]. However, there are others that take the style just a little further, tipping it over into the Postmodern (DF -4). The following extract, from the 'Brief Description' section of the course entitled '*Espaços de Habitar e Formas de Residência'* ('Habitation Spaces and Forms of Residence', p.25), not only contains the kind of syntactic complexity typical of the 'traditional' style, but also indulges in word-play, sound-play and abstraction so beloved of the Poststructuralists. Some of these features, highlighted in grey in the original, are essentially untranslatable.

> Extract 1: ARCT-03CP-FAUP (p.25)[11]
> *Na longa duração que se (contra)diz-(des)faz na/pela circunstância, entre o excesso de liberdade e o excesso de vigilãncia, a arquitectura inscreve nesse duplo risco o que a sua teoria identificou como argumentação problemática de arte e utilidade, abstracto e concreto, físico e virtual, local e global. Dos programas tratados pelo arquitecto,*

---

[10] There are one or two exceptions. The descriptions of the courses 'Redes e Instalações' (p.42), 'Patologias de Construção' (p.53) and 'Infraestruturas e Redes Urbanas' (p. 54) are notably more concise and factual.

[11] See Chapter 10 for a translation of this passage.

> *o da habitação (o domínio do privado, a medida do doméstico, a distãncia do íntimo – por condição um entre, é, provavelmente, o que mais acentuadamente sublinha-sublima, contamina-permuta essas dualidades, contaminações, circuitos, redes.*

The kind of polysemy created by the brackets and dashes in the neographism '*se (contra)diz-(des)faz'* is entirely dependent upon the surface texture of the Portuguese language, as are the near-rhymes of '*sublinha-sublima'* and '*contamina*'. Thus, this is an opaque Derridean style of prose, in which the signifiers refer to each other (and to other texts in the repertoire) rather than to any external referent. Other important markers include the agrammatical construction '*um entre'* ('a between'), and the use of some common poststructuralist buzzwords, such as 'contaminations', 'circuits', 'networks', (understood here as abstractions, in direct contrast to the '*redes*' and '*circuitos*' mentioned on pp. 42 and 54 of the same text, which are concrete physical entities).

Of all the disciplines represented in the Corpus, Architecture has the highest DF scores (of 10 texts, only 2 do not score either -3 or -4), which suggests a very strong postmodern identity for the discipline. However, not all the texts take the same Theory-based approach as the passage just quoted. For example, the following extract from a research proposal abstract is aiming at something much more poetic:

Extract 2: ARCT-01Abs-CG2[12]

> *Lugar mágico, paisagem grandiosa sobre a Foz do Tejo, Lisboa,, as pontes e as margens. Entre cidades sim, no sentido geográfico do termo e mais precisamente no sentido morfogenético do mesmo entre a cidade «em movimento» que é Lisboa e a cidade emergente que é Almada. Mas sobretudo entre cidades no seu sentido mais profundo e só aparentemente oculto.*

---

[12] See Chapter 10 for a translation of this passage.

Here too we find the same postmodern fascination with 'between-ness' as in the previous extract. But this author is not aiming at abstract theory. His purpose seems to be to create a text that is above all poetic and flowing, achieved through a series of verbless sentences that give a kind of stream-of-consciousness effect. We never really learn the purpose of the abstract. The text as a whole (Translation Corpus → Portuguese Texts → Architecture→ARCT-01Abs-CG2) remains an exercise in poetic prose, pleasing to the senses, but bewildering to anyone that is hoping to extract a kernel of concrete meaning.

Extract 3, the opening of an article by an art historian, seems to be aiming at both the poetic and the abstract/theoretical approaches simultaneously. It is elliptical and disconnected, operating almost entirely on the abstract plane.

> Extract 3: ART-06Art-FL2[13]
> *Poder-se-ia pensar com Peter Handke que "agora é agora" e nunca de modo nenhum "Viver o dia sem olhar às consequências!" Palavras vertidas em iconografias, albergadas sob distintos suportes e matérias, cumprem presença.*
> *Já não se acredita nem Musas, nem tampouco em utopias – sejam elas individuais ou comungadas. Os deuses foram postos em descanso. As artes são maiores de idade, lúcidas e sem afectos. Todavia, nos campos de solidão e certeza intelectual, desejam-se mútuas e displicentes. Rígidas, auto-suficientes, discutem e atraiçoam. Interferem-se. Vejam-se 2 exemplos: a voz é um excerto de imagem em processo; a postura, em seu hieratismo ou sequencialidade, cresce entre a monocromia coreográfica, entre o desempenho e a intencionalidade justa.*
> *As letras enquanto sinais, ausentes de compreensão ou famintas de entendimento, registam-se em suporte digital e evoluem até lugares onde duração e precariedade assumem novas simetrias.*

This is perhaps the most extreme example in my Corpus of the 'postmodern' style, and the article as a whole contains all the Postmodern markers listed in ***Appendix A*** (57). There are verbless sentences; lexical abstractions (eg. '*hieratismo*', '*sequencialidade*', '*monocromia coreográfica*', '*intencionalidade justa*'); rhetorical questions and interpolated passages of dialogue and verse. The 'meaning', if there is one, is clearly not being generated in the conventional way. Rather than offering a transparent window onto an extratextual reality, this prose seems to be concerned above all with surface texture and effect, thus resembling a work of art itself rather than an exercise in criticism.

---

[13] See Chapter 10 for a translation of this passage.

My final example of the 'postmodern' style in Portuguese is very different from the previous ones. This text has been allocated a DF of -4 not because of the texture of the prose (which is in fact quite simple), but because it is deliberately pursuing a very different aim to that inherent to EAD. Assuming from the outset a phenomenological stance in the tradition of Husserl, Sartre and Merleau-Ponty, the author rejects the impersonality of the scientific paradigm but instead uses a passionate poetic style to get his point across. The text is divided into 26 short numbered paragraphs, some no more than a sentence long, each of which presents the voice of a different subjectivity. It is illustrated in places with excerpts of poetry by famous writers from the Portuguese canon.

Extract. 4. PSY95-ChapMonog-JPA1[14]

> **16**
>
> Pelo amor me ofereço em holocausto pela vida do outro. Devoto-me, não já ao seu corpo, mas ao seu desejo, à sua subjectividade, ao seu espírito.
>
> (*Citação de Camões)*
>
> **17**
>
> Já não vejo, e sobretudo não me vejo, pelos meus olhos, mas pelos olhos do outro. E à sua visão me moldo como objecto. Se o outro me quer alegre, eu rio, mas choro se ele me quiser triste. Sou activo ou passivo, inteligente ou embotado, consoante os seus desejos.
>
> Se o outro me quer sem corpo, o meu corpo deixa de existir para mim. Deixo os prazeres e a comida, e ele vai desaparecendo. Mas sempre sobra corpo, e por isso me acho gordo. Podia bem ser esse o desejo do escrupuloso pai amado pela filha anoréctica.

---

[14] The translation of this passage can be found in the Corpus (Translation Corpus → English Texts→ Psychology→PSY-02ChapMonog-JPA1:16-17).

This kind of prose is not publishable in English as scientific discourse, for it is utterly alien to target culture expectations. As this author has discovered with other works he has written, unconventional or uncategorisable texts will only ever be considered by English publishers when there is incontrovertible evidence of their commercial and academic success in a number of other countries. Otherwise, they are rejected out of hand.

The ‘postmodern’ style, then, may take a number of different forms. Some of the texts in the Corpus seem to be trying to imitate the abstract theoretical approach of the French poststructuralists, while others are more poetic and emotive, fragmenting the classic units of discourse and blurring categories with a variety of different devices. Superficially, these practices seem to have much in common with those employed by the alternative discourses that sprouted in English and America in the last decades of the 20th century (see Chapter 6). But, as I shall argue in forthcoming chapters, the status of the ‘postmodern’ style in Portugal is very different to that of the non-hegemonic discourses in the Anglophone world. Not only is it much less marginalised, its relationship with the traditionally dominant style seems to be one of continuity, not subversion. This is a perspective that I shall pursue further in Chapter 8.

* * *

The fact that there are several academic discourses available in Portugal at present suggests that the system as a whole may be in a state of flux. That is to say, the discourse that for centuries occupied the centre of the national system (the ‘traditional’ style) now seems to be under pressure from another that is grounded on a very different epistemological and ideological premise, and as a result, it is being forced to change[15]. Under these circumstances, it is natural that there should be a certain amount of confusion amongst Portuguese academics about the ‘correct’ way to write in their respective disciplines, particularly in the absence of a solid pedagogical tradition.

This may be why there are so many hybrid texts in the Corpus (that is, texts that have features of more than one style, represented predominantly by a DF of -1). However, we should not necessarily assume that the mechanisms are the same in all cases. When hybrid texts occur in the more scientific disciplines, it probably represents the unintentional intrusion of features from the ‘traditional’ style into a discourse that is attempting to be Modern (as in MED-05ART-MID1/2; PHA-96Art-Anon; ECON-02Art-AM, and even LING-02Art-AS1, as we have seen). On the other hand, in History and Philosophy, where the ‘traditional’ style is deep-rooted, the -1 scores may indicate a conscious attempt to modernize. This, at least, appears to be the case in texts such as HIST-07Art-JGM, HIST-07Art-PPC and PHIL-03Art-Anon, which seem to have been written with an international readership in mind.

There may also be some disciplines which have espoused a hybrid style as a deliberate strategy or identity marker. Certainly, the overwhelming predominance of DF scores of -1 in Education, Law and Psychology suggests that these subjects may be attempting to forge a new discourse that fuses elements of the Traditional and the Modern styles (and by extension, the humanistic and scientific paradigms), perhaps to enable them to deal effectively with modern realities without wholly abandoning their cultural heritage.

It is interesting to see what the Portuguese academic style manuals have to say on the issue. Although many of the guides examined in the survey studiously avoided the difficult matter of prescribing a writing style, those that did broach the subject (principally, Estrela et al, 2006; Eco, 1997; Serrano, 1996; Azevedo, 2006, **Bibl:** ***App. D***) all advocate a plain straightforward model that communicates the content as precisely and concisely as possible. This would seem to represent a victory for the

---

[15] To a certain extent, these changing values are reflected in the Corpus. If we compare a text such as HIST-04Art-Anon (an article written and published many years ago, before it became customary to date books in Portugal, which was recently translated for inclusion in an anthology of ‘classic’ works of history scholarship) with another produced 15 years ago (HIST-93FragArt-JMS) and with some more recent material from the same discipline (such as HIST-07Art-JGM and HIST-07Art-PPC), we can gain some idea of the extent to which the ‘traditional’ style has already changed. There seems to be a definite move under way towards simplification, and younger scholars seem to be deliberately cultivating a plainer more transparent style that is less rhetorical and elaborate, in short, closer to the Modern style.

‘modern’ style, were it not for the endorsement given by some of these authors to certain features that are not generally acceptable in EAD. For example, Eco and Estrela et al. support the use of the 1st person plural for the presentation of claims, even by a single author; and Estrela et al. also explicitly endorse the use of Historic Tenses, certain Framing Devices and the Reflexive (***Appendix D***: 12)[16].

As for the ‘postmodern’ style, this represents a challenge to the whole empirical/scientific paradigm, in Portugal as elsewhere, and it will be interesting to see how it fares in the face of increased globalization. The influence of France is paramount here, of course; and one of the issues that I shall be exploring in the next chapter is Holsinger’s thesis (2005) that the postmodern attitude is basically a continuation or reinstatement of a pre-modern epistemology that somehow managed to bypass the scientific revolution. In a country such as Portugal, whose history has been recurrently marked by a profound conservatism and resistance to ‘modern’ values, it is not surprising that such tendencies continue to flourish.

---

[16] On the other hand, the same authors, in another more general work (2003:167-8), condemn the use of rhetorical exaggeration, verbosity and ‘non-existent’ words formed by the arbitrary use of affixes (i.e. lexical abstractions).

Chapter 8

The Historical Roots of Portuguese Academic Discourses

This chapter examines the various Portuguese academic discourses identified in Chapter 7 from a historical point of view. As there are (to my knowledge) no specifically linguistic studies that take a diachronic perspective on the subject, I have drawn mostly upon the considerable body of research that is available in the areas of history of ideas, history of education and general cultural history, in order to gain a better understanding of the various forces contributing to the situation described in Chapter 7.

As well as offering a broad overview of the circumstances that caused particular modes of discourse to prevail over others in Portuguese academia, I shall be developing three main arguments over the course of this chapter. These may be summarized as follows:

1) The 'traditional' style of discourse, used in many humanities disciplines today, essentially derives from the scholastic/rhetorical tradition dominant throughout Europe in the Early Modern period[1]. Although this was effectively ousted from England in the 17th century by the Scientific Revolution, it continued unabated in Portugal (as in many other Catholic countries) following the Counter Reformation, largely due to the

---

[1] The 'battle of the discourses' in fact began when the language of knowledge was still Latin. It was conceived in terms of a conflict between the Ciceronians, who favoured the High or Grand Style of rhetoric ('*estilo sublime*'), and the Anti-Ciceronians, who promoted the Plain Style (*'estilo simples*'). When Latin was replaced by the vernacular, the terms of this debate were simply transferred into the other language. The rhetorical model as a whole was only abandoned after the Plain Style had affirmed itself as the unequivocal vehicle of 'truth' (see Chapter 5 above). I argue here that this canonization of the Plain Style never really occurred in Portugal, which accounts for the co-existence of different discourses within the current academic context.

educational efforts of the Jesuits; indeed, along with the elaborate Baroque style of architecture and art with which it can be profitably compared, it became a marker of Catholic identity in the face of the Protestant threat. Thereafter, it was perpetuated over the centuries by a series of conservative political regimes that promoted Catholic epistemology over the 'new' or 'modern' knowledge that was spreading through the rest of Europe.

2) The 'modern' style has been represented in Portugal since the 18th century by figures campaigning for modernization and change. Hence, it has been generally associated with the progressive forces of democracy, science, technology, industrialization, capitalism, etc, - ideas largely brought into the country by foreigners or by Portuguese intellectuals that had spent some time abroad ('*estrangeirados*'). There were several attempts over the centuries to implement it, but these were generally quashed by the conservative forces occupying the centre of the national system. Only after the 'Carnation Revolution' of 1974 and the country's accession to the European Union in 1986 did the 'modern' style really gain a hold in Portuguese academia. Now it is in the ascendancy, actively promoted by research funding bodies and governments seeking to reap the economic benefits of technological development.

3) The 'postmodern' style is essentially a continuation or reinstatement of the language-based epistemology embodied in the 'traditional' style, and thus represents a new reaction against the empirical positivistic current of the scientific paradigm. It seems to have filtered into the country from France during the latter part of the twentieth century, probably via the many

> Portuguese academics that chose to do their postgraduate degrees there, but was easily assimilated, given the many similarities between the two cultures. Today it occupies a much more prominent position in the national system than its equivalent(s) in Anglo-Saxon academia.

The shifting relations between these various discourses will be interpreted within the broad framework of Polysystems Theory (Evan-Zohar, 1990), a theory that has proved very effective for the explanation of cultural change. That is to say, Portugal's cultural system is not understood to be a closed static entity (despite long periods of relative isolation under inward-turning regimes) but rather as something dynamic and heterogeneous, engaged in constant intercourse with its neighbours. Hence, the interplay between the 'traditional' and 'modern' styles over the years is explained in terms of a struggle between centres and peripheries, made all the more complex by the changing horizons of the systems in question.

This is a struggle that began back in the 17th century with the first stirrings of the Protestant-led Scientific Revolution and the gradual emergence of the discourse that would grow in influence and prestige to eventually become not only the dominant style used in Anglophone academia but also the hegemonic style of the modern world (see Chapter 5 above). The Catholic Church, in the repressive atmosphere of the Counter-Reformation, responded to this threat with purges and censorship, as well as an education campaign designed to promote its own values and reinforce the intellectual edifice of the Scholastics. A rich ornate style of discourse was cultivated at this time as a rhetorical tool and soon became (like the elaborate art and architecture of the Baroque) a marker of Tridentine Catholic identity.

Over the next few centuries, Portugal and Spain, for reasons that will be discussed below, proved more resistant to change than their co-religionists elsewhere in Europe. There were various attempts to introduce 'modern' ideas, but the forces at the centre were so powerful that they (and the discourse that represented them) were inevitably relegated to the margins. Indeed, as far as Portugal is concerned, there were only two very brief periods before 1974 when Enlightenment views acquired a central status in the national system - the period in office of the Marquis of Pombal in the 18th century and the brief Republic of 1910-1926 - and in both cases, the social changes introduced were fleeting and largely reversed afterwards. Aside of this, the country, like its larger neighbour, has been dominated by profoundly Catholic values, first through the perpetuation of the *ancien régime* with the support of the Inquisition (which was only finally dismantled in the nineteenth century) and then through the fascist dictatorship that was in power throughout most of the twentieth.

After the fall of the dictatorship in April 1974, the balance of power between the discourses began to change. Today, as we have seen, the 'traditional' and 'modern' styles of academic discourse are fairly equally represented. However, the national system is highly unstable. It is under pressure from three sides, not only from the hegemonic forces of globalization and its own conservative camp, but also from a new form of modernity ('postmodernity') led by its co-religionist and former cultural style leader, France. How these tensions will play out in the long term remains to be seen.

The Early Modern Period: the Reign of Rhetoric

When Francis Bacon published his *Advancement of Learning* in 1605, the rhetorical tradition was already well established in Portugal. During the Medieval period, rhetoric was taught in great centres of learning such as the monasteries of Santa Cruz in Coimbra and Alcobaça, and had an important place in the curriculum of the newly-founded University[2] as part of the Trivium (Fernandes, 1972:14-15). Indeed, by 1431, it was considered to be so important that Infante D. Henrique established a fund in order to maintain a course in it (*Idem*: 18).

With the arrival of humanism in the 16th century, it gained a new centrality, in Portugal as elsewhere. It was taught in all Portuguese schools as part of the humanities curriculum that predominated in the period, and was compulsory for anyone that wanted to do a degree in Arts at the University of Coimbra (*Idem*: 23). There was also a proliferation of rhetoric-related works by Portuguese authors, such as a treatise on eloquence by Tomé Correia, commentaries on the works of Aristotle, Cicero and Horace by Aquiles Estaço, and a series of rhetoric manuals by men such as Aires Barbosa, Fernando Soares Homem and Fr. Diogo Estella (*Idem*: 21). Of these, the most important was by far the *De Arte Rhetorica* (1562) by Cypriano Soares[3], which not only was used in Portuguese schools almost until the Pombaline reforms of the 18th century but also underwent numerous editions in cities all around the globe (*Idem*: 22).

By the mid 16th century, connections were already being made between rhetorical style and religious identity. When the Portuguese bishop, Jerónimo Osório, wrote to the recently crowned Queen Elizabeth of England in 1562 urging her to return to the Catholic fold, his richly ornate style (which had earned him the epithet of 'the Portuguese Cicero') became the target of satirical attack from Protestant opponents. Bacon, in the *Advancement of Learning*, predictably included Osorius on his list of men who 'hunt more after words than matter';[4] but even the English Ciceronians that were contemporaries of Osorius and generally admired his rhetorical skill felt that he was guilty of excess on this occasion. Roger Ascham, in *The Scholemaster* (1563-1570), criticised him of ‘overreaching’ himself to the point of compromising decorum; while Gabriel Harvey, comparing his style to Cicero’s, acknowledged that both man had fluent diction, ‘but where Cicero's flows without any ripples, Osorius' sometimes overflows the banks, like a swollen, hurrying torrent, too impatient to be confined within the bounds set by the other’ (*Cicerionianus,* 1577)[5].

---

[2] The first University in Portugal was founded by King D. Dinis in 1290. It began functioning in Lisbon under the name *Estudo Geral*, achieving full autonomy with the Royal Charter of 1309. In 1338, it was transferred to Coimbra, and thereafter passed back and forth between Lisbon and Coimbra several times before definitively settling in Coimbra in 1537 (Torgal, 1988:7-10).

[3] Soares was not strictly speaking Portuguese, having been born in Spain. However, he spent most of his life in Portugal, teaching at St Anton's College in Lisbon and at the universities of Coimbra and Evora (Fernandes, 1972: 22).

Following the publication of the epistle to the Queen[6], a controversy arose between Osorius and the distinguished English Latinist Walter Haddon (1516-1572) that has considerable bearing upon the issue of discourse. As Osorius’ attack on the English Reformation was rhetorical rather than theological (Ryan, 1953:143), Haddon, who was regarded as the best Latin orator, poet and epistolist of his generation, was selected by the English court to respond to the letter. Thus, with the honour of the nation to defend, Haddon set about demolishing Osorius’ argument point by point (*Idem*: 145-147).

Particularly interesting in the light of subsequent developments in both English and Portuguese discourse was Haddon’s criticism that Osorius does not present any *evidence* to support his charges, but merely attacks with vague generalities. Indeed, Osorius accuses the modern ‘spoilers’ of the church of leading unseemly lives, as well as preaching heretical doctrines; but he does not name a single modern reformer apart from Luther, and gives no indication of any familiarity with specifically English aspects of the Reformation (*Idem*: 146, 154 note 13). Haddon, for his part, takes care to support his own reply with references to figures such as Basil, Augustine, Jerome, Gregory the Great and St Paul, and amongst the moderns, Luther, Erasmus, Peter Martyr and Bucer (*Idem*: 146). Thus, we have here an early manifestation of a feature that continues to distinguish the discourses today, namely the taste for abstract generalization typical of the 'traditional' style, versus the insistence that assertions be supported by concrete evidence of particular instances in the 'modern' style.

---

[4] ‘Then grew the flowing and watery vein of Osorius, the Portugal bishop, to be in price’ (Bk. I.iv.ii).

[5] Translated from the Latin by Clarence A. Forbes. *Gabriel Harvey's Ciceronianus*, ed. Harold S. Wilson, Lincoln, Nebraska, 1945: 57

[6] The manuscript of Osorius’ letter, having circulated freely in the English court, was smuggled to the Continent where it was printed in 1563 in Latin at Louvain and Venice, and in both Latin and French at Paris. The Latin edition published in France ran to 500 copies. (Ryan, 1953: 143).

The reception that these two texts received outside England offers some insight into the cultural climate of the time. While Osorius' letter enjoyed great popularity on the Continent, becoming the 'rage of Paris' (*Idem*: 143), Haddon's reply seems to have had very little circulation (*Idem*: 149). Nevertheless, the controversy attracted sufficient attention in learned circles for others to enter the fray, with the focus inevitably falling upon the quality of the prose rather than the content of the argument. For example, the English Catholic Richard Shacklock described Haddon as 'a candle vnder a bushell' compared 'to the glistryng stares, whiche are this day in the Catholike church, and namely to Osorius, against whome he setteth hymselfe'[7].

Unfortunately, the fact that Osorius was writing in Latin means that we cannot readily compare his discourse with what is produced in Portuguese today. However, it is clear from the terms of the above controversy that a florid ornate style was already becoming a marker of Catholic identity. Over the next few centuries, this would become more pronounced, chiefly due to the remarkable influence of the Jesuits, who by the middle of the 17th century had become the most powerful educational force in the Christian world.

---

[7] From the Preface to Shacklock's English translation of Osorius' epistle, entitled *A Pearle for a Prince*, published in Antwerp by John Latius in 1565.

1540-1750: The Conquest of Souls

Historians disagree as to whether the Counter Reformation was essentially a reaction to the Protestant Reformation of Luther and Calvin or the result of an internal impulse for renewal emanating from within the Catholic Church itself (Mullett, 1999: 1-3; Wright, 2005:33). Whatever the cause, the effect, however, was clear. Catholicism was militantly demarcated from Protestantism (Küng, 2002:145) with repercussions not only upon theological doctrine and religious practice, but also upon all aspects of culture and society in the Christian world.

The Council of Trent, which met in northern Italy from 1545 to 1563, was the body that essentially defined the course that Catholicism was to take[8]. It not only restored the medieval mass and sacraments, stipulated rigid rules for the liturgy and reinforced Papal absolutism, but also reinstated Scholasticism as the official intellectual method of the Church (Mullett, 1999:49; Küng, 2002:147)[9]. This had profound effects upon the education systems that subsequently developed in the more conservative Catholic territories (such as Portugal and Spain) with long-term social and economic consequences, as critics from Luís Verney to Antero de Quental were quick to point out.

At the vanguard of the Counter Reformation were the Jesuits, a religious order chartered by the Vatican in 1540 for the 'defence and propagation of the faith'[10]. The mission of these 'Soldiers of Christ' was to 'search out the hidden venom of heretical doctrine and to refute it, and then to replant the uprooted trunk of the tree of faith' (Wright, 2005:29); and this they proceeded to do with a vengeance, using every means at their disposal. One of the most important weapons in their armoury was *rhetoric*, in which they tended to favour the elaborate Ciceronian (or 'Asiatic') style[11]. Unlike the anti-Ciceronian movement that was in the ascendancy in England (see Chapter 5 above) and which stressed the moral component of language, Tridentine Catholicism was generally more concerned with effective persuasion (Timmermans, 2002:123; Levy, 2004:46)[12]. Thus, the beautiful cadences, exquisite ornamentation and emotive force of their sermons were designed to impress and seduce, just like the magnificent *architecture* and *artwork* of their churches[13].

---

[8] The Inquisition had, of course, been in existence for much longer as an instrument for the persecution and/or conversion of heretics, and the notorious Holy Office (today called the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith) was formed in 1542 'to maintain and defend the integrity of the faith and to examine and proscribe errors and false doctrines'. In that same year, it issued a first Index of prohibited books (Küng, 2002:144). A similar Index was produced by the Spanish Inquisition in 1559 (Edwards, 2003:125).

[9] It is interesting, as an indicator of the endemic Iberian conservatism, that Spanish theologians were instrumental in ensuring that traditional Scholastic methods prevailed over the anti-Scholastic Christian humanist school at Trent (Mullett, 1999: 49).

[10] Strictly speaking, the Society's foundational bull talked of the 'propagation of the faith'. The word 'defence' was added later in 1550, rapidly becoming central to the order's identity (Wright, 2005:25).

Another weapon used by the Jesuits in the conquest of souls was *education*, an area in which they proved themselves particularly successful. They had educational establishments all over the world, including schools and colleges for boys, offering instruction in grammar, humanities and rhetoric; universities, with programmes in philosophy and theology; and seminaries for the training of priests (Wright, 2005:50-51). By 1773, when the order was dissolved by Clement IV, there were 865 of these teaching institutions worldwide (Gomes, 1995a: 34),

The aim of their education programme was to cultivate both the soul and the intellect; hence, the Regulations of the various Jesuit Colleges frequently used expressions such as '*scientia et mores*', '*doctrina, mores, pietas*', '*virtus et litterae*', etc. (Gomes, 1995b:53). However, insofar as it was directed at 'the formation of a social elite' (Daniel-Rops, *cit.* Mullett, 1999:94), Jesuit education had political as well as social goals. It was focused upon those who would eventually, as Loyola put it, 'play diverse roles…[in] the government of the land and the administration of justice' (*Idem*). This meant that the Society maintained close links with the centres of political and economic power, becoming immensely influential in all areas of life. Indeed, it was this influence that caused the order to be so reviled by certain sectors of society, leading eventually to its downfall.

---

[11] For more in-depth discussions of Jesuit rhetoric, see Conley (1990:152-157); Timmermans (2002:122-126 and 143-149); Levy (2004: 46-47 and 48-52).

[12] The Jesuit rhetorical model was not the only current within the Counter Reformation. However, its overwhelming dominance meant that it tends to be equated with Tridentine Catholicism in general (Timmermans, 2002: 124-125).

[13] Baroque architecture and artwork has been called the Jesuit 'house style', and certainly served a 'propaganda' function, as a number of authors have pointed out (Levy, 2004; Mullett, 1999: 201; Timmermans, 2002: 145-148). However, for Küng (2002:146), its main purpose was to mark a defiant confrontation with Protestantism: 'the grandiose architecture, sculpture, painting and music of the baroque were an expression of the reinforced claim to rule of an *Ecclesia militans et triumphans*, and at the same time, the last unitary style of ancient Europe'.

The socio-political thrust of Jesuit schooling also dictated the composition of the curriculum (Idem). As we have seen, rhetoric – the essentially political art of public persuasion – occupied an important role, particularly after 1599 when the *Ratio Studiorum* (Programme of Study) was instituted (Conley, 1990: 152-3; Gomes, 1995a; Timmermans, 2002: 123). The *Ratio* stipulated all students were to be trained in eloquence, and that the instruction would be based upon Cicero, Aristotle and Quintilian. This again marked the essentially Roman and 'anti-modern' nature of their approach (Timmermans, 2002: 124; Conley, 1990: 153).

