

MEANING NEGOTIATION IN ACADEMIC DISCOURSE: A TYPOLOGY OF CITATIONS AS SEMANTIC MARKERS

Tanja Collet

Abstract

In academic discourse, citations constitute a multifunctional pragmatic act: they acknowledge the property rights of writers, create intellectual or conceptual linkages, and enhance the persuasiveness of a text. Citations can, furthermore, serve to negotiate term meaning within the text. In this capacity, they acquire a dual dialogic quality: as citations, they participate in the social construction of knowledge by engaging in a 'dialogue' with the writers of previous texts but, as semantic markers, they also interact with the text's readers by responding to plausible needs for semantic clarification. The article's main focus is to present a typology of citations used as semantic markers. An analysis of the rhetoricity of semantic markers in academic discourse is also included in the discussion.

Keywords

academic discourse, citation analysis, semantic marker, meaning construal, writer-reader interaction

1 Introduction

Academic discourse is a discipline-specific communicative practice that broadly aims to generate and share knowledge. Academic texts, specialist works of writing such as research articles and monographs are generally written for a readership of insiders, members of a same discourse community who share required levels of content and discursual expertise (Swales 1990). It follows that academic texts are more often than not constructed to be understood within a limited cultural context only (Hyland 2004): a context determined by domain knowledge, on the one hand, and specific lexical and rhetorical practices, on the other. This article focuses on one such rhetorical practice: a form of manifest intertextuality (Fairclough 1992) or citation that aims to delineate or specify the meaning of a term by retracing and analyzing previous occurrences in the writings of other insiders, or by referring to such writings for whatever relevant semantic information they may contain. Although citations in general have received a great deal of attention in the literature of various fields, from Information Science to Applied Linguistics, little has been written about this particular form of manifest intertextuality. However, like citations in general, which are virtually mandatory in academic discourse, this form of manifest intertextuality can also be said to

constitute a conventional textual format, specifically in the areas of the humanities and the social sciences, where term meaning tends to be negotiated within the text and generally represents a domain- or theory-specific interpretation of what exists in the outside world. It is, indeed, difficult to imagine a text in an area such as philosophy or linguistics that does not contain a passage such as the one below:

- (1) *Nonsense errors involve, as Delisle, Lee-Jahnke et al. (1999: 163) state, misinterpreting the meaning of a word in the source text in such a manner that it leads to producing an illogical formulation in the target text.* (Bahumaid 2010: 581)

In this passage, extracted from our corpus, the citing writer delimits the meaning of *nonsense error* in his text on translator training by paraphrasing, and thus adopting, a definition that can be found in a multi-authored work in the area of translation studies published in 1999.

This type of citation, that I will henceforth call *semantic marker*, constitutes a rhetorical practice that is generally expected and accepted by community insiders in the areas of the humanities and social sciences where term meaning may fluctuate from one theoretical framework to another and where, as a consequence, the well-foundedness of an argument may depend on the precision with which terms are being used. Principally engaged in meaning construal, these citations highlight the historical quality of terms and their meanings, given that they link earlier occurrences in the works of others to present ones in the citing writer's own text. Semantic markers, then, like citations in general, rely on domain knowledge. They demonstrate the citing writer's domain knowledge, since only a knowledgeable writer is able to trace the chronology of a term's usage, but also involve the reader's domain knowledge, since they activate that knowledge during the reading process and then possibly add to it, or invite the reader to perform relevant look-ups when the activation fails or when a verification is deemed necessary.

Semantic markers, as mentioned earlier, have received very little attention in the literature. Their presence in academic texts is mentioned by only a few studies investigating citation practices and citation patterns in general, but none provide an in-depth analysis as this study attempts to do.

Since the 1960s-1970s, when citation analysis first caught on, many researchers have attempted to classify the various types of citations in citation classification schemes. In fact, according to White (2004), more than 20 such classification schemes have been drawn up since that time. The classification schemes generally adopt one of the following three perspectives: they focus

on citer motivations or on why writers cite other documents (Garfield 1977, Bavelas 1978, Brooks 1985, Brooks 1986, Case & Higgins 2000, Harwood 2009, etc.), on citation functions or on the textual functions of citations in continuous academic text (Moravcsik & Murugesan 1975, Chubin & Moitra 1975, Harwood 2009, Dontcheva-Navratilova 2016, etc.), or on the formal characteristics of citations embedded in academic discourse (e.g. Swales 1990). The classification schemes are all invariably complex, distinguishing numerous citer motivations and citation functions, and largely “idiosyncratic” (White 2004), a consequence of the fact that citation patterns and behavior are characterized by disciplinary and linguacultural variation (Peritz 1983, Dontcheva-Navratilova 2016). Few classification schemes incorporate semantically motivated citations, though there are at least two noteworthy exceptions: Garfield (1965) and Harwood (2009). Garfield (1965), one of the earliest and most-referenced studies of citer motivations, lists 15 possible motives for citing the works of other authors, obtained largely through observation and ranging from paying homage to pioneers to identifying theoretical frameworks or methods. He includes, furthermore, the following motive which hints at the possible use of citations as semantic markers: authors may insert citations to identify the publication in which a term or concept was first described. Harwood (2009), on the other hand, proposes a classification scheme consisting of eleven citation functions/citer motivations identified by interviewing informants working in two different disciplines: computer science and sociology. One such citation function/citer motivation is performed by what Harwood (2009) calls “position citations”: citations that allow authors to identify different viewpoints and explicate them in some detail. Position citations, according to the interviewees, allow various uses, one of them being that they “can also be used when writers want to specify what they understand by a particular term, when various researchers define this term in different ways” (Harwood 2009: 505). Neither Garfield (1965) nor Harwood (2009) go into any greater detail, which obviously was not the purpose of their studies. The aim of this study, however, is to provide that detail. It is corpus-based and uses content analysis to assess the properties of citations that act as semantic markers in academic discourse.

