analysis (□□□□□□). In this and the next chapters we are going to study macro-contrastive analysis (□□□ □□□), which is conducted on the textual and pragmatic levels of language. The traditional concern of linguistics has been the abstract formal system of the language (called“langue” [□□□□], “Competence (□ □□□)” or “code (□ □)” respectively by linguists of different persuasions). Linguists claim that to gain access to the code“underlying” a language, it is necessary to disregard much that goes into language. This purging of aspects which are seen either as irrelevant or as complicating factors has been called by Lyons (1970) the“idealization of data. ” One of the ways through which data can be idealized is decontextualization (□□ □□). A sentence can be decontextualized in two ways, either by being removed from the company of the sentences that precede or follow it in a text, i.e. its verbal context (□□□□), or by being separated off from the real-world situation in which it is used, i.e. its physical or situational context (□□□□). In the past few decades, however, an increasing interest arose for analyzing the way sentences work in sequence to produce coherent stretches of language. In fact the search for larger linguistic units and structures has been pursued by scholars from many disciplines. Linguists investigate the features of language that bind sentences together when they are used in sequence. Ethnographers (scienti c researchers of different races of people) and sociologists study the structure of social interaction, especially as manifested in the way people enter into dialogue. Anthropologists analyze the structure of myths and folk-tales. Psychologists carry out experiments on the mental processes underlying comprehension. And further contributions have come from those concerned with arti cial intelligence, rhetoric, philosophy, and style. These approaches have a common concern: they stress the need to see language as a dynamic, social, interactive phenomenon—whether between speaker and lis- tener, or between writer and reader. It is argued that meaning is conveyed not by single sentences but by more complex exchanges, in which the participants’ beliefs Peking University Press and Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd. 2019 P. Ke, Contrastive Linguistics, Peking University Linguistics Research 1, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-1385-1_6 133 and expectations, the knowledge they share about each other and about the world, and the situation in which they interact, play a crucial part (Crystal, 1987, p. 116). It was against this intellectual background that macrolinguistics emerged and developed. Sometimes known as“broad” or “human” linguistics, macrolin- guistics (□□□□□) takes as its goal the attainment of a scienti c understanding of how people use language to communicate with each other or, in Coulthard’s terms, of“situated speech. ” (Coulthard, 1977, p. 3) Comparing this with the goal of code linguistics, which is to specify the universal and particular properties of human languages, we may notice that with macrolinguistics the attention has been shifted from code (□□) to process: the process of communication. In antithesis to (or complementary to) Noam Chomsky’s Competence (□□□□), Hymes (1972) proposes that a speaker’s communicative competence should be the object of linguistic enquiry. This raises the whole question of how people communicate. Obviously they do so predominantly by means of language, though, to a lesser degree, other signaling devices such as gestures, facial expressions, and other similar paralinguistic devices (“body language”) also play a part. Since people communicate through language, code linguistics has a major say in any account of the process of verbal commu- nication. Nevertheless, it is not language itself that carries out verbal communi- cation. Knowledge of the code (□□) is a necessary condition for verbal communication since all forms of

communication involves the use of some code, but it is not a suf cient condition. There are other factors—non-codal, human factors—which affect the success or failure of communication. It is the concern of macrolinguistics to inquire what else is required for successful communication in addition to knowledge of the code (Competence [□□□]). Sometimes we use one word—sensitivity—to embrace all these non-codal aspects, but macrolinguis- tics sets out to investigate and explicitly specify the situational constraints to which speech-events are subject to and the socio-cultural variables which the communi- cating individual must be able to identify in order to produce appropriate utterances in a communicative event. To sum up, the following three points characterize macrolinguistics (□□□ □): (1) focusing on communicative competence rather than"linguistic" competence (in Chomsky's sense of the term) (2) attempting to describe linguistic events within their extralinguistic settings (3) searching for units of linguistic organization larger than the single sentence (Based on James, 1980, pp. 100–102) 134 6 Textual Contrastive Analysis 6.1 Text and Discourse A text is a piece of structured spoken or written language. It may be of considerable length, e.g. a webpage,, a fairy tale, a sermon, a novel, etc.; or it may consist of only one word, e.g."DANGER" as a warning sign outside a power substation. One important feature of a text is that a full understanding of it is often impossible without reference to the context in which it occurs (Fig. 6.1). Discourse (□□) is a general term for instances of language use, i.e. language produced as the result of an act of communication. According to Van Dijk (1980, p. 29), the difference between text and discourse (□□) lies in that the former is a theoretical conception related to a language user's Competence (□□□□) while the latter is a notion realistically perceived in relation to the user's Performance. We may consider a text from the point of view of its structure or functions (e.g. warning, instructing, carrying out a transaction, etc.), or both. On the structural or formal level, the study of the text addresses the question of how sentences are organized into larger, suprasentential units or texts: this is the eld of text analysis (□□□□). On the functional level, the study of the text concentrates on the ways in which people put language to use: this is the eld of discourse analysis (□□□□) (Coulthard, 1977). The terms"text analysis (□□□□)" and"discourse analysis (□□□□)" have sometimes been used in a confused way. There seem to be three approaches to the use of these two terms: (1) Some scholars have suggested that text analysis refers to the European tra- ditions and discourse analysis (□□□□) to Anglo-American traditions for doing the same thing. (2) Others tend to see the two terms as complementary, believing that"text analysis (□□□□)" starts with linguistic forms and works outwards to investigate in which contexts they are appropriate, whereas discourse anal- ysis (□□□□) starts with the communicative situations and works inwards to nd the formal linguistic correlates to the situational variables. (3) Still others use the term"text analysis (□□□□)" to refer to the study of written discourse (□□) and the term"discourse analysis (□□□□)" to talk about the study of spoken discourse.

Summarized by © lakhasly.com