To put their programme into practice, the Jesuits also produced numerous rhetoric manuals, of which one of the earliest and most influential was Cypriano Soares' *De arte rhetorica*, published just twenty years after the foundation of the order. Taking Cicero, Aristotle and Quintilian as models, Soares put a particularly high premium upon emotion ('*pathos*') as an important component of persuasion. This probably reflected actual rhetorical practice at the time, particularly in the realm of preaching, where emotion was sanctioned as a way of winning over souls (Conley, 1990: 154); and it may also reveal the influence of Loyola himself, whose *Spiritual Exercises* consisted in large part in the arousal and orientation of emotion through vivid amplification – on the Passion of Christ, for example (*Idem*). More unsympathetic commentators (Levy, 2004:115-118; Timmermans, 2002: 143-145) have seen it as a blatant form of manipulation, a way of 'intoxicating' the listener with words in order to silence his will.

It is clear then, that the kind of discourse implemented by the Jesuits had very little in common with the style that was gaining popularity in England at the same time. Theirs was an elitist discourse that sought to manipulate and seduce rather than enlighten. Elaborate and grandiose, it appealed to the emotions and the aesthetic sense rather than to reason. In short, it was as different from the Plain Style of the early English scientists as a sumptuous Baroque basilica is from a simple Protestant church.

This, then, was the force that most influenced Portuguese learning and discourse in the 17th century. Indeed, the importance of the Jesuits in Portugal cannot be underestimated. They entered Portugal in 1540 and by 1650 had some 650 members and around 20 institutions throughout the country, acquiring an effective monopoly over secondary education (Marques, 1996:266). In 1555, they were handed control of the College of Arts in Coimbra as part of an attempt by the Inquisition to purge that institution of its more progressive elements;[14] and when admission to the Faculties of Law and Canon Law became dependent upon the grade achieved by students at that College, the Jesuits gained indirect control over the University too (Marques, 1996: 273; Beal, 1969:3). Then, in 1559, they effectively acquired a university of their own; Cardinal D. Henrique (Grand Inquisitor and future regent to the throne) entrusted them with the administration and teaching at the newly-founded University of Evora, and full jurisdiction was granted by the pope nine years later.

---

[14] The College of Arts, founded in 1548, was a preparatory school for admission to the University. It began as a centre of humanistic learning, with an illustrious teaching body, many of whom were foreign. However, it soon became clear that such an institution could encourage 'free thought', which threatened the unity of the faith and the new religious and cultural policies implemented by King John III. The Inquisition intervened, detaining and persecuting a number of teachers on charges of 'Lutheranism' and 'immoral conduct' and succeeded in ridding the College of its more subversive elements. Thereafter, it became a docile pillar of the Counter Reformation (Marques, 1996:273-274; Torgal, 1988: 10-11; Gomez, 1969:37).

By the end of the century, the Jesuits were deemed to be the most powerful force within the State, more influential even than the nobility (Beal, 1969:5). Indeed, Jesuit historian Georgel claims that there was no other country in the world where the Company was more revered:

> "Il n'existait en Europe, ni meme dans les deux hemispheres, aucune contrée où la société des jésuites fût plus révérée, plus puissante et la plus solIdemente établie qu'en Portugal, ainsi que dans tous les pays et royaumes soumis à la domination portugaise...." (*cit.* Beal, 1969:6).

But the Jesuits were not the only conservative force in Portugal. The Inquisition, instituted in 1536 at the request of King John III[15], had also grown in power until, by 1615, it too was practically a 'state-within-a-state' (Marques, 1996: 267-71). With its network of informers ('*familiares*'), secret trials and *'autos-da-fé'*, it strongly discouraged any kind of intellectual originality or contact with other cultures. This served to ensure that Portugal, like Spain, remained largely isolated from the cultural and political developments that were taking place elsewhere in Europe.

For most of the 17th century, then, the Jesuits, Inquisition and Court in Portugal presented a united front against the forces of progress. They were committed to the policies laid down by the Council of Trent and suppressed any attempts at deviation. Educational innovation was not tolerated, and science (after the generation of Pedro Nunes, Amato Lusitano and Garcia Horta) went into decline (Marques, 1996:274-5)[16].

---

[15] It is unclear why the Court of the Inquisition should have been brought to Portugal at this time. Marques (1996:267) suggests that the king was essentially emulating the Spanish model and seeking a weapon with which to centralise his own power further, as neither Protestants nor Jews constituted a real threat to religious unity. Edwards (2003:129-135), on the other hand, mentions that the catalyst might have been the alarm caused in the kingdom by a Jewish messianic movement led by David Reubeni.

[16] Although the Jesuits had made enormous contributions to science elsewhere (Wright, 2005:185-201; Woods, 2005:100-114; Dear, 2001: 66-67), they were particularly hostile towards it in Portugal. Wright (2005:196) says that the Jesuits of 18th century Portugal were largely 'dyed-in-the-wool Aristotelians',

Scholasticism was reinstated as the only acceptable intellectual method, and in fact there was in fact a flowering of Thomist philosophy around this time, led by an elite group of Coimbra scholars known as the 'Conimbricenses' (Torgal, 1988: 11; Marques, 1996: 275; Wright, 2005:196).

This situation persisted well into the 18th century. The Jesuits retained their hold over education for many years to come and by 1759 had 20 colleges, 3 seminaries, 1 university and numerous lower schools in Portugal and Portuguese West Africa, and another 15 colleges in Brazil (Gomes, 1995a: 34). Cypriano Soares' rhetoric manual remained a staple of their education system (Fernandes, 1972:22), causing the elaborate Ciceronian-style of discourse to become firmly entrenched in Portuguese cultural habits. And the Inquisition intensified its purges, ensuring that new ideas were unable to infiltrate the country in any form (Marques, 1996: 369).

However, resentment was growing against both institutions. The Jesuits had become so rich and powerful that they attracted animosity from large swathes of the population, including other religious orders and the clergy (*Idem*: 368). And growing numbers of Portuguese intellectuals were leaving the country to pursue their studies or careers in environments where they would be free from persecution. It was these '*estrangeirados*' that eventually provided the main impulse for change that eventually came in the second part of the 18th century (*Idem*: 376-7; 380; Carneiro et al. 2000).

---

while Beal (1969:6) also points out that they showed much more adversity to modern science in Portugal than in other countries. Moreover, the Jesuits approached science in a different spirit to the English scientists. According to Shapin (1996:84), one of their main concerns was to bring the findings of science into line with Aristotelian conceptions of the proper role of experience in philosophizing. 'This they did by deploying a wide range of social and linguistic techniques to give such particular experience the aura of certainty that Aristotelian practice deemed necessary, including the naming of reliable witnesses, the public display of relevant expertise and the use of narrative techniques designed to make empirical statements look like indubitable axioms'.

1750-1777: a Brief Enlightenment

The *'estrangeirados'* (a heterogeneous network of intellectuals that lived and studied abroad, but who nevertheless aimed to use the knowledge acquired there for the modernization of Portugal) are often considered to be the main force behind the Portuguese Enlightenment (Carneiro et al, 2000). Although there were a number of such figures operating in different areas, two in particular stand out - Luís António Verney, an Oratorian friar who spent most of his life in Rome, and Sebastião José de Carvalho e Melo, otherwise known as the Marquis of Pombal - the first providing the theory and the second putting it into practice (Gomes, 1995c:65-66; Marques, 1996: 377).

However, there were also other factors that contributed to the pressure for change. The bourgeoisie had developed in number and power, and although most of Portugal's international trade was still controlled by foreigners, it was starting to assert itself as a class for the first time, pursuing interests that were distinct from those of the aristocracy and clergy (Marques, 1996: 371-2). An intelligentsia had also started to emerge that was, for the first time, unconnected to the church, but linked instead to the secular academies that had first appeared under King John V (Idem: 379). And on the political front, growing hostility towards Spain, combined with the decline of that country as a major player on the world stage, also meant that Portugal became progressively less 'Iberian' in its inclinations and started looking towards other nations for inspiration (*Idem*: 377-378).

To this extent, then, the country was ripe for change. When Verney's *O Verdadeiro Método de Estudar* ('The True Method of Studying') was published clandestinely in Lisbon in around 1751, following the confiscation of the 1746 Naples edition by the Inquisition (Saraiva & Lopes, undated: 613), it circulated widely, provoking intense debate. It is generally credited with being the main force behind the educational reforms implemented by the Marquis of Pombal between 1759 and 1772.

The *Verdadeiro Método de Estudar,* published under a pseudonym and dedicated, ironically, to the Jesuits, consisted of 16 letters, supposedly addressed to a professor of the University of Coimbra. The letters criticised Portuguese practice in a wide range of areas, including education, the use of Portuguese and Latin, science, medicine, philosophy, law and rhetoric. Not surprisingly, this earned the author the wrath of the Jesuits, to the extent that there were calls for an *auto-da-fé* for him and his works (Ferreira, 1984:16-18).

As a result, Verney became something of a hero for the forces of change and progress in Portugal[17]. Over the years he has been eulogised in the most extreme terms: Ferreira (1984: 7), for example, calls him *'o paladino de uma cultura nova, o pioneiro do método cartesiano de investigar a verdade, o apóstolo do experimentalismo nos estudos'*, while Fernandes (1976:139) claims he was a '*janela aberta à Europa e à subversão da metodologia jesuítica na educação da juventude*'.

Indeed, Verney did advocate replacing the verbalism of the Scholastics with more modern methods, and at times does so in terms not unlike those used by Bacon and the other representatives of the 'New Philosophy' in England (see Chapter 5):

> *Este é o comum vício dos Aristotélicos: toda a sua Física é mistério; são altíssimas contemplações, cobertas com o véu de palavras pouco comuns e fora do significado usual.* p.173[18]

Moreover, his own prose, with its short loosely-linked clauses and down-to-earth vocabulary (Saraiva & Lopes: 602) in many respects resembles the 'Attic' style that was developed in Britain in the 17th century by the Anti-Ciceronians.

---

[17] For further discussions of Verney's influence, see Ferreira (1984); Gomes (1995c); Carneiro et al. (2000: 601).

[18] All quotations from Verney are taken from the version edited by Joaquim Ferreira (1984 [1943]).

> *O estilo da história pede clareza e brevidade: aquela, para explicar todos os acidentes da matéria; esta, para que – sem longas frases, que suspendem a atenção – descreva as coisas que deve, com um fio de discurso continuado e sem ser interrompido com aqueles movimentos que constituem o orador.* p.123.

However, as Gomes (1995c:67) points out, the kind of Enlightenment that Verney was proposing for Portugal was very toned-down compared with the radical changes that were being implemented in countries like England and France. His Enlightenment was, in spirit, 'not revolutionary, anti-historical or irreligious like the French; but essentially progressive, reformist, nationalist and humanist. It was an Italian-style Enlightenment, an Enlightenment that was essentially Christian and Catholic' (my translation).

This can be seen, for example, in his recommendations regarding Rhetoric (Letters 5 and 6). He begins by asserting the importance of rhetoric, defending it against critics who associate it exclusively with church and court[19]. Rhetoric is required in every sphere of life, he claims. Moreover,

> …the speech of a man devoid of all artifice cannot be anything other than chaotic. He may have good reasons and very strong proofs; but if he does not know how to order them, who will be able to understand him? Who will be persuaded by them? (p. 88).

What Verney is essentially trying to do is to return Rhetoric to the kind of purity it had under the early Christian humanists, before it became sullied by the manipulations of the Jesuits. He denounces affectation, insisting that figures and tropes 'should be used at the right time and place, when the discourse requires'.

> There has to be proportion, selectiveness and order in all speech, whether this be everyday discourse, history or professorial pronouncements' (p.100).

---

[19] These critics were growing in number, largely as a result of the association of rhetoric with the Jesuits and the *ancient regime* in general (Timmermans, 2002:124, 187);

But it is noticeable that he does not reject the Ciceronian grand style outright. On the contrary, he devotes a considerable amount of space discussing how it may be used appropriately, so that the orator does not degenerate into a quixotic figure, verbally tilting at windmills (pp.110-118).

This position, then, is rather different from that of Bacon and the English empirical philosophers, whose attitude to language derived essentially from a belief in the primacy of things over words. Unlike them, Verney is not abandoning the rhetorical tradition; on the contrary, he is reaffirming it by trying to purge it of the negative image it had acquired under the Jesuits. According to Fernandes (1972:26), Verney 'was trying to combine the Classical tradition of Cicero and Quintilian with the theories emanating from modern French rhetorical currents, represented by the famous Lamy[20], whose precepts he accepted and copied'. The result, Fernandes goes on, was to 'provide a more solid orientation for rhetorical studies and their application in Portugal'.

Indeed, there is evidence that in 18th century Portugal, Rhetoric, rather than declining as it did in England, actively flourished. Many classical works of rhetoric were translated into Portuguese at this time (following Verney's recommendation that education should take place in the vernacular rather than in Latin) and it was taught at all the pre-university preparatory schools, such as the Royal College of Mafra and the Royal College of Nobles in Coimbra (Fernandes, 1972: 25-29). This situation probably reflects the growing influence of France, which itself had a flourishing rhetorical tradition. Indeed, French had already replaced Spanish as the second language in Portugal, a position it was to retain until the middle of the 20th century.

---

[20] Bernard Lamy, like Verney, was a member of the Oratorian Order, which was the chief rival of the Jesuits in education and theological disputation. Unlike the Jesuits, the Oratorians held that language should not be used with artifice, but rather as a simple means of transmitting the scriptures and revealing the sincerity of a pious soul (Timmermans, 2002:124-125). They were also influenced by Cartesian dualism and rationalism. However, their emphasis upon the conventional nature of language (see Lamy, *L'Art de Parler*, Ch. 13-14) distinguishes them from the English tendency towards linguistic realism, as described in Chapter 5. See Conley (1990: 173-176) and Timmermans (2002: 175-184).

On the other hand, Verney also made many recommendations concerning the teaching of science, which were effectively put into practice in the second half of the 18th century during the Marquis of Pombal's sweeping educational reforms[21]. These began with the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1759, a ban on the use of their textbooks and teaching methods, and the closing down of their university at Evora. The only remaining university, Coimbra, was then completely overhauled. After an inquiry into the existing academic conditions, new statutes were promulgated in 1772, which founded faculties of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy and endowed them with an astronomical observatory, natural history museum, physics and chemistry laboratories, a pharmacy and a botanical garden. The Faculty of Medicine was restructured to equip it for experimental research[22] and the other existing faculties were also renovated, with the introduction of new disciplines (Nunes, 2002:213; Marques, 1996:383-4; Torgal, 1988:13-14).

Pombal also created a national public school system, the first in Portugal, with the promulgation of a law in 1772 that established state primary schools administered by civil authorities. There was also a system of '*liceus*' or high schools, which taught philosophy, rhetoric, Greek, Latin and Portuguese, and a series of technical schools (military, commercial, industrial and agricultural) providing practical and vocational training (Gomez, 1969:49-51). These educational reforms were accompanied by a domestication of the Inquisition. Although the institution was not formally dismantled, the Holy Office lost its autonomy in 1769, becoming a mere organ of the state (Marques, 1996:369-370).

---

[21] The Marquis of Pombal rose to prominence in the reign of King Joseph (1750-1777), when, as Prime Minister, he was entrusted the government of the country. An 'enlightened despot', he is famous not only for his efforts at modernization but also for the cruel persecution of his enemies, such as the Jesuits and certain members of the aristocracy (Marques, 1996:391-394; Birmingham, 1993:79-92).

[22] The restructuring of the Faculty of Medicine, which included the creation of an Anatomical Laboratory, was based upon recommendations made by António Ribeiro Sanches in his work *Método de como aprender o studo de Medicina* ('Method of how to learn the study of Medicine'), commissioned by the Marquis of Pombal in 1763 (Marques, 1995: 377) See also Carneiro et al. (2000: 602-603), Torgal (1988: 14).

Thus, the scene was set for Portugal to proceed into the modern age. However, this potential was not realised. With the death of King Joseph in 1777, a new group took over the reins of power, and many of the changes implemented by the Marquis of Pombal were effectively reversed. Under Queen Mary I (nicknamed 'the Pious'), the Marquis of Pombal was deposed and his supporters removed from power. Political prisoners were released and nobles rehabilitated, and both church and aristocracy regained much of their former influence. Hence, the last decades of the 18th century witnessed in many respects a return of the *ancien régime* in Portugal[23].

Portugal's brief Enlightenment was already over. However, the seeds had been sown for change, and over the course of the next century, there would be a long and bitter struggle between the forces of tradition and the forces of progress, manifested not on the political, military and economic planes, but also on the level of *discourse*.

1777-1926: Traditionalists and Progressives

We have already seen how an elaborate emotive discourse was cultivated by prominent elements of the Counter Reformation in frank opposition to the plain style promoted by Protestant reformers; and how supporters of modernization in the 18th century Portugal focused on language as an issue with which to criticise aspects of the *ancien régime*. To a large extent, this division became more pronounced in the 19th century, as discourse style became something of an identity marker to distinguish traditionalists from progressives[24] in the bitter conflicts that swept through the country at this time.

---

[23] It should, however, be pointed out the Marquis' modernising efforts in the sphere of higher education did not come to an end completely under Queen Mary I. On the contrary, the tendency towards empiricism and reaction against Jesuit-style metaphysics continued for some time. Rational and moral philosophy was removed from the curriculum at the Faculty of Philosophy in 1791 and replaced by a course of Botany and Agriculture (Marques, 1996: 385); many important scientific and educational institutions were founded (of which the most important was the Royal Academy of Sciences, directed by the queen's uncle, the Duke of Lafões); and despite the still-tight mechanisms of censorship, a number of books and journals appeared dedicated to the dissemination of science (Nunes, 2001: 31-78; Carneiro et al. 2000: 605-612; Marques, 1996:379, 385).

On the conservative side, classical rhetoric underwent something of a revival in the early 19th century, not only in Portugal, but throughout much of Catholic Europe. This was largely a reaction to the excesses of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic conquests, and a represented a manifestation of nostalgia for conservative Catholic values:

> The beginning of the nineteenth century saw a kind of rhetoric that was, on the Old Continent, closely connected to the ideology of the *ancien régime* and the defence of Christianity. In the face of the Republican 'confusion', but also, little by little, in reaction to the Romantic ideal of the organic 'whole', a number of Catholic rhetoricians rose up in defence of the virtues of distinction, elegance, nobility and classicism traditionally associated with rhetoric/…/ They sought to restore the authenticity of Christian faith, and also, typically, the absolute authority of the Pope and of the monarchs that supported him. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, this was apparently the political and religious ideal pursued by those that were nostalgic for rhetoric. (Timmermans, 2002:214, translated by me from the Portuguese).

Indeed, publications continued to appear on the subject all over Europe (*Idem*). In Portugal, the most noteworthy were Borges de Figueiredo's rhetoric manual, which went through numerous editions, and a new translation of Longinus' treatise *On the Sublime* (Fernandes, 1972:29-31)[25].

---

[24] During the early part of the period, this took the form of a struggle between absolutists and liberals, the former favouring the continuation of the *ancient régime* and the latter fighting for a constitutional monarchy. Liberalism triumphed with the Revolution of 1820; but when John VI died in 1826, the *ancien régime* resurfaced in the figure of Miguel, the King's younger son, who returned the country to absolute rule, dissolving the courts and instituting a campaign of persecution against the liberal opposition. In 1834, following a bitter civil war, the *miguelistas* were defeated after which there resulted a wave of retribution against the property owners and ecclesiastical institutions that had supported him in his abolition of constitutional rule. In the second part of the 19th century, under the bourgeois monarchy, the political tug-of-war continued, the protagonists having now transformed into monarchists and republicans (Marques, 1995:446-518; Birmingham, 1993:96-147).

In the meantime, Liberalism had been growing in force in Portugal, attracting not only bureaucrats and jurists, but also doctors, scientists and academics - the 'cream of Portuguese intelligentsia' (Marques, 1996:453)[26]. These forward-looking intellectuals generally favoured a style of discourse that was clear, transparent and democratic, in keeping with their ideals[27], and they found ready-made models in the texts that managed to make their way into the country from England and elsewhere via the network of '*estrangeirados'* (Carneiro et al. 2000). Many of these *'estrangeirados'* were also Freemasons[28], a movement which acquired great importance during this period; indeed, their Lodges were important centres of British influence[29] in Portugal from the early 18th century (Gonçalves, undated: 2).

Hence, we can find clear examples of the 'modern' style of discourse being produced in Portuguese academia in the 18th and 19th century. For example, as early as 1790-93, José Correia da Serra[30] wrote, in his Introduction to his *Colecção de*

---

[25] Rhetoric also continued to be taught in Portuguese schools, although it was coming under increasing attack (for example, Ramalho Ortigão accused it of being a 'discipline for pedants'). In 1868, it was abolished as an autonomous discipline, surviving only as an adjunct of grammar and textual commentary in the teaching of Portuguese (Fernandes, 1972:29-31).

[26] For a more detailed description of Liberalism in Portugal, see Nunes, 1998, 2004.

[27] Portuguese Liberals generally supported a political constitution grounded on a popular base, restrictions to monarchical power, freedom of religion, expression and the press, free trade and industry, etc (Marques, 1996:470). However, the ideology that triumphed with the Constitution of 1820 continued to defend the union of Church and State, and a hereditary constitutional monarchy (*Idem:* 471).

[28] Prominent 18th/19th-century academics that were Freemasons included the mathematician Anastácio da Cunha; the physician Ribeiro Sanches; the Duke of Lafões (who founded the Royal Academy of Sciences in Lisbon); botanists Avelar Brotero and Correia da Serra; and the Italian chemist and botanist, Domingos Vandelli (Carneiro et al. 2000: 600; Gonçalves: 5; Marques, 1983:53).

[29] There was also an important French (Jacobin) component to Portuguese freemasonry. The Portuguese Masonic Constitution of 1806 initially adopted the French rite as the official and exclusive rite of the *Grande Oriente Lusitano*, though this was substituted by the Scottish rite some years later (Gonçalves: 5, 6-7).

[30] José Correia da Serra (1750-1823) was more famous as a botanist and geologist than as a historian. He was one of the founders of the Academy of Sciences in Lisbon, a '*estrangeirado*' and a freemason, persecuted by Pina Manique, the superintendent of police under Queen Mary I (Carneiro et al. 2000:608-609).

Livros Inéditos de História Portuguesa (‘Portuguese History Collection') published on the orders of the Royal Academy of Lisbon):

> *A História de Portugal não he para nós hum estudo indiferente, ou de mera curiozidade. Os feitos de nossos maiores tiverão consequências taes para o genero humano, que até aos mesmos estranhos interessa conhecellos. Mais ainda, quando a nossa Historia nos não distinguisse do vulgo das nações, fora sempre para nós huma instrução necessária. As leis que nos governão, os classes de pessoas em que a nação he dividida, os fóros, privilegios, e obrigações de cada hum de nós, a natureza dos bens que possuimos, a fórma de administração pública, os usos que seguimos, a língua que fallamos, são todas consequências de sucessos passados, e nelles sómente podemos achar o conhecimento da sua origem, e a explicação da sua natureza. Se a gloria não nos movesse a estudallos, a necessidade nos obrigara.*

This paragraph is clear and transparent, and largely organised according to the conventions that still govern EAD today. There is a short topic sentence summing up the content that follows, a more involved development section, and a snappy conclusion, and the connections between the various parts are clear and explicit. The only features that are not entirely assimilable to EAD are perhaps the top-heavy penultimate sentence and the use of the first person plural to refer to the Portuguese nation (though these are common features of contemporary Portuguese academic discourse today, as we have seen in Chapter 7 above).

In comparison, the following extract from a teaching manual written some fifty years later comes across as strangely archaic. It is taken from the prologue to António Feliciano de Castilho’s *Método Castilho para o Ensino de Ler e Escrever* (‘Castilho Method for the Teaching of Reading and Writing’, 2nd edition, Lisbon: Imprensa Nacional):

> *As verdades mais óbvias, são às vezes as últimas que se acham. Os espíritos elevados, que são, conjuntamente com as circunstâncias e o acaso, a quem se devem em geral, nas artes as invenções; nas ciências, os descobrimentos; os espíritos sublimes, arrojam-se às conquistas*

> *longínquas, desdenham as pequenezes subjacentes; só se comprazem nas esferas superiores, para além do experimentado e do conhecido. O génio que pesa e mede os astros quase imperceptíveis pelos abismos do céu, a distâncias que pareciam incomensuráveis, que de vezes não deixa passar sem os perceber os elementos e sucessos da vida trivial, que em torno dele se revolvem.* (Chapter II. pp. xlii-xliii)

While the extract by Correia da Serra can be translated fairly easily into English with only minimal alterations, this cannot be rendered meaningfully in English without radical structural reformulation. Not only does the passage represent a lengthy detour from the main argument, apparently included as a rhetorical flourish rather than for any important information that it might bring to bear, the prose itself breaks all the rules of English academic discourse. The lexis is erudite and abstract, and the syntax (with the exception of the first sentence) is convoluted, complicated by inversions, apposition and subordination. Particularly noteworthy is the last sentence, which does not have a finite verb, but rather four relative clauses piled one on top of the other. This, then, is clearly a manifestation of the ‘traditional’ style still found today in Portuguese academia.

Castilho is particularly interesting as an author owing to the controversy that developed around him in 1864-5, known as the 'Coimbra question'. He had become something of a sponsor and protector of younger writers, accruing around him a group of admirers; but his heavy erudite style and formalism attracted ridicule and criticism from the group that were to become famous as the ‘1870 generation’. After he had criticised members of the 'Coimbra school' (notably Teófilo Braga and Antero de Quental) in a postface to the *Poema da Mocidade* by Pinheiro Chagas, Antero de Quental responded vehemently with a leaflet entitled *Bom Senso e Bom Gosto*[31], which overtly challenged the canonised tastes of his day.

---

[31] Published in Coimbra by the *Imprensa Literária* in 1865. References are to the 3rd edition.

Presenting himself as an unknown outsider with nothing to lose (p.3), Antero accuses Castilho of attacking the group because of their intellectual independence and irreverence towards established figures such as himself (p.5). He presents the conflict in religious terms (*'A guerra faz-se á impiedade d'estes hereges das lettras, que se revoltam contra a auctoridade dos papas e pontifices'* p.5), and says that the great sin of the Coimbra group was that it 'wished to innovate' (p.6). Like Bacon and Verney before him, he criticises 'those that worship *words,* which enthral the masses, and despise *ideas*, which are difficult and do not sparkle' (p.9); Castilho's own critical writings, he claims, 'contain no ideas - though enough words to fill a synonym dictionary' (p.14).

Antero's own style, and the political tendency underpinning it, is well illustrated in a lecture that he presented in the Lisbon Casino in 1871, entitled '*Causas da decadência dos povos peninsulares'*. This was the first in a series of talks organised by the '1870 generation'[32] known as the 'Democratic Conferences', designed to provide a platform for their ideas on social, moral and political change, and raise public awareness of issues that were shaking Europe at the time[33]. The passage in which first expounds his argument concerning the economic, political and cultural decline of Spain and Portugal is interesting not only for its content but for its style of discourse.

> *Ora esses fenómenos capitais são três, e de três espécies: um moral, outro político, outro económico. O primeiro é a transformação de catolicismo, pelo concílio de Trento. O segundo, o estabelecimento de absolutismo, pela ruína das liberdades locais. O terceiro, o desenvolvimento das conquistas longinquas. /.../ esses fenómenos eram exactamente o oposto*

---

[32] This included, in addition to Antero de Quental and Teófilo Braga, João Augusto Machado de Faria e Maia, Manuel de Arriaga and Eça de Queirós. Later, the group was joined by Jaime Batalha Reis, Oliveira Martins, Ramalho Ortigão, Adolfo Coelho, Augusto Soromenho, Guilherme de Azevedo and Guerra Junqueiro (Saraiva & Lopes: 833-840).

[33] The lectures brought to an abrupt close at the sixth session, when notification was received from the authorities that were to be banned on the grounds that they were promoting doctrines that undermined religion and State institutions (Saraiva & Lopes, 838-840; Marques, 1996:516).