The sections below examine citation practices in general, before focusing on the characteristics of semantic markers as effective discursual strategies in academic texts. The main aim of the analysis is to construct a typology of semantic markers that uses two basic properties: the nature of the highlighted semantic information and the marker’s structural integration into the body of the text. The proposed typology is based on data extracted from a corpus of academic writings in the area of translation studies which appeared, between 2001 and 2011, in

the Canadian journal *Meta* (Journal des traducteurs – Translators’ Journal), a well-established scholarly journal published by Les Presses de l’Université de Montréal. The corpus and the method retained for its analysis will be described below as well.

2 Citation practices in academic discourse

Citation brings to the fore a fundamental characteristic of academic texts: their historicity or temporality. Academic texts are permeated by the content of prior texts. Traces of past works can be left unidentified (and will then only be noticed by highly knowledgeable insiders) or can be explicitly marked by surface cues in the body of the text. Citations are, of course, an example of the latter.

The use of citations in academic discourse has been studied from a variety of viewpoints, each identifying different purposes or discoursal functions for this form of manifest intertextuality (Fairclough 1992), a natural consequence of the fact that all scholarly writers are also readers of academic texts.

The practice of citation first drew the attention of information scientists, such as Garfield, who pioneered its study in the 1960s. Since then a large body of knowledge on citation functions and citer motivations has been produced by researchers working in at least three broad fields of study: Information Science, Sociology of Science and Applied Linguistics. We will not fully review that body of knowledge here (interested readers can consult, e.g. Swales 1986, White 2004 or Nicolaisen 2007), but restrict the discussion to the major points made by the three areas. These points, which are all relevant for semantic markers, are: citation as reward and as an ethical practice for dealing with issues regarding intellectual ownership (Information Science); citation as a ritual or as a means to participate in a discipline’s collective process of knowledge creation (Sociology of Science); citation as a rhetorical device for reader persuasion (Sociology of Science); and, citation as a distinguishing text-linguistic feature of academic writing (Applied Linguistics).

The traditional view of citations, from the Information Science perspective, is that they constitute a social device for coping with a tension that, according to Kaplan (1965), exists at the heart of all scholarly activity: every scholar’s desire to share their findings and discoveries and add to their area’s communal body of knowledge, while running the risk of having their claims stolen by other researchers. Citations, as argued by Kaplan (1965), resolve that tension, given that they serve to explicitly acknowledge the citing writer’s intellectual indebtedness and, hence, protect the cited author’s property rights and priority claims. He further elaborates that the “conferral of recognition on other works” accomplished by citations “is of obvious importance for the general recognition

processes within the social system of science” (Kaplan 1965: 182). Citations, then, do not only constitute an ethical practice, but indeed form the basis of a reward system: a system where to obtain credit for an idea, one has to give it away in the form of a publication, as explained by Cozzens (1989).

The normative view of citations, however, according to which proper etiquette in academic writing requires that one explicitly identify one’s sources, only highlights one aspect of the widespread use of citations in academic texts. Social constructionists claim, for their part, that citations signal, first and foremost, the citing writer’s reliance on the work of other authors, and prefer to explore the meaning of that dependency. They argue that the practice of citation underscores the communal nature not only of scientific knowledge but also of scientific progress. Indeed, from the social constructionist perspective, citations constitute a ritual whereby scholars affirm, on the one hand, “community membership” and the “acceptance of shared beliefs and values” (Rose 1993), and indicate, on the other, that their findings are the result of “collaborative action” (*ibid.*), even if only in the written realm. Citations, then, are symptomatic of every discipline’s collective process of knowledge creation: they embody an indirect dialogue between scholars on the meaning of earlier texts. It is in this regard that Small (1978) stressed the importance of viewing citations as interpretations of the cited works, as attempts at meaning creation and symbol formation. By linking interpretations and cited works, citations contribute to a historiography of scholarship and become clues, furthermore, to the overall cognitive structure of a discipline.

As interactions with past and current writers, citations can also be said to represent the interpersonal dimension of scholarly writing (Hewings et al. 2010). Indeed, as Hewings et al. (2010: 102) write: “Choices made regarding what work to cite is a crucial aspect of the interpersonal dimension of academic texts, with the act of citing making visible a network of scholarly relations”. This “network of scholarly relations”, made visible by the citing writer’s citation choices, helps to position the writer firmly as a member of a particular disciplinary community (community membership) and reflects, as discussed above, the writer’s intellectual influences (collaborative action). Sociologists of science, however, argue that this ‘network’ constitutes, furthermore, a rhetorical device crucial to the future success of the text in which it is embedded. Indeed, citation choices help the citing writer to create a relationship with the intended readership of the text; a readership of academic peers that needs to be persuaded to accept the findings put forward in the text and then brought to cite the text in turn so as to promote the integration of its contents into the community’s body of knowledge. Citations, then, also constitute a rhetorical resource for any researcher who is

struggling for recognition by their academic peers (Gilbert 1977). Researchers, after all, operate in a world where other academics have the power to ignore or, on the contrary, validate their claims. Consequently, researchers tend to choose their citations strategically, with the aim to enhance the overall persuasive character of their text acting as a determining factor (Brooks 1986).

It will be clear by now that citer motivations are rather complex. Hence, Harwood's (2004) claim, formulated from the perspective of Applied Linguistics, that citations constitute a multifunctional pragmatic act, i.e. a discursive act that has at least three pragmatic purposes in academic writing: a normative purpose, the acknowledgement of intellectual property rights; a social constructionist purpose, the identification of a network of scholarly relations and influences; and a rhetorical purpose, persuasion. For applied linguists, however, citations are, above all, a ubiquitous text-linguistic feature of academic writing; a distinctive feature of which the mechanics merit special attention. The act of citing, then, is often studied from the point of view of the writing process, with the focus generally being on the syntactic and lexical integration of citations in the text under construction as well as on the rhetorical value of these citation techniques.

