

Slovenski jezik  
Slovene Linguistic  
Studies

6  

---

2007

POSEBNI ODTIS – OFFPRINT

Ljubljana – Lawrence

**Agnes Pisanski Peterlin**

Filozofska fakulteta, Ljubljana

## **Grammatical Forms of Text-Organising Metatext: A Slovene-English Contrastive Analysis**

V članku so predstavljeni rezultati slovensko-angleške kontrastivne analize slovničnih oblik, ki se pojavljajo v dveh vrstah metabesedilnih elementov, to so napovedi in sklici. Analiza je narejena na korpusu znanstvenih člankov. Glavne razlike so v rabi prihodnjega in sedanjega časa v napovedih ter v rabi preteklih časov in stavkov brez osebne glagolske oblike v sklicih.

The paper presents the results of a Slovene-English contrastive analysis of grammatical forms found in two metatext categories: previews and reviews. A corpus of research articles (RAs) is used in the analysis. The main differences that emerge are in the use of the future and present tense in previews and in the use of past tenses and abbreviated clauses in reviews.

### **1. Introduction**

Discourse communities vary in their use of different strategies to organise discourse above the sentence level; they follow a variety of rhetorical conventions that govern textual structuring. Because lack of an awareness of such conventions may lead to difficulties in discourse production/reception, it is important to explore the textual conventions of different discourse communities: both disciplinary and cultural. Systematic research on rhetorical structures is relevant from both a theoretical and a practical point of view. From a theoretical point of view, it offers insight into the nature of rhetorical elements, which comprise a very heterogeneous category that is often problematic for description, because they constitute functional rather than formal categories (cf. Hyland, 2005). On the other hand, studies in contrastive rhetoric are useful from a practical point of view as well, above all in first- and second/foreign-language writing, writing instruction and translation. Whereas research focusing on disciplinary communities and their conventions is especially valuable for first-language writing and writing instruction, studies involving interlingual and intercultural differences contribute mostly to second/foreign-language writing, writing instruction and translation.

In the context of interlingual and intercultural studies on rhetorical conventions, metatext is one of the most frequently explored domains. Metatext, or metadiscourse, is used to organise a text and help the reader interpret and evaluate it. Research on metatext/metadiscourse has been carried out by a number of linguists (e.g., Williams, 1981; Vande Kopple, 1985; Clyne, 1987; Crismore and Farnsworth, 1990; Ventola and Mauranen, 1991; Mauranen, 1993a; Mauranen, 1993b; Intaraprawat and Steffensen, 1995; Valero-Garcés, 1996; Hyland, 1997; Bäcklund, 1998; Bunton, 1999; Hyland, 2000; Fuertes-Olivera et al., 2001; Crawford Camiciottoli, 2003; Hyland, 2005; Ifantidou, 2005); many

of these studies focus on intercultural rhetorical differences in academic discourse, in which successful intercultural discourse production/reception is essential.

Various linguists note that metatext analysis is in its essence a functional analysis (e.g., Mauranen, 1993b: 47). It is therefore impossible to formally define metatext units, but it is also important to explore the possible formal realisations of metatext because this may provide a better insight into its nature.

Research carried out so far shows that there may be considerable differences in the frequency and systematic distribution of metatext between different cultural communities – for example, German (Clyne, 1987), Finnish (Mauranen, 1993b), Czech (Čmejrková and Daneš, 1997), Swedish and German (Bäcklund, 1998), Bulgarian (Vassileva, 2001), etc. Most analyses suggest that metatext tends to be used more frequently and more systematically in English-language texts written by native speakers of English than in texts in other languages. So far, little research data on metatext use in Slovene is available, although certain studies do exist (e.g., Gorjanc, 1998; Kalin Golob, 2000). An English-Slovene contrastive analysis reveals that the use of two selected metatext categories (previews and reviews) is more limited in the Slovene texts analysed compared to the English texts used in the analysis (Pisanski Peterlin, 2005: 315). Comparing the formal realisations of selected metatext categories in Slovene and English is the next logical step in determining the similarities and differences between metatext in these two languages.

It is the aim of this paper to show that there are important differences between Slovene and English in the grammatical structures used in the two selected metatext categories, previews and reviews, for which differences in the frequency of use have already been established (Pisanski Peterlin, 2005); therefore an awareness of rhetorical conventions governing metatext in both languages is necessary for successful intercultural communication between the Slovene academic community and the international academic community. The second purpose of the paper is to show that differences between the two selected disciplines in the grammatical structures used in previews and reviews can also be observed within the same language. This suggests that detailed knowledge of disciplinary conventions is essential for the acceptability of the text. The corpus used in the present analysis is the corpus examined in Pisanski Peterlin (2005); the texts are listed in the Appendix. The present analysis is limited to the grammatical form of the verb, although this is, of course, not the only variable in which previews and reviews may differ. The verbal form was chosen because other variables (such as the adjective form, the pronoun, etc., which also frequently express anaphoric or cataphoric links) occur less systematically.

