SELL MONOGRAPHS N° 2

A GENRE APPROACH TO

RE-ENTRY PATTERNS IN EDITORIALS

BARRY PENNOCK

A GENRE APPROACH TO
RE-ENTRY PATTERNS IN EDITORIALS

MONOGRAPHS – Volume 2

Studies in **E**nglish **L**anguage and **L**inguistics

LENGUA INGLESA. UNIVERSITAT DE VALÈNCI

SELL MONOGRAPHS

1. A genre based approach to daytime talk on television — Carmen Gregori Signes
2. A genre approach to re-entry patterns in editorials — Barry Pennock

Edited by Francisco Femández

© **BARRY PENNOCK**
ISBN: 84-370-4265-8
Depósito legal: V. 574 - 2000
Artes Gráficas Soler, S. L. - La Olivereta, 28 - 46018 Valencia

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost I would like to thank Dr. Antonia Sánchez Macarro, the supervisor of my thesis, and Professor Francisco Fernández, the series editor, without whose help I would not have been able to take on the task of writing this book.

I should also like to acknowledge the help, advice and encouragement from my colleagues in the English Language Unit

My greatest thanks, however, must go to my wife, Charo, and my children, Jordi and Eddie, whose patience and understanding have allowed me to finish this book.

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION: A GENRE APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF TEXT RELATIONS ... 9

1.1. Introduction ... 9
1.2. Genre, Register, Language ... 9
1.3. Newspaper Genres ... 12
1.3.1. Broadsheets and Tabloids ... 13
1.3.2. Genres within Newspapers ... 15

2. COHERENCE, COHESION AND RE-ENTRY ... 25

2.1. Preamble ... 25
2.2. Text and Non-text ... 25
2.3. Coherence ... 26
2.3.1. Coherence and Completeness ... 28
2.3.2. Coherence and Repetition ... 29
2.4. Discourse Topic ... 29
2.4.1. Topic Shift ... 32
2.5. Cohesion ... 33
2.5.1. Cohesive Relationships ... 35
2.5.2. Lexical Cohesion ... 45
2.6. Re-entry devices and style ... 54
2.7. Personal Taxonomy of Re-entry Devices ... 59
2.7.1. Pronouns ... 60
2.7.2. Lexical Repetition ... 60
2.7.3. Text Equivalents ... 62
2.7.4. Hyponyms and Superordinates ... 62
2.7.5. Synonyms ... 63
2.7.6. Determiner Noun Phrases ... 63
2.7.7. Pro-forms ... 65
2.7.8. Demonstrative Pronoun Reference ... 66
2.7.9. Substitution and Ellipsis ... 66
2.7.10. Comparatives ... 66

2.7.11. Pseudo-cohesive or “Connex” Relationships..67
2.7.12. Collocation..67
2.7.13. Homophoric Reference 67
2.7.14. Exophoric Time Expressions 68
2.7.15. Resemblance to Previous Expression 68
2.7.16. Untriggered Elements 68

3. RESEARCH HYPOTHESES AND METHODOLOGY 69

3.1. Introduction...69
3.2. Hypotheses..69
3.3. Research Methodology 71
3.3.1. Selection of the Corpus 71
3.3.2. Computers and the analysis of the corpus..75
3.3.3. Methodology of Analysis...75
3.3.4. Elements accompanying re-entry devices 78

4. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA AND CONCLUSIONS 83

4.1. Preamble 83
4.2. Types of Re-entry Items...83
4.3. Differences between Broadsheets 85
4.4. Re-entry Patterns and Information Structure 85
4.4.1. DT and Differences between Broadsheets 87
4.4.2. DTs and Re-entry Devices 87
4.5. Other Factors Influencing the Patterns of Re-entry 90
4.5.1. Ellipsis 90
4.5.2. Hyponyms...90
4.5.3. Pronouns 91
4.5.4. Metadiscursive Nouns...91
4.5.4.1. Metadiscursive and Non-metadiscursive A-noun Headwords 91
4.6. Length of Text and Re-entry..95
4.7. Pronouns and Paragraph Boundaries 96
4.8. Conclusions...97
4.8.1. Differences Between Broadsheets: Correlations Between Linguistic and Extra-linguistic Factors 97
4.8.2. Patterns of Re-entry in Broadsheets...98
4.8.3. DT and Re-entry 101
4.8.4. Metadiscursive Nouns...101
4.8.5. Re-entry Items and Length of Text 105
4.9. Concluding Remarks...105

5. REFERENCES...107

INDEX 117

1. INTRODUCTION: A GENRE APPROACH TO THE STUDY OF TEXT RELATIONS

1.1. Introduction

The field of genre studies is based on the notion that there are different kinds of text/discourses which can be grouped together in a more or less clear-cut fashion. What is more, it is generally acknowledged that each set of texts that we feel belongs together share the following: (i) cognitive elements: themes, goals, plans, schemata; (ii) situational elements: context of situation and participants and (iii) linguistic elements. The linguistic elements cover all levels, phonological, morphological, syntactic, lexical, semantic and textual. Seen from this perspective, the type of text I am interested in, newspaper editorials, must not only be different from other newspaper sub-genres but from all other types of written communication. One of the factors that distinguishes newspaper editorials from other types of written communication is their structure which is instantiated in generic patterns of cohesive devices, which I call (after Jordan 1995) re-entry items. In the following pages I will attempt to come to a definition of genre and outline the characteristics that distinguish editorials from any other kind of discourse.

1.2. Genre, Register, Language

Genre was traditionally seen as an exclusively literary term (Cuddon: 1977: 285) and only in the last twenty or thirty years has it been used in non-literary spheres. Before the term became common currency in linguistics, (Crystal & Davy1969; Halliday 1971; Widdowson 1975; Carter & Nash 1990), among others, used the term "style" to refer to basically the same field of study. A better term "group styles" was coined by Hendricks (1976). However, the term "style" did not survive as a term for the description of discourse differences in

non-literary texts as it was already in use to refer to literary texts and “group styles” did not catch on at all. The two main terms in use today are register and genre. Biber (1985, 1986, 1988, 1995) has published widely in the field of register studies. His statement (Biber 1995: 8) that “there is no general consensus within sociolinguistics concerning the use of *register* and related terms such as *genre* and *style*” is typical of the fuzziness of the limits between these terms.

Apart from stylistics, the linguistic study of genre overlaps considerably with other disciplines such as sociolinguistics (Trudgill 1974, Wardaugh 1986), which analyses occupational varieties of discourse and text typology (Bühler 1934; Reiß 1976; Newmark 1988), which is widely used among researchers in translation. All of these disciplines are interested in the differences between discourses and the essential make-up of each particular descourse type. The main difference between Genre Analysis (Henceforth GA) and the three earlier disciplines is the onus on genres as social entities.