> *dos três factos capitais, que se davam nas nações que lá fora cresciam, se moralizavam, se faziam inteligentes, ricas, poderosas, e tomavam a dianteira da civilização. Aqueles três factos civilizadores foram a liberdade moral, conquistada pela Reforma ou pela filosofia; a elevação da classe média, instrumento do progresso nas sociedades modernas, e directora dos reis, até ao dia que os destronou; a indústria, finalmente, verdadeiro fundamento do mundo actual, que veio dar às nações uma concepção nova do Direito, substituindo o trabalho à força , e o comércio à guerra de conquista.* (pp.30-31).[34]

Despite having been written nearly 140 years ago, this prose scarcely differs from the kind of the discourse that is today in the English-speaking world: there is a clear topic sentence in which he summarizes his main points, which are then subsequently developed, firstly as simple sentences within the paragraph, and then as entire sections within the text as a whole. His sentences are clear and concise, with no extraneous ornament or elaboration, and the lexis is used denotatively.

This would seem to illustrate better than anything the connection between prose style and political inclination. In Portugal, it seems, the 'modern' style has generally been adopted by political progressives, those that favour modernization, secular democracy and civil liberties.

However, we should beware of drawing any simplistic analogies between the progressive camp in Portugal and the positivistic/utilitarian ideology that was in the ascendancy in England. Just as Verney in the 18th century was not trying to abolish rhetoric but to reassert it in the face of criticism engendered by Jesuit excesses, so Antero de Quental was by no means relinquishing the humanistic paradigm for the scientific one. On the contrary, in his later essay, *Tendências gerais da filosofia na segunda metade do séc. XIX*, he specifically criticises the 'icy fatalism that science breathes into the heart of man' *('o gélido fatalismo soprado pela ciência sobre o*

---

[34] This quotation is taken from the 5th edition published by Ulmeiro, Lisbon in 1987, edited by José A. Ribeiro.

coração do homem').[35] In reaffirming the importance of the human spirit or consciousness, he is in fact situating himself firmly within the Continental tradition of philosophical idealism in direct opposition to the materialistic or mechanistic account perpetrated by Cartesianism and Newtonian science[36].

In fact, this reluctance to assimilate the Enlightenment worldview (beyond the basic impulse for economic progress) seems to have been quite generalised in both Portugal and Spain in the late 19th century, and may account for the ease with which the Catholic Church reasserted its influence in both countries following the First Vatican Council of 1870. Threatened by the secularized republican culture that was taking root all over Europe, Pope Pius IX responded with a sweeping indictment of modernity (effectively a Counter Enlightenment) some three hundred years after the Council of Trent[37]. As a result, Portuguese religious intolerance returned with new saints, new religious orders and more persecutions of free thinkers; monasteries were once again legalised and even the Jesuits regained their control of the education of the conservative elite and the pious royal household (Birmingham, 1993:154).

---

[35] From 3rd edition, published by Ulmeiro (Lisbon), 1982:64.

[36] Within the national context, Saraiva & Lopes (undated: 863) see Antero as a representative of anti-Enlightenment sentiment in the line of Alexandre Herculano and Silvestre Pinheiro Ferreira. Indeed, the latter is seen to represent a continuation of the 'eclecticism of the Oratorians between Aristotle and Locke, from which is derived the equally eclectic spiritualism of Leibniz, later rediscovered by Antero'.

[37] The Pope's main purposes were to define the dogma of Papal Infallibility and to obtain confirmation of the position he had taken in his Syllabus of Errors (1864), condemning a wide range of positions associated with rationalism, liberalism and materialism. Consequently, the Index of books forbidden to Catholics was extended to include names like Descartes, Spinoza, Hobbes, Locke, Hume, Kant, Rousseau, Voltaire, John Stuart Mill and Comte, and Neo-Thomism was officially prescribed as the official philosophy to be taught in Catholic schools (Küng, 2002:168-178; Conway, 1997:21).

Indeed, the profound religiosity[38] at the heart of Portuguese culture may go some way towards explaining the failure of the brief Republic, established in 1910 after a rather lukewarm revolution (*Idem*: 148). With Freemasons effectively running the country, a wave of anti-clericalism led to renewed persecutions of Jesuits and priests, the closure of monasteries, and severance of links with the Vatican, fuelling the resentment of both the Catholic elite, who hankered after the values of the old regime, and the illiterate peasants, for whom religion was a central feature of their lives. Hence, despite the considerable advances made to education under the First Republic, with the expansion of primary schooling and the creation of mass literacy classes[39], the dissatisfaction[40] was such that, in 1926, a military coup was launched from the ultra-Catholic city of Braga bringing the Republic to an end and installing the right-wing dictatorship that coloured Portuguese politics for most of the rest of the 20th century.

1926-1974: God, Fatherland and Family

During the rightwing dictatorship that became known as the *Estado Novo* ('New State'), the University played an unprecedented role. Not only was Salazar's government drawn almost exclusively from the ranks of the professoriate (to the extent that Miguel Unamuno in 1935 described the regime as *fajismo da cátedra*, i.e. 'professorial' or 'academic' fascism), the university also played an important role in installing and maintaining the ideology that kept that regime in place[41]. This had far-reaching effects upon attitudes to knowledge, and by extension, upon the discourse in which that knowledge was encoded.

---

[38] This goes far beyond mere formal adherence to the official Catholic rites and symbols; rather, it involves an almost mystical attachment to land and community, and a 'soulfulness' that is inherently antagonistic to the Cartesian or scientific account of the world. It is above all a holistic experience, in which the emotions, as much as the intellect, are deeply engaged. The individual is integrated into a vast web of significances that gives meaning to his existence and provides the kind of emotional solace that we associate with 'home' and maternal protection (it is no accident that Mary cults are very important); thus, separation from the source of this significance is experienced painfully, accompanied by an intense yearning - something the Portuguese know as *saudade* (see Lourenço, 1988; Serrão, 1960).

[39] Two new universities were created at this time in Lisbon and Oporto. According to the decree of 24th March 1911, brought by the Minister of Education, António José de Almeida, their purposes were threefold: to generate knowledge through research; provide technical and professional training that would equip their graduates for the world of work; and extend their activities into the wider community through the creation of museums and institutes (Serrão, 1983:187).

[40] The dissatisfaction was not merely religious; there was great economic and political instability during the First Republic that caused hardship to many and fostered a yearning for stability.

That ideology has been termed 'clerical conservatism' (to distinguish it from the 'dynamic fascism' that developed in more industrialised states) and was the direct heir of the aristocratic conservatism over which the liberal bourgeoisie had triumphed in the late 19th century (Trevor-Roper, 1968:25-27). It was nationalistic, authoritarian and corporativist, and deeply rooted in traditional Catholic values[42], which had profound consequences upon academic production. Indeed, teachers at all levels of the education system that threatened the Catholic national identity with secular, republican or democratic ideas were subjected to severe controls (Torgal, 1999:73)[43], while many of the greatest minds of the era opted for voluntary exile rather than face persecution (Marques, 1996:656).

As regards pre-university schooling, state policy in the early years of the regime was concerned above all with the creation of an academic elite, through a dual education system that separated off pupils considered 'incapable of attaining the higher levels of culture' (Nóvoa, 2005: 117). Moreover, the dictatorship actively reversed the Republic's attempts to improve overall educational levels by closing down all the recently-founded junior schools ('*escolas primárias superiores'*) in 1926, and reducing compulsory education to a mere three years in 1930 (*Idem*)[44]. Indeed, the main objective of schooling in the early years of the regime seems to have been the inculcation of ideology (famously reduced to the trilogy 'God, Fatherland and Family'), with moral and civil training occupying a central role in the curriculum (*Idem*: 115).

---

[41] The ideology that eventually gave rise to the *Estado Novo* first began to manifest itself in student circles during the era of the Republic. Particularly important was the rather misleadingly-named *Centro Académico de Democracia Cristã* (Academic Centre for Christian Democracy, or *CADC*), which sought to reinvigorate the sluggish intellectual life of the Catholic elite and develop strategies to combat the prevailing anticlericalism. Revived and restructured in 1912, it became the focus for the energies of a new generation of committed Catholics, who eventually emerged as the nucleus of the new political order after the military coup of 1926 (Conway, 1997: 58-59; Martins, 1968:305-307; Torgal, 1999:66,128; Marques, 1996:586).

[42] It was strongly influenced by the encyclical *Rerum Novarum* issued by Pope Leo XIII in 1891 (Trevor-Roper, 1968:25; Torgal, 1999:68), which was deeply opposed to both laissez-faire liberalism and socialism (Küng, 2002:180; Conway, 1997:23-24). In 1940, the Portuguese state celebrated a Concordat with the Vatican, restoring the status of the Catholic Church in Portugal and confirming its monopoly over the teaching of religion and morals in all schools, and in 1950 it was defined in the Constitution as the 'religion of the Portuguese nation' (Marques, 1996: 656-657; Gomez, 1968:78).

[43] Decree-Law No. 25 317 of 13th May 1935, Article 1 read: 'Any civil servants, public employees or military staff that have revealed or reveal a spirit of opposition to the fundamental principles of the Political Constitution, or who do not pledge to fully cooperate with the aims of the State, shall be superannuated or retired, if they are entitled to that, or dismissed if they are not' (Gregório, 1992: 24-25; Torgal, 1999:91; my translation).

The state was also highly critical of modern science, a position that probably emanated from Pope Pius X (1903-14), who suppressed any reconciliation between Catholic teaching and modern knowledge [45]. In Portugal, the most important perpetrator of these ideas was the priest Manuel Gonçalves Cerejeira[46], whose famous work, *A Igreja e o Pensamento Contemporâneo*, affirmed the primacy of faith over reason, arguing that science was unable to explain reality in its full immensity or satisfy men's profoundest needs. The work was a great success, running to various editions. However, it also gave rise to what is (from our point of view) one of the most interesting controversies of the period after it was openly challenged in 1930 by young lecturer from the Department of Historical and Philosophical Studies, Sílvio

---

[44] It has been claimed that the *Estado Novo* actually viewed illiteracy in a positive light (Maria Filomena Mónica, 1978 *cit*. Nóvoa, 2005:97). However, this thesis is undermined by a parliamentary text of 1944 that clearly states 'Everyone has the right to a minimum education' and by statistics that show a reduction in illiteracy levels from 66% in 1920 to 30% in 1960 (*Idem*). Nóvoa (ob.cit.) concludes, after weighing up the arguments, that official policy was to avoid encouraging unattainable expectations of better employment or improved living conditions.

[45] In 1907, Pope Pius X issued a new *Syllabus of Modern Errors* and an anti-modern encyclical, and instituted a large-scale heresy-hunt designed to eradicate all perpetrators of 'modernism' in theological circles (Küng, 2002:181).

[46] Manuel Cerejeira was a close friend of Salazar from the time of their student days in the CADC, and an important figure in the regime. He lectured in the Faculty of Letters, University of Coimbra between 1916 and 1928, becoming Cardinal Patriarch of Lisbon in 1930.

Lima, in his *Notas Críticas ao Livro do Sr. Cardeal Cerejeira "A Igreja e o Pensamento Contemporâneo*[47].

In this controversy, the two epistemologies whose fortunes we have been tracing throughout this work - the holistic word-based approach of the humanities and the rational thing-based approach of the sciences – came head to head in a dramatic fashion. The result not only revealed the ultimate incommensurability of the two paradigms, but also illustrated the principle affirmed by Evan-Zohar (1990) and others that the paradigm that ultimately prevails in any given system is the one supported by the forces in power. In this case, Sílvio Lima lost his job, and though reinstated in 1942 with the help of an influential friend, was systematically refused promotion to a professorship until after the downfall of the regime in 1974 (Gregório, 1992: 25-29).

Lima's critique of Cerejeira was an attempt to apply the kind of reasoning used in modern scientific discourse to a text that was designed primarily to appeal to the 'soul'. Asserting the primacy of 'facts' over dogma, Lima explains that a laboratory analysis of the host used in the sacrament of the Eucharist would reveal it to be mere unleavened bread and that no transubstantiation had taken place (143), while a historical approach to religion could also show that many aspects of the faith were in fact 'false' and 'anti-historical' (141). Elsewhere, he accuses Cerejeira of 'Catholico-centrism' (26-27) and of failing to produce evidence to support his assertions (17-18) - an interesting echo of Haddon's criticism of Osorius[48].

On the level of discourse, there is evidence of continuing connections between prose style and epistemological/political position. Cerejeira's Preface is clearly couched in the ‘traditional’ style[49]. References to Horace and a Latin quotation situate the work within the traditional humanities paradigm; while the elevated diction and complex syntax confer pomp and dignity.

---

[47] The first edition, from which these references are taken, was published by Livraria Cunha, Coimbra in 1930. A second edition, corrected and expanded, came out a year later (Gregório, 1992:26, footnote 1).

[48] For a detailed analysis of the terms and consequences of this controversy, see Gregório (1992: 36-63).

> *Embora contra o prudente preceito horaciano, que manda durmam nove anos, fechados na discreta gaveta, os mal sazonados produtos do espírito, saem agora à luz da publicidade estes ensaios, que foram há mais de um ano o objecto de algumas conferências por aí realizadas.*
>
> *Para não desdizer de todo em todo ao velho Horácio, aqui se confessa que contudo sofreram, com alguma demora de publicação, ligeiro trabalho de lima sobre a primeira redacção, consoante aquele seu dito:*
>
> *«limae labor et mora» (p. vii)*

This pompous style is not generally sustained throughout the whole work. However, we do find some convoluted sentences, such as the following:

> *Examinando os objectos que os sentidos e a consciência nos apresentam, o espírito humano não se limita a determinar as suas propriedades e relações - o que faz a Sciência; mas, reconhecendo que eles não têm em si a sua razão de ser, por uma necessidade tão viva, ou melhor, mais viva que a primeira, procura explicá-los, determinar a sua origem, natureza e fim, referindo-os às suas razões últimas – objecto da Metafísica; elevando-se assim até Deus, entra em relações com Ele pela Religião, relações que são estabelecidas pelo próprio Deus – na Revelação Cristã.* (11-12).

As is typical of the ‘traditional’ style, the main clauses are deferred in all three parts of this long sentence, and there is a marked use of subordination, realised chiefly through participle phrases (‘*gerúndios*’) and relative clauses[50].

As regards Sílvio Lima’s text, despite its subject matter, it is probably better classified as provocative journalism than academic discourse. Eschewing the serious neutral style of the science he so vociferously defends, this work seems to be designed to ridicule and entertain as well as prove a point. There is heavy use of irony in which he seems to be parodying some of the excesses of the 'traditional' style[51]; elsewhere, he inserts conservational gambits and colloquial fillers as if he were chatting across a café table to a friend[52]; and in places even addresses Cardinal Cerejeira directly in a somewhat impudent tone.[53] Hence, it is more interesting in terms of content than discourse style, as least as regards our purposes.

---

[49] As Cerejeira’s work was first presented as a series of lectures delivered in a university setting and deals specifically with epistemological issues, I believe it may legitimately be considered ‘academic discourse’ in the Portuguese context. The edition quoted was published in Coimbra by Coimbra Editora Lda in 1924.

[50] It should be pointed out, however, that much of Cerejeira’s text is remarkably clear and unencumbered by the kind of features that usually make the ‘traditional’discourse very dense and difficult to read. This may be because the work had initially been conceived as a series of lectures to be delivered orally, or because the author wished to reach as broad an audience as possible.

Despite the Cardinal's doubts about the values of empirical science, there was nevertheless considerable scientific activity in the University of Coimbra during the dictatorship. Much of this was actually put to the service of the regime[54], such as the famous 'Scientific Colonialism' of Luiz Wittnich Carisso, a botanist who became famous through his various expeditions to Angola. A lecture given by him in the 'Sala dos Capelos' of the University of Coimbra on 2nd March 1928, entitled *O Problema Colonial perante a Nação*[55] clearly indicates the extent to which official ideology had permeated the halls of academia. The paper exudes pride at the Portuguese colonial achievements and optimism for the country's future, and is packed full of ideological buzzwords of the era such as '*nacionalidade*', '*fé*' and '*raça*'. Moreover, the scientific message has been carefully packaged within a humanities framework, with extravagant use of all the rhetorical resources inherent in the 'traditional' style:

---

[51] For example, having accused Cerejeira of possessing the 'lyrical temperament of the mystic', and being unable to 'repress the waves of emotion that his faith provokes in him and which continually explode across the pages of his book', he says: *'/.../ o Sr. Cardeal Cerejeira pretende, por assim dizer, limpar criticamente o pórtico da Igreja do pó racionalista que o incréu século XIX nêle acumulou. Finda essa missão, o Autor julgou e julga que o sol da Verdade arrancará deslumbradoras chispas de oiro das suas pedras imperituras'.* (p.8).

[52] For example: (p9) *'Mas vamos à análise';* (p20) '*de duas, uma';* (p28) '*e já agora'*.

[53] For example, (p18): *'Que diria a Sua Eminência a um homem que lhe afirmasse ter morrido, no Oriente, S. Francisco Xavier «a caminho do credo búdico ou mahometano»? Naturalmente, tal como eu, tal como todos, duvidaria; pediria provas.'*

[54] During the 1930s, the achievements of Portuguese scientists from previous centuries were collected and systematized with a view to stimulating national pride, while the products of Portuguese technology (such as the construction of hydroelectric dams) were used as a cultural and ideological weapon (Nunes, 2002: 220)

[55] Published by Coimbra University Press in 1928.

> *Levada a efeito com uma tenacidade admirável, sem meios de acção, num clima hostil e depauperante, contra o qual não havia defesas, a obra que os nossos avós realizaram é de facto formidável, e deve-nos encher de orgulho.*
>
> *Mas, para se sentir com tôda a intensidade a grandesa desta obra, não basta ler os Lusíadas, e muito menos a História – sobretudo essa História que até há bem pouco foi ensinada nas nossas escolas, na qual o portentoso esfôrço da nossa nacionalidade era descrito como um rasgo de valentia, quási como uma fantasia provocada pelo espírito aventuroso dos portugueses.*
>
> *Entalada entre o colosso espanhol e o mar, teria sido para êste lado que a nacionalidade, a transbordar de seiva exuberante, se teria lançado, na necessidade de proporcionar um objectivo às suas energias mal contidas, e de dar expansão ao excesso de vida que a animava.* (p.7*)*

Once more we can see the Portuguese penchant for deferring the main clause for rhetorical effect and for pompous grandiose diction. Carisso goes on:

> *Encarada desta forma, a nossa epopeía marítima e colonial aparecia-nos destituída de base scientífica: aparecia-nos como a obra de heróis, e não como a realização metódica de um plano grandioso, preparado e executado com aquelas qualidades de organização e de previsão, cuja falta hoje tão duramente sentimos, e tanto invejamos aos outros povos que actualmente desempenham na vida mundial um papel análogo, mas talvez mais restrito, do que aquele que há quatro séculos nos pertenceu.*
>
> *A nossa verdadeira História está hoje a fazer-se, e essa obra, de transcendente interêsse patriótico, honra sobremaneira os seus autores.* (p.8)

Thus science is introduced as a way of realising the Portuguese epic dream of conquest and empire, and also of raising the country to the economic level enjoyed by other European nations. Having been rhetorically presented in this way, framed by literary and mythical references, its potentially subversive effects are effectively neutralised. This is clearly science in the service of the regime.

Let us finish by looking briefly at another text by Carisso, a dissertation he presented in 1911 when applying for the position of Assistant Lecturer in Biology[56]. This is a purely scientific work on the subject of plankton;

> *Neste segundo fascículo apresentamos a lista das Diatomáceas que encontrámos numa série de pescas de Plancton feitas na enseada de Buarcos e na foz do Rio Mondego, junto da Figueira da Foz, no decorrer dos anos de 1909, 1910 e 1911.*
>
> *A descrição desses trabalhos já foi publicada no primeiro fascículo desta colecção, por forma que nos julgamos dispensados de a repetir aqui.*
>
> *Apresentamos, porém, de novo o quadro geral dos lanços, visto termos efectuados mais algumas pescas, posteriormente à publicação daquele fascículo.*

The difference between the two styles of discourse is remarkable. This is pure scientific discourse, as transparent and factual as it is possible to be. The only thing that distinguishes it from something published today in a modern scientific journal is the use of the first-person plural (which is, as we have seen, a way of being impersonal in Portuguese).

Whether the difference between the two styles is determined primarily by the genre or by the political regime in power is difficult to say. The dissertation was produced in the early years of the Republic, when the scientific paradigm was being promoted as a route to economic power and democratic freedom; but of course the rather prosaic nature of the subject matter does not really permit much rhetorical manoeuvring, had the author wished to engage in it.

For this reason, it is not possible from this brief analysis to determine the extent to which scientists under the *Estado Novo* were obliged to modify their discourse to suit the regime. Only a thorough analysis of a large corpus of texts would be able to clarify the issue - and this, unfortunately, is beyond the scope of this work.

---

[56] *Materiaes para o Estudo de Plancton na Costa Portuguesa: Fascículo II Bacillariales (Diatomaceae)* Coimbra University Press, 1911.

Post-1974: The Triumph of the Modern?

The 'Carnation Revolution' of 25th April 1974 effectively put an end to the dictatorship that had controlled all aspects of Portuguese life and culture for half a century, ushering in a new era of democracy and modernization. There were now concerted attempts to raise educational standards, develop industry and technology, and expand the economy – a project greatly facilitated by Portugal's accession to the European Community in 1986.

In truth, the process of improving education had already begun during the dictatorship with the *Plano de Educação Popular* launched in 1952. Concerned by UNESCO figures that showed Portugal to be far behind other European countries with an illiteracy rate of 40%, Salazar's regime discovered the need to invest in the intellectual and cultural development of the country (Nóvoa, 2005: 113). Consequently, the exclusively ideological view of education espoused in the early years of the *Estado Novo* gave way in the '50s and '60s to a more pragmatic policy oriented towards the preparation of a skilled workforce, with a view to industrialization and economic expansion (*Idem*: 119).

This led to a reassessment of the role of science and technology, an approach continued after the 'Revolution', with the Educational Reforms of the 1980s (Nóvoa, 1991: 51). It was at this point that the 'empirical experimental Anglo-Saxon' model began to assert itself alongside the 'typically deductive Latin' model in the field of education (*Idem*: 53), no doubt bringing consequences on the level of discourse.

Since then, successive governments have pledged to develop science and technology with a view to furthering Portugal’s economic interests and raising the country to the level of its European partners. Like them, Portugal is now in pursuit of 'excellence' (see Chapter 6), and has implemented a rigorous system for the assessment of academic performance based upon a quantitative scientific model. Research programmes are increasingly international in scope, and undertaken in partnership with institutions or businesses in other countries, which means that English has acquired great prestige as a lingua franca in many different disciplines. This is naturally reflected not only in an escalating demand for translation and EAP courses in Portugal, but also in a new awareness on the part of Portuguese academics of the norms governing English academic discourse, norms which are then frequently transferred to their mother tongue.

It would seem, then, that the victor in the Portuguese battle of the discourses that we have been tracing over the course of this chapter is the ‘modern’ style, the plain discourse that has been associated from the outset with the values of progress and democracy. As we have seen, this has had advocates and representatives in Portugal since the 18th century, drawn principally from the ranks of Liberals, Republicans and Democrats opposed to the traditional Catholic regimes that occupied the centre of the national system for so long. Once the country had emerged from its long isolation and began to participate actively in European and global affairs, the ensuing economic and cultural pressures made it inevitable that the ‘modern’ style would move into the ascendancy. As we have seen in Chapter 7 above, it already dominates Portuguese academic production in the more scientific subjects, while law, education, the social sciences and even history seem to be following suit.

That is not the whole story, however. The ‘traditional’ style still has many adherents, and not all of them are dyed-in-the-wool conservatives. On the contrary, there seems to be a current in some arts and humanities subjects that deliberately cultivates features from the ‘traditional’ style and extends them (often radically) in conscious contravention of the norms of the ‘modern’ style. This is the discourse that I have dubbed the ‘‘postmodern’ style’, a style that draws not only upon the poststructuralist *écriture* of France, but also upon the very rich humanities tradition of Portugal itself.

In this final section, therefore, I would like to develop the argument, put forward by Holsinger (2005) with respect to French culture that the Postmodern attitude to discourse and knowledge has its roots in the Premodern, that is to say, in the language-based epistemology favoured by the Scholastic and Rhetorical traditions. I will argue that Portuguese academic discourse has not only been strongly influenced by French in this respect, but that it has a natural predisposition towards such an epistemology as a result of its own particular history. The most significant common denominator is Catholicism, which permeates both cultures perhaps more deeply than many people realise. Having for centuries promoted an attitude to knowledge and discourse that is diametrically opposed to the Reformation- and Enlightenment-inspired perspective of the sciences, its values seem to be re-emerging in a new form to challenge the hegemony of the Modern and the forces of globalization.

Holsinger’s premise is that medievalism formed part of the everyday fabric of intellectual culture in 20th century France, and that it influenced the emergence of structuralism, post-Freudian psychoanalysis, poststructuralism and French feminism in generally unacknowledged ways (2005:20). This, he argues, was due to the pressure of Catholic theology. Not only had Thomism formed the basis for instruction in Roman Catholic schools since Leo XIII's 1879 encyclical *Aeterni Patris*, but in the 1940s and '50s, it was the centre of a vigorous debate between traditional Thomists on the one hand and the proponents of a '*nouvelle théologie'* on the other (*Idem*: 40). These 'ecclesiastical and theological paroxysms' culminated in the Second Vatican Council of 1962-65, precisely at the same time as the post-Sartrean intellectual avant-garde was starting to emerge (*Idem*: 21, 160-166).

In the years immediately preceding the tumultuous '60s, a book about the language of monastic learning (*L'Amour des lettres et le désir de Dieu*, by Leclercq, published in 1957) had become an academic bestseller in France (*Idem*: 63). Holsinger mentions it in order to point out a possible connection between the medieval pedagogical technique of *ruminatio* and a certain passage in Lacan which evokes the notion of the text as food, something to be 'chammed, digested and absorbed in the exegetical process' (*Idem*). For our purposes, however, a more interesting connection may be made with a study by Bourdieu et al. (1965) of French academic discourse, particularly the initial essay by Bourdieu & Passeron entitled (in the English translation) 'Language and Relationship to Language in the Teaching Situation'.

Ruminatio, according to Leclercq, was a 'repeated mastication of divine words' (*cit.* Holsinger, 2005: 63), an attempt by monks to incorporate the sacred words into their very beings through a kind of theological osmosis. This is exactly the term used by Bourdieu & Passeron to describe the kind of French academic discourse that they term 'traditional' (and it could equally be used about the more extreme examples of 'traditional' style in Portuguese):

> Speech points to itself, rather than to what it formally signifies. For both orator and auditor, all attention is turned away from the signified. Traditional teaching uses words to seduce. Through a process of osmosis, it promotes the transmission of an already confirmed and legitimate

> culture, and secures commitment to the values which this contains. Charismatic and traditional teaching stand in marked contrast to the rational use of language, which is suited to democratic education. (1994:19-20)

Although Bourdieu & Passeron do not explore the historical roots of this discourse, their ironic use of religious imagery throughout the essay hints at an ultimately hieratic source: for example (the italics are mine), 'language is first and foremost a *marvellous incantation* whose whole justification lies in *placing the disciple in a fit state to receive grace'* (p.19); 'the *propitiatory ritual* of erudite citation pays homage to celebrated masters or to culture…' (p.20); 'destined above all to play the part of the *faithful at a church service*, students must answer with *ritual responses'* (p.11); 'through a kind of *incantatory or sacrificial rite*, [students] try to call up and reinstate tropes, schemas or words which to them distinguish professorial language' (p.4). Thus, they implicitly suggest a connection between medieval theological learning habits and the 'traditional' style of academic discourse then in use in French universities, a connection that becomes more explicit when we take account of the ongoing Scholastic influence in Catholic education systems.

Although Holsinger does not refer to Bourdieu's book on academic discourse, he does devote considerable space to a discussion of the origins of the sociologist's famous term 'habitus'[57]. Moreover, the concept of 'habitus' underlies his own argument regarding the influence of medievalism upon 20th century French intellectuals. He points out, for example, that Bataille, Lacan, Foucault and Sollers all went to Jesuit primary schools (*Idem*: 19); that Bataille was a medievalist before he ever became the 'anti-philosopher' that so influenced the *Tel Quel* generation (*Idem*: 1-2; 26-56); that Lacan's intellectual maturation included formative contacts with premodernist philosophers and theologians (*Idem*: 60-61); that Derrida's deconstructive project was influenced by the tradition of apophatic theology (*Idem*: 115-116); and that Barthes was immersed in medieval exegetical culture and had undertaken an in-depth textual analysis of Loyola's *Spiritual Exercises* (*Idem*: 158-172). Indeed, Barthes, Holsinger points out, was also influenced by Rhetoric and considered Loyola's *Exercises* as one of the first Christian appropriations of the classical rhetorical tradition (*Idem*: 171); he had lectured on Rhetoric (*Idem*) and gives considerable attention to tropology in his own writings (*Idem*: 186-194).