## 2. Selected metatext categories

For practical reasons, this analysis is limited to two types of metatext used for signposting. According to McCarthy, signposting the text is “showing a reader a way round it” (1991: 31). Signposting is thus a type of metatext that helps the reader understand how the propositional content of the text is organised. Two subtypes of signposting can be distinguished: retrospective signposting, or reviews, elements used to remind the reader about what has already been said in the text, and prospective signposting, or previews, elements used to announce what is about to be presented in the text. The following sentences (1) are examples of three Slovene previews from the

introductory section of a mathematics paper from the corpus. The sentences follow a brief introductory passage in which certain basic definitions and conventions used in the paper are explained. The previews announce the content of the paper.

- (1) Očitno sta preslikavi  $f(x) = x$  in  $f(z) = 0$  endomorfizma. Ti dve preslikavi bomo imenovali trivialna endomorfizma. V članku bomo pokazali, da so vsi endomorfizmi obsega realnih števil trivialni. Mnogo bolj zapletena je struktura endomorfizmov obsega kompleksnih števil. Pokazali bomo, da obstaja veliko netrivialnih endomorfizmov obsega kompleksnih števil. Med drugim bomo ugotovili, da obstajajo povsod nezvezni avtomorfizmi (bijektivni endomorfizmi) obsega kompleksnih števil. (Šemrl, 1996)

In (2) an example of a review from an English mathematics paper from the corpus is provided.

- (2) §4. THE FUNDAMENTAL THEOREM. We have noted in §1 that the Lebesgue integral is not powerful enough to integrate every derivative. This fact led Denjoy and Perron to develop their (very different) theories of integration. (Bartle, 1996)

In the above example, the review on page 628 reminds the reader of the following statement (2a) found in the introductory section of the paper, on page 625:

- (2a) There exist functions  $F$  that are differentiable at every point, but such that their derivatives  $F'$  are not Lebesgue integrable.

In her analysis, Mauranen (1993a: 10) notes that previews and reviews occur in the form of clauses, sometimes in the form of abbreviated clauses. She claims that combinations of reviews and previews often form a single unit of commentary in a text. Mauranen observes that different types of metatext units tend “to cluster in the same metatextual units” (1993a: 10).

### 3. Corpus

The corpus used in the analysis is composed of 32 research articles (RAs) from two disciplines (mathematics and archaeology; for each discipline 16 articles were selected, 8 in Slovene and 8 in English.). All the articles were published between 1995 and 1997; their length is between 3,000 and 10,500 words. RAs from four journals were selected: *American Mathematical Monthly* (for English mathematics articles), *Obzornik za matematiko in fiziko* (for Slovene mathematics articles), *Antiquity* (for English archaeology articles) and *Arheološki vestnik* (for Slovene archaeology articles).

### 4. Method

The texts are analysed in three stages. In the first stage, all the instances of previews and reviews identified in all the texts used in the analysis and the grammatical forms of the verbs used in them are determined. The second stage includes the processing of quantitative data on the grammatical forms used for individual parts of the corpus. In the third stage a comparison between the results for the two lan-

guages and the two disciplines is drawn, and the examples of previews and reviews are analysed once more to shed light on the differences that have been established.

## 5. Results

Table 1 shows the number of examples for all the verbal forms.

Form	English			Slovene		
	Math.	Arch.	Total	Math	Arch.	Total
Present Tense	35	11	<b>46</b>	1	2	<b>3</b>
Future Tense	11	4	<b>15</b>	32	0	<b>32</b>
Let	3	0	<b>3</b>	–	–	–
<i>Naj</i>	–	–	–	0	2	<b>2</b>
Imperative	–	–	–	8	0	<b>8</b>
Modal Verb	5	1	<b>6</b>	1	0	<b>1</b>
Present Perfect	19	2	<b>21</b>	–	–	–
Past Tense	6	0	<b>6</b>	–	–	–
<i>Preteklik</i>	–	–	–	13	5	<b>18</b>
Non-finite/verbless clause	4	3	<b>7</b>	1	1	<b>2</b>

**Table 1.** Forms of signposting used in all the subcorpora and the sum total for the English and Slovene parts of the corpus

Because there is some discrepancy between the English and Slovene morphology, the grammatical terms used in the table above must be explained. The term *present tense* is used to label both the English present simple and the Slovene *sedanjik* ‘present tense’. Similarly, the term *future tense* is used for the English *will/shall* future and the Slovene *prihodnjik* ‘future tense’. The English verb *let* is listed as a separate category and is labelled as *let*; similarly, the Slovene particle *naj* ‘let’ is listed as a separate category labelled as *naj*. The term *imperative* is used for the Slovene *velelnik* ‘imperative’ (1st person). The term *modal verb* is used to cover all the English and Slovene modal verbs used. The term *present perfect* is used for the English present perfect simple, the term *past tense* is used for the English past simple and *preteklik* is used for the Slovene *preteklik* ‘past tense’. The term *non-finite/verbless clause* is used for both the English and Slovene non-finite and verbless clauses.