For instance, citations can be incorporated in the text as quotation or as summary. Indeed, citing writers can choose to reproduce word for word the passage found in another work or can, on the contrary, summarize the foreign content and re-express it in their own words. Applied linguists, such as Hyland (1999, 2004), claim that these citation techniques carry substantial rhetorical meaning since the way information is presented to the text's readership is crucial in garnering acceptance for the findings being discussed. Hyland (1999) observes that citing writers overwhelmingly prefer to manipulate the cited content by rephrasing and thus in fact modifying the original author's words. Maximizing the cited passage's effectiveness in supporting the arguments put forward in the text seems to be the determining guideline here.

Swales (1990), for his part, introduced the well-known distinction between "integral" and "non-integral" citations to refer to the two syntactic options that exist for identifying the author of the cited information. Writers can choose to syntactically integrate the name of the cited author as a structural element in the citation sentence, as in:

- (2) *Swales (1990) sees a citation as integral if the name of the cited author appears as a sentence element in the citation sentence.*

Or, they can choose to separate the name of the cited author from the citation sentence, as if to signal that that information is additional and not vital, by putting it in parentheses or by referring to it with a superscript number, as in:

- (3) *A citation is non-integral if the author's name is given in parentheses or is referred to by another device, such as a superscript number (Swales 1990).*

Applied linguists, such as Hyland (1999, 2004), argue that both options serve a specific purpose in academic discourse; indeed, that they reflect a rhetorical decision on the part of the writer to either foreground the name of the cited author, i.e. the source of the cited material, or to emphasize, on the contrary, the content of the reported passage.

Other citation signals, i.e. text elements that manifestly mark citations in academic writing, have been found to have significant rhetorical value (Buckingham & Neville 1997, Hyland 2004, Tadros 1993, Thomas & Hawes 1994). Reporting verbs, for instance, used by writers to introduce foreign text fragments or reported content generally also signal stance or author commitment to the cited information. Indeed, reporting verbs, such as *suggest*, *contend*, or *show*, and *demonstrate*, are citation language forms that allow academic writers to show how they position themselves, and their texts, in relation to the reported information conveyed by the citation.

To conclude, then, from the perspective of Applied Linguistics, citations are complex multifunctional pragmatic acts, as established in Information Science and Sociology of Science, whose structural characteristics carry various rhetorical meanings, all aimed at gaining acceptance for the claims made by the text.

3 Citations as semantic markers

Semantic markers have all of the hallmarks of citations discussed in the previous section. They insert a text in a particular disciplinary tradition, position it in relation to other relevant research, and signal the novelty or continuity of that position. However, unlike citations in general, semantic markers are primarily concerned with term meaning: they are used when writers want to specify what they understand by a term, particularly when that term has already been used or defined elsewhere. Consequently, from the point of view of the text's content, their contribution is essentially semantic in nature, concerned more with the precision of the language in which the text's arguments are phrased, than with the identification of a theoretical framework or method, or with the rallying of supporting evidence for the claims made by the text. Semantic markers acknowledge, in particular, that the concept of intellectual ownership can apply

to the meaning of a term in specialized language, as opposed to that of a word in everyday language.

They are, as mentioned earlier, a unique sub-category of what Harwood (2009: 505) has called “position citations”, i.e. citations that allow authors to “(i) identify representatives and exemplars of different viewpoints; (ii) explicate researchers’ standpoints in detail; and (iii) trace the development of a researcher’s/ field’s thinking over time”. Indeed, Harwood (ibid.) includes in this wider category citations used “when writers want to specify what they understand by a particular term, when various researchers define this term in different ways”, but does not offer any further explanations. Put differently, Harwood’s wider category of position citations covers a diverse variety of citations, while including the narrowly defined semantic markers that deal solely with term meaning. Indeed, as the analysis in this article will show, citing writers use semantic markers to (i) identify relevant definitions of a term or other useful semantic information (synonyms, hyponyms, etc.); (ii) indicate whether such a definition or other such information will be applied as is or modified to better suit the argumentative needs of the text; or (iii) provide an overview of the historical evolution of a term’s meaning or usage.

Consider, for instance, the two examples of semantic markers below. In the first, the citing writer quotes word for word a definition while signalling, rather succinctly, that it will be preserved intact in the text. The example, then, implements elements (i) and (ii) of Harwood’s definition of a position citation as applied to semantic markers.

- (4) *In the context of this paper, text is used “to refer to a sequential collection of sentences or utterances which form a unity by reason of their linguistic cohesion and semantic coherence: e.g. a scientific article; a recipe; poem [...], etc.” (Wales, 1995: 459). (Sousa 2002: 28)*

In the second, on the other hand, the citing writer does not quote or summarize existing definitions, but provides etymological information by indicating that a set of key terms that will be used throughout the text mirrors, in fact, Saussure’s well-known distinction between ‘signifier’ and ‘signified’. Consequently, it can be said that this example implements elements (i) and (iii) of Harwood’s definition as applied to semantic markers.

- (5) *In the same way that Saussure (1969) suggested that the linguistic sign is comprised of the signifier and the signified, the work of professional interpreters is made up of an énoncé, or utterance, and an énonciation, the act of uttering as it is produced and received in a particular socio-cultural context. (Clifford 2001: 368)*

As citations, and in particular as position citations, semantic markers possess dialogic quality. In fact, as a social constructionist device, they constitute, on the one hand, a mechanism of indirect intercommunication among members, especially writers, of a disciplinary community, both past and present. But their dialogic quality extends, on the other hand, also to the text's readership, made up mostly of community insiders, though exceptions may occur, with whom semantic markers also interact. Indeed, semantic markers can be said to embody an indirect dialogue between the writer and the future readers of the text, since they betray a certain awareness of readers' needs for clarification. Semantic markers, then, also act as an "interactive resource" (Thompson 2001), i.e. a resource that is available to any writer who has to manage the flow of information throughout the text under construction by constantly anticipating the likely reactions and needs of imagined readers. As Thompson (2001: 61) puts it: "writers make assumptions about the questions that might plausibly be asked by the reader and construct the text to provide answers". One way of providing these answers, particularly if the anticipated question is of a terminological nature, is by way of semantic markers that expand on the meaning content of key terms employed in the text or on other semantic characteristics of these terms. The semantic marker below, for instance, inserts the text in a terminological tradition by citing and adopting the definition of *translation strategy* taken from a previous work, but responds, by the same token, to imagined requests for semantic clarification on the part of the reader. The marker, consequently, fixes the meaning of *translation strategy* in the text while informing readers that a term, used by other authors and with which they may also be familiar, namely *translation method*, is in fact a synonym.