---

[57] Bourdieu developed this concept, Holsinger claims, while translating Panofsky's book, *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism*, which referred repeatedly to the 'medieval habit of mind'. Panofsky, for his part, apparently drew the term directly from the *Summa Theologiae* of Thomas Aquinas (Holsinger, 2005: 94-113).

How does this bear upon Portuguese academic discourse?

Firstly, there is the question of the French influence upon Portuguese culture as a whole. The end of the 17th century saw the decline of Spain as a major world power and the ascendancy of France, and from this time, French became the second language of Portugal and the most important influence upon all aspects of its life and culture (Marques, 1996: 378). This situation was to remain in place until well into the 20th century. The older generation in Portugal today learned French at school rather than English, and the close links between the two countries meant that France was the natural destination for many Portuguese academics wishing to pursue their postgraduate studies abroad. This meant that there was a ready-made conduit for French intellectual currents.

Portugal was also particularly receptive to postmodernism due to its own historical background. The influence of Scholasticism was, if anything, even more pronounced in Portugal than in France due to its long periods of isolation under strict Catholic regimes, while Rhetoric also played an important role in the education system until well into the 19th century. Even progressive thinkers like Luís Verney and Antero de Quental did not go so far as to abandon their inherited philosophical orientation completely. As we have seen, Verney was by no means prepared to jettison rhetoric in favour of observation; while Antero, in his 1890 work *Tendências Gerais da Filosofia na Segunda Metade do Século XIX*, overtly rejected positivism in favour of a Hegelian-inspired philosophical idealism.

Hence, the culture tended naturally towards a language-centred epistemology. This meant that poststructuralism was assimilated far more easily in Portugal than it was in Britain and America. After all, social constructivism is not an outrageous notion in a country that has not been brought up on empiricism and linguistic realism, and poststructuralist discourse is much less of a shock when the traditional academic style is itself opaque. Moreover, the etymological affinities between Romance languages mean that the intertextual probings of Barthes and Derrida do not seem anything like as bizarre to the Portuguese as they do to English-speakers. If anything it is the ‘modern’ style that is more alien, as is shown by the frequent tendency of Portuguese academics to drift into complexity and abstraction even in the most prosaic scientific texts (see ***Appendix A***).

Consequently, postmodernism in all its aspects occupies a much more central role in Portuguese culture than it does in the Anglo-Saxon world. The resulting discourse, though less represented in the Corpus than the ‘modern’ and ‘traditional’ styles, nevertheless has a significant presence, and may be on the increase (though this can only be assessed by a longitudinal study of a large corpus of texts). Hence, we should be wary of any glib pronouncements regarding the 'triumph' of the ‘modern’ style.

The historian, Joel Serrão (1960), views Portuguese history as a cyclical flux, the constant ebbing and flowing of tradition and innovation, nationalism and cosmopolitanism:

> *É bem sabido que ao Marquês e à usa política /.../ se segue aquela cujo símbolo será Pina Manique, o zeloso intendente, o farejador de novidades francesas...José Anastácio da Cunha e José Agostinho de Macedo poderão acaso ser tomados como paradigmas existenciais de situações do seu tempo. Herculano, e aqueles que atacaram a sua História de Portugal; as Conferências do Casino, e a sua proibição. O nacionalismo da geração de 90, a Renascença Portuguesa, a Seara Nova, o Integralismo Lusitano, a Renovação Democrática, etc., etc., - fluxos e refluxos do mesmo mar, embora as águas possam ser e, por vezes, tenham sido diversas.*
> *Assim tem sido. Assim terá de continuar a ser?* (p. 52)

In the light of this analysis, we may well wonder if the postmodern current might not represent one more cycle of the tide, another ebbing away of rational values in a culture that has often chosen soul over intellect.

As regards the discourses that float in on the waves, these clearly have a very unstable relationship to each other and to others being produced in different parts of the European polysystem. While the 'modern' style of Portuguese is very similar to EAD, the 'traditional' and 'postmodern' styles are clearly more Latin in their affinities, derived from a quite different epistemology. The question then arises of how we can possibly translate the one into the other without committing epistemicide[58].

And yet, given the prevailing balance of power on the world stage, this is often what an English translator is expected to do. In the next section, we shall look at some of the practical, theoretical and ethical implications of this complex situation.

---

[58] This term was coined by Santos in the original version of his General Introduction to the multi-volume work *Reinventing Social Emancipation* (2005) to describe how alternative knowledges have been systematically wiped out by modern science as part of its imperialistic project. The notion was subsequently extended to academic translation by me (Bennett, 2007b).

PART IV

Translating Portuguese Academic Discourses

Chapter 9

Translating Portuguese Academic Discourse: the Issues

As far as practical translation and translator training are concerned, it is generally agreed that understanding a text is a prerequisite for translating it (Schäffner, 2002: 2). Text linguistics and/or discourse analysis[1] now feature heavily in translator training programmes, and trainees are encouraged to explore a source text thoroughly before embarking upon their translation (Schäffner, 2002; Trosborg, 2002). Many authors also stress the need to apply this kind of scrutiny to target culture texts in order to develop an awareness of the cultural expectations surrounding the genre (Hatim, 1997; Hatim & Mason, 1990; Scollon & Scollon, 2001; Baker, 1992:119-215).

It was my desire to understand the mechanisms governing some of the individual texts presented to me for translation that prompted me to undertake this extensive exploration of the structure and history of academic discourse in Portuguese and English. Reluctant simply to pass off the more extreme examples as 'badly written', and believing, with the Critical Discourse theorists (Fairclough, 2003, 1992, 1989; Kress & Hodge, 1981; Wodak & Meyer, 2001), that language is inescapably ideological, I have sought to understand the cultural and historical reasons why some Portuguese academic discourse is so very different from the 'windowpane prose' that pervades English academia.

My explorations, however, have revealed a situation far more complex than I had ever imagined at the outset and have raised more questions than they have answered. Firstly, it is clear that English Academic Discourse is by no means as neutral and objective as it makes itself out to be. Like other forms of language, it encodes *value* in its very structure, and far from providing a transparent window upon some extralingual reality, it actively constructs it, as discussed in Chapters 4 to 6. Secondly, the values inherent in EAD are diametrically opposed to those manifested by the Portuguese discourse of the humanities in both its variants. While EAD prefers simple straightforward forms of expression that privilege the referential content, the Portuguese 'traditional' and 'postmodern' styles value complexity, ornamentation and surface style. EAD aims as far as possible to be demotic and accessible, while the Portuguese deliberately cultivates erudition. EAD gives priority to reasoned logical argument, while 'traditional' style in Portugal employs a more emotive holistic approach with recourse to classical rhetorical devices. Finally, authors of English academic texts usually try to suppress their subjectivity in the interests of the 'facts', while in some kinds of Portuguese writing, pompous oracular pronouncements are quite commonplace.

---

[1] As Schäffner (2002:2-3) points out, the proliferation of different theoretical models in this area of linguistics has resulted in a certain terminological confusion. Here, as elsewhere in this work, I use 'text' to refer to an individual concrete piece of (written or oral) communication and 'discourse' to refer to a higher level, i.e. regular patterns of language use by social groups in areas of sociocultural activity.

This may seem an excessively polarised account, and of course, plenty of current examples may be found on both sides that reveal all shades of grey in actual practice. Nevertheless, I believe that there are historical reasons for such a polarization. The conflict may be traced back to the Early Modern Period, when, following the Protestant espousal of the Plain Style, Counter Reformation Catholics deliberately cultivated an elaborate 'Ciceronian' discourse as a marker of identity. As Küng (2002:145,146,169) repeatedly points out, this 'militant demarcation' was also manifested in many other aspects of culture, such as art, architecture and education, and reaffirmed several times over the course of the ensuing centuries.

With the reification of the Plain Style in Anglophone culture, a whole new approach to knowledge was installed, replacing the old word-based learning of the Scholastic/Rhetorical tradition. This, meanwhile, continued relatively unchanged in Catholic countries, occupying the centre of the Portuguese cultural system for several centuries. Hence, there is a fundamental incompatibility underlying English Academic Discourse and the Portuguese ‘traditional’ style (and its ‘postmodern’ offshoot) that raises tremendous problems for translation. Indeed, the differences in some cases are so great that we might even speak of an *incommensurability of paradigms*.

In this chapter, therefore, I will explore some of the problems raised by this situation. I will look first at the *epistemological* issue deriving from the differing perceptions of how language relates to ‘reality’; then I will go on to discuss *ethical* problems implicit in or unleashed by each of these discourses, and *political* difficulties connected with the relative status of the two paradigms on different levels of the polysystem. Finally, I look at how these issues play out in the day-to-day practice of translation.

Incommensurable paradigms?

Up to now, I have described the two paradigms in terms of a language-based or 'logocentric' orientation to knowledge versus a ‘thing-based’ or ‘scientific’ orientation. However, these tags do not reveal all the dimensions of the issue. In this section, therefore, I shall discuss some of the different aspects connected with this opposition, and discuss whether or not the two paradigms can be considered to be incommensurable.

a) Epistemological dimension

English Academic Discourse, as we have seen, is posited upon a belief that there is a world 'out there' that can be known objectively and experienced universally. To the extent that it presupposes that referential language corresponds to that outside world in an unproblematic way, it is *realist*. To the extent that it demands that all assertions be backed up by 'evidence', by reference to concrete individual examples of whatever is being asserted, it is *empirical*.

We should not underestimate the centrality of both realism and empiricism in Anglo-American culture. As regards the former, Rorty in 1991 (p.2) lamented 'philosophers in the English-speaking world seem fated to end the century discussing he same topic – realism – which they were discussing in 1900'[2], a perspective reinforced by Miller, who, in 2008, claims 'the nature and plausibility of realism is one of the most hotly debated issues in contemporary metaphysics, perhaps even the most hotly debated issue in contemporary philosophy'. As for the latter, Berman (1988: 110) points out that all controversies in America take place 'customarily *within* empiricism', meaning that cognitive status is not accorded to claims derived from other philosophical approaches. Indeed, English makes a clear distinction between 'knowledge' or 'fact' on the one hand (which is justified by evidence and therefore true) and mere 'belief' or 'assertion' on the other, which is unsupported scientifically (Sokal & Bricmont, 1998:102; Sokal, 2008:109; Boghossian, 2006:12-13).

The long dominance of Anglo-American philosophy by the Analytic school is further evidence of this orientation. Dedicated to the logical clarification of thoughts, this predicates a direct connection between linguistic propositions and the observable world, and as such, its inquiries are generally felt to be continuous with, or even subordinate to, those of science[3]. Hence, there has traditionally been strong resistance to idealist and constructivist attitudes to knowledge in the Anglo-Saxon world, as we saw in Chapter 6. That the realism debate is still ongoing shows just how deeply ingrained this orientation is, despite the fact that most French- and German-speaking philosophy has long put the issue behind it (Rorty, 1991:12).

---

[2] Rorty goes on: 'In that year, the opposite of realism was still idealism. But by now language has replaced mind as that which, supposedly stands over and against "reality". So discussion has shifted from whether material reality is "mind-dependent" to questions about which sorts of true statements, if any, stand in representational relations to non-linguistic terms'.

Unlike EAD, the Portuguese ‘traditional’ and ‘postmodern’ styles do not presuppose any fundamental correspondence between language and things. In the more extreme examples of these styles, meaning is generated intra- and intertextually using devices that English speakers are more used to associating with literary writing. There may also be a foregrounding of the interpersonal dimension, with the projection of a strong authorial persona and constructed addressee, and the use of overt rhetorical devices. As a result, surface texture tends to take priority over referential content, which means that these texts do not lend themselves particularly well to summarisation or reformulation, nor to translation into 'windowpane prose'.

As I argued in Chapter 8 above, there are historical reasons for this preference. Catholicism, from which both these discourses ultimately derive, has always been less interested in the physical world than in man’s symbolic systems, the product of his spirit. In Scholasticism, knowledge was inevitably *mediated* through language (and in the Church generally, though texts, sermons, icons, images, etc), while the Rhetorical tradition cultivated the *interpersonal* and *intertextual* dimensions of discourse over and above the referential. Not only were these linguistic habits transferred to the ‘traditional’ style of academic discourse, they will also have influenced the development of postmodern constructivist currents in the second part of the 20th century, as Holsinger (2005) convincingly argues (see Chapter 8 above).

---

[3] Despite the development of Continental currents, Logical Positivism retained its centrality in Anglo-American philosophy until the appearance of *Ludwig Wittgenstein*’s notion of ‘language games’ in 1955 and Austin and Searle’s 'Speech Act Theory' in the ‘60s.

Indeed, even historical proponents of the 'modern' style of discourse in Portugal, such as Luís Verney and Antero de Quental, did not go so far as to advocate linguistic realism. Both men were interested in the social and political benefits of scientific knowledge and plain prose, but stopped short of accepting the full epistemological implications of the paradigm. In the case of Verney, his attitude to language was close to that of his fellow Oratorian, the rhetorician Bernard Lamy (Fernandes, 1972:26), who had explicitly affirmed language to be conventional, the product of agreements between primitive groups (*L'Art de Parler*, 1675, Ch. 13-14). As for Antero, he explicitly renounced scientific epistemology in his 1890 work, *Tendências gerais da filosofia na segunda metade do século XIX*:

> *O universo da ciência, feito à imagem dessa inteligência que opera só sobre dados primitivos e elementares, é pois um universo inferior e elementar; foi como amputado dos seus órgãos mais nobres. E, pela mesma razão, um universo abstracto. A verdadeira realidade, concreta, viva, espontânea, falta-lhe; faltam-lhe as ideias superiores, as que alumiam, interpretando-as, as inferiores, as fornecidas pela sensibilidade. É por isso que as grandes explicações da ciência, no fundo, nada explicam. Um profundo mistério continua a envolver o universo que ela acaba de explicar: o mistério das ideias, que é o mistério do que na consciência está para além da sensibilidade, região obscura onde assentam essas explicações.*
> (Ulmeiro, 3rd edition, 1982: 63).

This, then, is ultimately an affirmation of the superiority of the humanistic paradigm over the scientific one, a position that would be reiterated many times throughout the course of the 20th century in Portugal.

Today, in the Anglo-Saxon world, the scientific paradigm is so dominant that humanists, such as theologicans, philosophers, historicans and literary critics, 'have to worry about whether they are being "scientific", whether they are entitled to think of their conclusions, no matter how carefully argued, as worthy of the term "true"'

(Rorty, 1991: 35). Despite some reaction against this in literary departments in the wake of poststructuralist currents (Chapter 6 above), non-empirical approaches to knowledge remain peripheral (Berman, 1988:179, 110, 7; Sokal and Bricmont, 1998: xiii).

In Portugal, the situation was, until recently, quite the reverse. The humanistic paradigm occupied the centre of the system, and (with the exception of brief periods under the Marquis of Pombal and the First Republic) science was proscribed, marginalised or rendered innocuous through repackaging within a humanistic framework (as in the Scientific Colonialism of Luis Carisso, described in Chapter 8). Only since the last decades of the 20th century has it been systematically promoted through legislation and funding. As for the 'modern' style of discourse, this has been consciously cultivated through academic style manuals and the occasional university course in the last ten to fifteen years (albeit unsystematically); however, there continues to be resistance against the worldview that it transmits, as can be seen by some of the comments in ***App. C:*** *Annex 2*. The result is that there is a somewhat eclectic range of discourses available to the Portuguese scholar, all of which seem to be considered equally acceptable in some areas (see ***App.A***: 42-43, Tables 4a and 4b).

This means that, although there is epistemological equivalence[4] between Portuguese and English academic discourse in some fields and genres, in others texts are governed by quite different norms. For example, history has been colonised by the discourse of science in English (Martin, 2002; 1993c, 1993b; Schleppegrell & Oliveira, 2006:262), while in Portugal, it continues to be dominated by the humanities paradigm (***App. A***: 43). Similarly, architecture, art and musicology in Portugal have been heavily influenced by postmodern currents emanating from

---

[4] The notion of 'equivalence' in translation has fallen into some disrepute in recent decades following the appearance of functional approaches (Nord, 1997: 4-8). I nevertheless find it a useful concept for comparing source- and target-culture norms governing non-literary discourses.

France (*Idem*), while in England they will rarely stray far from the empirical model in terms of discourse[5].

These epistemological disjunctions naturally cause immense difficulties for the translator, as I discuss below.

b) Ethical dimension:

Ethics has recently become a concern of translators, who – contrary to their historical role as the passive mouthpiece for authors - have started to view themselves as active agents with the power to influence the world through textual intervention. Newmark (in Schäffner [Ed.] 2002:59) advocates intervention in the interests of Enlightenment values, namely by correcting factual falsehoods, ensuring respect for human rights, etc. However, most other commentators on this issue (Venuti, 1995; Baker, 2006, 2007; Spivak, 2000) approach it from the opposite direction, militating against the universalism and supposed neutrality of the Enlightenment legacy by supporting the partisan perspectives of minority groups. The discrepancy between these two ethical positions reflects the complex relationship between the two paradigms of knowledge in this confused postmodern age.

When scientific discourse first emerged in the 17th century, it was a vehicle for democratic values, as we have seen. Deliberately setting itself against the obscurantism of the Schoolmen, it sought to enlighten and liberate rather than manipulate and enslave, cultivating reason, objectivity and universalism as part of a broader project for equality, freedom, peace and progress. Today, however, 'windowpane prose' is perceived by many as an instrument of Anglo-Saxon cultural imperialism. Not only have its neutrality and universalism been repeatedly called into question, it is also accused of conspiring with the structures of power in modern society and exacerbating global inequality.

---

[5] This can be gauged by browsing academic journals in the field in libraries or on line, a technique that I and other 'technical' translators habitually use to assess target culture expectations within particular discourse areas.

Consequently, we have seen the emergence in Anglo-American culture of emancipatory discourses that deliberately overturn the most sacred presumptions of the hegemonic one in order to give a voice to minority groups. We have also seen the development of a dense abstract critical discourse that seeks to intervene in existing texts in order to illuminate semantic dimensions that would otherwise go unnoticed. And yet - in another twist of the tale - these supposedly emancipatory and critical discourses have themselves come under attack for being obfuscatory and elitist, for cultivating a kind of 'secular mysticism' (Sokal and Bricmont, 1998: 37) that has opened the door to right-wing fundamentalism (Sokal, 2008:xvi).

In Portugal, the conflict is being played out on a quite different time frame. With the prolonged domination of the country by conservative Catholic regimes, the language-based humanities paradigm remained central up to 1974 and beyond, as we have seen. This has meant that science and the 'modern' style of discourse also retained their associations with freedom, reason and progress for much longer, particularly amongst sectors of the political left. But the situation may be changing. As the scientific paradigm encroaches further upon traditional forms of knowledge and the full extent of the global hegemony becomes known, resentment may start to build amongst academics that are forced to change their textual practices to suit changing times. Indeed, there is already some evidence of it, as we have already seen in ***Appendix C*** (*Annex II*).

In this context, the return of the language-based paradigm in the form of the 'postmodern' style is open to a number of different interpretations. Should it be seen as a form of resistance to Anglo-American cultural colonization? Does it represent the resurgence of traditional rightwing values in opposition to those of the liberal democracy currently in power? Or might it be something else completely, perhaps a manifestation of a profound dissatisfaction with the hollowness at the core of the scientific paradigm? These, after all, were the sentiments expressed by Antero de Quental in the 1890 extract quoted above, reiterated in 1921 by the Spanish philosopher, Miguel Unamuno:

> [The nineteenth century saw the growth of a kind of knowledge that was] unphilosophical and technical, dominated by a myopic specialism and by historical materialism /…/ And as it failed to satisfy, men continued their quest for happiness, but without finding it, either in wealth, or in knowledge, or in power, or in pleasure, or in resignation, or in a good conscience, or in culture. And the result was pessimism /…/ 'Give me my soul again!' – the cry of Faust….
>
> (1954: 298-9)

Today, it is not only the Iberians that are questioning the scientific paradigm on this basis. Many at the centre of the global system are starting to wonder about the value of a knowledge that has no place for the emotions, for morals, for aesthetic pleasure or indeed for the 'soul'. Consequently, alternative academic discourses have sprouted in English that deliberately cultivate the subjective and aesthetic dimensions, and books have appeared with titles such as *The Recovery of Rhetoric* (Roberts and Good [Eds.] 1993) and *Return to Reason* (Toulmin, 2001)[6] that seem to signal the beginning of a new holistic approach to knowledge in the Anglo-American world.

Thus, the choices that an English academic translator has to make during his/her professional practice have to be seen within a broad framework that has an ethical component, as well as an epistemological one. The decision to domesticate or otherwise may partly depend upon whether one sees the Portuguese ‘traditional’ style as an archaic remnant of a conservative religious mindset designed to obscure and enthral or as a legitimate weapon against a modern imperial power; whether one sympathises with a holistic approach to the pursuit of knowledge or believes that the academic enterprise should be an exclusively rational affair; whether one perceives transparency in discourse as democratic and fair or as an imperialistic ploy used by the hegemonic power to silence alternative world views. The perspective one holds may in turn depend upon which part of the polysystem one happens to be situated in at any given moment.

---

[6] Toulmin argues that the emphasis upon 'rationality' at the expense of 'reasonableness' that developed after the Enlightenment has led to a serious imbalance in our lives, which can only be countered by a form of intellectual inquiry based upon a more humane and compassionate kind of reason.

Over and above all the particular perspectives on particular discourses, one also has to ask the overriding question of whether a translator ever has the right to domesticate any text to the extent that the underlying epistemology and its attendant values are annihilated. Might this not constitute a kind of 'epistemicide’? After all, the way that a particular culture formulates its knowledge is intricately bound up with the very identity of its people, their way of making sense of the world and the value system that holds that worldview in place. Epistemicide, as the systematic destruction of rival forms of knowledge, may be nothing less than symbolic genocide.

Hence, there are ethical questions involved in academic translation that go far beyond conventional notions such as fidelity to the source text or more recent concepts such as ‘loyalty’[7]. Unfortunately, however, they frequently have to be subordinated to political and economic concerns, as I describe below.

---

[7] This is defined by Nord as 'the responsibility that translators have towards their partners in translational interaction. Loyalty commits the translator bilaterally to the source and target sides, taking account of the difference between culture-specific concepts of translation prevailing in the two cultures involved’ (1997:140, 123-5).

c) Political dimension:

The question of power is relevant both on the levels of the individual text and the discourse as a whole. Practising translators are used to weighing up the relationship between the producer and receiver of a text (along with other factors such as its pragmatic purpose[8]) in order to determine their translation strategy; but with regards to academic discourses, this principle may also be extended to the broader political scenario. That is to say, the relationship between the two paradigms of knowledge at any given level of the polysystem may play a big role in determining translation choices.

In the world system, the scientific/empirical model currently dominates in most sectors of academia due to the political and economic clout wielded by Anglophone nations, particularly the United States. Hence, a Portuguese academic who wishes to publish in a peer-reviewed international journal or participate in a major international conference will be expected to bring his/her discourse into line with the expectations of the international discourse community in that field. Given the very strict standards exacted by the most prestigious of these institutions, this usually means full domestication of the text is necessary to avoid rejection or exclusion on linguistic or epistemological grounds. The only exception to this rule is when the individual scholar in question has achieved such an international standing that the discourse community is prepared to receive his/her work on its own terms, as happened with the French poststructuralists in the 1960s, '70s and ‘80s for example. This is, however, a rare situation, and not one that faces the average translator during the normal daily working routine.

---

[8] The principle that any translation process is determined primarily by the purpose of the translational action forms the basis of *Skopos* theory, elaborated by Vermeer (1997, 2000) in the wake of work done by Katharina Reiss, and continued by Nord (1997) and others.

The situation is more complex when the text in question is directed at an institution that occupies a peripheral role in the target culture. This is the case, for example, with some journals in the field of literary studies, cultural studies, social science or other interdisciplinary areas that have espoused a postmodern approach to knowledge in defiance of the hegemonic model. These frequently employ a discourse that has been influenced by French theorists, and is therefore much closer to the Latinate model[9]. In these cases, radical domestications are largely unnecessary.

A similar situation occurs when the text receiver is actually an institution from the source culture. It is becoming increasingly common in Portugal for research centres to publish the results of their work in English in their own journals or on their websites in order to reach a broader public, thereby collapsing the distinction between text producer and text receiver. Translations of this nature will probably try to steer some kind of a middle course in order to satisfy the institution's desire to impose its own epistemological perspective and its need to attract a foreign readership.

Other complex cases are generated in situations where English is used as a lingua franca between non-Anglophone institutions. This is increasingly common on the level of the European system, where multi-institutional international research networks and partnerships are proliferating. Here the immediate power-holder (that is to say, the organising institution or team leader) often sets the tone, expecting texts produced under its auspices to conform to its national or institutional style. This means that an excessively transparent discourse may not always be appropriate. French and German humanities scholars, for example, brought up as they are on a philosophical tradition that has long jettisoned linguistic realism (Rorty, 1991:12), may expect a denser, more abstract style than is usual in EAD.

---

[9] This point was made by one Portuguese academic working in the field of Literary/Cultural Studies during the course of the survey described in ***Appendix C*** (*Annex II*: No. 93).

Hence, the power balance at every level of the polysystem will determine expectations as to how the results of academic research are presented. The fact that the scientific paradigm is dominant in Anglophone circles does not mean that it is necessarily so elsewhere, and the English language is now so widespread as a lingua franca that native speakers no longer have the monopoly over how it is used (Tribble, 2008:308). Moreover, the polysystem is a constant state of flux, and translators have to be aware of which paradigm is in the ascendancy at relevant points of it at any given moment. At present, this is not an easy question to decide.

* * *

So, to what extent may the two paradigms of knowledge be considered incommensurable and how does this affect the day-to-day operations of the academic translator?

First of all, it should be pointed out that, in practice, the situation is by no means as black and white as it is in theory. Today, there are a number of hybrid discourses in both cultures as a result of mutual influence between the paradigms. In Portugal, researchers are generally aware of the norms existing in the Anglophone world and try to modify their discourse accordingly when aiming to publish abroad (see ***App.C:***20-23*)*, and there seem to be attempts in certain disciplinary areas to fuse the two approaches to knowledge, presumably for cultural and political reasons (***App.A:***59). Meanwhile, in the English-speaking world, some literary and cultural studies departments now routinely produce an opaque Latinate style of discourse in imitation of the French poststructuralists, as we have seen (Chapter 6). This would suggest that the two paradigms are not incommensurable and that some kind of half-way house situation is in fact possible.

Secondly, it is clear that both paradigms have been present historically in both cultures at different times and that they are strongly connected to discipline. Ultimately, then, the distinction is not really between Portuguese and English, but between the *sciences* and the *humanities*, as C.P. Snow famously pointed out in 1959. In Portugal, as in England and America, academics working in the more scientific areas generally try to produce a clear objective style of prose that privileges the referential content and avoids figurative language and ambiguity, while humanities scholars everywhere are allowed much more leeway for the expression of subjectivity and the use of literary devices. The fact that Portuguese scientific writing may sometimes display features from the humanities paradigm and that English humanities writing can often seem very plain and scientific is clearly due to the fact that a different paradigm has traditionally dominated in each culture.

Nevertheless, despite the existence of common ground, there is still a large grey area that is construed differently in each language. Architecture, for example, is categorised as a physical science in the British Academic Written English Corpus (Nesi, 2008: 240), while in my corpus of Portuguese texts, it is the 'artiest' of all the disciplines, frequently employing a very extreme form of postmodern discourse. History and some texts in Psychology are also much less scientific in Portugal than they usually are in the English-speaking world. Consequently, they constitute areas of cultural disjunction that can cause particular problems for the translator.

In the next section, I shall discuss how these and other issues may be resolved in the real-life context of the professional translator.

Market-Driven Translation

However idealistic a translator may be, the fact that s/he is operating under market conditions means that it is not always possible to exercise choices on the basis of ideological or ethical judgment alone. Professionals who earn their living in this way (as opposed to 'ivory tower' academics who dabble in literary translation in their spare time) are very much constrained by real-life factors, particularly the expectations of the 'target-text user'[10], whoever or whatever that might be. These expectations in turn will depend upon political and economic forces.

The main aim of market-driven translation[11], like other commercial enterprises, is to satisfy the customer, thereby creating a potential for the expansion of one's own professional activity. If the customer has produced a research proposal, the purpose is obviously to acquire funding for that project; if s/he has written a thesis, the aim is to be awarded the degree in question. Professional translators, then, will attempt to help their customer achieve that aim by tailoring their discourse to suit the real-life situation in hand.