On the whole, different verbal forms tend to be used for previews and reviews; the only form that was found in both is the present tense. Tables 2 and 3 show the results for previews and reviews separately.

Form	English			Slovene		
	Math.	Arch.	Total	Math.	Arch.	Total
Present Tense	32	10	42	1	2	3
Future Tense	11	4	15	32	0	32
Let	3	0	3	–	–	–
<i>Naj</i>	–	–	–	0	2	2
Imperative	–	–	–	8	0	8
Modal Verb	5	1	6	1	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>46</b>

**Table 2.** The forms of previews in English and Slovene research articles

Table 2 shows that for advanced labelling the present tense, the future tense, let, *naj*, the imperative and modal verbs were used in the articles analysed.

Form	English			Slovene		
	Math.	Arch.	Total	Math.	Arch.	Total
Present Tense	3	1	4	–	–	–
Modal Verb	–	–	–	1	0	1
<i>Preteklik</i>	–	–	–	13	5	18
Present Perfect	19	2	21	–	–	–
Past Tense	6	0	6	–	–	–
Non-finite/verbless clauses	4	3	7	1	1	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>21</b>

**Table 3.** The forms of reviews in English and Slovene research articles

Table 3 shows that for retrospective labelling the present tense, the present perfect, the past tense, the *preteklik* and non-finite/verbless clauses were found in the corpus used in the analysis.

## 6. Discussion

Because it has been seen that previews and reviews have almost completely different formal realisations, it is best to consider them separately. Table 2 shows an important discrepancy between Slovene and English previews. In the English articles, the most frequent grammatical form used for advance labelling is the present tense (42 exam-

ples); in both disciplines more than half of the previews are expressed in the present tense. On the other hand, such use of the present tense is quite rare in the Slovene articles (three examples); only one of the 42 previews found in the Slovene mathematics RAs is in the present tense. It is difficult to come to any conclusion regarding the use of the present tense in previews in the Slovene archaeology RAs because they contain only four instances of previews, of which two are in the present tense. Examples (3) and (4) are instances of the present tense in previews found in the research articles from both disciplines in both languages:

- (3) Naslednja lema nam opiše pozitivne elemente v  $M_n$ . **Lema 1.** *Vsak pozitiven element iz  $M_n$  je enak vsoti  $n$  ali manj pozitivnih elementov oblike  $v_k * v_k$ , kjer so  $v_k$  matrike velikosti  $1 \times n$ .*
- (4) In the end, we return to two central aspects of mortuary practice at Franchthi: the proximity of the graves of the dead to the space of the living (and, indeed, the overlapping of spaces) and the repeated use of a given area for burial, surely essential clues to the Mesolithic attitude towards death. (Cullen, 1995)

In addition to the present tense, the future tense is frequently used in previews. Although a number of forms are available for referring to future time in English, only the formal *will/shall* future occurs in the previews of the research articles analysed, as illustrated in (5):

- (5) In this context, “looking random” means that the next number produced is unpredictable. Then we must ask, “Unpredictable by whom?” To elaborate on that point, we will consider a sequence of examples of increasing unpredictability, which corresponds to decreasing populations of predictions. (Bassein, 1996)

The future tense occurs very frequently in Slovene mathematics articles (32 examples vs. one example with the present tense; the total number of previews is 42), but it is interesting that it never occurs in Slovene archaeology articles.

In the English part of the corpus, previews in the future tense occur less frequently than previews in the present tense. In the English mathematics RAs the present tense occurs in 32 previews and the future tense in 10 previews (the total number of all previews for that part of the corpus is 51), whereas in the English archaeology RAs the present tense occurs in 10 previews and the future tense in four previews (the total number of all previews for that part of the corpus is 15). It seems that this difference between the languages can be explained by the fact that the use of the present tense with future time reference is fairly common in English. Other non-verbal elements are used to indicate future time reference. In (6), the non-verbal elements indicating future time reference are clearly noticeable:

- (6) Having established our terminology, we now consider a central idea of this article, the Mandelbrot set, or Mandelset. (Bedding and Briggs, 1996)

This sort of use is much rarer in the Slovene texts, although it does occur in (7):

- (7) Naslednja lema nam opiše pozitivne elemente v  $M_n$ . (Turnšek, 1996)

In such examples, the future tense is much more common in Slovene, as in (8):

- (8) Dokaz izreka lahko bralec najde v [4] ali [7]. Naslednji izrek pa nam bo povedal, da je struktura množice sebiadjungiranih rešitev enačbe (2.1), glede na delno urejenost v množici sebiadjungiranih matrik, kar enaka kot struktura množice invariantnih podprostorov matrike  $B - X_{\max}$  glede na inkluzijo. **Izrek 3.3.** ... (Dobovišek, 1996)

Forms other than the present and the future tense for used advanced labelling are much rarer. Imperative and optative constructions – for example, the Slovene imperative for the first-person plural (example 9), the Slovene particle *naj* (example 10) and the English verb *let* (example 11), all of which are quite similar in their essence – can sometimes occur.