There are two main research branches in GA. On the one hand, several British and American researchers work on genre from within the field of ESP: Ewer (1979); Lackstrom (1978); Selinker (1979); Swales (1981, 1985, 1990); Widdowson (1975). On the other, researchers in the systemic-functional tradition, based mainly in Britain and Australia, have also looked at genres within the systemic-functional and related paradigms: Kress (1985), Ventola (1977); Martin (1992), Eggins (1994), Downing (1996), Vázquez (1995) Gregori-Signes (2000). The main difference between those researchers working from within the field of ESP and those working in the systemic-functional paradigm is the focus on the discourses that they study. The former seem more interested in the empirical study of genre analysis while the latter delve more deeply into the nature of genre in general. However, both disciplines have enough in common for their conclusions to be complementary and non-contradictory.

Several authors (Kress 1985; Dixon 1987; Todorov 1991, Ventola 1977) emphasise that genre—whether literary or linguistic—is a socially defined concept. Kress calls genre a “linguistic-social category” (1985: 35). As such, genre exists in the minds of the producers of any language even before a text is written. This is the view forwarded by the literary critic, Todorov, (1991:17-18):

> In a given society, the recurrence of certain discursive properties is institutionalised, and individual texts are produced and perceived in relation to the norm constituted by that codification. A genre whether literary or not, is nothing other than the codification of discursive properties.

That genre is a social phenomenon is beyond question, however, what remains to be agreed upon is the exact nature of genre and its relationship to both register and language. Recently some of the most interesting work on genres has been produced in systemic-functional circles. However, before the term genre became common usage in systemics, register was the concept that was felt to unite linguistic and extra-linguistic levels. According to Hasan (1978) variation in language can be explained by cumulative variables in field, tenor and mode of discourse together with the situational context.

At first glance, genre might be thought to be explained sufficiently by field, i.e., the nature of the social action taking place, but the participants (tenor) and the channel (mode) are important variables which interact together. Each instance of the interaction of field, tenor, mode make up what is called the contextual construct and each construct of this kind has extra-linguistic contextual configurations, called generalised structural formulae, which determine the compulsory elements and their sequential ordering. All of these variables together make up genre.

In Hallidayan circles genre has ousted register as this term was felt to be an inadequate tool to describe all variations in language. Downing (1996: 23) mentions sports commentary in which the sporting event taking place constitutes one field while the commentary on it constitutes another. Furthermore, Martin (1992) claims that genre is on a more abstract level than register, which, in turn is on a more abstract level than language.

My position is that language certainly does form a separate level from register. Field, mode, and tenor all influence the language we use in a particular context of situation, but not to the extent that they dictate the exact surface forms used. Language is, therefore, the non-automatic verbal instantiation of each configuration of register in a "specific extralinguistic situation" (Hasan, 1978: 231). This view allows us to see language as yet another variable, which is intrinsically connected to a particular genre but also separate from it. This means that in identical communicative situations the surface forms used may be, and normally are, different every time.

How genres are instantiated in language constitutes a complex issue as many variables have to be taken into account. The language used in a genre is hardly ever predictable because of the mediation of register and this explains the problems we come across when we "attempt to make social categories match up with linguistic patterns" (Downing, 1996: 25). An example of the difficulties we can come across when trying to describe genres is described by Fairclough (1995: 76) namely that there are genres that include other genres—party political broadcast, which can include interviews, fireside chats, etc.

Vázquez (1995: 28) argues that the missing element in the systemic view of genre is the intention of the speaker or writer, namely, his or her goal in

communicating in the first place. He explains that this may be due to Halliday's reluctance to use terms found in the field of pragmatics. Downing (1996: 24) agrees and claims Halliday has "consistently avoided admitting to a psychological construct such as purpose or intention". According to Downing (1996), other authors, Goatley (1994) and Martin (1992), assign purpose (a synonym of goal) to field and genre respectively.

Goals exist presumably before a text or discourse. Carrying out a goal means that the language producer must focus on those plans, or courses of action, verbal or otherwise, that are needed to carry out his or her purpose. Such plans, for instance, the wish to convince a reader of a particular opinion, must be instantiated ultimately in language, which, in the case of written texts means words, sentences, paragraphs and topic, to mention but a few of the elements.

The hypotheses state that each genre must have typical, though not automatic, ways of being instantiated through language means that we often map our goals onto particular rhetorical and verbal strategies. I would argue that re-entry patterns and discourse topic development, for example, are moulded by each particular genre. As the instantiation of a genre through language is not automatic, however, we need to analyse texts very carefully to detect possible patterns. As the goal of this book is to find these patterns in editorial discourse, we will first look at what makes editorials a genre in their own right.

1.3. Newspaper Genres

If we were to ask almost anyone who speaks English to mention different styles of language it would be very strange not to hear newspaper language mentioned. Most people in the English speaking language community would be able to distinguish the language of a newspaper article from a recipe or a prayer, for instance, without any difficulty. Many authors tacitly or explicitly recognise the fact that newspapers form a genre, for instance, Crystal & Davy (1969), Hughes (1984), Carter & Nash (1990), Bell (1991), Fowler (1991), Jucker (1992), Bhatia (1993), Biber (1988, 1995), Bolívar (1995). Jucker (1992) claims that this must be because journalese has certain characteristic linguistic patterns:

> Newspaper language is a variety to the extent that it has linguistic features that distinguish it from other varieties. It is obviously part of the larger variety of media language as a whole, and -on a different level- it is part of the variety of written language. (Jucker 1992: 25)

It is also true that language alone is not the only factor that separates newspapers from other genres. In fact, language, might not even be the most

important factor that characterises newspapers. In the following excerpt Jucker (1992:3) tacitly agrees that genre is a social phenomenon instantiated through language:

> ... all newspapers share a large number of non-linguistic discourse features. The language is transmitted in printed form, and it is public in that it is intended for a very large audience.

In Britain, furthermore, most newspaper readers would be able to place newspapers in categories according to the audience they are designed for. As I wish to begin the task of distinguishing different newspaper genres in order to analyse them more efficiently I shall start, in the next section, by looking into the difference between the two major types of British newspapers, the so-called quality newspaper and the tabloids.