- (6) *A translation strategy (Delisle, Lee-Jahnke et al. 1999) – or translation method, as some scholars (Newmark 1988) call it – refers to a coherent plan of action adopted by translators in translating a given text. (Bahumaid 2010: 571)*

In short, in the text, semantic markers are invested with a dual dialogic quality, operating on a vertical but also on a horizontal axis: from citing writer to authors of previous texts, and from citing writer to readers of the current text. This dual dialogic quality mirrors, to a great extent, Kristeva's (1980: 66) belief, inspired by the work of Bakhtin, that the status of a word in a text is defined "horizontally (the word in the text belongs to both writing subject and addressee) as well as vertically (the word in the text is oriented toward an anterior or synchronic [...] corpus [of texts])".

This dual dialogic quality allows semantic markers to fulfill all of the basic pragmatic functions of citations, as defined by Information Science and

Sociology of Science. Of these functions, discussed in the previous section, two mainly concern the vertical axis and one the horizontal axis. The normative and social constructionist functions enact an indirect dialogue with past and current writers, whereas the rhetorical function manipulates the text's content and form to respond to plausible reactions from the text's readership. Semantic markers, then, execute the normative function of citations by acknowledging the intellectual property rights of writers who have coined, defined or redefined terms; the social constructionist function by basing language use in the text on past language use and by firmly positioning it in a disciplinary community's terminological tradition; and, the rhetorical function by signalling a mastery of a discipline's terminological history, as well as an awareness of the audience's likely needs for precision.

Semantic markers, finally, also exploit the citation signals, studied by Applied Linguistics, to enhance the overall persuasiveness of the text segments in which they are embedded. Their structural characteristics, for instance, such as the extent of verbatim overlap with the original text, represent significant rhetorical choices. This, however, will be discussed in more detail in the section which presents the various types of semantic markers. But first the corpus from which the semantic markers were extracted and the method used for its analysis need to be described.

4 Data and methodology

A relatively small but specialized corpus was compiled for this content-based study of semantic markers. Since content-based studies of citations require extensive knowledge of the subject field (Petrić 2007, Dontcheva-Navratilova 2016), research articles in an area that the author is quite familiar with, namely translation studies, were used for the study. The articles were selected by a random process (as per the classical method in citation studies initiated by Moravcsik & Murugesan 1975) from issues of the translators' journal, *Meta*, published over a ten-year period between 2001 and 2011. In total, 60 articles were analyzed from the following issues: 46/2 (2001), 47/1 (2002), 49/1 (2004), 53/3 (2008), 53/4 (2008), 55/3 (2010), 56/1 (2011), 56/2 (2011), 56/3 (2011) and 56/4 (2011).

All the primary source texts were read in their entirety as is customary in citation content analysis (Chubin & Moitra 1975). Only influence citations (i.e. references to other scholarly texts) were considered for extraction, whereas so-called data citations (i.e. references to texts that serve as primary sources and which may or may not be scholarly) (Zwaan & Nederhof 1990: 556) were excluded. Each influence citation was analyzed within the context of the citing

text, and extracted if the citing sentence contained linguistic cues, such as reporting verbs or other expressions, hinting at the semantic value of the citation. Semantic markers, for example, are likely to contain reporting verbs, such as *define*, *describe*, *explain*, *distinguish*, *call*, *formulate*, *refer to*, etc. that indicate the citing writer's 'semantic' motivation for referring to a particular text. The example below is a case in point:

- (7) *Meanwhile Kenny (1998: 515) defines 'sanitization' as the suspected adaptation of a source text reality to make it more palatable for target audiences.* (Bowker 2001: 350)

In the absence of explicit linguistic cues, typographical cues were taken into consideration, such as the use of italics or quotation marks to highlight a term. It should be noted, however, that linguistic and typographical cues often appear in combination in semantic markers. In fact, the semantic marker quoted previously contained both.

- (8) *Body language or "physical expressiveness" (Shochat and Stam, 1985: 51-52) may be culturally determined.* (Pettit 2004: 31)

Finally, in the rare absence of both linguistic and typographical cues, the general meaning of the citation within the context of the citing text was examined to resolve the issue of extraction. The semantic marker, below, for instance, defines two types of translation errors, the *functional error* and the *absolute error*, but does not contain obvious linguistic or typographical cues.

- (9) *The functional error has to do with the transgression of certain functional aspects of the translation project, whereas the absolute error is independent of the specific translation task and involves an unjustified infringement of the cultural or linguistic rules, or of the use of a given language (Gouadec 1989; Nord 1996).* (Melis and Albir 2001: 281)

In total, 213 semantic markers were extracted from the 60 primary source texts. They were then coded with the classification labels that will be introduced in the next section. To ensure reliability, each primary source text was read and analyzed by two readers (the author and a trained student assistant) as is customary in citation content-analysis since Moravcsik and Murugesan (1975). The two readers extracted the candidate semantic markers first independently and then intercompared the results. Consensus was reached through discussion. The same method was used for the coding of the 213 semantic markers.

Lastly, it should be noted that the overall methodology adopted for this study draws on techniques developed in Grounded Theory (Hadley 2017) insofar as the study moved from the data to the theory. In fact, data collection and coding largely preceded theory formation. As a consequence, the theory about semantic markers advanced in this article is ‘grounded’ in the data yielded by the corpus. Specifically, the classification or typology was developed from the extracted data, which was analyzed and coded for its lexico-semantic properties. The classification, then, involved the progressive identification of the various types of semantic markers from the collected data.