- (9) **3. Nekatero lastnosti grafa M (G) Najprej si oglejmo**, kako je s številom točk in povezav grafa  $M^k$  (G) glede na število točk in povezav grafa G. Dokažemo lahko naslednjo trditev. Trditev 1. ... (Mencinger, 1996)
- (10) DODATEK 1. POZNOANTIČNO GROBIŠČE NA KICLJU BLIZU GORENJE VASI PRI ŠMARJETI. Naj na kratko opišemo še dve pomembni najdišči iz pozne antike, odkriti že konec prejšnjega stoletja. V obeh primerih gre za grobišči z okostnimi grobovi. (Božič and Ciglencečki, 1995)
- (11) Let us consider the issue of the randomness of a sequence of numbers first. The intuitive criterion for such a sequence to be considered random – technically pseudo-random – is that it “look random”, in other words, that it exhibit disorder. (Bassein, 1996)

Toporišič (2000: 360) claims that the particle *naj* and a finite verbal form are frequently used to express a wish, as in the following example: *naj gre*, which he paraphrases as ‘*želim da gre ali dovoljujem mu iti, sme iti, lahko gre*’. The examples of previews with *naj* are analogous to what Quirk et al. (1992: 829) consider the imperative for the first-person: according to them, the imperative for the first person in English is expressed using *let's* (or *let us* and *let me* in the singular); the first-person imperative marker *let's* is considered to be an unanalysed particle (Quirk et al., 1992: 148).

In the Slovene articles, only the imperative is used in the mathematics articles (8 instances) and only the form with *naj* occurs in the archaeology articles (two instances). In the English articles, previews with *let* are very rare; 3 examples are found in the mathematics articles, and no such examples occur in the archaeology articles.

Constructions with modal verbs are relatively rare. In the Slovene research articles, only one example (12) can be found in a mathematics article. In the English research articles, 6 instances occur altogether, 5 of which are from the mathematics articles. Example (13) is from an archaeology article.

- (12) Najprej moramo pokazati, da je množica S linearno neodvisna. Naj bo  $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  končna podmnožica S. Potem lahko za vsak  $i = 1, \dots, n$  najdemo tak ... (Šemrl, 1996)

- (13) A geo-archaeological investigation of the late Quaternary history of the Thessalian plain, carried out from 1982 to 1992, has enabled us to specify in detail the landscapes occupied by Neolithic farmers and to infer the reason for their choices. To do so, we must first consider the nature of river floodplains. (Van Andel and Runnels, 1995)

As far as reviews are concerned, a different set of issues emerges. Of all the forms found in reviews, past tense forms occur most frequently in both languages. (This category includes the English present perfect and past simple and the Slovene *preteklik*.) The past tense system in English is not parallel to the past tense system in Slovene (at least not to the same degree as the present tense systems are), but such systemic differences are, of course, not rare. Kovačič (1991: 164) claims that there are actually few cases where structure  $X_1$  in L1 is a functional, semantic and syntactic equivalent of structure  $X_2$  in L2.

In Slovene, the past tense form occurring in reviews is, of course, the *preteklik* as in example (14), which is found in 18 out of 20 reviews all together.

- (14) Algoritem, ki smo ga uporabili v dokazu trditve 1.1, je dobro poznan Evklidov algoritem. (Bračič, 1996)

In the English articles, the present perfect occurs much more frequently (21 cases) in reviews than the past tense (6 cases). This can probably be explained by the fact that the present perfect inherently indicates current relevance. The idea of a review is quite similar to this: what has already been said is once more made relevant for the present (the moment of writing/reading) by the review, as in example (15). However, instances of reviews with the past simple can also be found (in the mathematics research articles only), although the form itself does not express a connection with the present, as in example (16). This may be a consequence of the fact that in informal, especially American, English, the present perfect is often used instead of the past tense. McArthur (1992) claims that such usage is nonstandard and typical of American English.

- (15) We have shown at the outset that the Neolithic advance in Greece and the southern Balkans proceeded mainly in areas not occupied by an indigenous Mesolithic population, while farther west and north such a population did exist. (Van Andel and Runnels, 1995)
- (16) As a result, if no strand representing an HP is generated in Step 1, then the probability that there is no HP in the graph is very high. In fact, “for all practical purposes this result could be taken as certainty, since most ‘definite’ conclusions in every day life are based on far lower probabilities” [Devlin, p. 16]. ... As we saw above, a PDP provides good evidence that there are no HPs in a graph. (Fallis, 1996)

Because the English language system formally distinguishes between a past action related to the present and a past action not related to the present, and the Slovene language system does not, current relevance is expressed in Slovene using other means. One of the most frequent means of expressing current relevance is the adverb *že*

'already'. Examples (17) and (18) illustrate the similarities between the construction *preteklik + že* and the present perfect.