The strategy used will vary from case to case[12]. It will depend primarily on the nature of the aim, the context in which the action is taking place and the power-balance between the participants. However, other factors (such as the epistemological and political dimensions described above) will also enter into the equation indirectly; it is part of the translator's job, for example, to assess which paradigm is dominant in that part of the polysystem and whether the customer has sufficient status within it to impose his/her own discursive style. Unfortunately, abstract ethical concerns (be they Enlightenment-inspired or Enlightenment-resisting) rarely affect the choices made by the market-driven translator; these tend to remain the province of 'ivory tower' specialists that are not dependent upon translation for their living.

---

[10] This is one of the many agent roles in the translation process, as defined in some functional theories of translation. Others include: initiator, commissioner, source-text producer and target-text receiver, as well as the translator him/herself (Nord, 1997:19-23).

[11] This is a concept that I developed during the course of my own professional activity and have used in the training of translators (see Bennett, 2004). It obviously has much in common with *Skopos* theory and other functionalist approaches (Vermeer, 1997, 2000; Nord, 1997).

[12] As Nord (1997:29) explains, 'the *Skopos* of a particular translation task may require a "free" *or* a "faithful" translation, or anything between these two extremes, depending on the purpose for which the translation is needed. What it does *not* mean is that a good translation should *ipse facto* conform or adapt to target-culture behaviour or expectations, although the concept is often misunderstood in this way'.

Genre is clearly an important factor in this approach, and some academic genres (such as the research proposal and thesis, mentioned above) have an inherent purpose. In each of these cases, success will depend upon satisfying the expectations of the text-receiver (the grant-awarding body or the examiners respectively), which will in turn depend upon the location of that receiver within the polysystem. European or international funding authorities tend increasingly to be oriented towards the scientific paradigm, justifying a domesticating strategy on the part of the translator; local financing schemes, on the other hand, may prefer a traditional approach. Similarly, English or American juries are likely to be biased towards the scientific paradigm (unless they are from one of the peripheral disciplinary areas mentioned above), while those from countries with a strong tradition of philosophical idealism may incline towards a less empirical approach.

Course Programmes, as a genre, have both an informative and (in the current climate of crisis) appellative function, particularly when designed to be posted on the web or published in the form of a prospectus. Their target public is increasingly international, given the various mobility programmes now available to students and researchers, and this would incline them generally towards the transparent factual discourse typical of the scientific paradigm. However, this presupposition may need to be modified in the light of discipline and departmental identity. For example, a psychology or architecture programme that has a strong humanities orientation may deliberately be presented in a postmodern style as an indicator of the approach that will be adopted on the course (this in fact is what occurred with sections of the architecture prospectus included in my Corpus [ARCT-03CP-FAUP]) In such cases, a radical domestication would probably be resented by the text-producer as incompatible with the expectations of the public they are trying to reach.

The translation strategy used for genres whose function is primarily to divulge the results of research (articles, conference papers, reports, full-length monographs, multi-authored volumes, etc) will also be determined largely by the text receiver. In cases where research institutes are publishing their own work, as mentioned above, the distinction between text producer and receiver is collapsed, and the need for assimilation to target culture norms is reduced. However, it is perhaps more common for translation to be requested by academics or institutions that are hoping to secure publication of their work abroad. In these cases, it is the international discourse community within the particular area that calls the tune. The market-oriented translator will thus try to conform to the journal's house style or publisher's guidelines in order to maximise the text's chances of acceptance.

An exception to this scenario is (as we have said) when the academic in question has such a high profile that they have been invited to contribute by an editor or colleague. In these cases, a more source-text oriented approach is often in order as a result of the altered power balance between the two principal agents in the process.

As for abstracts, these may be either prospective (describing research that has not yet been undertaken in order to acquire funding, secure a place at a conference, etc) or retrospective (summarising work already completed). Once again, the differences in purpose will determine translation strategy. A prospective abstract will usually need to conform to text-receiver expectations more closely than a retrospective one in order to ensure that its aim is achieved.

Ultimately, though, the academic translator cannot be held wholly responsible for all the discourse decisions made during the process of intercultural communication. Given the practical difficulties of reformulating a text construed entirely according to the norms of one paradigm into a discourse that will conform in all respects to the other, one hopes today for a certain degree of intercultural awareness on the part of the text producer. That is to say, it is helpful to the translator if the original text has been written with a particular public in mind; this will ensure that the more extravagant features of the 'traditional' or 'postmodern' style will be omitted or attenuated if the text receiver is likely to be unsympathetic.

In the next and final chapter, I shall look at some of the concrete issues that have arisen during the course of my own experience as an academic translator in Portugal.

Chapter 10

Translating Portuguese Academic Discourse: the Practice

One of the consequences of the different historical path followed by Portuguese as opposed to English is that the split between ‘factual’ or objective knowledge, and ‘fictional’ or subjective representation, that took place after the Enlightenment failed to happen. This is reflected in the language on different levels. In Portuguese, like most other Romance languages, the same word (*história*) is still used for both ‘history’ and ‘story’; *ciência* (literally ‘science’) still covers all kinds of knowledge, including that provided by textual analysis, philosophy and even theology[1]; and *experiência* continues to be used for both ‘experience’ (subjective, holistic) and ‘experiment’ (scientific, objective). Similarly, the moral aspect of knowledge implicit in the humanities tradition is retained in Portuguese in words such as *consciência,* which means both moral ‘conscience’ and the objective ‘consciousness’, and *educação*, which is 'upbringing' (i.e. character development) as well as the more cognitive 'education'.[2]

---

[1] The redefinition of ‘*ciência*’ brought about by the development of empiricism and positivism was strongly resisted in Portugal. Cardinal Cerejeira begins his work *A Igreja e o Pensamento Contemporâneo* (Coimbra Editora, 1924:5-6) with the following observation: ‘Há duas maneiras de entender a palavra *sciência*: - no sentido genérico de todo o conhecimento scientífico, isto é, elaborado por processos scientíficos, e portanto rigoroso - e no restricto, de conhecimento apenas experimental. No primeiro caso, compreende-se a sciência *strictu sensu*, ou o estudo dos *fenómenos*; a história, ou o estudo dos *acontecimentos*; e a filosofia, ou o estudo das *naturezas*'. He goes on to affirm that religious knowledge is the most complete knowledge of all as it not only pronounces upon nature and events, but also reveals supernatural mysteries and confirms truths accessible to reason. Similar sentiments are expressed by Canon Henrique José Marques (1965:13): '/.../ a cultura humana não pode estreitar-se ou circunscrever os seus voos à ciência dos sentidos e às ciências do espírito, negando-lhes capacidade de alcance metafísico suprasensível. A metafísica é precisamente a ciência do intelecto humano, sendo a ciência do ser que fecunda o espírito e é o solo natural onde germina’. Today, the older broader sense is retained particularly (though not exclusively) in collocations such as 'conselho científico', 'revista científico', etc.

[2] See Williams (1983/1976) for a historical account of the semantic trajectory followed by each of these terms in English.

This naturally raises problems for translation into English. For example, while Faria (2003:55) renders Humboldt's notion of *Bildung durch Wissenschaft* relatively unproblematically into Portuguese as *educação/formação através da ciência*, the term is notoriously difficult to translate concisely in English. Indeed, Readings (1996: 64-67) devotes several pages to the question, explaining that *Wissenschaft* is philosophical as well as scientific knowledge, while *Bildung* has a strong moral component and therefore cannot be translated simply by 'education'. This suggests a fundamental philosophical split between English and Portuguese (and indeed German) in this area of culture[3].

Portuguese and Spanish, being closer to Latin, also reveal obvious etymological traces of older meanings that are no longer evident in English. For example, words like 'data' and 'facts', which in English we associate strongly with the scientific paradigm, have cognates in *dados/datos* and *factos/hechos*; yet, as these words are derived from the verbs 'to give' and 'to do/make' respectively, they continue stubbornly to suggest 'things given' and 'things done or made' (indeed, in the case of *dados* and *hechos*, the nouns are identical with the Past Participle forms of the verb). The very language thereby implies the presence of a giver or a maker.

However, this humanities orientation, while evident in the Portuguese language as a whole, does not permeate all the discourses used in academia. As we have seen, there also exists a 'modern' style that is grounded upon an empirical epistemology and is therefore very similar to EAD in structure. Texts construed in this style usually do not contain many of the semantic ambiguities mentioned above. They may, though, present translation difficulties of a syntactical nature, mostly deriving from structural differences between the two languages in question.

---

[3] Examples from the Corpus of semantic problems of this type include the uses of 'consciência', 'ciência' and 'história' in the following extracts: '*É certo que a crescente racionalização das consciências e a atitude de uma boa parte do clero impediu que a viragem do século tivesse sido vivida com qualquer temor de fundo milenarista'* (HIST-06Art-FC); '*Trata-se de uma peça magnífica, em que a boa tradição do trabalho do ferro, animada pelas impressões moduladoras da luz e pela ambivalência das formas, se une a um jogo reflexivo /.../ sobre a praxis da ciência na sua relação com a efemeridade da vida'* (ART-08Art-VS2); '*Este conjunto de episódios, aparentemente desligados, mas que resultam estar indelevelmente conectados pela presença do rio, perfazem uma história que o Parque Patrimonial do Mondego pretende narrar. E como vai fazê-lo? Como pretende o parque contar uma história geral ou as várias histórias que se entrecruzam no espaço e no tempo?'*

In this final chapter, then, I shall discuss the practice of translating Portuguese academic texts in a real-life situation, looking at each of the three major discourse types in turn. The section on the 'modern' style will centre upon technical questions of the kind mentioned above, illustrated with examples from the Corpus. My discussion of the Traditional and 'postmodern' styles, on the other hand, will focus upon epistemological, ethical and political issues arising from individual texts; these sections will therefore be organised around particular case studies, considered as concrete examples of translational activity in specific sociocultural contexts. Finally I shall look briefly at the question of hybrids (i.e. texts with features of more than one style).

1) The 'modern' style

The 'modern' style does not raise many problems for translation, given its inherent similarities to EAD. However, as has already been pointed out, there are some syntactical features of Portuguese texts that require reformulation in English, namely the phenomenon of the Fronted Passive, which is grammatically impossible to reproduce literally in English, and certain uses of the Gerund. In addition to these, there is the question of Nominalizations, which are common in scientific discourse but which inevitably have to be presented with a different word order in English. I will discuss each of these in turn.

i. Fronted Passives

Although the English language does not have a reflexive voice as Portuguese does, most reflexives are readily translatable into English by a verb + reflexive pronoun, active or intransitive verb, or by a passive structure, depending upon function (see ***App.A***: 20-21 and Chapter 7). However, the phenomenon of verbal fronting, which frequently occurs with both the reflexive passive and the '*ser*' passive and is particularly common in scientific texts, can often cause problems for the English translator.

Johns (1991) examines the question of interlanguage strategies for dealing with fronted passives in his study of academic abstracts in Brazilian Portuguese and English. He identifies five different strategies used by translators when rendering these forms into English, namely: i) conversion into an (A)SV structure; ii) reformulation as a nominalisation; iii) direct transfer of the (A)VS structure into English; iv) pro-form insertion; and v) use of the active instead of passive.

Of these alternatives, I myself regularly use Strategies 1, 2, 4 and 5 for dealing with this phenomenon, as can be seen in the Corpus. Strategy 3, however, is agrammatical in English. Johns includes it because his study is descriptive rather than prescriptive, but he does point out that most of the translations in his corpus have been done by Brazilians rather than by native speakers of English. As it is unequivocally wrong, I do not consider it as a possible solution. The others, however, are described below in more detail using examples from my own Corpus (these are not restricted to Abstracts, as in Johns' study).

Conversion into (A)SV structure:

This is the simplest option, involving the passive voice in English and maintaining the normal word order with the grammatical subject coming before the verb.

> *'Descrevem-se três casos clínicos de crianças de apresentação invulgar'* ('Three clinical cases are described of children with unusual symptoms') (MED-00Abs-IA)
>
> *Escolheram-se três áreas metropolitanas de características distintas: Lisboa, Porto e Coimbra.* ('Three very different metropolitan areas have been chosen, namely Lisbon, Oporto and Coimbra' (GEOG-06Abs-PS2)
>
> *Procedeu-se a uma análise diferencial dos sexos de forma a determinar diferenças estatisticamente ao nível da prevalência e da tipologia...* ('A differential analysis was performed to establish statistical differences between the sexes as regards prevalence and type…') (PSY-07Abs-MDFS2)
>
> *Para a sua calibração utilizou-se o programa OxCal 3.5* (This was calibrated using the programme OxCal 3.5) (ARLG-02Art-SOJ)
>
> *Por estes fundamentos, pede-se ao juiz que não seja concedida* a liminar de reintegração de posse… ('On these grounds, the court is asked not to grant the preliminary injunction…') (LAW-08Art-BSS1)

However, this strategy may not be possible in some situations for various reasons. In those cases an alternative solution has to be sought.

Use of the Active:

When the verb does not take the passive in English or if the information following it is excessively complex, it may be necessary to transform the sentence into the active.

> *...procurou-se determinar a relação entre os comportamentos de bullying e outras formas de comportamento social (comportamentos toxicodependentes e comportamentos delinquentes)* ('…we attempted to determine the relationship between bullying and other forms of

> social behaviour, such as drug addiction and delinquency') (PSY-07Abs-MDFS2)

However, the problem with this solution is that it converts an impersonal statement into a personal one, an equivocal strategy if the author of the original text has gone to some lengths to be objective.

More acceptable is the use of the Impersonal Active, which is a very common device in EAD (see Chapter 4 above), particularly useful for the translation of aim statements.

> *Com este trabalho pretende-se analisar e avaliar as condições higrotérmicas de um museu sem sistemas de climatização permanente* ('This work aims to analyse and assess the hygrothermal conditions of a museum that is not equipped with permanent air-conditioning') (ENG-08Abs-CF)

> *Neste artigo discutem-se as vantagens e desvantagens da utilização de uma haste tibial com uma femoral relativamente à utilização única de uma haste femoral.* ('This article discusses the advantages and disadvantages of using tibial and femoral stems jointly as opposed to the use of a femoral stem alone') (MED-06-Abs-AC2)

> *...pretendeu-se aprofundar o processo de construção social que lhe esteve subjacente* ('…this chapter explores the process of social construction underlying this great sporting event') (SOC-05Abs-SM8)

Nominalization:

An alternative way to formulate the aim statement in English involves the use of a nominalization.

> *Com esta candidatura visa-se consolidar, dinamizar e promover a investigação científica desenvolvida em três unidades da Faculdade de Economia da Universidade de Coimbra.* ('The objective of this application is to promote and consolidate the scientific research developed in three units of the Faculty of Economics, University of Coimbra') (SOC-02RP-CES2)

> *Não se pretende com esta investigação qualquer generalização ou falso universalismo...* ('The aim of the study is not to arrive at any general or universal conclusions…') (EDUC-07Abs-CQ)

Nominalizations are also used occasionally in my Corpus to translate other fronted passive situations besides aim statements.

> *…não se podem adoptar posturas de alheamento e, muito menos de indiferença.* ('…alienation and indifference are clearly inappropriate responses') (EDUC-06Abs-ZR)

However, this kind of solution is less common, possibly because it represents a greater departure from the source text that it not always justified.

Pro-form insertion:

This involves reformulation using an impersonal structure with 'it'.

> *Reconhece-se actualmente que o ambiente /.../ influencia o bem-estar individual e comunitário.* ('It is now recognised that the environment…influences individual and community wellbeing'). (GEOG-06Abs-PS2)
>
> *No nosso estudo constatou-se que os homens referem significativamente em menor percentagem a presença destes sintomas do que as mulheres* ('In our study, it was found that men mentioned these symptoms considerably less than women') (PHA-05Frag3Art-SS1)
>
> *Deve-se ter em conta que, à excepção da data mais antiga, as restantes incluem-se perfeitamente no intervalo de ocupação pré-histórica de Castelo Velho.* ('It should be borne in mind that all except the oldest date may be included in the span of prehistoric occupation of Castelo Velho) (ARLG-02-SOJ)

All of these strategies attempt to deal with the grammatical problem raised by verbal fronting using devices that are usual features of EAD. The only one that is equivocal is transformation into the active voice with a personal subject, as mentioned above. However, given the increased acceptability of personal pronouns in certain fields (**App. B**:15-19), this was felt to be a viable option in some situations.

ii. Gerunds:

The *gerúndio* in Portuguese, like the Present Participle in English, may be used to express many different kinds of syntactic relations[4] (***App. A***:23-25), which means that it can be source of ambiguity. Given the high value put on precision in EAD, particularly in more scientific areas, it often needs to be reconstrued in translation using a more explicit structure.

However, the precise nature of the relationship is not always clear from the context, as in the following example:

> *A reconstrução do ligamento cruzado anterior utilizando um enxerto sintetizado in vitro pela engenharia tecidular é cada vez mais uma realidade, evitando os riscos do aloenxerto e da morbilidade associada à colheita do autoenxerto.* (MED-06Abs-ACS)

Should we understand that the process described in the first clause is becoming more common *because* it avoids the risks associated with allografts and with autograft harvesting[5]?

> i.e. The reconstruction of the anterior cruciate ligament using a graft synthesized in vitro by tissue engineering is becoming increasingly common *due to the fact that* it avoids the risk of the allograft and the morbidity associated with the harvesting of the autograft.

---

[4] These include temporality (anteriority, posteriority, simultaneity), causality, consequence, purpose, condition and concession. The gerund is also frequently used in Portuguese for relations that would normally be expressed in English using a simple coordinating structure.

[5] i.e.'The reconstruction of the anterior cruciate ligament using a graft synthesized in vitro by tissue engineering is becoming increasingly common *due to the fact that* it avoids the risk of the allograft and the morbidity associated with the harvesting of the autograft.'

Or is the reduction in those risks being presented as a *consequence* of the procedure becoming more widespread, which has occurred for other reasons (economic or technical factors, for example)?

> i.e. The reconstruction of the anterior cruciate ligament using a graft synthesized in vitro by tissue engineering is becoming increasingly common, *thereby avoiding* the risk of the allograft and the morbidity associated with the harvesting of the autograft.

Alternatively, the participle phrase (*gerúndio*) may be unrelated to the increased use of the technique, but instead qualifies the first part of the main clause:

> i.e. The reconstruction of the anterior cruciate ligament using a graft synthesized in vitro by tissue engineering, *which avoids the risk of the allograft and the morbidity associated with the harvesting of the autograft*, is becoming increasingly common.

As I did not have the opportunity to clarify this issue with the author directly, I avoided taking a decision by splitting the sentence in two and allowing the relationship between them to remain inexplicit.

> The reconstruction of the anterior cruciate ligament using a graft synthesized in vitro by tissue engineering is becoming increasingly common. It avoids the risk of the allograft and the morbidity associated with the harvesting of the autograft.

This option has the advantage of reducing syntactic complexity while leaving all the interpretative possibilities open. On the other hand, the lack of a linker causes a minor loss of fluency, and transfers the burden of filling in the gaps to the reader. In this particular context of a highly specialized orthopaedic journal, it is hoped that the target readership would have sufficient background knowledge to be able to do so.

However, such an open-ended solution is not always possible. For example, in the following sentence, the translator is obliged to opt for one or another interpretation of the gerund in *'sendo possível*'.

> *Aparentemente, sendo possível, deve-se evitar o uso de hastes femorais em conjunto com a prótese tibial de base sem haste." (MED-07Abs-AC5)*

The problem is compounded by the fact that the subject of '*sendo*' is also elliptical. Hence, the choices are between 'although it is possible' (in which case 'it' refers to the use of femoral stems with stemless tibial components'), 'as it is possible' (where 'it' refers to the avoidance of the use of femoral stems with stemless tibial components), 'when/wherever possible' and 'if possible'.

In situations like this, a translator has to make use of commonsense, taking the rest of the context as a guide.

iii. Nominalizations

Nominalizations are of course a very important feature of EAD and also feature heavily in the Portuguese 'modern' style, where they occupy a similar technical role. However, an important difference is caused by the grammar of the language, which determines that all qualifying information in a noun phrase must follow the head, rather than being distributed both before and after it, as in English. This means that the kind of compound noun structure that is so common in scientific English (where qualifying nouns and adjectives essentially lose their independent status and become absorbed into the technical term[6]) is not usually possible in Portuguese. Hence, it is not easy to distinguish between a noun that is being qualified by other nouns and adjectives, and an accepted technical term.

For example, the term 'wall base ventilation system' is rendered in Portuguese as '*sistema de ventilação da base das paredes*' (ENG-06Abs+Art-AG1), which could also mean 'ventilation system at the base of walls'; a 'triptan-induced contraction' is indistinguishable from a 'contraction induced by triptans' ('*contracção induzida por*

---

[6] See Halliday (1993a, b; 1998) for a description of how this repackaging process occurs on different time scales (logogenetic, phyllogenetic and ontogenetic).

triptanos' – PHA-06AbsPhD-SS2); and 'supply-side economic reforms' ('*reformas do lado da oferta da economia*' – ECON-08Abs-MA) could also be translated as 'reforms on the supply side of the economy'. Other examples are: '*cortina de contenção hidráulica*' (ENG-08Abs-FM1); '*células transicionais superficial da bexiga*' (MED-00Art-Anon); '*reboco à base de cal*' (ENG-08Abs-VPF1) and '*construto de indecisão na carreira*' (PSY-03Art-TS).

The fact that most of the technical terms used by Portuguese scientists were originally coined in English and then translated into Portuguese is both a curse and a blessing for the English translator. It means that there is no excuse for not using the correct term (important for the text's author not only because control of technical terminology is a vital aspect of securing discourse community membership but also because the meaning of the whole structure may be affected if the words are presented in the wrong word). Sometimes the Portuguese version is far from transparent. For example, it is not easy to guess that '*risco do crédito aos consumidores*' (ECON-04Art-CF1) is in fact 'consumer over-indebtedness' in English, or that '*sistema de moldação por reacção*' (ENG-03Art-PM) is actually 'Reaction Injection Moulding', commonly abbreviated to 'RIM'. Moreover, in some fields, terminology has not yet been standardized in Portuguese, which means that different authors may translate the same term in different ways[7].

On the other hand, authors of technical texts often facilitate the translator's task by providing the specialised terminology at the outset or by making themselves available for consultation. There are now also ample resources available in the form of online terminological databases, concordancers and translation memory tools, not to mention simple Internet searches to find the relative occurrences of all the possible translations one can think of for a particular term. Hence, an experienced technical translator will usually be able to locate the correct word in a relatively short time.

---

[7] There are, however, projects under way to develop terminological glossaries and databases in Portuguese in a wide variety of technical areas. See for example the online resource centre Linguateca (www.linguateca.pt).

In the 'modern' style of academic discourse, then, a great deal of research is often needed in order to manage the technical vocabulary typical of more scientific subjects. Nevertheless, these kinds of texts are still relatively easy for the English translator; the grammar is usually simple, the language used in a denotative way and the overall structure of the text mirrors that typical of EAD. In comparison, the 'traditional' and 'postmodern' styles raise problems of an altogether different order, as we shall see.

2) The 'traditional' style

The 'traditional' style of Portuguese academic discourse brings many problems for the translator due to the fact that it is predicated on an entirely different approach to knowledge, as described above. This has concrete repercussions, not only on the level of syntax (long complex sentences with heavy subordination, verbless sentences, etc), lexis (archaic or poetic diction, high levels of abstraction, etc) but also on the level of the text as a whole. There are differences not only as regards how the information is organized, but also in the amount of information that is included. English translators of Portuguese academic texts have to consider how to deal with *redundancy*, since this is another common feature of this discourse. As we have seen, traditional rhetoric, particularly the grand style of Cicero or the copiousness of Erasmus, both of which clearly influenced Portuguese discourse of the humanities a great deal, valued the mellifluous polysyllabic sentence; this meant that words were often included not for what they added to the meaning, but for their rhythmic pattern or sound, and for the shape they gave to the phrase

The Portuguese propensity for indirectness also causes problems for the English translator. Probably for the stylistic reasons indicated above, there is a tendency on all levels (sentence, paragraph, text) to *embed*, *adorn* or *defer* the main idea to such an extent that a reader untrained in the discourse may not easily perceive the point that is being made. Hence, if the translated text is destined for an international journal or institution, these features may have to be completely domesticated in order to prevent rejection.

In this section, I will concentrate upon particular case studies involving texts from the Corpus that I have been asked to translate at particular times. The linguistic problems raised by the discourse style and the translation strategies adopted will be discussed in the light of the particular circumstances of production and reception in each case.

Case Study 1: HIST-92Art-JMS[8]

This history article, which was presented to me in the early days of my translating career, throws into particularly sharp relief the epistemological disjunction that may exist between the context of production and context of reception, and provides a particularly poignant illustration of some of the dilemmas that may face the academic translator in Portugal. This is because the author of the text, a specialist in Portuguese history, who wished to publish in international journals, had a very low level of English and almost no awareness of the different conventions governing textual production in the Anglophone world. Not only did he make no attempt to adjust his style in accordance with target culture expectations, but actively resisted my attempts to do so, on the grounds that his 'voice was lost'. Only when the translated text was rejected by a journal on linguistic grounds did he relent and allow me to rewrite it as I saw fit. Hence, I ultimately produced two very different translations of the same article, one that was more source-text oriented, designed to satisfy my immediate client (the author), and another that was entirely domesticated in order to satisfy the requirements of the text receiver (the journal).

---

[8] As this article was written and translated before personal computers were widespread, I no longer have a copy of the complete text. The two extracts that I kept for teaching purposes are labelled and included in the Corpus, but have not been registered in the database or considered in the statistical analysis presented in ***Appendix A***.

The following extract contains many of the Distinguishing Discourse Markers listed in ***Appendix A*** (Complex Sentences, Framing Devices, Deferred Topic, Historic Tenses, Personal References, Reflexives, etc). As a consequence, it requires extensive reformulation in order to become acceptable to English language discourse norms.

> *E, ainda antes de avançarmos, seja-nos permitido relevar, por um lado, a dimensão do modo de vida dos que não só em Lisboa, como no Porto e em outras cidades e vilas litorâneas, se dedicavam aos serviços da fretagem naval, bem como ao transporte de encomendas e ao comércio marítimo, a ponto de uma outra carta régia, também de 1414, para evitar burocracias excessivas, aceitar como prova dos direitos alfandegários o juramento dos mestres do navios reinóis e dos mercadores que fretassem navios estrangeiros; por outro, registe-se a já crónica dependência nacional em relação ao trigo de fora, designadamente ao do Noroeste Europeu e do Mediterráneo.*

The complexity of the extract is due largely to the tendency to pack large amounts of information into a single sentence by means of subordination. The 'facts', which in English would probably be placed in the main clause, are here presented only indirectly, embedded in a framework that instead highlights the interpersonal dimension of the writer/reader relationship ('*e, ainda antes de avançarmos, seja-nos permitido relevar…*'). Moreover, the precise nature of the connection between the various circumstances described (the royal charter, the lifestyle of the merchants, the dependence on foreign wheat, etc) is not made explicit.

My first translation - the one that was submitted for publication, out of respect for the author's wishes - was in fact a compromise between the author's style and the preferred style in English. It involved splitting the long sentence into several shorter ones, pruning away much of the subordination, and replacing the magisterial 'we' of the first sentence by an impersonal construction. Thus, 'allow us to point out' becomes 'two things need to be pointed out', which also functions as a topic sentence, thus imposing English paragraph structure.

> Before we proceed, two things need to be pointed out. Firstly, the lifestyle of those involved in the shipping industry, not only in Lisbon, but also in Oporto and other towns and cities along the coast, was so lavish that another royal charter, also issued in 1414, reduced excessive bureaucracy by allowing the shipmaster's word (in the case of Portuguese ships, and the merchant's in the case of freighted foreign vessels) to be taken as proof of customs rights. Secondly, the country was already registering a chronic dependence on foreign wheat from northwest Europe and the Mediterranean.

A more thorough domestication, however, requires a change in focus. The following version thus removes the interpersonal frame completely, fronts factual information about the royal charter (as a given from which to proceed to the new) and also makes explicit the connections between the various circumstances mentioned.

> Another royal charter, also of 1414, reduced bureaucracy by allowing the shipmaster's word (in the case of Portuguese ships, the merchant's in the case of freighted foreign vessels) to be taken as proof of customs rights. This illustrated the immense power wielded by those involved in the shipping industry in Lisbon, Oporto and other coastal cities and towns, and also reflected the chronic national dependence on foreign wheat from northwest Europe and the Mediterranean.