5 Typology of semantic markers

In the text, semantic markers possess both a particular content and a surface structure. Consequently, their realization in the text can be described by two sets of features: a set of textual features, on the one hand, and a set of semantic features, on the other. The textual features seek to capture two basic structural characteristics of semantic markers: the degree of structural overlap with the text fragment of the original text, and their syntactic integration into the structure of the citing text. The semantic features, for their part, focus on the nature of the semantic information transferred from the original text. Taken together, the two sets seek to illustrate how semantic markers operate in academic discourse, i.e. how they add to the text’s rhetoricity.

The first subsection below presents the textual and semantic features that apply to semantic markers, and act as classification labels in the typology. It should be noted that semantic markers possess various combinations of textual and semantic features. Due to the combinatorial properties of the features, the typology is, in a sense, open-ended. The second subsection illustrates the interconnectedness of the textual and semantic features and aims to show their rhetorical function in academic discourse.

5.1 Semantic and textual features of semantic markers

Five textual features capture the structural characteristics of semantic markers. These textual features are not unique to semantic markers, but identify structural characteristics, such as the amount of overlap with the cited text, and formal characteristics, such as the nature of the semantic marker’s syntactic integration, that also apply to citations in general. The surface structures identified by the textual features have various rhetorical values, which citing writers tend to manipulate to the benefit of their texts. The textual features are therefore an essential component of the semantic marker’s rhetorical purpose, which is to inform the text’s readership effectively and help persuade it of the arguments put forward by the citing text.

The five textual features are described below:

Integral citation	<p>The name of the cited author is embedded in the structure of the citation sentence. Integral citations give greater prominence to the cited author.</p> <p><i>The theme, according to Halliday (1994: 37), "is the element which serves as the point of departure of the message; it is that with which the clause is concerned".</i> (Chen 2011: 128)</p>
Non-integral citation	<p>The name of the cited author is not incorporated into the structure of the citation sentence, but put in parentheses at the end of the sentence, or referenced by superscript numbers or any other indirect method. Non-integral citations place greater emphasis on the reported message.</p> <p><i>In addition, the hyper-theme "is predictive; it establishes expectation about how the text will unfold" (Martin and Rose 2003: 194).</i> (Chen 2011: 128)</p>
Direct quotation	<p>The words of the cited author are reproduced <i>as is</i> in the citing text. Direct quotations embed into the citing text the voice of the cited author, but may be introduced by reporting verbs that express stance or writer commitment to the content of what is being reported.</p> <p>Direct quotations may be of variable length. Short quotes are generally less than or equal to ten original words quoted, and are incorporated into the citation sentence (Chang 2008). Long quotes, on the other hand, exceed ten words, but remain embedded in the citation sentence (Chang 2008). Block quotes, finally, correspond to extensive fragments of original wording, and are often separated from the body of the text by indentation (Chang 2008).</p> <p><i>Aesthetic distance is defined by Jauss (1982: 25) as the "disparity between the given horizon of expectations and the appearance of a new work".</i> (Chen 2011: 122)</p>
Summary	<p>The citing writer summarizes in his or her own words the cited author. This represents a strategic rhetorical choice as it allows the writer greater flexibility to emphasize and interpret the comments of the cited author; or, said differently, summary allows the writer to employ or manipulate the cited fragment in such a way that it most effectively supports the argument the citing text is putting forward (Hyland 2004).</p> <p><i>García Vizcaino (2008: 216-221) distinguishes between explicitation (rendering the pragmatic effect of heteroglossia in a more explicit way), compensation (making up for the loss of linguistic multiplicity elsewhere in the text), and the use of code switching.</i> (Boyden and Goethals 2011: 23)</p>
Reference	<p>The cited author is referenced but his comments are neither quoted nor summarized. Semantic markers often rely on this basic format to convey partial semantic information related to a term's etymology or synonymy, as in the following example:</p> <p><i>Transcription or borrowing (or Catford's (1965) transference), which involves reproducing or transliterating the SL term when no suitable equivalent for it exists in the TL.</i> (Bahumaid 2010: 573)</p>

Table 1: Textual features

Eight semantic features identify the main types of semantic information conveyed by semantic markers. The semantic features were identified progressively during the analysis and coding of the collected data. Unlike the textual features, they are unique to semantic markers. They capture the semantic content that is distinctive of semantic markers and which is at the basis of their dual dialogic quality, as explained in Section 3.

The eight semantic features are the following:

Etymology	The citation identifies the originator of a concept and/or the term designating it. <i>It shows the value of the Icelandic language, as a mythomoteur of Icelandic national identity to use Anthony Smith's coinage (1988: 15).</i> (Kristmannsson 2004: 59)
Naming	The citation names a concept. <i>This translational process, because of its peculiarities, has sometimes been called transediting (Stetting 1989; Hursti 2001; Hautanen 2006) [...].</i> (Valdeón 2011: 68)
Definition	The citation defines or explains the meaning of a term. <i>Within the field of translation studies, Vermeer (1992: 38) defines culture as "the whole of norms and conventions governing social behaviour and its results".</i> (Korning Zethsen 2010: 546)
Polysemy	The citation identifies an alternate meaning for a term. <i>At the same time, however, new thoughts for a redefinition of the concept were formulated which no longer viewed "equivalence" as an overall encompassing concept [...] but as a concept relative to certain parameters which may vary by individual text [...] or which may vary by so-called [...] invariance postulates to be negotiated between the translator and the author of the original (Albrecht 1990).</i> (Gerzymisch-Arbogast 2001: 228)
Synonymy	The citation identifies an alternate name for a concept. <i>Body language or "physical expressiveness" (Shochat and Stam, 1985: 51-52) may be culturally determined.</i> (Pettit 2004: 31)
Hyponymy	The citation identifies the hyponyms of a named or unnamed superordinate term, or hypernym. <i>Unlike soft news, which revolves around human-interest stories, hard news generally refers to those news stories that are timely, factual, important and serious on issues such as politics, economics, business and major crime (Fedler, Bender et al. 2001: 121).</i> (Chen 2011: 120)