- (17) Debelina plasti II znaša 56 cm, kar pomeni že precej debelo plast. Ta profil je bil posnet že v območju, kjer se skalno dno spušča in se sedimenti debelijo. Omenili smo že, da se debelina plasti zelo spreminja in je večinoma precej manjša od debeline v tem profilu. (Brodar, 1996)
- (18) Ammerman (1989: 164) pointed to three propositions essential to the indigenist model: i) there was a settled Mesolithic population ready to accept farming as a way of life; ii) late Mesolithic and early Neolithic population densities were similar in any given region, and iii) continuity existed in settlements across the region. As we have noted, these conditions are not met in Greece where the evidence indicates that agriculturalists settled almost solely in regions without a history of Mesolithic occupation. (Van Andel and Runnels, 1995)

In addition to the past tense forms discussed above, non-finite and verbless clauses also appear in reviews, although much less frequently. Among all the reviews in both languages (58), only 9 non-finite and verbless clauses occur: 7 in the English research articles (4 in the mathematics articles and 3 in the archaeology articles) and 2 in the Slovene research articles (1 in a mathematics article and 1 in an archaeology article).

It seems likely that the use of clauses without a finite verbal form as metatext is more limited in Slovene than in English. Although no significant differences in the use of verbless clauses between the two languages can be expected, the use of non-finite clauses is once again linked to systemic differences between the two languages; contrastive analyses of non-finite verbal forms confirm this systemic difference (e.g., Kovačič, 1991; Kocijančič Pokorn and Šuštaršič, 1999; Kocijančič Pokorn and Šuštaršič, 2001). Non-finite verbal forms in general are more frequently used in English than in Slovene: thus Kovačič (1991: 166) claims that the participle is used much more frequently in English than in Slovene because it is not as stylistically marked as it is in Slovene, and Kocijančič Pokorn and Šuštaršič (1999: 280) suggest that the use of the infinitive in Slovene is in some cases equivalent to its use in English, whereas in other cases a finite verbal form in a main or subordinate clause is used in Slovene where the infinitive is used in English, and there are cases in which either the infinitive or a finite verbal form may be used.

The small number of reviews with no finite verbal form in Slovene can be explained by the fact that the use of such forms is very limited in Slovene and encompasses mainly fixed expressions; for example, *kot že rečeno* 'as already stated'.

- (19) Having determined that the sequence has at least two limit points, two more questions occur to us. (Brillhart and Morton, 1996)
- (20) Pri preverjanju na terenu smo, kot že rečeno, ugotovili, da je bil morebitni depo odkrit v sklopu poznoantične naselbinske postojanke. (Božič and Ciglencečki, 1995)

Of all the forms in reviews, the present tense occurs least frequently. It has already been mentioned that examples of such present tense use were only found in

the English articles (3 in the mathematics articles and 1 in the archaeology articles). In such examples, the current relevance is so strong that a present tense is used to express it.

- (21) Of course, the preceding paragraphs do not provide an exhaustive demonstration that there is no epistemically important difference between the methods acceptable to mathematicians and a PDP. (Fallis, 1996)

## 7. Conclusion

The analysis shows that four important differences between forms of previews and reviews found in the English and Slovene RAs analysed can be observed, which confirms the initial hypothesis. The first difference concerns the use of the present tense, which occurs very frequently in English previews, whereas its use is quite restricted in the Slovene texts. The second difference is related to the first one: the future tense in previews is found twice as frequently in the Slovene RAs as it is in the English RAs.

The third difference concerns the forms found in reviews and can be explained by the systemic differences in referring to the past between the two languages. In the English texts, the present perfect occurs in reviews very frequently, and the past tense is far less frequent. This is not surprising because the present perfect expresses current relevance whereas the past tense does not, and current relevance is, of course, a key characteristic of reviews. In Slovene, the *preteklik* is the functional equivalent of both the English present perfect and the past tense, and so it is understandable that the *preteklik* is found in most reviews. Current relevance is sometimes stressed and made explicit by the adverb *že*.

The fourth difference concerns the use of abbreviated clauses in reviews; such use is relatively rare in both languages, although more examples were found in the English texts. Contrastive analyses of non-finite forms (Kovačič, 1991; Kocijančič Pokorn and Šuštaršič, 1999; Kocijančič Pokorn and Šuštaršič, 2001) suggest that the use of non-finite forms is more limited in Slovene than in English. It therefore seems likely that the same is true of the use of non-finites in reviews. In addition to the forms mentioned above, imperative-optative forms and modal verbs have also been found in previews. However, because such forms are relatively rare, it is difficult to come to any conclusions regarding their use.

In addition to the interlingual differences listed above, certain differences in the preference of grammatical form of the selected metatext categories can also be observed between the two disciplines within the same language, most notably, the preference for the future tense in previews in the Slovene mathematical articles and no such instances occurring in the Slovene archaeological articles. As the number of previews and reviews is significantly lower in the archaeological texts in both languages, the differences are less pronounced.