1.3.1. Broadsheets and Tabloids

The first thing that anyone would notice about upmarket and downmarket newspapers is not the style that they use, however different this may be, but their actual physical appearance, which accounts for one set of names given to these two newspaper-types: broadsheets and tabloids. As the names imply, the broadsheets are larger in format than the tabloids. It could be argued that the size of each type of newspaper is not completely independent of their content. The news in tabloids, for example, is often shorter than in broadsheets. The visual format of the tabloids can be described as "flashier", while that of broadsheets is more conservative, no matter what their political stance may be. In linguistic terms, according to Hughes (1984), tabloid journalism is known for being "superficial, sensationalist, limited, bigoted and cheap in all senses" (1984: 129). He summarises the differences between the two:

> Certain broad generalisations can be made about the news-style of the "quality" press as opposed to the "popular" press. The "popular" press relies on a sensational treatment of a small segment of the news, one which may be banal or momentous. This it achieves by emphasis on a few "stories" arranged hierarchically on the front page, with top priority given to "human interest" or rarity items. These are dramatised by large headlines, powerful emotive language and the impact of sizeable, close-up photographs invariably "cropped" out of their original shape. Contrariwise, the "quality" paper attempts to give a more balanced and sober "spread" of news with emphasis on world events presented in neutral language, with smaller, rectangular photographs being used to create interest, but not drama. (Hughes, 1984: 131-2)

While agreeing that the two types of newspapers exist, Jucker (1992) criticises the use of the terms “quality” and “popular” as the first is a value judgement and the second is erroneous as the "qualities" are popular too. Both newspaper types share the same kind of content, news reports, editorials, film and theatre reviews, advertisements, cartoon strips, etc. It is true that tabloids feature national news much more than broadsheets. In general, the broadsheets include more sections than the tabloids. As far as goals are concerned, Crystal & Davy (1969: 174) claim that their aims are quite similar:

> they are both concerned to present a certain number of facts in as interesting a manner as possible to audiences whose constitution they are fairly clear about. Also, the general pressures working on the authors are the same —the need for compression of the information into a limited space, the need for clarity, the avoidance of ambiguity, and so on.

Jucker (1992: 2) points out that tabloids and broadsheets aim to inform their readers and entertain them at the same time but that entertainment is a higher priority for the tabloids.

In order to explain the differences between the two main styles from the producer’s point of view, Bell (1991: 104-106) mentions two approaches that analyse “style shift”, “audience design”, based on the work done by Labov (1968, 1972) and “accommodation theory” defended by Giles & Powesland (1975); Thakerer *et al.* (1982); Giles *et al.* (1987); and Coupland *et al.* (1988). Audience design looks at two parameters which influence the style of a speaker. The first is that of the “inter-speaker” which corresponds to characteristics of a social kind: age, gender, social class of the speaker. The second factor, the “intra-speaker” dimension, has to do with the way speakers adapt their speech to the kind of listeners they have. The proponents of the second approach, accommodation theory, claim that the primary factor in the style that speakers adopt is the influence of their audience. In both approaches the target audience is the main factor which determines which style a speaker, or, in the case of newspapers, the journalists use.

The influence of the reader in newspaper style is supported by the research carried out by Bell (1991) and Jucker (1989). Bell (1991: 107-108), in his studies on the deletion of determiners in appositional naming expressions, states that this practice was more common in papers like *The Sun, The Mirror, The Express* than in *The Telegraph, The Guardian* and *The Times.* The deletions were found in greater numbers in papers catering for lower socio-economic classes.

After studying the deletion of determiners Jucker (1989) divided British newspapers into the three categories below. He found that determiners were

deleted more often in Downmarket papers than in Midmarket papers, while there were very few deletions in the Upmarket papers. He was then able to correlate a difference in style with a certain type of reader. Using this information Jucker (1989) divides British newspapers into three categories.

Upmarket:	The Times, Financial Times, Guardian, Independent, Daily Telegraph
Midmarket:	Daily Mail, Daily Express, Today
Downmarket:	Daily Mirror, Star, Sun.

The writers mentioned in this section all maintain that tabloids and broadsheets are different in almost every way. This would seem to lend support to my view that such variations warrant comparing the discourse in the two newspaper-types to discover the differences between them and/or to study either type to find out what makes them unique.

1.3.2. Genres within Newspapers

In what remains of this chapter I shall look at the various genres found in newspapers. Stylistically all newspaper genres are supposed to be couched in a type of language known as “journalese”. However, Crystal & Davy (1969:173) warn that the very fact that there are several identifiable genres within the pages of a daily newspaper makes journalese a rather heterogeneous style:

> It seems that the concept of 'the language of newspaper reporting' is not as meaningful as is generally assumed. There is not one, but a number of 'journaleses' that can be found between the pages of the daily and weekly press; and while they do have a certain amount in common, their overall styles are very different.

That such a thing as journalese exists is doubted by nobody although once we begin to analyse the content of newspapers beyond headline language, we find that it is often not such an easy task to differentiate one genre from another as we might think. According to Bell (1991) there are two main genres in newspapers, “editorial” and “advertising”. He states (1991: 13) that editorial content is divided in the following way:

> We can divide editorial copy into three broad categories: service information, opinion and news. Service information consists of lists rather than continuous copy: sports results, television programmes, share prices, weather forecasts. (...) Opinion copy includes what are often called ‘editorials’ or ‘leaders’ - a statement of the newspaper’s own views on an issue, usually appearing on an inside page under a reduced banner of the paper’s ‘masthead’.

The best known genres in newspapers are editorials and news reports. My interest in the former is obvious as it is the object of this book, however, the latter are also important as editorials generally rely on the news reports to supply the reader with information about which the editorial will give the newspaper's opinion. Therefore, with regards to content, the editorial or editorials will normally be similar to that of one or more news reports in that particualr day's issue of the newspaper. News reports are divided into hard news, feature articles and special topic news which includes coverage of sports, finance, arts, etc. (Bell, 1991: 13). Both are apparently very different but keeping a news report objective is often a difficult task, especially in feature articles, which deal with subjects in more depth:

> By journalistic tradition, opinion and news reporting are supposed to be kept separate. (..) Although numerous media researchers have shown that fact and opinion are by no means easy to separate, this has made little difference to how newsworkers perceive - or newspapers present - these categories. (Bell 1991: 13)

Bell's view of newspapers is influenced by the fact that he knows how journalists categorise different genres. The approach towards newspaper genres that I suggest is not concerned primarily with the point of view of the producers of newspapers. I am interested in analysing texts, and more specifically, editorial texts, with a view to understanding how readers might perceive them.