This clearly illustrates the extent to which the process of adapting this text for foreign consumption involves far more than merely replacing one chain of signifiers with another. The very organization of the discourse - the information that is focused upon or omitted, the length of clauses, degree of explicitness etc – reflects a whole different attitude to language and to knowledge, a difference that is clearly not recognized by the editors of international journals.

Case Study 2: MUS-06Art-VN

The following extract is from the introduction to a much more recent article in the field of Musicology. Once again, it was being translated for submission to an international journal, hence a strategy of domestication was adopted to maximise the article's chances of being accepted.

> *Diante de quem o lê ou escreve, o termo 'estilo' rasga um vertiginoso campo aberto. Isto dever-se-á tanto ao facto de envolver uma quantidade ilimitada de dados dificilmente mensuráveis, não passíveis de uma organização inteiramente satisfatória, na perspectiva do musicólogo, como, na do intérprete, por despertar, enquanto 'palavra-faísca', intensas lembranças de experiências contrastantes na sua trajectória musical e pessoal. Para tal, o músico toma como referência não só a prática de repertório e a literatura especializada que conhece, como também a sua observação de outras modalidades de arte e até de vivências não exclusivamente ligadas ao ofício artístico, ainda que muitas vezes a revelação daí advinda se cinja unicamente à perturbação de certezas anteriores, reacendendo o processo, inserindo-o numa busca infindável — à procura dos estilos e da sua relação com cada um, ou até do estilo próprio, no caso do compositor —, sendo esta uma trajectória individual e intransferível, ainda que partilhada.*

Despite the fact that the text as a whole is a largely analytical discussion of the effects produced by different kinds of musical notation and describes an entirely tangible experiment in graphic reproduction, the discourse used in this introduction clearly subscribes to a neo-romantic idealistic view of the creative process. Terms like *'palavra-faísca'*, '*reacendendo*', '*revelação*', '*busca infindável'*, etc, evoke Romantic discourse on divine inspiration, while even relatively banal notions are expressed in emotionally violent language (eg. '*rasga um vertiginoso campo aberto*'; '*despertar /.../ intensas lembranças'*).

Again, the syntax is also anything but clear and linear, with a sprouting of subordination that defies translation into a language like English. The last sentence in particular illustrates very well the Portuguese tendency to cultivate verbal foliage that, to English eyes, only obscures the main trunk of the argument. In order to make this text acceptable within the target discourse, we have had to implement some quite serious alterations.

> To anyone using it, the term 'style' is a bewilderingly broad concept. For the musicologist, it is not easy to categorise and measure; while, for the musician, it is likely to be associated with intense personal memories of different situations experienced over the course of a musical career. The musician gets around the problem in performance by relying on current practice and specialist literature concerning the repertoire in question, and also possibly by consulting other art forms, including those that are not exclusively artistic - even though the effect of this may be merely to unsettle any previous preconceptions s/he once had and stimulate further quest.

The flamboyant emotive terms of the original have mostly been replaced by more matter-of-fact equivalents, while familiar-sounding collocations from the target discourse ('broad concept'; 'not easy to categorise and measure'; 'current practice'; 'unsettle preconceptions', etc) have been introduced in order to assimilate the text to target discourse expectations. As regards the syntax, the last sentence has been quite radically pruned in order to make the argument more linear, and elsewhere the information has been reorganized in the interests of clarity and cohesion. In places, connections have been made more explicit by the introduction of new elements.

This strategy clearly has repercussions on the underlying ideology as well as upon the surface 'feel' of the text. In this case, the author, while accepting the need for such alterations, expressed his disgruntlement at the hegemony of English in the Survey of Portuguese Researchers, suggesting that Italian, or even Latin, might be a more appropriate lingua franca in his discipline (***App.C***. *Annex II*: No. 22).

Case Study 3: LIT-01Other-CEC2

The following short text (taken from the blurb on the cover of a volume of conference proceedings) illustrates another characteristic of Portuguese discourse that may cause problems for the translator, namely the habit of deferring the main information (***App.A***: 26-28) instead of presenting it in first place, as might be expected in English. Each of the two sentences that make up the following paragraph is organized in this way.

> *Se algo caracteriza a construção narrativa da modernidade, é certamente a forma como a percepção do outro se torna cada vez mais central para os projectos de descrição do mundo. Assim, quer se trate do modo como a consciência da etnicidade ganha os seus contornos em narrativas de viagens dos séculos XVIII e XIX, ou colabora na construção da noção de mestiçagem na sociedade brasileira do século XX; quer se trate de compreender a forma como a construção da figura moderna do "artista" o propõe como lugar de uma diferença social e simbólica; quer se trate, finalmente, do estudo de um desses casos exemplares, que o paradigma goetheano declina na própria forma como pensa a noção de Weltliteratur – o certo é que todas estas narrativas da modernidade a pensam a partir do modo pelo qual o outro é construído e incorporado ao discurso do sujeito, de formas muitas vezes paradoxais.*

Although with some manipulation, English does permit a similar word order to the original (as in my translation below), a more complete domestication would probably require an inversion of the long sentence so that the main clause is presented in first position. In practice, however, it was not necessary to domesticate further, as the translation was commissioned by the research unit that published the conference proceedings in question. This represents a collapse of the text-producer/text receiver distinction, which naturally brought repercussions on translation strategy.

What is completely alien to English, however, is the persistent use of an abstract subject with a material or verbal process in the Active voice (i.e. '*a consciência da etnicidade /.../ colabora..*'; '*o paradigma goetheano declina…*'; '*a* *construção da figura moderna do "artista" o propõe…'* etc), a form which seems to suggest that the abstract fruits of human thought have a kind of autonomy and are able to produce effects in the world independent of the individuals that call them into being. While this kind of structure is common in Portuguese and probably reflects a worldview unbound by Cartesian dualisms (see ***App.A***. 37-38 and Chapter 7 above), it sounds strange to the English ear as an overt personification of an unremittingly abstract entity[9]. Moreover, it is specifically denounced by some of the authors of style manuals as a kind of 'anthropomorphism' that can lead to 'absurd propositions' (Dunleavy [2003: 118-119 **Bibl.** ***App.B***] quoted in Chapter 4).

For these reasons, I felt it necessary to reformulate these structures into passives or nominalisations, in order to achieve minimal levels of acceptability to an Anglophone readership. This was because, despite the power detained by the research unit over the terms of the intercultural transaction, the fact that translation had been requested at all suggested that it was interested in divulging its work to a broader public. Such features in an English text would, I felt, be interpreted by many in the international discourse community as bad writing, and would thus ultimately reflect upon the reputation of the unit concerned.

> If the narrative construction of modernity can be characterised by anything at all, it is by the increasingly central position occupied by perceptions of the Other in descriptions of the world. Whether concerned with the development of ethnic awareness in travel literature of the 18th and 19th centuries, and its part in the construction of the notion of the *mestizo* in Brazilian society in the 20th century; the construction of the modern figure of the 'artist' as a locus of social and symbolic difference; or the study of any of these examples, epitomised by the Goethean paradigm in the notion

---

[9] Of course, the Impersonal Active is a common feature of EAD too, as we have seen. However, it would seem that the range of permissible noun-verb collocations used with such structures is very limited. The subject is restricted to concrete entities (eg. 'this paper/article/chapter argues...') or to technical terms that have been nominalized from observable processes, and the verb that can be used with them seems to be limited to existential or …processes (see Chapter 4). Dunleavy (2003:118-119, quoted in Chapter 4) even objects to making human institutions such as 'society' or 'learning organizations' into the active agent in a process.

> of *Weltliteratur*, all these narratives of modernity are organised around the construction of the Other and the often paradoxical ways in which this construction is incorporated into the discourse of the subject.

This situation, therefore, offers a good example of the kind of middle course that a translator often has to steer when there is a conflict between the customer's overt purpose (i.e. to publish its works on its own terms, in accordance with the specific epistemology that orients its production) and its implicit one (to make that work known to a wider public). Hence, my strategy was to reformulate those aspects which were unequivocally alien in English, while maintaining surface features that, while not standard style, were also not totally unfamiliar.

The extract quoted in Case Study 3 draws to some extent upon postmodern discourses in both content and form (it was in fact allocated a Deviance Factor of -3), in keeping with the epistemological orientation of the research centre that produced it. However, I have considered it here as an example of the 'traditional' style because it is by no means as extreme as some of the other texts in my Corpus. These are what we shall look at next.

3) The 'postmodern' style

As we saw in Chapter 7, the texts that have been labelled 'postmodern' in the Corpus do not form a coherent discourse like the Modern and 'traditional' styles; instead, a variety of anti-hegemonic attitudes have been adopted in keeping with the anti-essentialist project of Postmodernism itself. Hence, there are texts that seem to be cultivating the kind of opaque abstract style typical of post-Derridean Critical Theory; some that adopt an elliptical poetic approach or flowing stream-of-consciousness style, and others that are fragmented patchworks made up of snippets of different genres and styles.

In this section, I shall look again at the extracts discussed in Chapter 7, this time from the translational perspective.

Case Study 4: ARCT-03CP-FAUP (p.25)

As explained in Chapter 7, this extract is taken from one of the many course descriptions included in a prospectus for an Architecture Faculty. The prospectus as a whole varies widely as regards discourse, with some course programmes being presented in a conventional informative manner, others employing the rather pompous verbose tone typical of the 'traditional' style and others assuming a deliberately postmodern stance. This is the case of the following extract from the course entitled '*Espaços de Habitar e Formas de Residência'* ('Habitation Spaces and Forms of Residence', p.25).

> *Na longa duração que se (contra)diz-(des)faz na/pela circunstância, entre o excesso de liberdade e o excesso de vigilância, a arquitectura inscreve nesse duplo risco o que a sua teoria identificou como argumentação problemática de arte e utilidade, abstracto e concreto, físico e virtual, local e global. Dos programas tratados pelo arquitecto, o da habitação (o domínio do privado, a medida do doméstico, a distância do íntimo – por condição um entre, é, provavelmente, o que mais acentuadamente sublinha-sublima, contamina-permuta essas dualidades, contaminações, circuitos, redes.*

As I have already pointed out (Chapter 7), there are features of this passage that deliberately mark a postmodern orientation, such as wordplay ('*se (contra)diz-(des)faz*'), soundplay ('*sublinha-sublima, contamina-permuta*'), deliberate agrammaticalities ('*um entre*') and the use of certain 'buzzwords' from the poststructuralist lexicon (*'dualidades, contaminações, circuitos, redes*', etc). These features effectively signal to the potential student the way in which the subject matter will be approached on the course. Clearly, the perspective will not be a scientific/empirical one (as we might expect from the courses entitled 'Redes e Instalações', p.42; 'Patologias de Construção', p.53; and 'Infraestruturas e Redes Urbanas', p. 54, which are presented in the prospectus in a much more factual straightforward way). Instead, the constructed landscape is itself conceived as a text that can be decoded and read, and architectural practice as a way of intervening in that landscape.

In Anglophone culture, this postmodern approach to the physical landscape has found expression in the work of David Harvey (1973, 1985) and Edward Soja (1989), who make use of a similar lexicon[10], and there are also many authors working in Critical Theory that cultivate this kind of opaque discourse (Chapter 6 above). Indeed, the challenge of translating poststructuralist writing has been quite extensively theorized by authors such as Davis (2001), Lewis (1985), Spivak (1993) etc. However, in this particular instance, the translator has to weigh the ideological issue against other more pragmatic concerns. If one attempts to reproduce all the surface effects of the original in the translation, this might result in a loss of intelligibility that could be counterproductive to the ultimate purpose of the text, namely to attract students to the course. Moreover, architecture in Anglophone culture generally has a much more empirical and scientific orientation (see Chapter

---

[10] 'The landscape has a textuality that we are just beginning to be able to understand, for we have only recently been able to see it whole and to 'read' it with respect to its broader movements and inscribed events and meanings. Harvey's 'inaugural' reading focuses upon the hard logics of the landscape, its knife-edge paths, its points of perpetual struggle, its devastating architectonics, its insistent wholeness. Here, capital is the crude and restless *auteur*. It strives and negotiates, creates and destroys /.../ Capital is seen as two-facedly choreographing the chronic interplay of time and space, history and geography... Nothing is wholly determined, but the plot is established, the main characters clearly defined, and the tone of the narrative unmistakeably asserted.' (Soja,1989: 157).

9), which means that many prospective students might be fazed by this kind of discourse.

My strategy, therefore, was once again to try to steer a middle course between the two extremes. I thought it necessary to signal the postmodern orientation by mobilising items from the relevant lexicon, while at the same time retaining a certain intelligibility (or at least *illusion* of intelligibility)[11] through the use of relatively conventional English grammar. Hence, in my version below, I made no attempt to reproduce the word play. The dual senses of 'contradicted' and 'undone' are presented separately; the neogrammaticalization '*um entre*' has been lexicalized as 'a between-space', while the sound patterning of *'sublinha-sublima, contamina-permuta*' has been left to chance (that is to say, subordinated to meaning). On the other hand, concessions were made to the original by reproducing the alternative prepositions 'in/by', and in phrases such as 'architecture /…/ inscribes into this double risk', which is not really acceptable in EAD (another example of an abstraction made into the active agent) yet conveniently evokes the discourse of postmodernism in a way that should help to signal the orientation that the course itself is likely to have.

> In the *longue durée* that is contradicted and undone in/by circumstance, architecture, caught between a surfeit of freedom and a surfeit of vigilance, inscribes into this double risk a situation that its theory has identified as the problematic conflict between art and utility, the abstract and the concrete, the physical and the virtual, local and global. Out of all the programmes that the architect is involved in, the question of habitation (the private, the measure of the domestic, the realm of intimate - a between-space by definition) is probably what most strongly

---

[11] One of the problems with much postmodern discourse is that it often does not have a content as such. That is to say, there is not always an underlying referent or signified - indeed, Derridean deconstruction was predicated on this assumption. Instead, the meaning is created on the surface through the interplay of signifiers. Hence, I have sometimes found it convenient in my translation of Portuguese postmodern texts to pacify the empirically-minded Anglophone reader with an *illusion* of intelligibility (through the use of reasonably conventional grammar and lexis) while at the same time refraining from imposing any meaning upon the text that was not there in the original. This is ultimately a pragmatic solution, taken in extreme situations of epistemological disjunction.

> underlines/sublimates contaminates/substitutes those dualities, contaminations, circuits, networks.

Case Study 5: ARCT-01Abs-CG2

The extract below, also from the field of architecture, is just as grammatically alien to English as the previous one, but in different way. Instead of using elaborate syntax heavy with subordination, this text asserts its poeticality with short verbless sentences that are deliberately elliptical. It also maintains suspense by deferring any mention of location or purpose for several paragraphs:

> *Lugar mágico, paisagem grandiosa sobre a Foz do Tejo, Lisboa, as pontes e as margens. Entre cidades sim, no sentido geográfico do termo e mais precisamente no sentido morfogenético do mesmo entre a cidade «em movimento» que é Lisboa e a cidade emergente que é Almada. Mas sobretudo entre cidades no seu sentido mais profundo e só aparentemente oculto.*

In this case, the balance of power between text producer and text receiver was rather different from the previous example. The abstract formed part of a bid for international funding, which made it necessary to tailor the text to the receiver's expectations. Unfortunately, I was not given details about the precise nature of the competition and the kind of discourse expected; however, general research in the field of architecture suggested that an excessively poetic and elliptical style might not have been entirely appropriate to the circumstances.

My strategy was, therefore, to standardise the grammar and textual organisation, while keeping close to the lexis of the original. Hence, I filled in the gaps by introducing verbs and linking the clauses in a more conventional way, and removed the suspense component by explicitly identifying the place that was being referred to at the beginning of the abstract. The effect was to make the discourse sound more concrete and familiar, without (I hope) entirely sacrificing the poetic component.

> Almaraz is a magical place, with a magnificent landscape that extends over the mouth of the Tagus and across Lisbon, its bridges and river banks. It is located between cities, not only geographically, but also in the morphogenetic sense of being between the city 'in movement' that is Lisbon and the emerging city that is Almada. But it is also between cities in a much deeper sense, a sense that is only apparently hidden.

Case Study 6: ART-06Art-FL2

My final example of postmodern style is from an article by an art historian about the relationship between literature and visual art. As described in Chapter 7, the article as a whole makes use of the full gamut of postmodern discourse markers, and seems to be aiming at being simultaneously abstract and poetic.

> *Poder-se-ia pensar com Peter Handke que "agora é agora" e nunca de modo nenhum "Viver o dia sem olhar às consequências!" Palavras vertidas em iconografias, albergadas sob distintos suportes e matérias, cumprem presença.*
> *Já não se acredita nem Musas, nem tampouco em utopias – sejam elas individuais ou comungadas. Os deuses foram postos em descanso. As artes são maiores de idade, lúcidas e sem afectos. Todavia, nos campos de solidão e certeza intelectual, desejam-se mútuas e displicentes. Rígidas, auto-suficientes, discutem e atraiçoam. Interferem-se. Vejam-se 2 exemplos: a voz é um excerto de imagem em processo; a postura, em seu hieratismo ou sequencialidade, cresce entre a monocromia coreográfica, entre o desempenho e a intencionalidade justa.*
> *As letras enquanto sinais, ausentes de compreensão ou famintas de entendimento, registam-se em suporte digital e evoluem até lugares onde duração e precariedade assumem novas simetrias.*

In this particular case, the author had been invited to contribute an article for a catalogue accompanying an art exhibition, which was itself linked to an academic conference. She was therefore writing for a mixed public of humanities academics and artists.

As the balance of power in this case was tilted towards the text producer, it seemed unnecessary to domesticate the article excessively. I merely ensured that the sentences were grammatical by introducing finite verbs, and reformulated some of the abstractions (‘*hieratismo*’ and ‘*sequencialidade*’ are presented in adjectival form, for example, while ‘*intencionalidade*’ becomes merely ‘intention’). In other aspects, the translation sticks quite closely to the original. There are no major alterations to the order in which the information is presented, nor attempts to create cohesion through the addition of linking devices. I also attempted to reproduce the feel of the original through the use of evocative vocabulary.

> We could consider, along with Peter Handke, that “now is now” and never ever “live for the day without considering the consequences!” Words that have been poured into iconographs, lodged in different media and materials, mark their presence.
>
> No one believes in the Muses anymore, or in Utopias, individual or communal. The gods have been put to rest. The arts are grown up now; they are clear-headed, emotionless. However, amidst the loneliness and intellectual certainty, they desire each other, mutually, uneasily. Rigid, self-sufficient, they argue and attract. They meddle with each other. Here are 2 examples: the voice is an excerpt of image in process; posture, hieratic and sequential, grows amidst choreographic monochrome, between the performance and the just intention.
>
> Letters as signs, incomprehensible, starved of sense, are recorded digitally and evolve until they reach places where duration and uncertainty take on new symmetries.

As these three texts have shown, although the postmodern style raises epistemological problems for the academic translator, in practice these are not insuperable. The various pragmatic considerations arising from the real life context of production and reception will ultimately dictate the best strategy to adopt.

Before closing this chapter, a brief mention must be made of the various hybrid discourses that are such a feature of this Corpus.

4) Hybrid discourses

There are a large number of texts in the Corpus which reveal features of both the ‘modern’ style and the ‘traditional’ style and may thus be considered as hybrids. The reasons for this may vary. As has already been suggested in Chapter 7 and ***Appendix A*** (58-59), in texts that are attempting to be 'modern' and scientific, the intrusion of features from the ‘traditional’ style may represent a 'lapse' on the part of the author, an instinctive reversion to the style that is perhaps comes more naturally in Portuguese. On the other hand, when a Deviance Factor of -1 has been attributed to texts from subject areas that have been traditionally dominated by the ‘traditional’ style, such as history or philosophy, this may represent a conscious attempt to modernize the discourse, perhaps with a view to publishing abroad. In both cases, from a *Skopos* perspective, the preferred translation strategy would clearly be assimilation as far as possible to EAD.

However, the final case that I would like to consider raises some more interesting questions as, in content and approach, it straddles the two paradigms.

Case Study 7: GEOG-01Art-MGPS1

This study, carried out under the auspices of a Geography Research Unit, is concerned with the phenomenon of religious pilgrimages. Its subject is Fatima, the religious shrine where visions of the Virgin Mary were reportedly seen in 1917 - a highly-charged symbol within Portuguese culture that few are able to discuss objectively. However, the author’s approach to her topic is scientific in all respects: the aims of the study are presented using technical terminology from Human Geography; the methods are empirical (extensive surveys of pilgrims at the site); and the results are presented statistically, accompanied by graphs, tables and diagrams. The discourse too is remarkably objective. In relating the legend of the visions, the author distances herself from the claims by the use of reported speech (something which noticeably fails to occur in most press coverage of Fatima-related events):

> */.../ em 1917, de 13 de Maio a 13 de Outubro, três crianças que pastoreavam um pequeno rebanho num local chamado Cova da Iria, afirmaram ter presenciado seis aparições...*

The notion of the 'sacred' is also treated not with the charged language of the believer, but with the detachment of the anthropologist:

> *Um outro vector de investigação relaciona-se com a avaliação da maior ou menor sacralidade atribuída aos diversos locais de interesse religioso de Fátima, permitindo uma diferenciação do espaço em função das percepções que os peregrinos sentem e exprimem.*

This distance is maintained in the mobilization of terms from the discourse of consumerism and advertising:

> *Neste sentido, bem se poderá afirmar que o peregrino a pé faz parte, no fenómeno social que Fátima também é, da sua imagem de marca*

Within such a consistently objective approach to the topic, it therefore comes as a shock to encounter the term *Nossa Senhora* ('Our Lady'), used each time the author makes reference to the Virgin Mary. For this is a term from the religious paradigm, implying identification with the Catholic community and belief in the verity of the supernatural phenomena at the heart of the cult. As such it represents a clash of discourses, something that might perhaps not be noticed by the Portuguese reader, but which is startling in English.

The translator's dilemma here is whether or not to neutralize this term. Not only is it stylistically inappropriate in a geography article, it also effectively undermines the scientific stance and objectivity of the article as a whole. For by collapsing the distance between the researcher and the object of study so carefully set up elsewhere, it infringes one of the most important institutional imperatives of science, namely the norm of *disinterestedness* (cf. Merton, 1973: 275-277).

In practice, however, the problem was diminished by the fact that the article was to be published in a highly specialized journal dealing exclusively with the phenomena of pilgrimages and religious tourism, in which context such hybrid discourse may not be out of place. However not all text-receivers are as accommodating. It usually falls to the translator to weigh up each case s/he is presented with in the light of the specific circumstances of production and reception, and to gauge her discourse accordingly. In some situations, mistakes may be very costly indeed to both parties in the transaction.

* * *

Ultimately, then, the epistemological gulf that separates much Portuguese academic writing from EAD is not really a question of national culture, nor even of religious background, though I may be perceived to have argued as much. If we recall, the debates that we are engaged in today about how best to encode the products of our intellectual endeavours were actually raging at the time of Osorius within the sphere of a single language – Latin; and two generations later, at the time of Bacon, the same issue was being discussed within the vernacular. Thus, the question is not in essence interlingual. It may have happened that, due to a particular conjunction of circumstances, the dominant groups in England tended towards one side in that debate and the dominant groups in Portugal towards the other; but, as we have seen, in both cultures at different times, there have been dissenting voices, not to mention different groups in power. Hence, to reduce the debate to a conflict between national or religious tribes would be a gross simplification of the issues in hand.

To my mind, C.P. Snow got it right in 1959 when he identified the dichotomy as being between a scientific approach to knowledge (rational, utilitarian and oriented towards the world ‘out there’) and a humanities approach (holistic, language-based, and concerned with man’s symbolic systems and questions of value). These epistemologies are still today so far apart from each other that it seems at times they are unable to communicate; witness the translator's dilemma upon being asked to rewrite an article drafted in accordance the norms of one paradigm into terms acceptable to the other; or the bitter controversies that raged in the wake of the Sokal Hoax and the Bad Writing Contest.

And yet it is more urgent than ever to try to reach an entente. For any culture that attempts to retain a monopoly on the 'truth', to define what may legitimately constitute 'knowledge', puts itself at risk. Insensitive to the values of others, it fosters resentment; guilty of epistemicide, it sets itself up for attack from marginalised elements whose worldview has been trampled on in the race for power.

With Richard Rorty, I would like to argue in favour of a ‘new fuzziness’ in academia (1991:38), that is, a deliberate attempt ‘to blur…the distinctions between the objective and the subjective and between fact and value which the critical conception of rationality has developed’. According to this conception of knowledge, the desire for objectivity and truth which currently governs scientific enterprise would be put aside on the understanding that this goal is fundamentally unattainable and replaced by a more pragmatic desire for solidarity and community (*Idem:* 39).

> In this situation, 'the humanities' would no longer think of themselves as such, nor would they share a common rhetoric. Each of the disciplines that now falls under that rubric would worry as little about its method or cognitive status as do mathematics, civil engineering, and sculpture. For terms which denoted disciplines would not be thought to divide 'subject-matters', chunks of the world which had 'interfaces' with each other. Rather, they would denote communities whose boundaries were as fluid as the interests of their members. (*Idem*: 44-45).

What is holding us back from achieving that goal? According to Rorty, it is a 'cultural lag, the fact that the rhetoric of the Enlightenment praised the emerging natural sciences in a vocabulary which was left over from a less liberal and tolerant era'; this rhetoric, he goes on, 'enshrined all the old philosophical oppositions between mind and world, appearance and reality, subject and object, truth and pleasure' (*Idem*: 44). Thus, we can deduce, it had no words with which to express or even perceive the things that fell in between.

The problem, then, is one of language, the inability of our lexicosyntax to deal with a world that is not painted in black and white. We are not talking here about natural languages, such as English, Portuguese or German - these are all as rich and multi-faceted as the societies they represent; rather, the question is about 'the languages of paradigms' ('discourses' is a good enough word!), which remain rigid and hidebound in their desire to preserve their identities. It would seem that we need more 'fuzziness' at the boundaries of these discourses if we are to get beyond the cold war situation that has paralysed academia for the last three hundred years.

In this, perhaps, the translator has a role to play – even the mercenary translator that is moved more by market forces than by a vision of a better world. For in the attempt to negotiate a relationship between a text producer and a text receiver in a politically-weighted context, the solution found is very often a ‘fuzzy’ one, a compromise discourse that grafts together aspects of both paradigms. If these new fuzzy discourses could be encouraged to bear progeny, then we would be well on our way to the kind of situation that Rorty envisaged - a world where English Academic Discourse has lost its capital letters and became resigned to lower case status in the interests of global communication.

Conclusion

When I first embarked upon this study of English and Portuguese academic discourses in translation, I had little notion of the magnitude of what lay in store. The project began as an informal inquiry carried out within the ambit of my work in translator training, extended to a Master's Thesis, and was converted to a Doctorate when I realised that implications were so vast that nothing less than a full-length book would be able to do justice to it. Now I have realised that I could in fact have written three doctorates: one about EAD, another about Portuguese academic discourse and a third about the translation issues arising from the epistemological gap between them – and I would still probably come away with the same sensation of having only scratched the surface.

Despite this frustration, I do nevertheless feel that I have managed to partially achieve my initial aims, at least to my own satisfaction. That is to say, I believe that I have found enough evidence to confirm my intuition that there is in Portugal an academic discourse that is clearly distinguishable from EAD, with definable parameters, a traceable history and a coherent ideological outlook (and, also, as we have seen, at least two variants, in the form of the 'traditional' and 'postmodern' styles). The fact that more detailed studies may ultimately end up reformulating or even contradicting some of the claims I have made is by the way; what has been important at this stage, I feel, was for some kind of initial reconnaissance to be undertaken of a terrain which, till now, has been a total *terra incognita*. This study, then, should be perceived as a kind of provisional sketch map that can be used to orient any explorers that come after me and be discarded when its categories no longer serve.

As regards my second aim of examining what happens to this discourse in translation, this might have achieved more interesting results had it been carried out in a conventional descriptive way, using published translations rather than those taken from my own private corpus[1]. That strategy was unfortunately not possible, for the reasons described in Chapter 1. Nevertheless, my translations have been informed by a thorough knowledge of what is expected by the international discourse community in different genres and fields, acquired through years of training and experience in EAD[2], backed up by formal academic research into the prescriptive (pedagogical) and descriptive approaches to the subject (***Appendix B*** and Chapters 3-4 respectively), as well as by professional research undertaken during the translation process itself into local disciplinary and genre norms operating upon individual texts. Hence, I believe that the English versions included in the Corpus offer a reliable indication of the standard currently demanded by the international community, and that they have thus helped lay bare some of the practical and theoretical problems that occur in this area of translation.