Because the corpus used in the analysis is quite limited in size, it must be stressed that the results of the present study are not representative of Slovene or English writing in general. Nonetheless they indicate potential problem areas to be explored through further research.

Metatext is a very complex and heterogeneous concept: the present study with its formal description of two metatext categories, previews and reviews, in two languages and two disciplines, can provide a framework for the methodology of subsequent analyses of this issue. Furthermore, the analysis of differences in metatext form between Slovene and English provides valuable information for successful discourse production/reception in Slovene and successful intercultural communication between the Slovene academic community and the international academic community.

### References

- Bäcklund, I., 1998. Metatext in professional writing. A contrastive study of English, German and Swedish. *TEFA* 25: 1–42.
- Bunton, D., 1999. The use of higher level metatext in Ph.D. theses. *English for Specific Purposes* 18: S41–S56.
- Clyne, M. G., 1987. Cultural differences in the organization of academic texts: English and German. *Journal of Pragmatics* 11: 211–247.
- Crawford Camiciottoli, B., 2003. Metadiscourse in ESP reading comprehension: an exploratory study. *Reading in a Foreign Language* 15: 1–19
- Crismore, A., and Farnsworth, R., 1990. Metadiscourse in popular and professional science discourse. In W. Nash (ed.) *The Writing Scholar*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. 118–136.
- Čmejrková, S., and Daneš, F., 1997. Academic writing and cultural identity: the case of Czech academic writing. In A. Duszak (ed.) *Culture and Styles of Academic Discourse*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 41–61.
- Fuertes-Olivera, P. A., Velasco-Sacristán, M., Arribas-Baño, A., and Samaniego-Fernández, E., 2001. Persuasion and advertising English: Metadiscourse in slogans and headlines. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33: 1291–1307.
- Gorjanc, V., 1998. Konektorji v slovničnem opisu znanstvenega besedila. *Slavistična revija* 46 (4): 367–388.
- Hyland, K., 1997. Persuasion and context: The pragmatics of academic metadiscourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 30: 437–455.
- Hyland, K., 2000. *Disciplinary Discourses*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Hyland, K., 2005. Metadiscourse. Exploring Interaction in Writing. London and New York: Continuum.
- Ifantidou, E., 2005. The semantics and pragmatics of metadiscourse. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37: 1925–1953
- Intaraprawat, P., and Steffensen, M. S., 1995. The use of metadiscourse in good and poor ESL essays. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 4: 253–272.
- Kalin Golob, M., 2000. Razvoj sklicevalnih avtomatizmov v prvem slovenskem dnevniku. *Slavistična revija* 48: 1–26.
- Kocijančič Pokorn, N., and Šuštaršič, R., 1999. Slovensko-angleška protistavna analiza nedoločnika v vlogi premega predmeta. *Vestnik* 23: 267–282.
- Kocijančič Pokorn, N., and Šuštaršič, R., 2001. Slovensko-angleška protistavna analiza nedoločnika v vlogi osebkovega oziroma povedkovega določila. *Slovenski jezik – Slovene linguistic studies* 3: 32–41.

- Kovačič, I., 1991. Medsebojni odnos kontrastivne analize in prevajanja – praktičen primer. In M. Tir. (ed.) *Zbornik IV simpozija Kontrastivna jezička istraživanja*. Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet. 163–171.
- Mauranen, A., 1993a. Contrastive ESP rhetoric: Metatext in Finnish-English economics texts. *English for Specific Purposes* 12: 3–22
- Mauranen, A., 1993b. *Cultural Differences in Academic Rhetoric: A Textlinguistic Study*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- McArthur, T., (ed.) 1992. *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- McCarthy, M., 1991. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
- Pisanski Peterlin, A., 2005. Text-organising metatext in research articles: An English-Slovene contrastive analysis. *English for Specific Purposes* 25: 307–319.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., and Svartvik, J., 1992. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. Tenth impression. (1st edition 1985.) London and New York: Longman.
- Toporišič, J., 2000. *Slovenska slovnica*. Maribor: Obzorja.
- Valero-Garcés, C., 1996. Contrastive ESP rhetoric: Metatext in Spanish-English economics texts. *English for Specific Purposes* 15: 279–294.
- Vande Kopple, W. J., 1985. Some exploratory discourse on metadiscourse. *College Composition and Communication* 36: 82–94
- Vassileva, I., 2001. Commitment and detachment in English and Bulgarian academic writing. *English for Specific Purposes* 20: 83–102.
- Ventola, E., and Mauranen, A., 1991. Non-native writing and native revising of scientific articles. In E. Ventola (ed.) *Recent systemic and other functional views on language*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 457–492
- Williams, J. M., 1981. *Style: Ten Lessons in Clarity and Grace*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.