As Bell (1991: 13) states above, the possible differentiation between the two genres based on the dichotomy fact/opinion is often blurred, so it is my hypothesis that the main difference between them are to be found in the rhetorical structure. In this sense, Bhatia (1993:168) claims that the news report, in the form of an inverted pyramid, is the only genre that uses the rhetorical strategy of presenting the solution first as in this way the freshest news is presented first: *solution → situation → problem →evaluation.* In contrast, editorials use the more common strategy of *situation → problem → solution → evaluation;* and *situation → problem → evaluation*; *situation → evaluation.*

1.3.2.1. Editorials

The main goal of most editorials is to get the editor's views on important issues across to the reader. To conform to this goal various strategies are used. Digressions, or dramatic topic shifts, for instance, are normally avoided. The repetition of ideas, or phrases, however, is allowed to a certain extent if it is needed to transmit the desired information or to satisfy a rhetorical need. To make the editorial easier to follow editorials share a rhetorical strategy with

many other kinds of written texts, that is, making the Discourse Topic text initial, and adhering to it throughout, although this pattern is not followed blindly. Finally, formal language, is the norm in editorial texts although the odd stretch of colloquial language is not unknown. There are, conceivably, many other ways that the information in this kind of text could be organised but these strategies are the ones that most writers in our culture follow for this particular kind of text.

In accordance with my view of genre, the goals of editorials and the general strategies, which are used to implement them, eventually lead to certain surface forms, be they lexical, syntactic, rhetorical, etc., becoming the preferred way to get the job done. Such forms are either learned or acquired within a particular communicative situation eventually making a particular textual device become associated with a text designed for a specific goal, i.e. curricula, letters of application, abstracts. So, surface forms pertaining to the language level become associated with the more abstract concept —editorial genre. This view of how genre eventually affects textual strategies is shared by Fowler (1991: 227):

> Now, it is intuitively obvious that there exist within newspapers distinct genres of writing: editorials, reviews, financial reports, sports, accounts of parliamentary proceedings, etc. Presumably, each genre employs certain textual strategies which cue readers to expect a particular kind of discursive experience, a particular view on some specialised portion of the represented world.

This does not mean that there is a mechanical determinism involved in genre to such an extent that genre dictates the language or even, in many cases, the style to be used (Fowler 1991: 227):

> ... there is no 'standard form' and style for editorials: they employ many different kinds of textual procedures, though a number of features recur *(but not all, nor every time):* certain kinds of modality, certain pronouns, high diction or alternatively vernacular diction, hypotaxis, syntactic parallelism, etc. Editorials are presumably a kind of Wittgensteinian family recognisable by options from a set of cues and such families provide a complicated descriptive task for the taxonomist of genre.

Fowler (1991) apparently suggests that a textual strategy is not instantiated by a particular surface structure but that there are sets of options that can be activated. Using insights supplied by Schank & Abelson (1977) we might envisage, in a simplified way, the writing of an editorial being made up of a series of verbal strategies realised by an editor, whose aim is to write about an issue which is currently in the news. To fulfil such a goal, he or she may use a plan, that is, a series of actions in chronological order, that are triggered by

contextual stimuli, bottom-up information, and/or scripts, which are default (unmarked) courses of action that rely on top-down information or world knowledge (Schank & Abelson, 1977: 89). Scripts are normally preferred to plans whenever possible as they are more economic, in terms of processing and are usually effective in a given context. So, to use the, by now, famous restaurant script as an example, it is easier and more effective to follow the restaurant ritual, than use our imagination in the quest for a more creative way of obtaining food as this will probably take more effort and might end in failure.

In the case of editorials, a script would include choosing one topic only and a fixed sequence of verbal events: title, introduction, body and conclusion. Nevertheless, the language used in each piece of expository writing, unlike that of a restaurant script, is very diverse due to the unique "problems" that the writing of each new editorial brings. Every time we wish to get an idea across we are likely to come up against problems, rather like what sometimes happens in restaurants when a script does not go entirely as planned, that is, "obstacles", in Schank & Abelson's terms (1977: 51). Scripts, as I said earlier, rely on top-down processing but each problem that we come across when writing an editorial at a local level normally requires a plan which is determined by the bottom-up information that is encountered.

Thus, at a global level it is my hypothesis that editorials conform to a finite number of rhetorical structures depending on the specific goal of the editor when writing each leader. Each type of editorial could be likened to the different scripts needed when we go to a MacDonald's, a drive-in, or an elegant Italian restaurant. At a local level, I believe that each strategy, to successfully achieve a goal, can be instantiated by an infinite set of verbal structures which include a finite set whose members appear more frequently. The scripts or plans used to carry out the goals at both levels are constrained by the general nature of the editorial genre as depicted below:

Editorial Genre

Field	expressing views, opinions, predictions, suggestions on current issues as identified in newspaper articles.
Tenor	journalist/editor to newspaper reader, hierarchical: respected authority as writer to non-expert readers, social distance: quite high.
Mode	language role: rather constitutive channel: visual: print; processing time for addresser greater than for addressee, designed to be read once; rhetorically expository.
Goal	To convince or influence the reader. (Adapted from Goatley 1994: 24-25)

Bhatia (1988: 165) claims that as editorials are concerned with giving the reader the newspaper's position on the stories that have been covered in recent newspaper reports and normally follow the formal schema below:

> **1** Presenting the case, which concerns actual events, i.e., what is or what was in the world of everyday events. It may be seen as framing issues, clarifying choices or defining areas of concern.
> **2**. Offering the argument, where the editor discusses the possible alternative worlds, i.e. what was not or what might have been and can be seen in terms of Kinneavy's (1971) confutation and confirmation.
> **3**. Reaching the verdict, which concerns the world of desired events, i.e., what would be or what should have been and is generally seen as the writer's conclusion.
> **4**. Recommending action, where the writer is seen as suggesting how the desired world of events can be realised. (Bhatia 1988: 165)

Bhatia's schema seems to imply that all editorials follow the same structure. Other authors suggest that this is not the case. Bolívar (1995) claims that there are several kinds of editorials depending on the goal of the author. Central to Bolívar's (1995) view of editorials, based on research by Tadros (1981) and Sinclair (1983), is that even written texts are designed to take into account interaction and that it is possible to find evidence of traces of such interaction in editorials. In other words, interaction informs the structure of the editorial. She claims that written and oral discourses do not differ essentially in that both are moulded by social conventions that "govern social interaction" (1994: 72 [my translation]).

According to Bolívar, all discourse is the use of language to cause some effect in those listening or reading or to react to something we hear or read (1994: 73). Following work by Sinclair & Coulthard (1975) on oral exchanges in the classroom between teacher and students, she claims that interaction is manifested in editorials by a triadic structure made up of initiation, follow-up and evaluation. Of the three, evaluation is the most important. She quotes Labov & Waletzky (1967: 37) who define evaluation as "that part of the narrative which reveals the attitude of the narrator towards the narrative by emphasising the relative importance of some narrative units as compared to others". Bolívar claims that editorials are divided into two or three-parts called "movements". The first movement describes the situation (Winter 1977, 1980; Hoey 1979, 1983), the second, shows how the situation might develop and the third, which is optional, refers to the world "that should be". Internally, movements are generally made up of two or three "triads" the first triad expresses "Situation", the second, "Development", and the third, "Recommendation". Finally, the

triads themselves are composed of “lead”, “follow”, and “valuate” which mirror the functions of the movements.