My approach has also had the advantage of offering an insight into the psychological processes affecting a professional translator's decisions. That is to say, it highlights the gulf existing between the 'market-oriented' translator, who has to satisfy her clients in order to make a living, and the 'ivory-tower' theorists, who may be more interested in epistemological, ethical and ideological issues. The conflict that arises between these two perspectives is itself productive, in that it raises questions that are very significant on the broader cultural plane.

---

[1] Many of the translations included in the English section of the Corpus are preliminary versions, which do not always correspond completely to the final published versions. In some cases, authors subsequently negotiated alterations to the translation or made changes to their original before submitting the English text for publication. Other changes will also have been introduced as a result of the peer-reviewing process or upon suggestions from editors, as is customary in the English academic world.

[2] This EAD training and experience was acquired in three different professional areas: as a specialised *translator*; as a *teacher* of EAP to undergraduates, postgraduates and established academics, and as *researcher/author* of published academic texts.

This study may therefore prove to be useful on a number of different levels. In practical terms, its conclusions as regards the differences existing between English and Portuguese norms in academic discourse may be of interest to translators and translator trainers operating in the specific Portuguese context. They may also be applied to teaching situations (particularly the various EAP courses that are now appearing in Portuguese universities) and in the production of culture-specific training manuals in the area of academic discourse.

Hopefully, too, this work will serve to open a door into new research areas that have hitherto been neglected. Portuguese academic discourse has not even been recognised as an entity till now, and therefore offers a wealth of possibilities for further research. Indeed, much more work needs to be done before truly reliable conclusions may be drawn: we need descriptive studies into how the discourse operates in different disciplines and genres; historical studies into the way it has developed over time, and critical studies into its relationship with culture and ideology. Hopefully, resources currently being developed in the area of Corpus Linguistics will facilitate this task immensely, enabling reliable results to be generated in a relatively short period of time.

I also hope that my work might serve to encourage more comparative approaches within the field of EAD itself, thus helping to overcome the notorious ethnocentrism that currently afflicts almost all linguistic studies in the field (see Chapter 3). Such an opening-up should have the effect of making Anglophone academics and cultural gatekeepers more aware that alternative ways of construing knowledge do in fact exist, and that EAD is not the transparent neutral window upon the outside world that it has long purported to be. This in turn may help legitimise some of the inter-discourses that are being produced on the margins of cultures, thereby contributing to the development of a new desirable climate of 'fuzziness' within international academia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Askehave, I. & Swales, J. 'Genre Identification and Communicative Purpose: A Problem and a Possible Solution' in *Applied Linguistics 22/2 June 2001.* Oxford. 195-212.

Atkinson, Dwight. 1996. 'The Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, 1675-1975: a Sociohistorical Discourse Analysis' in *Language and Society, Vol 25, No 3*. Cambridge.

Atkinson, Dwight. 1998. 'Integrating Multiple Analyses in Historical Studies of Scientific Discourse: The Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, 1675-1975' in *Essays in the Study of Scientific Discourse: Methods, Practice and Pedagogy*, John T.Battalio. (Ed.), Stamford and London: Ablex. 139-165.

Atkinson, Dwight, 1999. *Scientific Discourse in Sociohistorical Context: The Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, 1675-1975*. New Jersey & London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Austin, John. 1962. *How To Do Things With Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Baker, Mona 1992. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation,* London & New York: Routledge.

Baker, Mona. 2006. *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account.* London & New York: Routledge.

Baker, Mona. 2007. 'Reframing Conflict in Translation' in *Social Semiotics* Vol. 17 No. 2, special edition on Translation and Conflict, Abington: Taylor & Francis. 151-169.

Banks, David. 1994. *Writ in Water: Aspects of the Scientific Journal Article,* Brest: Université de Bretagne Occidentale.

Barthes, Roland. 1967 [1953]. *Writing Degree Zero.* Translated from the French by Annette Lavers. New York: Hill & Wang.

Barthes, Roland. 1993, 1972 [1957]. *Mythologies*. Translated from the French by Annette Lavers. London: Vintage Books.

Barthes, Roland. 1978 [1967]. 'The Death of the Author' in *Image, Music, Text*, translated from the French by Stephen Heath. New York: Hill & Wang.

Bassnett, Susan, 1991 [1980]. *Translation Studies*, Revised Edition, London & New York: Routledge.

Bassnett, Susan, 1993. 'Taking the Cultural Turn in Translation Studies' in *Dedalus - Revista Portuguesa de Literatura Comparada, 3/4.* 171-179.

Battalio, John T. (Ed). 1998. *Essays in the Study of Scientific Discourse: Methods, Practice and Pedagogy*, Stamford and London: Ablex.

Bazerman, Charles. 1998. 'Emerging Perspectives on the Many Dimensions of Scientific Discourse' in *Reading Science: Critical and Functional Perspectives on the Discourses of Science,* Jim. R. Martin & Robert Veel (Eds.). London & New York: Routledge.

Beal, Tarcísio. 1969. *Os Jesuítas, a universidade de Coimbra e a Igreja Brasileira. Subsídios para a História de Regalismo em Portugal e no Brasil, 1750-1850.* PhD thesis, Catholic University of América. Michigan: Ann Arbor.

Beauvoir, Simone de. 1983 [1949]. *The Second Sex.* Translated from the French by H.M.Parshley. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Bennett, Karen. 2004. 'What has Translation Theory got to learn from Contemporary Practice?" in Proceedings of the 7th Seminar on Scientific and Technical Translation in Portuguese, *Tradução e Interculturalismo,* Lisbon: Foundation for Science and Technology / União Latina. 29-34.

Bennett, Karen. 2006. 'Critical Language Study and Translation: The Case of Academic Discourse' in *Translation Studies at the Interface of Disciplines,* João F. Duarte, Alexandra A. Rosa & Teresa Seruya (Eds.) Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 111-127.

Bennett, Karen. 2007a, 'Galileo's Revenge: Ways of Construing Knowledge and Translation Strategies in the Era of Globalization' in *Social Semiotics, Vol. 17, No. 2,* Myriam Salaama-Carr (Ed.), Abington: Taylor & Francis. 171-193

Bennett, Karen. 2007b, 'Epistemicide! The Tale of a Predatory Discourse' in *The Translator, Vol. 13, No. 2*. Manchester: St Jerome. 151-169.

Bercovitch, Sacvan. 1975 *The Puritan Origins of the American Self.* New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

Berman, Art. 1988. *From the New Criticism to Deconstruction: the Reception of Structuralism and Post-Structuralism*. Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Bernstein, Basil. 1971. *Class, Codes and Control: Primary Socialization, Language and Education.* London: Routledge.

Bhabha, Homi. 1994. *The Location of Culture.* London & New York: Routledge.

Bhatia, Vijay, K. 2002. 'A Generic View of Academic Discourse' in *Academic Discourse,* John Flowerdew (Ed), London & New York: Longman. 21-39.

Birmingham, David. 1993. *A Concise History of Portugal.* Cambridge, New York & Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre & J-C Passeron. 1994 [1965]. 'Language and Relationship to Language in the Teaching Situation' in *Academic Discourse : Linguistic Misunderstanding and Professorial Power.* Pierre Bourdieu, J-C Passeron & M. de Saint-Martin (Eds). Stanford : Stanford University Press. 1-34.

Bourdieu, P. *Homo Academicus,* Paris, 1984

Boghossian, Paul. 2006. *Fear of Knowledge: Against Relativism and Constructivism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brooks, Peter. 2003. 'On Difficulty, the Avant-Garde, and Critical Moribundity' in *Just Being Difficult? Academic Writing in the Public Arena*, Jonathan Culler & Kevin Lamb (Eds). California:Stanford University Press, 12—138.

Bunton, David. 2002. 'Generic Moves in Ph.D Thesis Introductions' in *Academic Discourse,* Flowerdew, John. (Ed). London & New York:Longman. 57-75.

Burgess, Sally. 2002. 'Packed houses and intimate gatherings: Audience and rhetorical structure' in *Academic Discourse,* John Flowerdew (Ed). London & New York: Longman.196-215.

Butler, Judith. 2003. 'Values of Difficulty' in *Just Being Difficult? Academic Writing in the Public Arena*, Jonathan Culler & Kevin Lamb (Eds). California:Stanford University Press, 19-215.

Butterfield, Herbert. 1965 [1931]. *The Whig Interpretation of History*. New York & London: Norton.

Cameron, Deborah, Frazer, Elizabeth, Harvey, Penelope, Rampton M.B.H. & Richardson, Kay. 1992. *Researching Language: Issues of Power and Method,* London & New York: Routledge.

Candlin, Chris & Hyland, Ken (Eds), 1999. *Writing Texts: Processes and Practices***,** London & New York: Longman.

Capra, Fritjof. 1983 [1982]. *The Turning Point: Science, Society and the Rising Culture.* London: Fontana.

Carneiro, Ana, Simões, Ana & Diogo, Maria Paula. 2000. 'Enlightenment Science in Portugal: The *Estrangeirados* and their Communication Networks' in *Social Studies of Science* 30/4. 591-619.

Carrilho, Manuel M. (Ed). 1994. *Retórica e Comunicação*. Oporto: Edições Asa.

Chang, Yu-Ying & Swales, John, 1999. 'Informal elements in English academic writing: threats or opportunities for advanced non-native speakers?' in *Writing Texts: Processes and Practices***,** Candlin, Chris & Hyland, Ken (Eds), London & New York: Longman. 145-167.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. 'Rationality/Science', *Z Papers Special Issue*. http://www.chomsky.info/articles/1995----02.htm (accessed 13/10/08).

Chow, Rei. 2003. 'The Resistance of Theory; or, The Worth of Agony' in *Just Being Difficult? Academic Writing in the Public Arena*, Jonathan Culler & Kevin Lamb (Eds). California:Stanford University Press, 95-105.

Cmejrková, S. 1996. 'Academic Writing in Czech and English' in *Academic Writing: Intercultural and Textural Issues,* Eija Ventola & Anna Mauranen (Eds), Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Cmejrková S. & Danes, F. 1997. 'Academic Writing and Cultural Identity: the Case of Czech Academic Writing' in *Cultural Styles of Academic Discourse,* Anna Duszak (Ed.) Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. Collini, Stefan. 1998. 'Introduction' to *The Two Cultures* by C.S.Snow, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. vii-lxxi.

Collins, James. 1999. 'The Ebonics Controversy in Context: Literacies, Subjectivities and Language Ideologies in the United States' in *Language Ideological Debates*, Jan Blommaert (Ed). The Hague: Mouton. 201-234.

Columbi, M. Cecilia & Mary J. Schleppegrell. 2002. 'Theory and Practice in the Development of Advanced Literacy' in *Developing Advanced Literacy in First and Second Languages: Meaning with Power*, Mary Schleppelgrell & Columbi (Eds), New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum. 1-19.

Conley, Thomas M. 1990. *Rhetoric in the European Tradition.* Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.

Connor, Ulla. 1996. *Contrastive Rhetoric: Cross-Cultural Aspects of Second-Language Writing.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Conway, Martin. 1997. *Catholic Politics in Europe: 1918-1945.* London & New York: Routledge.

Croll, Morris W. 1969a. [1929]. '"Attic" and Baroque Prose Styles: the Anti-Ciceronian Movement' in *Essays by Morris W. Croll*, Max Patrick & Robert O. Evans, with John W. Wallace (Eds) New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Croll, Morris W. 1969b [1929]. 'The Baroque Style in Prose' edited by John M. Wallace, in *Essays by Morris W. Croll*, Max Patrick & Robert O. Evans, with John W. Wallace (Eds), New Jersey: Princeton University Press. 207-233.

Culler, Jonathan & Kevin Lamb. 2003. 'Dressing Up, Dressing Down' in *Just Being Difficult? Academic Writing in the Public Arena*. Jonathan Culler & Kevin Lamb (Eds). California:Stanford University Press.1-12.

Culler, Jonathan & Lamb, Kevin (Eds). 2003. *Just Being Difficult? Academic Writing in the Public Arena*. California:Stanford University Press.

Cunha, Celso & Lindley Cintra. 1985. *Breve Gramática do Português Contemporâneo.* 5th Edition. Lisbon: Edições João Sá da Costa.

Curry, Mary Jane & Lillis, Theresa. 2004. 'Multilingual Scholars and the Imperative to Publish in English: Negotiating Interests, Demands and Rewards' in *TESOL Quarterly*. Vol. 38 No. 4.

Darian, Steven. 1998. 'The Language of Classifying in Introductory Science Texts' in *Essays in the Study of Scientific Discourse: Methods, Practice and Pedagogy*, John Battalio (Ed.) Stamford and London: Ablex.

Davies, Mark & Ana Maria Raposo Preto-Bay. 2008. 'The Corpus do Português and the Routledge Frequency Dictionary of Portuguese: New Tools for Learners and Teachers' in the *Proceedings of the 8th Teaching and Language Corpora Conference*. 96- 99. Lisbon: ISLA.

Davis, Kathleen. 2001. *Deconstruction and Translation*. Manchester: St Jerome.

Davis, Edward B. & Michael P. Winship. 2002. 'Early Modern Protestantism' in *Science and Religion: A Historical Introduction.* Gary B. Ferngren (Ed). Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.117-129.

Dawson, Christopher. 1991 [1950]. *Religion and the Rise of Western Culture*. New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Auckland: Doubleday.

Dear, Peter. 2001. *Revolutionizing the Sciences: European Knowledge and its Ambitions, 1500-1700.* Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave.

Derrida, Jacques. 1967. *De la Grammatologie.* Paris : Éditions de Minuit.

Derrida, Jacques. 1972. 'La Différance' in *Marges de la Philosophie*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1-29.

Derrida, Jacques. 1991 [1982/1972]. 'Différance' translated from the French by Alan Bass in *A Derrida Reader: Between the Blinds.* Peggy Kamuf (Ed). New York: Columbia University Press. 61-79.

Ding, Dan. 1998. 'Rationality Reborn: Historical Roots of the Passive Voice in Scientific Discourse' in *Essays in the Study of Scientific Discourse: Methods, Practice and Pedagogy*, John T.Battalio (Ed.), Stamford and London: Ablex. 117-135.

DuPlessis Rachel Blau. 1990. *The Pink Guitar: Writing as Feminist Practice*. New York & London: Routledge.

Duarte, João F., Rosa, Alexandra.A. & Seruya, Teresa. (Eds), 2006, *Translation Studies at the Interface of Disciplines*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company

Duszak, Anna. 1994. 'Academic Discourse and Intellectual Styles' in *Journal of Pragmatics, 21* New Holland. 291-313.

Duszak, Anna. (Ed). 1997. *Cultural Styles of Academic Discourse,* Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Duszak, Anna. 1997. 'Cross-Cultural Academic Communication: a Discourse-Community View' in *Cultural Styles of Academic Discourse.* Anna Duszak(Ed). Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter

Dutton, Denis. 1999. 'Language Crimes: A Lesson in How Not to Write, Courtesy of the Professoriate' in *The Wall Street Journal*, February 5, 1999. (http://denisdutton.com/language_crimes.htm)

Edwards, John. 2003 [1999]. *Inquisition*. Stroud: Tempus.

Evan-Zohar, Itamar, 1990 [1979], 'Polysystem Theory' in *Poetics Today: International Journal for Theory and Analysis of Literature and Communication*, Vol. 11, No. 1. 8-51.

Eggins, Suzanne. Wignell, Peter and Martin, Jim, 1993 [1987]. 'The Discourse of History' in *Register Analysis: Theory and Practice*, M. Ghadessy (Ed.) London: Pinter, pp.75-109.

Estrela, Edite, Soares, Maria Almira & Leitão, Maria José Leitão. 2003. *Saber Escrever, Saber Falar: um guia completo para usar correctamente a língua portuguesa* (7th edition). Lisbon: Dom Quixote.

Fairclough, Norman. 1989. *Language and Power*, London & New York: Longman.

Fairclough, Norman. 1992. *Discourse and Social Change.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, Norman. (Ed). 1992. *Critical Language Awareness*, London & New York: Longman.

Fairclough, Norman. 2003. *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*, New York & London: Routledge.

Fanon, Franz. 2000, 1968 [1952]. 'The Negro and Language' from *Black Skin White Masks*, translated from the French by Charles Lamm Markmann. In *Routledge Language and Cultural Theory Reader*. Lucy Burke, Tony Crowley and Alan Girvin (Eds). London & New York: Routledge. London: MacGibbon & Kee. 419-426.

Faria, Luísa Leal de. 2003. *Universidade e Cultura*. Lisbon: Catholic University Press.

Ferguson, Margaret. 2003. 'Difficult Styles and "Illustrious" Vernaculars: A Historical Perspective' in *Just Being Difficult? Academic Writing in the Public Arena*, Jonathan Culler & Kevin Lamb (Eds). California:Stanford University Press. 15-28.

Ferngren, Gary, B. (Ed.) 2002. *Science and Religion: A Historical Introduction.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Fernandes, R.M. Rosado. 1972. 'Breve Introdução aos Estudos Retóricos em Portugal' in *Elementos de Retórica Literária.* 2nd Edition. 13-32.

Ferreira, Joaquim. 1984 [1943]. 3rd edition. 'Preface' to *O Verdadeiro Método de Estudar* by Luís António Verney. Oporto: Domingos Barreira. 7-53.

Ferreira, Valdemar de Azevedo. 2005. 'John Locke, filósofo de linguagem' in *A Herança de Locke (Locke's Legacy)*, Teresa de Ataíde Malafaia & J. Carlos Viana Ferreira (Eds). Lisbon: University of Lisbon Centre for English Studies. 123-140.

Feyerabend, Paul. 1978 [1975]. *Against Method.* London: Verso.

Flowerdew, John. (Ed). 2002. *Academic Discourse,* London & New York:Longman.

*Foucault, Michel. 2002a, 1970 [1966]. *The Order of Things*. London & New York: Routledge.

Foucault, Michel. 2002b, 1972 [1969], *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, translated from the French by A.M.Sheridan Smith, London & New York: Routledge.

Foucault, Michel. 1979 [1977], *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison,* translated from the French by A. Sheridan, Middlesex: Penguin.

Galtung, Johan. 1981. 'Structure, culture, and intellectual style: an essay comparing Saxonic, Teutonic, Gallic and Nipponic Approaches' in *Social Science Information 20, 6.* London and Beverly Hills: Sage.

Garfinkel, Harold. 1967. *Studies in Ethnomethodology.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Gaukroger, Stephen. 2006. *The Emergence of Scientific Culture: Science and the Shaping of Modernity, 1210-1685*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays.* New York: Basic.

Ghadessy, Mohsen. 1995. ‘Thematic Development and its Relationship to Registers and Genres’ in *Thematic Development in English Texts*, Ed. Ghadessy, London and New York: Pinters. 129-145.

Ghadessy, Mohsen. (Ed) 1995 *Thematic Development in English Texts,* London and New York: Pinters.

Giddens, Anthony. 1991. *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age.* California: Stanford University Press.

Gilbert, G.N. & Mulkay, Michael. 1984. *Opening Pandora’s Box: a Sociological Analysis of Scientific Discourse.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gomes, Joaquim Ferreira. 1995a. ‘O *Ratio Estudiorum* da Companhia de Jesus’ in *Para a História da Educação em Portugal: Seis Estudos*. Oporto: Porto Editora. 25-42.

Gomes, Joaquim Ferreira. 1995b. ‘O *Modus Parisiensis* como Matriz da Pedagogia dos Jesuítas’ in *Para a História da Educação em Portugal: Seis Estudos*. Oporto: Porto Editora. 49-56.

Gomes, Joaquim Ferreira. 1995c. ‘Luís António Verney e as Reformas Pombalinas do Ensino’ in *Para a História da Educação em Portugal: Seis Estudos*. Oporto: Porto Editora. 65-80.

Gomez, Samuel. 1968. *Education in Portugal.* PhD thesis, University of Connecticut. Michigan: Ann Arbor.

Gonçalves, A.M. Undated. *A Shortened History of Freemasonry in Portugal.* www.freemasons-freemasonry.com/arnaldoGeng.html (accessed 13/10/08).

Good, James, M.M. & Roberts, Richard H. (Eds).1993. *The Recovery of Rhetoric: Persuasive Discourse and Disciplinarity in the Human Sciences,* Charlottesville & London: University Press of Virginia.

Grabe, William & Kaplan, Robert B. 1996. *Theory and Practice of Writing: An Applied Linguistics Perspective,* London & New York: Longman.

Greaves, Richard L. 1969. ‘Puritanism and Science: the Anatomy of a Controversy’ in *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. 30, No. 3, 345-368

Greenblatt, Stephen. 1988. *Shakespearian Negotiations: The Circulation of Social Energy in Renaissance England.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Greenblatt, Stephen & Giles Gunn (Eds). 1992. *Redrawing the Boundaries: the Transformation of English and American Literary Studies.* New York: the Modern Language Association of America.

Gregório, Nídia. 1992. ‘“Subversão” e repressão na Universidade no início do Estado Novo: Dois Casos Exemplares’ in *Ideologia, Cultura e Mentalidade no Estado Novo: Ensaios sobre a Universidade de Coimbra,* Luís Reis Torgal (Ed.). Coimbra: Faculty of Letters. 22-77.

Hackett, Jeremiah, 2007. "Roger Bacon", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Summer 2007 Edition)*, Edward N. Zalta (Ed.) (accessed 13/10/08). http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2007/entries/roger-bacon

Hall, Stuart. 1980 [1973]: 'Encoding/decoding'. In *Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies, 1972-79*, Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (Ed.) London: Hutchinson. 128-38.

Hall, Stuart (Ed). 1997. *Representation: Cultural Representation and Signifying Practices.* London & California: Sage.

Halliday, Michael A.K. 1993a, ‘On the Language of Physical Science’ in *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power,* Michael Halliday & Jim R. Martin (Eds), Pittsburgh & London: University of Pittsburgh Press. 54-68.

Halliday, Michael A.K. 1993b, 'Some Grammatical Problems in Scientific English' in *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power,* Michael Halliday & Jim R. Martin (Eds), Pittsburgh & London: University of Pittsburgh Press. 69-85.

Halliday, Michael A.K. 1993c. 'The Construction of Knowledge and Value in the Grammar of Scientific Discourse: Charles Darwin's "The Origin of the Species"' in *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power,* Michael Halliday & Jim R. Martin (Eds), Pittsburgh & London: University of Pittsburgh Press. 86-105.

Halliday, Michael.A.K. 1993d, 'Language and the Order of Nature' in *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power,* Michael Halliday & Jim R. Martin (Eds), Pittsburgh & London: University of Pittsburgh Press.106-123.

Halliday, Michael.A.K. 1993e, 'The Analysis of Scientific Texts in English and Chinese' in *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power,* Michael Halliday & Jim R. Martin (Eds), Pittsburgh & London: University of Pittsburgh Press.124-132.

Halliday, Michael, A.K. 1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar,* 2nd Edition. London: Arnold.

Halliday, Michael A.K. 1998.'Things and Relations: Regrammaticising Experience as Technical Knowledge' in *Reading Science: Critical and Functional Perspectives on Discourses of Science,* Jim R. Martin. & Robert Veel (Eds). London & New York: Routledge.

Halliday, Michael A.K. & Hasan, Ruqueira, 1976, *Cohesion in English,* London & New York: Longman.

Halliday, Michael.A.K. & Martin, Jim.R. (Eds). 1993. *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power,* Pittsburgh & London: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Harré, Rom. 1990. 'Some Narrative Conventions of Scientific Discourse' in *Narrative in Culture: The Uses of Storytelling in the Sciences, Philosophy and Literature,* Christopher Nash (Ed.) London & New York: Routledge. 81-100.

Harvey, David. 1973. *Social Justice and the City.*

Harvey, David. 1985. *The Urbanization of Capital: Studies in the History and Theory of Capitalist Urbanization.*

Harvey, Irene E. 1986. *Derrida and the Economy of Différance.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Hatim, Basil. 1997. *Communicating across Cultures: Translation Theory and Contrastive Text Linguistics,* Exeter: University Exeter Press.

Hatim, Basil & Mason, Ian. 1990. *Discourse and the Translator.* London & New York: Longman.

Hatim, Basil & Mason, Ian. 1997. *The Translator as Communicator.* London & New York: Routledge.

Hermans, Theo. 1999. *Translation in Systems: Descriptive and System-Oriented Approaches Explained.* Manchester: St Jerome.

Hill, Christopher. 1997 [1965] *Intellectual Origins of the English Revolution Revisited,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hobsbawm, Eric. 1962. *The Age of Revolution: Europe 1789-1848.* London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

Hobsbawm, Eric. 1993. 'The New Threat to History' in *New York Review of Books, 40(21)* (December 16). 62-64.

Hobsbawm, Eric & Terence Ranger (Eds). 1983. *The Making of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holloway, John. 1965 [1953]. *The Victorian Sage: Studies in Argument.* New York: Norton.

Holmes, James. 1994 [1972]. 'The Name and Nature of Translation Studies' in *Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies.* Amsterdam & Atlanta: Rodopi, 67-80.

Holsinger, Bruce. 2005. *The Premodern Condition: Medievalism and the Making of Theory*. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.

Hughes, Geoffrey. 1988. *Words in Time: A Social History of English Vocabulary.* Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.

Hyland, Ken. 1999a. 'Academic Attribution: Citation and the Construction of Disciplinary Knowledge' in *Applied Linguistics, 20/3.* 341-367.

Hyland, Ken. 1999b. 'Disciplinary Discourses: Writer Stance in Research Articles' in *Writing Texts: Processes and Practices*, Chris Candlin & Ken Hyland (Eds), London & New York: Longman. 99-121.

Hyland, Ken. 2000, *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing,* Harlow: Longman.

Hyland, Ken. 2002. 'Activity and Evaluation: Reporting practices in academic writing' in *Academic Discourse,* John Flowerdew (Ed). London & New York: Longman.

Hyland, Ken. 2006. 'The "Other" English: Thoughts on EAP and Academic Writing' in *The European English Messenger, 15.2.*

Irigaray, Luce. 2000 [1997]. 'When our lips speak together', translated from the French by Catherine Porter with Carolyn Burke. In *Routledge Language and Cultural Theory Reader*. Lucy Burke, Tony Crowley and Alan Girvin (Eds). London & New York: Routledge. 184-188.

Johns, Tim. 1991. 'It is Presented Initially: Linear Dislocation & Interlanguage Strategies in Brazilian Academic Abstracts in English and Portuguese', University of Birmingham, http://web.bham.ac.uk/johnstf/itispres.htm (accessed 8/1/2002).

Johnson, Barbara. 2003. 'Bad Writing' in *Just Being Difficult? Academic Writing in the Public Arena*, Jonathan Culler & Kevin Lamb (Eds). California:Stanford University Press, 15-168.

Johnson-Sheehan, Richard.D. 1998. 'Metaphor in the Rhetoric of Scientific Discourse' in *Essays in the Study of Scientific Discourse: Methods, Practice and Pedagogy*, John T.Battalio (Ed.), Stamford and London: Ablex. 167-179.

Jordan, R.R. 1997. *English for Academic Purposes: A Guide and Resource Book for Teachers*. Cambridge, New York & Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Kachru, Yamuna. 1987. 'Cross-Cultural Texts, Discourse Strategies and Discourse Interpretation' in *Discourse Across Cultures: Strategies in World Englishes,* Larry Smith (Ed). UK: Prentice Hall.

Kaplan, Robert. B. 1980 [1966]. 'Cultural Thought Patterns in Inter-Cultural Education' in *Readings on English as a Second Language,* Kenneth Croft (Ed.) Massachesetts: Winthrop. 399-418.

Kamuf, Peggy (Ed.). 1991. *A Derrida Reader: Between the Blinds*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Katan, D. 1999. *Translating Cultures,* (St Jerome), UK.

Keller, Evelyn F. & Longino, Helen, E. 1996. *Feminism and Science,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kirchhofer, Anton. 2004. 'A*sking Directions in Theory' in The European English Messenge Vol. 13.2*- 11-16.

Knorr-Cetina, Karin. 1981. *The Manufacture of Knowledge.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Kress, Günther. 1985. *Linguistic Processes in Sociocultural Practice,* Victoria: Deakin University Press.

Kress, Günther & Hodge, Robert. 1981 [1979] *Language as Ideology*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd.

Kuhn, Thomas S. 1970 [1962]. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Küng, Hans. 2002 [1988]. *The Catholic Church.* Translated from the German by John Bowden. London: Phoenix Press.