### **Appendix: The corpus used in the analysis**

#### **English Research Articles**

##### **Mathematics**

- Bartle, R. G., 1996. Return to the Riemann Integral. *American Mathematical Monthly* 103 (8): 625–632.
- Bassein, S., 1996. A sampler of randomness. *American Mathematical Monthly* 103 (6): 483–489.
- Bedding, S., and Briggs, K., 1996. Iteration of quaternion functions. *American Mathematical Monthly* 103 (8): 654–664.
- Brillhart, J., and Morton, P., 1996. A case study in mathematical research: The Golay-Rudin-Shapiro Sequence. *American Mathematical Monthly* 103 (10): 854–869.
- Burger, E. B., and Struppeck, T., 1996. Does  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} 1/n!$  really converge? Infinite series and p-adic analysis. *American Mathematical Monthly* 103 (7): 565–577.
- Fallis, D., 1996. Mathematical proof and the reliability of DNA. *American Mathematical Monthly* 103 (6): 491–497.
- Neidinger R. D., and Annen, R. J. III, 1996. The road to chaos is filled with polynomial curves. *American Mathematical Monthly* 103 (8): 640–653.

Pinkham, R. S. 1996. Mathematics and modern technology. *American Mathematical Monthly* 103 (7): 539–545.

### **Archaeology**

- Barclay, G. J., Maxwell, G. S., Simpson, I. A., and Davidson, D. A., 1995. The Cleaven Dyke: a Neolithic cursus monument/bank barrow in Tayside Region, Scotland. *Antiquity* 69 (263): 317–326.
- Cooney, G., and Mandal, S., 1995. Getting to the core of the problem: petrological results from the Irish Stone Axe Project. *Antiquity* 69 (266): 969–980.
- Cullen, T., 1995. Mesolithic mortuary ritual at Franchthi Cave, Greece. *Antiquity* 69 (263): 270–289.
- Currie, E. J., 1995. Archaeology, ethnohistory and exchange along the coast of Ecuador. *Antiquity* 69 (264): 511–526.
- Osborne, R., 1996. Pots, trade and the archaic Greek economy. *Antiquity* 70 (267): 31–44.
- Pearson, M. P., Sharples, N., and Mulville, J., 1996. Brochs and Iron Age society: A reappraisal. *Antiquity* 70 (267): 57–67.
- Prescott, C., 1996. Was there really a Neolithic in Norway? *Antiquity* 70 (267): 77–87.
- Van Andel, T. H., and Runnels, C. N., 1995. The earliest farmers in Europe. *Antiquity* 69 (264): 481–500.

### **Slovene Research Articles**

#### **Mathematics**

- Bračič, J., 1996. Številski sistemi s kompleksnimi osnovami. *Obzornik za matematiko in fiziko* 43 (5): 139–149.
- Dobovišek, M., 1996. Sebiadjungirane rešitve matričnih kvadratnih enačb. *Obzornik za matematiko in fiziko* 43 (3): 65–72.
- Kobal, D., 1996. Primerjava dolžin vzporednih sklenjenih poti. *Obzornik za matematiko in fiziko* 43 (5): 129–138.
- Lavrič, B., 1996. Vsote praštevil in vsote njihovih kvadratov. *Obzornik za matematiko in fiziko* 43 (6): 161–167.
- Magajna, B., 1996. Kvantna ravnina. *Obzornik za matematiko in fiziko* 43 (6): 168–177.
- Mencinger, M., 1996. Konstrukcija Mycielskega. *Obzornik za matematiko in fiziko* 43 (2): 39–46.
- Šemrl, P., 1996. Endomorfizmi obsega kompleksnih števil. *Obzornik za matematiko in fiziko* 43 (1): 1–7.
- Turnšek, A., 1996. Popolnoma pozitivne preslikave. *Obzornik za matematiko in fiziko* 43 (1): 9–15.

#### **Archaeology**

- Božič, D., and Ciglencečki, S., 1995. Zenonov tremis in poznoantična utrdba Gradec pri Veliki Strmici. *Arheološki vestnik* 46: 247–277.
- Brodar, M., 1995. Mlajša paleolitska postaja Podrisovec. *Arheološki vestnik* 46: 25–38.

- Brodar, M., 1996a. Mornova zijalka pri Šoštanju. *Arheološki vestnik* 47: 9–28.
- Brodar, M., 1996b. Vilharjeva jama v Risovcu blizu Postojne. *Arheološki vestnik* 47: 29–39.
- Dular, J., and Breščak, D., 1996. Poznohalštatska hiša na Gradišču pri Valični vasi. *Arheološki vestnik* 47: 145–162.
- Horvat, J., 1995. Notranjska na začetku rimske dobe: Parti pri Stari Sušici, Ambroževo gradišče in Baba pri Savini. *Arheološki vestnik* 46: 177–216.
- Plesničar Gec, L., 1997. Emona v pozni antiki v luči arhitekture. *Arheološki vestnik* 48: 359–370.
- Sagadin, M., 1995. Mengeš v antiki. *Arheološki vestnik* 46: 217–245.