Most editorials in Bolívar’s corpus are made up of two complete movements and a third movement of two triads (1995: 291). However, she notes that editorials that occupy the first position on an editorial page are normal the most complex (1994: 156) and also that shorter editorials have a simpler structure than longer ones as we can see in table 1.1.(1994: 157). As the editorial is often used to give the opinion of the newspaper, it is not surprising that the valuate turn is of great importance. Bolívar claims that valuates can act as “concluders” showing logical and temporal conclusions or results, prophesies and directives, which can be either direct or indirect, i.e. implicit (1995: 291-292). Bolívar’s views seem to corroborate my hypothesis that the editorial genre has a preferred set of rhetorical structures. We will see whether this also applies to re-entry patterns.

Movement 1	**Movement 2**	**Movement 3**
Triad 1 = Situation	**Triad 1 = Situation**	**Triad 1 = Situation**
lead	lead	lead
follow	follow	follow
valuate	valuate	valuate
Triad 2 = Development	**Triad 2 = Development**	**Triad 2 = Development**
lead	lead	lead
follow	follow	follow
valuate	valuate	valuate
Triad 3 = Recommendation	**Triad 3 = Recommendation**	
lead	lead	
follow	follow	
valuate	valuate	

Table 1.1.: Movements

Biber (1988, 1995) offers more characteristics of the editorial. He looks at genres, which he calls registers, from a multi-feature point of view. That is, instead of comparing one feature in various genres, Biber takes a series of features grouped into what he calls dimensions, that is, situational or functional parameters such as formal vs. informal, interactive vs. non-interactive, literary vs. colloquial, restricted vs. elaborated. He claims that such parameters “can be considered as dimensions because they define continuums of variation rather than discrete poles”(Biber 1988: 9).

Using multiple dimensions Biber is able to distinguish the genres. He claims that this would not be possible using just one feature. Below, I have summarised the features in each dimension. I have also signalled the prototypical registers of each with brief comments on how editorials relate to each dimension:

Dimensions

Dimension 1: Involved versus Information Production

Characteristic linguistic features: Verbs like *think, wish , feel* are found more in **Involved** production, as are features such as THAT deletion, copula verbs, the IT pronoun, contractions. **Informational** production is characterized by a higher number of nouns, greater word length, less repetition.

Characteristic registers: Telephone conversations are typical of the involved pole whereas official documents are typical of the informational pole.

Editorials: are nearer the informational pole than the involved pole.

Dimension 2: Narrative versus Non-Narrative Discourse.

Characteristic linguistic features: **Narrative discourse** has the following distinguishing features: past tense verbs, third person pronouns, perfect aspect verbs, etc. **Non-Narrative** discourse is characterized by present tense verbs and attributive adjectives.

Characteristic registers: Romance fiction has the most narrative features, whereas at the non-narrative extreme we find broadcasts.

Editorials: are nearer the non-narrative pole than the narrative pole.

Dimension 3: Situation-dependent versus Elaborated reference.

Characteristic linguistic features: The features which are characteristic of **Situation-Dependent** registers are: time and place adverbials and adverbs. The features found in **Elaborated Reference** production are WH-relative clauses on object positions, nominalizations, phrasal co-ordination, etc.

Characteristic registers: Broadcasts are typical of Situation-Dependent discourse whereas official documents are characteristic of Elaborated Reference.

Editorials: are almost neutral with regard to this dimension.

Dimension 4: Overt Expression of Argumentation

Characteristic linguistic features: Infinitives, prediction modals, suasive verbs, conditional subordination, necessity modals, split auxiliaries.

Characteristic registers: Professional letters are overtly argumentative whereas broadcasts are negatively marked for the linguistic features above.

Editorials: are heavily marked for this dimension.

Dimension 5: Abstract versus Non-abstract Style

Characteristic linguistic features: Agentless passives, past participial (passive) adverbial clauses, *by-* passives, past participial (passive) postnominal clauses (e.g. *the textbook [which was] used in that class,* etc.

Characteristic registers: Telephone conversations are non-abstract whereas technical and engineering prose is abstract.

Editorials: Neutral.

Dimension 6: On-line Informational Elaboration Marking Stance ("typically used to provide informational elaboration while at the same time explicitly presenting the speaker's stance or attitude towards the proposition" [Biber 1995: 167-168])

Characteristic linguistic features: *that-* complement clauses on verbs, *that-* complement clauses on adjectives, *that-* complement clauses on object positions.

Characteristic registers: Prepared speeches show common use of the above features whereas Mystery and Adventure fiction is negatively marked with regard to them.

Editorials: are positive on the scale. (Adapted from Biber 1995: 144-167)

None of the above dimensions are sufficient to characterise any genre but the cumulative effect of all six is enough to enable us to distinguish between them. The editorial genre is distinguished from spoken discourse as it has few of the features of such discourse, i.e., deletion of the relative pronoun *that,* contractions and overt markers of personal opinion. Editorials have a certain number of the features common to narratives, third person pronouns, for instance, but they are nearer to the non-narrative pole with regards to the use of the tenses. However, what characterises editorials most of all is dimension 4, the manifestation of "overt argumentation and persuasion" (Biber 1995: 258). Editorials usually present various points of view but they "seek to convince the reader of the advisability or likelihood of one of them" (Biber 1988: 148). Biber (1988:195) furthermore states that:

> Institutional editorials, which are the official opinions of a newspaper, generally make no attempt at objectivity: they are overt expressions of opinion intended to persuade readers.

From the preceding pages it seems evident that there is a consensus with regards to the existence of the editorial genre (or register according to the terminology used by certain researchers). It also seems clear that both rhetorically and linguistically editorials are distinct from any other genre. That

the editorial is recognised from a social point of view and can also been characterized linguistically proves that the analysis of editorials from a linguistic perspective may shed further light on its social dimension and will definitely enrich our knowledge of the genre as a linguistically differentiated manifestation of language.

2. COHERENCE, COHESION AND RE-ENTRY

2.1. Preamble

As defining re-entry items involves describing the terms “text”, “discourse”, “coherence” and “cohesion”, I will review the work of several linguists who have attempted to come to definitions of these terms. I will start by looking at text and discourse first as most of the literature on cohesion and coherence depends to a great extent on these notions.