Term usage	The citation indicates how or in which context a term is used. <i>Translation procedures differ from translation methods in that the former relate to whole texts while the latter are used for sentences and the smaller units of language (Newmark 1988).</i> (Bahumaid 2010: 571)
Translation equivalent	The citation identifies equivalents in other languages. <i>The distinction between an “Overt Translation” and a “Covert Translation” goes back at least to Friedrich Schleiermacher’s famous distinction between “verfremdende” and “einbürgernde” Übersetzungen, which has had many imitators using different terms.</i> (House 2001: 250)

Table 2: Semantic features

It follows from the above that each semantic marker can be assigned a minimum of three features: two textual and at least one semantic. Indeed, each semantic marker possesses two textual features: one signalling the structural overlap between the original text fragment and the citing text (direct quotation, summary or reference), and the other describing the syntactic integration of the marker in the citation sentence (integral or non-integral citation). Each semantic marker possesses in addition at least one semantic feature, though semantic features are often clustered in groups of two or three. For instance, several of the examples illustrating the eight semantic features listed in the table above exploit more than one such feature. A case in point is the example given for “hyponymy”, which exploits the identified feature but also a second one, namely “definition”. Given the high number of possible combinations of textual and semantic features, the typology is, as mentioned earlier, in a sense open-ended.

5.2 Rhetorical dimensions of the semantic and textual features

In the text, the interplay between the semantic and textual features has important rhetorical dimensions. The examples analyzed below seek to illustrate that interconnectedness and its importance for the markers’ overall rhetorical value as a discursive device aimed not only at informing the text’s readers but also at garnering acceptance for the text’s claims.

The following principles guided the selection of the examples: the examples have to (a) illustrate various combinations of semantic and textual features; (b) illustrate all of the textual features and most of the semantic features (in fact, all but two semantic features – term usage and translation equivalent – are highlighted by the selected examples); and (c) demonstrate the rhetorical or persuasive dimensions of the combined semantic and textual features. Each example analyzed below is preceded by a heading listing the analyzed marker’s semantic features followed by its textual features.

- **Naming, reference, non-integral**

- (10) *Subjective forms that depend on context for definition are known collectively as deixis (O’Grady and Dobrovolsky 1992). (Clifford 2001: 368)*

This semantic marker contains an instance of naming: it informs the reader that “deixis” is used in the literature to refer to a group of “subjective forms that depend on context for definition”. The marker uses a non-integral reference to *O’Grady and Dobrovolsky 1992* to confirm that assertion and, hence, give more weight to the authorial voice.

- **Etymology, naming, reference, integral**

- (11) *It is, however, likely that blind recipients, being aware that an audio description is by necessity a selective description of visual cues, create an additional inference to derive what Sperber and Wilson (1995) have termed an ‘implicated premise’ (i.e., “if Caterina carries keys and no other rattling objects are described, then the rattle must be from these keys”). (Braun 2011: 654)*

The citing writer uses an integral reference to *Sperber and Wilson (1995)* to indicate that these two scholars coined the complex term “implicated premise” to refer to an “additional inference” created by “blind recipients” of an “audio description” of “visual cues”. The integral reference inserts the names of the cited authors into the structure of the sentence as the subject of the verb *have termed*. This syntactic position gives a certain prominence to the cited authors’ names, and helps to draw the reader’s attention to what the citing writer wishes to highlight, namely that the two cited authors created the term in question, “implicated premise”. The semantic information thus provided underscores the extent of the domain knowledge of the citing writer, who is not only able to link a term to a concept, but also to its creators and to a particular work published in a particular year.

- **Definition, direct quotation (short quote), integral**

- (12) *As Nida (1994: 157) puts it, culture refers to “the total beliefs and practices of a society”. (Bahumaid 2010: 570)*

Through an integral direct quotation, the citing writer introduces into the text the voice of the cited author, whose name is also foregrounded in the citation sentence. The rhetorical aim here is to place equal emphasis on the reported definition and on the identity of its creator. The authority of the cited author’s voice is thus highlighted and this strengthens by the same token that of the citing writer.

- **Definition, direct quotation (block quote), integral**

- (13) *Whittaker argues that this finding may be explained by the explicitation hypothesis, a well-known translation mechanism (Baker 1993; Blum-Kulka 1986; Chesterman 2001; Klaudy 1993; Pym 2005; Toury 2001) defined as follows by Blum-Kulka (1986):*
The process of interpretation performed by the translator on the source text might lead to a TL text which is more redundant than the SL text. This redundancy can be expressed by a rise in the level of cohesive explicitness in the TL text. This argument may be stated as “explicitation hypothesis”, which postulates an observed cohesive explicitness from SL to TL texts regardless of the increase traceable to differences between the two linguistic and textual systems involved. It follows that explicitation is viewed here as inherent in the process of translation (Blum-Kulka 1986: 19). (Vanderbauwhede, Desmet and Lauwers 2011: 444)

When the citing writer attaches great importance to a definition, convinced, for instance, that reformulating or summarizing it runs the risk of reducing its clarity and effectiveness, s/he may opt for a block quote. Block quotes attract visual attention to the cited text fragment through the optics of indentation. They are, moreover, often introduced by citation sentences in which the name of the cited author has been syntactically integrated: *defined as follows by Blum-Kulka (1986: 19)*. By syntactically incorporating the name of the cited author in the introductory sentence, the citing writer seeks to strengthen the overall effect of the foregrounding of the cited author’s voice accomplished through block quotation, which allows for extensive use of the original wording of the cited author.

- **Hyponymy, definition, summary, non-integral**

- (14) *For this purpose students may use comparable or parallel corpora. In corpus-based translation studies the former is a computerized set of comparable untranslated original texts in two languages [...] while the latter is a set of source texts with translations (Olohan 2004). (Biel 2011: 169)*

The citing writer uses a non-integral summary to identify and define two hyponyms of ‘corpus’: *comparable* and *parallel corpora*. This approach blends the voice of the citing writer with that of the cited author. They become one in the text with only the non-integral citation at the end of the semantic marker revealing the true origin of the provided semantic information. The non-integral citation recognizes the cited author’s intellectual property rights, but its main function is to confirm and strengthen the citing writer’s assertions.