Prispelo marca 2006, sprejeto septembra 2006  
Received March 2006, accepted September 2006

### Slovnične oblike metabesedila v vlogi organizatorja besedila: slovensko-angleška kontrastivna analiza

Diskurzne skupnosti za organizacijo diskurza nad ravniyo stavka uporabljajo različne strategije. Ker lahko nepoznavanje retoričnih konvencij povzroča težave pri oblikovanju in sprejemanju diskurza, so raziskave besedilnih konvencij različnih strokovnih in kulturnih skupnosti zelo pomembne. V okviru medjezikovnih in med-kulturnih študij retoričnih konvencij je metabesedilo eno najpogosteje raziskovanih področij.

Namen prispevka je pokazati pomembne razlike med slovenščino in angleščino pri rabi slovnični struktur v dveh izbranih kategorijah metabesedila ter analizirati razlike pri rabi slovničnih struktur v izbranih kategorijah metabesedila med dvema strokama. Iz praktičnih razlogov je analiza omejena na dve vrsti metabesedila, to so napovedi in sklici. Korpus, ki je uporabljen v analizi, je sestavljen iz 32 znanstvenih člankov iz dveh strok, matematike in arheologije, v dveh jezikih, slovenščini in angleščini.

Analiza kaže štiri pomembne razlike med oblikami napovedi in sklicev v slovenskih in angleških znanstvenih člankih. Prva razlika je v rabi sedanjika v napovedih, ki se besedilih uporablja zelo pogosto, v slovenskih pa je njegova raba precej omejena. Druga razlika dopolnjuje prvo: v slovenskih znanstvenih člankih se prihodnjik uporablja še enkrat pogosteje kot v angleških. Tretja razlika se nanaša na sistemsko razliko med jezikoma v izražanju preteklosti in zato na glagolske čase v sklicih; v angleških besedilih se pojavljata dve obliki, *present perfect* zelo pogosto in *past tense* precej redkeje. V slovenščini je preteklik funkcijsko ekvivalenten tako angleškemu *present perfect* kot *past tense*, zato ne preseneča, da se v večini sklicev pojavlja preteklik, včasih pa je relevantnost za sedanjost eksplicitno poudarjena s prislovom *že*. Četrta razlika se nanaša na rabo polstavkov v sklicih; teh je v angleških besedilih nekoliko več, čeprav so v obeh jezikih razmeroma redki. Poleg medjezikovnih razlik lahko opazimo tudi nekatere razlike med strokama.

Metabesedilo je kompleksen in heterogen koncept: pričujoča analiza ponuja okvir za metodologijo nadaljnjih študij tega področja. Hkrati rezultati te analize, ki

so pokazali razlike v obliki metabesedila med jezikoma, predstavljajo informacije, ki so pomembne za uspešno medkulturno komunikacijo med slovensko in mednarodno znanstveno skupnostjo.

### Grammatical Forms of Text-Organising Metatext: A Slovene-English Contrastive Analysis

Discourse communities vary in their use of strategies to organise discourse above the sentence level. Because lack of an awareness of rhetorical conventions may lead to difficulties in discourse production/reception, it is important to explore the textual conventions of different disciplinary and cultural communities. In the context of interlingual and intercultural studies on rhetorical conventions, metatext is one of the most frequently explored domains.

The aim of this paper is to show that there are important differences between Slovene and English in the grammatical structures used in two selected metatext categories and to analyse interdisciplinary differences in the grammatical structures used in the selected metatext categories. For practical reasons, this analysis is limited to two types of metatext used for signposting, i.e., previews and reviews. The corpus used in the analysis is composed of 32 research articles from two disciplines, mathematics and archaeology, in two languages, Slovene and English.

The analysis shows that four important differences between forms of previews and reviews found in the Slovene and English RAs can be observed. The first difference concerns the use of the present tense in previews; it occurs very frequently in the English texts, whereas its use is quite restricted in the Slovene texts. The second difference is related to the first one: the future tense in previews is found twice as frequently in the Slovene RAs as it is in the English RAs. The third difference concerns systemic differences in referring to the past between the two languages and consequently the tenses found in reviews; in the English texts, two forms occur, the present perfect, which is very frequent, and the past tense, which is far less frequent. In Slovene, the *preteklik* is the functional equivalent of both the English present perfect and the past tense, and so it is understandable that the *preteklik* is found in most reviews; current relevance is sometimes stressed and made explicit by the adverb *že*. The fourth difference concerns the use of abbreviated clauses in reviews; such use is relatively rare in both languages, although more examples were found in the English texts. In addition to interlingual differences, certain interdisciplinary differences can also be observed.

Metatext is a very complex and heterogeneous concept: the present study provides a framework for the methodology of subsequent analyses of this issue. At the same time, the findings of interlingual differences in metatext form provide valuable information for successful intercultural communication between the Slovene academic community and the international academic community.