2.2. Text and Non-text

It is generally agreed upon that if there is such a thing as text, it must have some kind of structure. According to Hoey (1991) there are three views of text organisation held by various schools.

> **1** that there is none;
> **2** that text has organisation but does not have "the status of structure, a structural description being one that permits one to make predictive statements about the data under examination.
> **3** that text does permit of full structural description. (Adapted from Hoey 1991: 13)

Which of these options is the best? I know of no author who believes that texts are completely bereft of any kind of organisation, so we can safely discard option one. Option three was held to be true by van Dijk (1983) and other textlinguists such as de Beaugrande & Dressler (1981), Petöfi (1988), at the beginning of their research due to the influence of transformational-generative grammar. Option two is the one that Hoey (1990) propounds as the texts he has analyzed show definite patterns. If we discard option one, option two seems to me to be more satisfactory than option three as one thing is a thorough description of discourse and text and another a complex algorithm that would

produce all possible coherent texts of the kind suggested by the pioneers in textlinguistics. I will therefore take option two as the best preliminary definition of text.

Many of the attempts to define text have been attacked for being too "surface-oriented", that is, some researchers rely too heavily on surface markers in their definitions of textuality. Halliday & Hasan (1976), for instance, claim that a text is a semantic unit rather than a structural one, and that texts do not consist of sentences but are "realised" by them. The difference between a text and a random collection of sentences is that the former has "texture", that is, "it functions as a unity with respect to its environment" (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 2). For Halliday and Hasan (1976) texture is provided by the explicit relations of cohesion that exist between anaphoric elements and the elements that they refer to. Brown & Yule (1983), on the other hand, do not believe that a text must "explicitly" reveal features of cohesion to be considered a text. We will explore these questions in the following sections.

2.3. Coherence

The terms used to describe how a text may be considered as such even though there are no surface connectors is coherence. Coherence covers many aspects, such as what we consider to be "normal", the sequencing of events, completeness and intertextuality or genre. In van Dijk's opinion the semantic coherence of a discourse is conditioned cognitively by the "assumed normality" of the worlds involved, that is, "our expectations about the semantic structures of discourse are determined by our "knowledge" about the structure of worlds in general and of particular states of affairs or courses of events" (1977: 99). This definition would cover both fictional worlds and the "real" world. Thus, in a science-fiction text we would accept as "normal" events or states that would be considered impossible in the world that we live in. Randquist (1985) claims that "knowledge structures" "which contain the prototypical, sociocultural determined knowledge about a particular part of the world" (1985:193) are a make or break factor when deciding if a text is grammatical or acceptable. An illustration of this is the example below, taken from Schank & Abelson (1977:40):

Ex. 2.1 John went to a park. He asked the midget for a mouse. He picked up the box and left.

According to the authors, this particular text would not be acceptable in a "normal" world but could be possible in a text-world of the science-fiction type.

Van Dijk (1972) claims that a lot of our knowledge of the world is organised in "frames" that is, data structures which represent stereotyped situations, and "scripts" which denote prototypical actions and events in a determined order, i.e. buying a pizza in a pizza parlour (Randquist, 1985: 204). The midget example above uses "weird semantics", to use Randquist's (1985) terms but is really only a variety of purchasing script. The frame theory deals quite successfully with simple situations like Schank & Abelson's (1977) office frame but as Brown & Yule (1983) point out, there are texts which could contain a frame, which, in turn might contain one or more frames. Besides this fact, it is often difficult to define exactly what kind of frame we are dealing with, as in this example.

Ex. 2.2 The Cathedral congregation had watched on television monitors as Pope and Archbishop met, in front of a British Caledonian helicopter, on the dewy grass of a Canterbury recreation ground. (*The Sunday Times,* 30 May 1982)

This could, Brown & Yule (1983) state, be a Cathedral frame, a television-watching frame, and a recreation-ground frame. As such it could contain "a large number of sub-frames covering endless aspects of our stereotypic knowledge of "recreation" (which) would have no function in our understanding of this text" (1983: 240-1) This is precisely the weakest part of the frame theory. Where is the limit to the amount of knowledge that is foregrounded in our minds? This is an important question as the whole frame theory was constructed to offer a plausible method of limiting the amount of information activated in the brain at a given moment. Van Dijk (1972) recognises this problem and comments that a "election" is made from the "possible information" available but, unfortunately, offers no clues as to how this selection is carried out, which is exactly the kind of drawback Brown & Yule (1983) refer to.

Hatakeyama *et al.* (1985) regard the coherence of a text as depending on its "interpretability". This means building a bridge between the text and the real world we live in. The first thing that an interpreter has to do to achieve this goal is to form a "mental representation" of the text. To do this he assigns a "canonical syntactical representation", that is, the syntactic structure of the text. Next, he constructs the "canonical representation of the signification", which includes (a) the canonical text, i.e. the "unambiguous canonical representation of the syntactic <u>and</u> semantic structure of the text to be interpreted", and (b) "the canonical representation of those hypotheses (presuppositions, inferences, implications) which the interpreter constructs with regard to the states of affairs in the text" (1985: 52-3). The interpreter then constructs the representation of

the world (world fragment) that he believes to be manifest in the text. This representation is given the name "text world". Then, the interpreter uses all his knowledge, beliefs, assumptions, and so on, to interpret the text with regard to the "real" world. In other words, he assigns models to the sense component of the text. The final step is "to determine which "world fragment" (extra-linguistic correlate), considered as being acceptable by the interpreter, can be assigned as an interpretation to the text to be interpreted" (1985: 54). If no world fragment can be assigned to the text, the interpreter can change his models or construct new ones in order to interpret it. Coherence is, therefore, a property of a text world, which depends on the interpreter and the interpretation model of the interpreter.

Randquist (1985) states that for certain texts, i.e., narratives, the basic building block of coherence is "temporal linearity". She goes on to say that functional sequences are basic for textual cohesion. Violations of temporal linearity and other functional sequences are more likely to cause a written or spoken chunk to be deemed a non-text than violations of topical sequences. That is "weird" semantics" is tolerated to a greater extent than "weird" syntax. Winter (1979) states that clauses or other stretches of language need to be logically and/or temporally ordered and that surface cohesion, that is, repetition, etc., is often not necessary for a text to be deemed coherent.

2.3.1. Coherence and Completeness

One of the conditions for sequences of linguistic units to be considered discourse is that they must form a "whole", that is, the discourse must be complete. Van Dijk (1972) (like Werlich 1983), states that the description of states or events must contain "all the facts constituting a certain situation..." (1972: 108). Nevertheless, he admits that complete descriptions, although theoretically possible, are practically impossible. However, it might suffice to mention the word *office* and/or *desk* for the reader or listener to obtain a mental representation of an office frame being used. Perhaps a more convenient way to explain under-complete or over-complete texts would be to treat them as a stylistic variation of more "normal" texts.