- **Polysemy, definition, direct quotation (long quote), non-integral**

- (15) *This represents a shift from coherence as a semantic concept to coherence as a pragmatic concept, i.e., “an interpretive notion, which is intrinsically indeterminate because it is relative to participants ascribing their understanding to what they hear” (Bublitz and Lenk 1999: 154). (Braun 2011: 647)*

Through non-integral citation, the voice of the citing writer overlaps with the voice of the cited authors. The quotation marks, however, which delimit the long quote embedded in the sentence, clearly signal to the reader that the words s/he is seeing were inserted in the text and are, in fact, those of the cited authors, whose names are given in parentheses at the end of the semantic marker. The rhetorical aim, here, is to signal that the *shift from coherence as a semantic concept to coherence as a pragmatic concept* was initiated not by the citing writer but by other researchers.

- **Synonymy, reference, integral/definition, direct quotation (short quote), non-integral**

- (16) *Shifts within this particular reiteration chain may also have a more global impact on the target-text reception, as reiteration or recurrence, to use de Beaugrande and Dressler’s (1981) term, is a textual feature “used to assert and reaffirm one’s viewpoint” (de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981: 55). (Gumul 2011: 767-768)*

The citing writer uses different textual features to convey different types of semantic information. The writer opts for an integral reference to de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) to signal an instance of synonymy; specifically the use of the term *recurrence* by the cited authors to refer to the linguistic phenomenon of ‘reiteration’. S/he then employs a non-integral short quote to embed into the text segment part of de Beaugrande and Dressler’s definition of ‘recurrence’, which by extension also applies to its synonym, ‘reiteration’. The direct quotation, in short, builds on the integral reference, since the latter introduced the cited authors but also linked a previously employed term in the text, ‘reiteration’, to a synonymous term, not yet used in the text, but for which a definition, judged useful by the citing writer, had been formulated by the cited authors. Following the integral reference that definition can be effectively inserted into the text segment. The example demonstrates that citing writers adjust the textual and semantic features of semantic markers to the information they wish to convey.

To conclude, the semantic features of the markers analyzed above identify content that provides the text’s readership with semantic clarifications, which enhance the text’s readability. The semantic features signal, furthermore, that a domain’s terminology is socially constructed and, in fact, negotiated from one

text to the next. Finally, they confirm that the citing author's domain knowledge is extensive, and strengthen in this manner the text's persuasive force. The textual features, for their part, are used in various ways, as shown by the examples, to increase the text's persuasiveness.

6 Conclusion

Citations have multiple functions in specialized discourse. By inserting the text under construction in the historical chain of text production, they acknowledge intellectual indebtedness, partake in the social construction of knowledge, and enhance the text's overall persuasiveness. Citations can furthermore help to delineate the meaning of specific terms within the confines of the new text. As semantic markers, citations acquire a dual dialogic quality: they are oriented towards the writers of the previous texts to which they refer and with whom they engage in a negotiation of term meaning, but they also interact with the reader by responding to possible questions or to plausible needs for more precise semantic information. Finally, semantic markers present a number of textual features, which have various rhetorical values, and which tend to be exploited to enhance the overall persuasiveness and readability of the text.

This study of semantic markers is ongoing. This article proposed a typology of citations used as semantic markers, but did not provide quantitative data on the prevalence of the various types of semantic markers in academic texts, nor did it examine their preferred location in the texts' organizational structure. Work on these questions is currently underway. A contrastive study of the use of semantic markers in various disciplines in the humanities and social sciences, such as linguistics, history and psychology, is also planned for the near future.

References

- Bavelas, J. B. (1978) 'The social psychology of citations.' *Canadian Psychological Review* 19(2), 158-163.
- Brooks, T. A. (1985) 'Private acts and public objects: An investigation of citer motivations.' *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 36(4), 223-229.
- Brooks, T. A. (1986) 'Evidence of complex citer motivations.' *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 37(1), 34-36.
- Buckingham, J. and Neville, M. (1997) 'A model of citation options.' *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics* 20(2), 51-66.
- Case, D. O. and Higgins, G. M. (2000) 'How can we investigate citation behavior? A study of reasons for citing literature in communication.' *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 51(7), 635-645.
- Chang, Y. Y. (2008) 'Citation and disciplinary knowledge: A comparison between two fields.' *Concentric: Studies in Linguistics* 34(2), 123-152.
- Chubin, D. E. and Moitra, S. D. (1975) 'Content analysis of references: Adjunct or alternative to citation counting?' *Social Studies of Science* 5, 423-441.