Labov, William. 1972. *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Lakoff, Robin. 2000 [1975]. 'Talking like a Lady' from *Language and Woman's Place.* In *Routledge Language and Cultural Theory Reader*. Lucy Burke, Tony Crowley and Alan Girvin (Eds). London & New York: Routledge. 154-160.

Lakoff, George & Johnson, Mark. 1981 [1980]. *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.

Lambert, José & Van Gorp, Hendrik, 1985. 'On Describing Translations' in *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*, Theo Hermans (Ed.), London & Sydney: Croom & Helm.42-53.

Latour, Bruno & Stephen Woolgar. 1979. *Laboratory Life: the Social Construction of Scientific Facts.* Los Angeles: Sage.

Lea, Mary R. & Street, Brian. 1999. 'Writing as academic literacies: understanding textual practices in higher education' in *Writing Texts: Processes and Practices*, Candlin, Chris & Hyland, Ken (Eds), London & New York: Longman. 62-81.

Lefevere, André.1985. 'Why Waste our Time on Rewrites? The Trouble with Interpretation and the Role of Rewriting in an Alternative Paradigm' in *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*, Theo Hermans (Ed.) London & Sydney: Croom Helm. 215-243.

Lefevere, André. 1992. *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, London & New York: Routledge.

Lemke, Jay. 1998. 'Multiplying Meaning: Visual and Verbal Semiotics in Scientific Text' in *Reading Science: Critical and Functional Perspectives on Discourses of Science* Martin, J.R. & Veel, R. (Eds). London & New York: Routledge. 87-113.

Lentricchia, Frank. 1983 [1980]. *After the New Criticism.* London: Methuen.

Leung, Matthew Wing-Kwong, 2006. 'The Ideological Turn in Translation Studies' in *Translation Studies at the Interface of Disciplines*, João Ferreira Duarte et al. (Eds) Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 129-144

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1968 [1958] *Structural Anthropology*, translated from the French by Claire Jacobson and Brooke Grundfest Schoepf. London: Allen Lane.

Levy, Evonne. 2004. *Propaganda and the Jesuit Baroque*. California & London: University of California Press.

Lewis, Philip E. 2000/1985. 'The Measure of Translation Effects' in *The Translation Studies Reader*, Lawrence Venuti (Ed.) London & New York: Routledge. 264-283.

Lillis, Theresa & Curry, Mary Jane. 2006a. 'Professional Academic Writing by Multilingual Scholars: Interactions with Literacy Brokers in the Production of English-Medium Texts' in *Written Communication*, Vol. 23 No. 1. London, California & New Delhi: Sage. 3-35.

Lillis, Theresa & Curry, Mary Jane. 2006b. 'Reframing Notions of Competence in Scholarly Writing: From Individual to Networked Activity' in *Revista canaria de Estudios Ingleses,* 53. 63-78.

Lindberg, David C. 1992. *The Beginnings of Western Science: The European Scientific Tradition in Philosophical, Religious, and Institutional Context, 600 BC to AD 1450.* Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.

Lindberg, David C. 2002. 'Medieval Science and Religion' in *Science and Religion: A Historical Introduction.* Gary B. Ferngren (Ed.) Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press. 57-72.

Lourenço, Eduardo. 1988. *O Labirinto da Saudade*, Lisbon: Don Quixote.

Luke, Alan, 1993. 'Introduction' to *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power,* Halliday & Martin (Eds), Pittsburgh & London: University of Pittsburgh Press. x-xii.

Lyotard, Jean-François. 1984 [1979]. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, translated from the French by Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Marques, A.H. de Oliveira. 1983. *A Maçonaria Portuguesa e o Estado Novo.* 2nd Edition. Lisbon: Dom Quixote.

Marques, A.H. de Oliveira. 1996. *Breve História de Portugal.* Lisbon: Presença.

Marques, Henrique José. 1965. 'Universidade Católica em Portugal' in *A Defesa*. Évora.

Martin, J. R. 1989, *Factual Writing: Exploring and Challenging Social Reality* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martin, J. R. 1993a, 'Literacy in Science: Learning to Handle Text as Technology' in *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power,* Halliday & Martin (Eds), Pittsburgh & London: University of Pittsburgh Press. 166-202.

Martin, J. R. 1993b. 'Technicality and Abstraction: Language for the Creation of Specialized Texts' in *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power,* Halliday & Martin (Eds), Pittsburgh & London: University of Pittsburgh Press. 203-220.

Martin, J.R. 1993c. 'Life as a Noun: Arresting the Universe in Science and Humanities' in *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power,* Halliday & Martin (Eds), Pittsburgh & London: University of Pittsburgh Press. 221-267.

Martin, J. R. 1998. 'Discourses of Science: Recontextualisation, Genesis, Intertextuality and Hegemony' in *Reading Science: Critical and Functional Perspectives on Discourses of Science* Martin, J.R. & Veel, R. (Eds). London & New York: Routledge. 3-14.

Martin, J. R. 2002. 'Writing History: Construing Time and Value in Discourses of the Past' in *Developing Advanced Literacy in First and Second Languages: Meaning with Power*, Mary Schleppelgrell & Columbi (Eds), New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum. 87-118.

Martin, J. R. & Veel, Robert. (Eds.) 1998. *Reading Science: Critical and Functional Perspectives on Discourses of Science.*London & New York: Routledge.

Martins, H. 1968. 'Portugal' in *European Fascism*, S.J. Woolf (Ed.). London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson. 302-336.

Marzola, Alessandra. 2001. 'A Theoretical Autobiography' in *The European English Messenge, X/1*, 51-56.

Mateus, Maria Helena M., Brito, Ana Maria, Duarte, Inês & Faria, Isabel H. 1989. *Gramática da Língua Portuguesa* (4th edition). Lisbon: Caminho.

Matthiessen, C.M. 1998. 'Construing Processes of Consciousness: From the Commonsense Model to the Uncommonsense Model of Cognitive Science' in Martin, J.R. & Veel, R. (Ed) 1998

Mauranen, Anna. 1993. *Cultural Differences in Academic Rhetoric,* Frankfurt, Berlin, New York, Bern, Paris, Vienna: Peter Lang.

Mauranen, Anna. 1996. ‘Discourse Competence – Evidence from Thematic Development in Native and Non-Native Texts’ in *Academic Writing: Intercultural and Textual Issues,* Eija Ventola & Anna Mauranen (Eds), Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

McCloskey, Donald. 1990. ‘Storytelling in Economics’ in *Narrative in Culture: The Uses of Storytelling in the Sciences, Philosophy and Literature,* Christopher Nash (Ed.) London & New York: Routledge. 5-22.

McCloskey, Donald. 1993. ‘The Rhetoric of Economic Expertise’ in *The Recovery of Rhetoric: Persuasive Discourse and Disciplinarity in the Human Sciences,* Richard Roberts & James Good (Eds), Charlottesville & London: University Press of Virginia. 137-147.

McEnery, Tom & Kifle, Nazareth Amselom. 2002. ‘Epistemic modality in argumentative essays of second-language learners' in *Academic Discourse,* John Flowerdew (Ed). London & New York:Longman. 182-195.

McKenny, John. 2003 ‘Seeing the Wood and the Trees: Reconciling Findings from Discourse and Lexical Analysis’. *University Centre for Computer Corpus Research on Language (UCREL) Technical Papers, Vol 16 Special Issue.* Proceedings of the Conference Corpus Linguistics 2003 Lancaster University (UK) 28-31 March 2003 (accessed 31/7/07). http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/publications/CL2003/papers/mckenny.pdf

McKenny, John. 2006. *A Corpus-Based Investigation of the Phraseology in Various Genres of Written English with Applications to the Teaching of English for Academic Purposes.* PhD Dissertation. School of English, University of Leeds.

McKenny, John & Bennett, Karen. 2008. ‘Polishing Papers for Publication: Palimpsests or Procrustean Beds?’ in the *Proceedings of the 8th Teaching and Language Corpora Conference*. Lisbon: ISLA. 198-206.

Merton, Robert K. 1942. ‘The Normative Structure of Science’ in *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*, Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press. 267-278.

Merton, Robert K. 1973. *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*, Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.

Merton, Robert K. 2001, 1970 [1938], *Science, Technology and Society in Seventeenth-Century England,* New York: Howard Fertig

Meyer, Michel. 2002 [1999]. ‘O Período Contemporâneo' in *História da Retórica,* Meyer, Michel, Carrilho, Manuel M., & Timmermans, Benôit. Translated from the French by Maria Manuel Berjano. Lisbon: Temas e Debates.

Meyer, Michel. 2007 [1993]. *Questões de Retórica, Linguagem, Razão e Sedução*, translated from the French by António Hall. Lisbon: Edições 70.

Meyer, Michel, Carrilho, Manuel M., & Timmermans, Benôit, 2002 [1999]. *História da Retórica.* Translated from the French by Maria Manuel Berjano. Lisbon: Temas e Debates.

Miller, Alexander. 2008. ‘Realism’ in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2008 Edition)*, Edward N. Zalta (Ed.). (Accessed 28/9/08) http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2008/entries/realism//

Milton, John. 1999. ‘Lexical thickets and electronic gateways: making text accessible by novice writers' in *Writing Texts: Processes and Practices***,** Candlin, Chris & Hyland, Ken (Eds), London & New York: Longman. 221-243.

Moss, Ann. 1993, ‘Commonplace-Rhetoric and Thought Patterns in Early Modern Culture’ in *The Recovery of Rhetoric: Persuasive Discourse and Disciplinarity in* *the Human Sciences,* Richard Roberts & James Good (Eds), Charlottesville & London: University Press of Virginia. 49-60.

Mullett, Michael A. 1999. *The Catholic Reformation.* London & New York: Routledge.

Mulligan, Lotte. 1980. 'Puritans and English Science: A Critique of Webster' in *Isis*, Vol. 71, No. 3, 456-469.

Murray, Stuart J. 2003. 'The Politics of the Production of Knowledge: An Interview with Gayatri Chakravorty-Spivak' in *Just Being Difficult? Academic Writing in the Public Arena*, Jonathan Culler & Kevin Lamb (Eds). California:Stanford University Press, 18—198.

Myers, D.G. 1999. 'Bad Writing'. *Weekly Standard* 4 (May 10, 1999): 36-39. http://www-english.tamu.edu/pers/fac/myers/bad_writing.html (accessed 13/10/08).

Myers, Greg. 1990. 'Making a Discovery: Narratives of Split Genes' in *Narrative in Culture: The Uses of Storytelling in the Sciences, Philosophy and Literature,* Christopher Nash (Ed.) London & New York: Routledge.

Nader, Laura. (Ed). 1996. *Naked Science: Anthropological Enquiry into Boundaries, Power and Knowledge.* London & New York: Routledge.

Nash, Christopher (Ed.) 1990. *Narrative in Culture: The Uses of Storytelling in the Sciences, Philosophy and Literature,* London & New York: Routledge.

Nesi, Hilary. 2008. 'BAWE: An Introduction to a New Resource' in the *Proceedings of the 8th Teaching and Language Corpora Conference*. 239-246. Lisbon: ISLA.

Ngugi Wa Thiongo. 1986. *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. London: Heinemann.

Nord, Christiane. 1997. *Translating as a Purposeful Activity: Functionalist Approaches Explained.* Manchester: St Jerome.

Nóvoa, António. 1991. 'As Ciências da Educação e a Reforma do Sistema Educativo' in *Ciências de Educação e Mudança***,** António Nóvoa, Bártolo Campos, J. Pedro Ponte, Maria Emília Brederode Santos. Oporto: Sociedade Portuguesa de Ciências de Educação. 51-67.

Nóvoa, António. 2005. *Evidentemente: Histórias da Educação.* Oporto: Asa Editores, SA.

Nunes, Maria de Fátima. 1998. *O Liberalismo Português: Ideários e Ciências – o universo de Marino Miguel Franzini (1800-1860).* Lisbon: Instituto Nacional de Investigação Científica.

Nunes, Maria de Fátima. 2001. *Imprensa Periódica Científica (1772-1852)*. Lisbon: Estar Editora.

Nunes, Maria de Fátima. 2002. 'Opinião Pública, Ciência e Tecnologia em Portugal XVIII-XX' in *Cultura: Revista de História e História de Ideias, Vol. XV (2nd series).* 211-223.

Nunes, Maria de Fátima. 2004. 'Bases Ideológicas do Liberalismo' in *Eborensia, Ano XVII, Nº. 33.* 3-24.

Orwell, George. 1984 [1946]. 'Politics and the English Language' in *George Orwell: Essays*. London: Penguin Modern Classics. 348-359.

Ott, Walter. 2004. *Locke's Philosophy of Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Palumbo-Liu, David. 2003. 'The Morality of Form: or, What's "Bad" About "Bad Writing"?' in *Just Being Difficult? Academic Writing in the Public Arena*, Jonathan Culler & Kevin Lamb (Eds). California:Stanford University Press, 17-180.

Partridge, A.C. 1969. *Tudor to Augustan English: a Study in Syntax and Style from Caxton to Johnson.* London: André Deutsch.

Pennycook, Alastair. 1994, *The Cultural Politics of English as an International Language.* Essex: Longman.

Popper, Karl. 2002, 1959 [1935]. *The Logic of Scientific Discovery.* Translated from the German by the author. London & New York: Routledge.

Popper, Karl. 1972/1979. *Objective Knowledge: An Evolutionary Approach* (Oxford), U.K.

Potter, Jonathan. 1996. *Representing Reality: Discourse, Rhetoric and Social Construction*. London, California & New Delhi: Sage.

Prigogine, Ilya & Isabelle Stengers. 1984 [1979]. *Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature.* London: Fontana.

Readings, Bill. 1996. *The University in Ruins*. Massachusetts and London: Harvard University Press.

Roberts, R.H. & Good, J.M.M. 1993. *The Recovery of Rhetoric: Persuasive Discourse and Disciplinarity in the Human Sciences,* Charlottesville and London: University Press of Virginia

Romano, Carlin. 2003. 'Was it as bad for you as it was for me?' in *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* Oct. 24 2003 (accessed 13/10/08). http://chronicle.com/free/v50/i09/09b01101.htm

Rorty, Richard. 1991. *Objectivity, Relativism and Truth (Philosophical Papers, Vol. 1)*. Cambridge, New York & Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, David. 1998. 'Science Discourse and the Industrial Hierarchy' in *Reading Science: Critical and Functional Perspectives on Discourses of Science,* Jim R. Martin. & Robert Veel (Eds). London & New York: Routledge. 236-265.

Rose, H. 1993, 'Rhetoric, Feminism and Scientific Knowledge Or From Either/Or to Both/And' in *The Recovery of Rhetoric: Persuasive Discourse and Disciplinarity in the Human Sciences,* Roberts & Good (Ed), 1993.

Rüegg, W. 1993, 'Rhetoric and Anti-Rhetoric in the Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Human Sciences in Germany' in *The Recovery of Rhetoric: Persuasive Discourse and Disciplinarity in the Human Sciences,* Roberts & Good (Ed) 1993

Russell, Colin. A. 2002. 'The Conflict of Science and Religion' in *Science and Religion: A Historical Introduction.* Ed. Gary B. Ferngren. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press. 3-12.

Ryan, Lawrence V. 1953. 'The Haddon-Osorio Controversy (1563-1583)' in *Church History, Vol. 22 No. 2*. Cambridge University Press.

Said, Edward. 1995 [1978]. *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Samraj, Betty. 2002. 'Disciplinary Variation in Abstracts: The Case of Wildlife Behaviour and Conservation Biology' in *Academic Discourse,* Flowerdew, John. (Ed). London & New York:Longman. 40-56.

Santos, Boaventura S. 1995, *Towards a New Common Sense: Law, Science and Politics in the Paradigmatic Transition.* New York & London: Routledge.

Santos, Boaventura S. 2005. 'General Introduction' to *Reinventing Social Emancipation. Toward New Manifestos* in Santos, Boaventura S. (Ed.), *Vol. 1. Democratizing Democracy: Beyond the Liberal Democratic Canon*. London: Verso, pp. xvii – xxxiii.

Santos, Boaventura S. (Ed.) 2006. *Another Production Is Possible: Beyond the Capitalist Canon, Vol II* of *Reinventing Social Emancipation. Toward New Manifestos*. London: Verso.

Santos, Boaventura S. (Ed.) 2007. *Another Knowledge Is Possible, Vol. III* of *Reinventing Social Emancipation. Toward New Manifestos*. London: Verso.

Saraiva, António J. & Oscar Lopes. Undated. 16th edition. *História da Literatura Portuguesa*. Oporto: Porto Editora.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1959 [1916]. *Course in General Linguistics*, translated from the French by Wade Baskin. New York: Philosophical Library.

Schäffner, Christina. 2002. 'Discourse Analysis for Translation and Translator Training: Status, Needs, Methods' in *The Role of Discourse Analysis for Translation and in Translator Training.* Christina Schäffner (Ed). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, Ltd. 1-8.

Schäffner, Christina. (Ed.) 2002. '*The Role of Discourse Analysis for Translation and in Translator Training.* Christina Schäffner (Ed). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.

Schleppelgrell, Mary & Columbi (Eds). 2002. *Developing Advanced Literacy in First and Second Languages: Meaning with Power.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Schleppelgrell, Mary & Oliveira, Luciana. 2006. 'An Integrated Language and Content Approach for History Teachers' in *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 5*. 254-268.

Scholes, Robert. 1974. *Structuralism in Literature: An Introduction.* New Haven & London: Yale University Press.

Scollon, Ron. 1994. 'As a matter of fact: The Changing Ideology of Authorship and Responsibility in Discourse' in *World Englishes, Vol.13. Nº1.* 33-46.Oxford & Massachusetts: Basil Blackwell.

Scollon, Ron & Scollon, Suzanne W. 2001 [1995]. *Intercultural Communication,* Massachusetts: Basil Blackwell.

Searle, John. 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Serrão, Joel. 1960. 'Em Torno do Problema da "Filosofia Portuguesa"' in *Temas de Cultura Portuguesa*, Lisbon: Atica. 49-52.

Serrão, Joaquim Veríssimo. 1983. *História das Universidades*. Oporto: Lello & Irmão.

Shapin, Steven. 1996. *The Scientific Revolution.* Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.

Showalter, Elaine. 1986. 'Feminist Criticism in the Wilderness.' *The New Feminist Criticism: Essays on Women, Literature, and Theory*. Elaine Showalter. (Ed). London: Virago.

Simon, Sherry. 1996. *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission.* New York: Routledge.

Simons, Herbert. W. (Ed). 1989. *Rhetoric in the Human Sciences.* London & New Delhi: Sage.

Simons, Herbert.W. 1993. 'The Rhetoric of the Scientific Research Report: "Drug-Pushing" in a Medical Journal Article' in *The Recovery of Rhetoric: Persuasive Discourse and Disciplinarity in the Human Sciences,* Richard Roberts & James Good (Eds), Charlottesville & London: University Press of Virginia. 148-163.

Skrine, Peter. 1978. *The Baroque: Literature and Culture in Seventeenth-Century Euope*. London: Methuen & Co.

Smith, Barry et al., 1992. 'Open letter against Derrida receiving an honorary doctorate from Cambridge University', London: *The Times,* May 9.

Smith, Larry. (Ed). 1987. *Discourse Across Cultures: Strategies in World Englishes* UK: Prentice Hall.

Snell-Hornby, Mary, 1988, *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Snell-Hornby, Mary, Pöchhacker, Franz & Kaindl, Klaus. (Eds). 1992. *Translation Studies: An Interdiscipline*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Snow, C.P. 1998 [1959] *The Two Cultures,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Soja, Edward W. 1989. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London & New York: Verso.

Sokal, Alan. 2008. *Beyond the Hoax: Science, Philosophy and Culture.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sokal, Alan & Jean Bricmont. 1998 [1997]. *Fashionable Nonsense: Postmodern Intellectuals' Abuse of Science*. New York: Picador.

Spade, Paul Vincent, 2006. "William of Ockham", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2006 Edition)*, Edward N. Zalta (Ed.) (accessed 13/10/08). http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2006/entries/ockham

Spender, Dale. 1980. *Man Made Language.* London: Pandora.

Spivak, Gayatri C. 2000 [1993]. 'The Politics of Translation' in *The Translation Studies Reader*, Lawrence Venuti (Ed.) London & New York: Routledge. 397-416.

Swales, John M. 1990. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings* Cambridge, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press

Swales, John, U.Ahmad, Y-Y. Chang, D.Chavez, D.Dressen, and R. Seymour. 1998. 'Consider This: the Role of Imperatives in Scholarly Writing' in *Applied Linguistics 19/1*. 97-121.

Tawney, R.H. 1938 [1922], *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism,* West Drayton: Penguin.

Taylor, Charles A. 1998. 'Science as Cultural Practice: A Rhetorical Perspective' in *Essays in the Study of Scientific Discourse: Methods, Practice and Pedagogy*, John T.Battalio (Ed.), Stamford and London: Ablex. 89-101.

Thompson, Geoff. 2001. 'Interaction in Academic Writing: Learning to Argue with the Reader' in *Applied Linguistics 22/1.* 58-78.

Timmermans, Benoît, 2002 [1999]. 'Renascimento e Modernidade da Retórica' (translated from the French by Maria Manuel Berjano) in *História da Retórica,* Michel Meyer, Manuel M. Carrilho & Benoît Timmermans. Lisbon: Temas e Debates. 83-226.

Toffler, Alvin. 1984. 'Science and Change'. Foreword to *Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature* by Ilya Prigogine & Isabelle Stengers, London: Fontana.

Toolan, Michael J. 1988. *Narrative: A Critical Linguistic Introduction.* London & New York: Routledge.

Torgal, Luís Reis. 1988 [1978]. *A Universidade de Coimbra*. Coimbra: Reitora da Universidade de Coimbra.

Torgal, Luís Reis. 1992. 'Introdução' in *Ideologia, Cultura e Mentalidade no Estado Novo: Ensaios sobre a Universidade de Coimbra,* Luís Reis Torgal (Ed.). Coimbra: Faculty of Letters. 13-22.

Torgal, Luís Reis. 1999. *A Universidade e o Estado Novo: O Caso de Coimbra 1926-1961.* Coimbra: Minerva.

Toulmin, Stephen. 2001. *Return to Reason.* Cambridge MA & London: Harvard University Press.

Toury, Gideon. 1978. 'The Nature and Role of Norms in Literary Translation' in *Literature and Translation: New Perspectives in Literary Studies*. Leuven: Acco.

Toury, Gideon. 1982. 'A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies' in *Dispositio: Revista Hispánica de Semiótica Literaria, Vol. VII, No. 19-20-21*. 23-39.

Toury, Gideon. 2006. 'Conducting research on a "Wish-to-Understand" basis' in *Translation Studies at the Interface of Disciplines*, Duarte, João F., Rosa, Alexandra A. & Seruya, Teresa (Eds), Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 55-66.

Trevor-Roper, Hugh. 1968. 'The Phenomenon of Fascism' in *European Fascism*, S.J. Woolf (Ed.). London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson. 18-38.

Tribble, Christopher. 2008. 'In this Present Paper…Some Emerging Norms in Lingua Franca English in the Sciences?' in the *Proceedings of the 8th Teaching and Language Corpora Conference*, pp. 307-309. Lisbon: ISLA.

Trosborg, Anna. 2002. 'Discourse Analysis as Part of Teacher Training' in *The Role of Discourse Analysis for Translation and in Translator Training.* Christina Schäffner (Ed). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, Ltd. 9-52.

Turner, Graeme. 1996 [1990]. *British Cultural Studies: An Introduction.* London & New York: Routledge.

Unamuno, Miguel. 1954 [1921]. *The Tragic Sense of Life*, transl. J.E.Crawford Flitch, London: Macmillan & Co.

Unamuno, Miguel. 1935. 'Comentário: Nueva Vuelta a Portugal' in *Ahora,* 3.7.

Uzgalis, William, "John Locke", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Summer 2007 Edition)*, Edward N. Zalta (Ed.) (accessed 13/10/08) http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2007/entries/locke

Valenza, Robin & John Bender, 2003. 'Hume's Learned and Conversable Worlds' in *Just Being Difficult? Academic Writing in the Public Arena*, Jonathan Culler & Kevin Lamb (Eds). California:Stanford University Press, 29-42.

Van Bonn, Sarah & Swales, John. 2007. 'English and French Journal Abstracts in the Language Sciences: Three Exploratory Studies' in *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 6*. 93-108.

Ventola, Eija. & Mauranen, Anna. (Eds). 1996, *Academic Writing: Intercultural and Textual Issues*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*, London & New York: Routledge.

Vermeer, Hans. 1997. 'Para Quê Traduzir' in the Proceedings from the 3rd Translation Conference of the Instituto Superior de Assistentes e Intérpretes, Oporto.

Vermeer, Hans. 2000. 'Skopos and Commission in Translational Action' in *The Translation Studies Reader*, Lawrence Venuti (Ed.) London & New York: Routledge. 221-232.

Vickers, Brian. 1993. 'The Recovery of Rhetoric: Petrarch, Erasmus, Perelman' in *The Recovery of Rhetoric: Persuasive Discourse and Disciplinarity in the Human Sciences,* Richard Roberts & James Good (Eds). Charlottesville & London: University Press of Virginia. 25-48.

Von Flotow, Louise 1991. *Translation and Gender: Translation in the Era of Feminism.* Manchester: St Jerome.

Weber, Max. 1992, 1930 [1920]. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism,* translated from the German by Talcott Parsons. New York and London: Routledge.

White, Hayden. 1978. *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism.* Baltimore & London: John Hopkins Press.

White, Hayden. 1997. ‘The Suppression of Rhetoric in the Nineteenth Century’ in Schildgen, Brenda Deen (Ed.), *The Rhetoric Canon.* Detroit: Wayne State University, 21-31.

White, Hayden. 1999. *Figural Realism: Studies in the Mimesis Effect.* Baltimore & London: John Hopkins.

Whittaker, Rachel. 1995. ‘Theme, Processes and the Realisation of Meanings in Academic Articles’ in *Thematic Development in English Texts*, Mohsen Ghadessy (Ed). London and New York: Pinter

Wiegman, Robyn. 2003. ‘Feminism’s Broken English’ in *Just Being Difficult? Academic Writing in the Public Arena*, Jonathan Culler & Kevin Lamb (Eds). California:Stanford University Press, 75-94.

Wignell, Peter. 1998a. ‘Technicality and Abstraction in Social Science’ in *Reading Science: Critical and Functional Perspectives on Discourses of Science* Martin, J.R. & Veel, R. (Eds). 297-326.

Wignell, Peter. 1998b. *Making the Abstract Technical: On the Evolution of Social Science.* PhD Dissertation. Department of Linguistics, University of Sydney.

Wignell, Peter, Martin, J.R. & Eggins, S. 1993 ‘The Discourse of Geography: Ordering and Explaining the Experiential World’ in *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power,* Halliday & Martin (Eds), Pittsburgh & London: University of Pittsburgh Press. 136-165.

Williams, Glyn. 1999. *French Discourse Analysis: the Method of Post-Structuralism*. London & New York: Routledge.

Williams, Raymond. 1983 [1976]. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society.* London: Fontana.

Wilson, David B. 2002. ‘The Historiography of Science and Religion’ in *Science and Religion: A Historical Introduction.* Gary B. Ferngren (Ed.). Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.13-27.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 2006 [1956]. *Philosophical Investigations.* Translated from the German by G.E.M.Anscombe. Malden & Oxford: Blackwell.

Wodak, Ruth & Meyer, Michael. 2001. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis.* London, California & New Delhi: Sage.

Wolin, Richard. 1993. ‘Preface to the MIT press edition: Note on a missing text’. In *The Heidegger Controversy: A Critical Reader.* R. Wolin (Ed.) Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wood, David & Robert Bernasconi (Eds). 1985. *Derrida and Différance*. Warwick: Parousia Press.

Woods, Peter. 2006 [1999]. *Successful Writing for Qualitative Researchers.* London & New York: Routledge.

Woods, Thomas E. 2005. *How the Catholic Church Built Western Civilization.* Washington DC: Regnery.

Wright, Jonathan. 2005. *The Jesuits: Missions, Myths and Histories.* London: Harper Perennial.

Yakhontova, Tatyana. 2002.’“Selling” or "Telling"? The issue of cultural variation in research genres' in *Academic Discourse,* John Flowerdew (Ed). London & New York: Longman.

Yakhontova, Tatyana. 2006. 'Cultural and Disciplinary Variation in Academic Discourse: The Issue of Influencing Factors” in *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 5*. 153-167.

APPENDICES