Hatakeyama *et al.* (1985) see completion as the "closedness" of the "world fragment" or extra-linguistic correlate of the text. They state that the properties of coherence and closedness of a world fragment are not inherent to it but depend on what the interpreter knows, believes or imagines about the world fragment. Therefore, the "states-of-affairs", i.e. the contents/themes of a world fragment are judged to be complete if they are interpreted as such by the reader. Nevertheless, this view of completion would leave the matter entirely in the

hands of the reader, which seems to contradict the feeling that most readers have that certain texts are intrinsically more complete than others.

2.3.2. Coherence and Repetition

Coherence has often been connected to the notion of repetition and its connection to coherence has been dealt with by many authors: so the term "repetition" must, perforce, appear many times in a chapter that deals with text coherence and is even more closely linked to the phenomenon of cohesion. This does not mean that repetition only concerns questions of coherence and cohesion. Tannen (1989: 20) states that:

> . . . repetition is at the heart of language. From fixed expressions, through proverbs to phonemes and morphemes, language is structured by repetition because repetition is structure

However, it is in the field of textual cohesion in which many linguists have observed a close relationship between repetition and coherence. Johnstone (1987: 212) states that repetition is a mechanism for assimilating the new to the old. Hobbs (1979: 73) maintains that repetition—what he calls elaboration—is a sign of coherence because if we say something again "there must be some reason" (1979:). This brings up the question of intentionality. As Tannen (1987) points out: "Every aspect of discourse analysis raises questions of intentionality". Hattim & Mason (1990) agree that language use is motivated and that repetition, which they call "recurrence" is not accidental. But do speakers and writers deliberately use repetition to get across more efficiently what they want to communicate or is it simply that when we stick to one particular subject, words have to be repeated? According to Tannen (1987: 73), lexical repetition is used to set the topic of the conversation and so repetition has a very important role in making a text coherent and being a surface phenomenon must be, therefore, a sign of cohesion. Repetition is a form of "discourse management" according to Goffman (1981), who goes on to say that discourse is organised through the following requirement: "that a theme once established, be adhered to throughout a segment of discourse" (1981: 287). Finally, Foucault (1972) suggests that all text is intertext or, in other words, all discourse is structured by repetition.

2.4. Discourse Topic

One of the most important elements of text organisation and one which is connected to both the overall coherence of a discourse and to the cohesive

elements that are its physical manifestation is "Discourse Topic" (Henceforth DT). Text linguists were some of the first researchers to attempt a "scientific" definition of DT. Van Dijk has dealt with DT extensively in several publications (van Dijk: 1977, 1983, 1988). In the first of these, *Text and Context* (1977), he forwards a semi-formal definition of "macrostructure" which is a synonym of DT (1977: 133-4):

> a concept or a S conceptual structure (a proposition) may become a discourse topic if it HIERARCHICALLY ORGANIZES the conceptual (propositional) structure of the sequence.

Van Dijk (1977), therefore, claims that the DT is a propositional structure, that is, a kind of summary of the discourse, but may not be totally explicit. In other words, it may belong the deep structure. Thus, no single surface form or set of surface forms has, necessarily, to be linked isomorphically to a DT.

Although DTs do not have to be explicit, in most written discourse of the informative type —editorials, newspaper reports and expository essays— they are normally manifested by surface forms. This being the situation, it is important to identify the forms surface DTs can take. Giora (1985) explores the ways in which DTs can be made explicit and is particularly interested in what constitutes the minimum surface form of a DT. If there is an explicit DT, Giora suggests that its minimal expression is a noun phrase and "a subsuming predicate" (1985: 17). This is the view held by Keenan & Shieffelin, who say that the DT is always a proposition, not just a noun phrase (1976: 380). Giora argues that noun phrases, are insufficient to embody a DT. The following chunk of text is incoherent because the noun phrase *Mary* is not a strong enough connection to become a DT and this would explain why the example below is incoherent.

> Ex. 2.3 They say Mary's very smart. (sic) Yeah, she has a nice handwriting and she lives with her uncle und she dyes her hair every now and then. (1985: 21)

If a noun phrase was sufficient to form a DT the fact that all the sentences refer back to *Mary* would be sufficient for the text to be coherent, which it clearly is not. We must take into account, therefore, not only the noun phrase, but its predicate, to be able to affirm that the extract is coherent. Giora's view of DT would certainly be more amenable to some researchers than van Dijk's. Brown & Yule (1983) criticise van Dijk's idea that text can be reduced to the kind of propositions seen in logic. They explain that such semantic reductionism will in fact create a string of propositions which will be, paradoxically, longer than the actual text analysed. What is more, they explain

that the reduction of sentences to propositions amounts to nothing more than an "interpretation" of the text and is therefore subjective and will vary depending on the researcher (Brown & Yule, 1983: 109-110). I agree with Brown & Yule (1983) in that a formal approach to textual analysis can offer insights into textual processes but that beyond such insights it will not explicate a text any more than other kinds of exegesis. However, if we can understand van Dijk's "proposition" not as it is understood in logic, that is, the relation between a predicate and its arguments, nor as a synonym of sentence, but as one and only one semantic representation per clause or sentence, van Dijk's view of DT is a useful one. We must have some kind of mental representation of text, whether it is propositional or not and my view is that a DT would comprise mainly propositional information compressed through memory restraints into a few propositions or perhaps only one, namely, the DT.

Many authors hold that a DT is normally found in text-initial position (Ervin-Tripp 1968; Hinds 1979; Werlich 1983; Giora 1985). The implication is, therefore, that most DTs are, as we suggested above, explicit. Such DTs coincide with what have been called "topic sentences", a concept which originated, according to Halliday (1994: 387), in American composition theory. We must bear in mind, however, that even in genres where DTs are made explicit, they are still optional. Van Dijk (1988: 136) warns that topic sentences need not always occur but "are often given to emphasise the topic".

For van Dijk (1977: 151-152), the notion of the topic sentence limiting what can go next is important as DTs "determine for a discourse or part of it the range of possible concepts which may be used and thus are a global constraint on lexical insertion". Similarly, Eggington & Ricento (1981) see the function of the topic sentence as creating the right frame for the subsequent text: "The first sentence creates a culturally shared **mind-set** about what the set of acceptable second sentences might be" (1981: 76).