- Cozzens, S. E. (1989) 'What do citations count? The rhetoric-first model.' *Scientometrics* 15(5-6), 437-447.
- Dontcheva-Navratilova, O. (2016) 'Rhetorical functions of citations in linguistics research articles: A contrastive (English-Czech) study.' *Discourse and Interaction* 9(2), 51-74.
- Fairclough, N. (1992) 'Intertextuality in critical discourse analysis.' *Linguistics and Education* 4, 269-293.
- Garfield, E. (1977) 'Can citation indexing be automated?' In: Garfield, E. (ed.) *Essays of an Information Scientist*. Vol. 1. Philadelphia: ISI Press. 84-90.
- Gilbert, N. G. (1977) 'Referencing as persuasion.' *Social Studies of Science* 7(1), 113-122.
- Hadley, G. (2017) *Grounded Theory in Applied Linguistics Research: A Practical Guide*. New York: Routledge.
- Harwood, N. (2004) 'Citation analysis: A multidisciplinary perspective on academic literacy.' In: Baynham, M., Deignan, A. and White, G. (eds) *Applied Linguistics at the Interface*. London: BAAL and Equinox. 79-89.
- Harwood, N. (2009) 'An interview-based study of the functions of citations in academic writing across two disciplines.' *Journal of Pragmatics* 41(3), 497-518.
- Hewings, A., Lillis, T. and Vladimirov, D. (2010) 'Who's citing whose writings? A corpus based study of citations as interpersonal resource in English medium national and English medium international journals.' *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 9(2), 102-115.
- Hyland, K. (1999) 'Academic attribution: Citation and the construction of disciplinary knowledge.' *Applied Linguistics* 20(3), 341-367.
- Hyland, K. (2004) *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Kaplan, N. (1965) 'The norms of citation behavior: Prolegomena to the footnote.' *American Documentation* 16(3), 179-184.
- Kristeva, J. (1980) *Desire in Language. A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Moravcsik, M. J. and Murugesan, P. (1975) 'Some results on the function and quality of citations.' *Social Studies of Science* 5(1), 86-92.
- Nicolaisen, J. (2007) 'Citation analysis.' *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology* 41(1), 609-641.
- Peritz, B. C. (1983) 'A classification of citation roles for the social sciences and related fields.' *Scientometrics* 5(5), 303-312.
- Petrić, B. (2007) 'Rhetorical functions of citations in high- and low-rated Master's theses.' *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 6(3), 238-253.
- Rose, S. K. (1993) 'Citation rituals in academic cultures.' *Issues in Writing* 6(1), 24-37.
- Small, H. G. (1978) 'Cited documents as concept symbols.' *Social Studies of Science* 8(3), 327-340.
- Swales, J. (1986) 'Citation analysis and discourse analysis.' *Applied Linguistics* 7(1), 39-56.
- Swales, J. (1990) *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tadros, A. (1993) 'The pragmatics of text averral and attribution in academic texts.' In: Hoey, M. (ed.) *Data, Description, Discourse. Papers on the English Language in Honour of John McH Sinclair on His Sixtieth Birthday*. London: Harper Collins. 98-114.
- Thomas, S. and Hawes, T. (1994) 'Theme and the rhetorical function of citation in research articles.' *Interface. Journal of Applied Linguistics* 9(1), 15-27.

- Thompson, G. (2001) 'Interaction in academic writing: learning to argue with the reader.' *Applied Linguistics* 22(1), 58-78.
- White, H. D. (2004) 'Citation analysis and discourse analysis revisited.' *Applied Linguistics* 25(1), 89-116.
- Zwaan, R. A. and Nederhof, A. J. (1990) 'Some aspects of scholarly communication in linguistics: An empirical study.' *Language* 66(3), 553-557.

Sources

- Bahumaid, S. (2010) 'Investigating cultural competence in English-Arabic translator training programs.' *Meta* 55(3), 569-588.
- Biel, L. (2011) 'Professional realism in the legal translation classroom: Translation competence and translator competence.' *Meta* 56(1), 162-178.
- Bowker, L. (2001) 'Towards a methodology for a corpus-based approach to translation evaluation.' *Meta* 46(2), 345-364.
- Boyden, M. and Goethals, P. (2011) 'Translating the Watcher's voice: Junot Díaz's The Brief Wondrous Life of Oscar Wao into Spanish.' *Meta* 56(1), 20-41.
- Braun, S. (2011) 'Creating coherence in audio description.' *Meta* 56(3), 645-662.
- Chen, Y. (2011) 'The translator's subjectivity and its constraints in news transediting: A perspective of reception aesthetics.' *Meta* 56(1), 119-144.
- Clifford, A. (2001) 'Discourse theory and performance-based assessment: Two tools for professional interpreting.' *Meta* 46(2), 365-378.
- Gerzymisch-Arbogast, H. (2001) 'Equivalence parameters and evaluation.' *Meta* 46(2), 227-242.
- Gumul, E. (2011) 'Translational shifts of syntactic and lexical markers of ideology: Reporting the Iraqi conflict in Polish reprint press.' *Meta* 56(4), 758-774.
- House, J. (2001) 'Translation quality assessment: Linguistic description versus social evaluation.' *Meta* 46(2), 243-257.
- Korning Zethsen, K. (2010) 'Has globalisation unburdened the translator?' *Meta* 55(3), 545-557.
- Kristmannsson, G. (2004) 'Iceland's "Egg of Life" and the modern media.' *Meta* 49(1), 59-66.
- Melis, N. M. and Albir, A. H. (2001) 'Assessment in translation studies: Research needs.' *Meta* 46(2), 272-287.
- Pettit, Z. (2004) 'The audio-visual text: Subtitling and dubbing different genres.' *Meta* 49(1), 25-38.
- Sousa, C. (2002) 'TL versus SL implied reader: assessing receptivity when translating children's literature.' *Meta* 47(1), 16-29.
- Valdeón, R. (2011) 'Embedding anglocentric perceptions of the world: The Falklands-Malvinas binomial in the news.' *Meta* 56(1), 63-80.
- Vanderbauwhede, G., Desmet, P. and Lauwers, P. (2011) 'The shifting of the demonstrative determiner in French and Dutch in parallel corpora: From translation mechanisms to structural differences.' *Meta* 56(2), 443-464.

Tanja Collet is Associate Professor of Linguistics at the University of Windsor in Windsor, Ontario, Canada. She specializes in text linguistics and in the study of languages for special purposes (LSP). Her research interests concern the intersection between terminology, text linguistics and LSP, with a main focus

on term-text dynamics in specialized discourse. Her current research focuses on academic discourse, specifically on lexical cohesion and coherence phenomena in scientific writings, such as journal articles. She is presently involved in a study of the semantic and terminological dimensions of citation use in academic discourse. Her work has appeared in *Discourse & Society*, *JosTrans: The Journal of Specialised Translation*, *Meta*, *Terminology*, *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction*, etc. She serves on the editorial board of the international academic journal *Meta: Journal des traducteurs*, *Meta: Translators' Journal*, published by Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal.

Address: Dr. Tanja Collet, Ph.D., Department of Languages, Literatures and Cultures, Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Windsor, 401 Sunset Ave., Windsor, Ontario, N9B 3P4, Canada. [email: tcollet@uwindsor.ca]