The concept of DT ties in with what many authors now see as the reader's active participation in the reading process. Silberstein (1994: 12) claims that the reader "is an active, problem solving individual who coordinates a number of skills and strategies to facilitate comprehension". Giora (1985) proposes that tying propositions to a DT is a dynamic concept from the reader or listener's stance and is based on the assessment and storage model of Reinhart (1981). In this model, the reader "constructs" a DT, which is normally found at the beginning of a text and when new propositions are encountered, they are confronted with those that have been stored. The new propositions are either added to the pool of propositions or rejected depending on whether they are compatible with the topic or not. Thus the construction of a DT is a cooperative venture between the producer and the interpreter.

2.4.1. Topic Shift

A proposition can be subsumed by a DT if it is felt to be coherent and can then be stored and added to what Stalnaker (1978) calls a context set. On the contrary, when an incoming message content "is no longer subsumable under a given DT, it either opens a new entry under which subsequent information will be stored, or it is signalled as unrelated" (Giora, 1985: 22). The "new entry" Giora refers to may mean an independent DT or a sub-topic, she does not make this issue clear. However, she does state that the difference between DTs and digressions hinges on the fact that the latter are made up of propositions that are only felt to be connected to the rest of the discourse when they are preceded by digression markers ("cue phrases" Allen 1987; "framing moves" Sinclair & Coulthard 1975), such as *by the way.* She adds that unrelated propositions are deemed to be incoherent if not preceded by such markers.

For van Dijk (1977: 94) change is not only possible but necessary as we cannot just go over the same things again and again. In fact too much repetition or tautology (Wittgenstein 1918) is a sign of an incoherent text. For discourse change to take place in a coherent fashion there are constraints on how new elements can be introduced into the text. Van Dijk (1977) claims that "individuals" which have just been introduced into the discourse are required to be:

> related to at least one of the individuals already 'present'. Similarly we would also expect assigned properties to be related to properties already assigned. And finally a change of world or situation will also be constrained by some accessibility relations to the world or situation already established. (Van Dijk, 1977: 94)

Topic change depends on the existence of a relation, explicit or implicit, between given or old information and new information. All the propositions in a text should be connected either through surface elements or because they are related semantically to the same DT. Normally, a coherent text would include propositions belonging to sub-topics, which, in turn are connected to a DT. Van Dijk (1977: 97) claims that there are several requirements for discourse development to be coherent in descriptions or narratives. First, unless otherwise indicated, temporal and causal order in the description of events should correspond to the linear ordering in discourse; second, there should be "continuity with regard to individuals" (van Dijk, 1977: 98) in a particular discourse; and third, there should be coherence between "the assumed normality of the worlds involved" in the discourse and "our knowledge about the structure of worlds in general and of particular states of affairs or courses of events" (van

Dijk, 1977: 99). Van Dijk acknowledges that our descriptions of places, people and events may not be as simple as we have just described. A writer may choose to alter the canonical order of events or write about things that have never happened nor could ever happen. In such cases, for the development of the text to be considered coherent the deviations from the norm must be signalled.

The word “change”, used by van Dijk and others seems to imply that we may say things that are totally unconnected as long as digression markers are used. Certainly, one may talk about the most varied of subjects when conducting a conversation, but presumably they all have to do with the people taking part in the conversation, if nothing else. We must not forget that a communicative event like a conversation is a lot more than just what is said. In this sense, DT is connected to the goal of the genre of conversation, that is, maintaining communication. Very often the things we talk about are the least important part of such a social event. So, from a wider perspective, even the widest ranging conversation would have a DT, i.e., the “topics held to be of interest to the participants”. I prefer the term “topic shift” (Brown & Yule, 1984: 69) as it has a less abrupt meaning, more in accordance with reality.

The notion of discourse topic is of paramount interest to anyone involved in looking at cohesion and cohesive elements in a text. Without a DT, a text is just a random set of sentences and the cohesive devices (re-entry items), or *consecutio temporum*, to mention just two markers of coherence, would be of very little use to the reader or listener when trying to come to a mental representation of a text.

2.5. Cohesion

Hatakeyama *et al* (1985) place cohesion between coherence, an abstract property of texts which is hierarchically at a higher level, and what they call “connex expressions”, which are at a lower level. They define “cohesion” and “connexity”, as elements of the verbal, i.e. non-abstract, construction of a text. An expression is described as connex when all its independent units have, for instance, the same rhythmic or syntactic pattern (irrespective of their meanings), or when the same word is present in all the independent units, and so on. Hankamer *et al.* (1985: 68-9) state that cohesion constitutes “strong connexity” and that connex expression may also become cohesive when their sense-semantic thematic structure fulfils certain conditions:

> (a) the themes of the (syntactically well-formed) independent units of the subsequences of an expression must be united to a subsequent theme by means

of sense-semantic (sic) relation, and the subsequences must also be well-formed with regard to the theme and/or rheme progression; (b) the subsequence themes must be united to the theme (or theme complex) of the expression by means of sense-semantic relations

Although no examples of cohesion are offered, my interpretation is that they mean that pairs or chains formed by an antecedent and subsequent anaphors must maintain "semantic identity relations" not only between themselves but between different pairs or chains and ultimately to the topic of the discourse. For most researchers cohesion is a much less problematic term than coherence and most agree in general that coherence is an abstract term while cohesion is a more tangible one. One drawback common to most definitions, such as the ones below is that cohesion is seen as a purely surface phenomenon. In this sense Hoey refers to it as "automatic recognition".

Coherence	**Cohesion**
Coherence is defined as "the relationship between illocutionary acts (Widdowson 1978: 28).	"the overt linguistically-signalled relationship between propositions" (Widdowson 1978: 31)
"concerns the ways in which the components of the textual world, i.e. the configuration of concepts and relations which underlie the surface text, are mutually accessible and relevant" (Beaugrande and Dressler 1981: 3-4)	"concerns the ways in which the components of the surface text, i.e. the actual words we hear or see, are mutually connected within a sequence" (Beaugrande and Dressler 1981: 3)
Coherence is "subjective and judgements concerning it may vary from reader to reader ... coherence is a facet of the reader's evaluation of a text. (Hoey 1991: 12)	"cohesion is a property of the text, and ... is objective, capable in principle of automatic recognition" (Hoey 1991: 12)

Stoddard's definition (1991) is nearer to reality as she states that both the notions of coherence and cohesion should be viewed from the reader's point of view. "Cohesion" is a mental construct resulting from reader processing in which "linguistic signals indicate no more than the potential for cohesion" (Stoddard 1991: 17). She adds that coherence differs from cohesion in that although both are a product of reader-processing, coherence relies less on syntactic elements. Many cohesive elements need reader-processing to exist at all. For instance, the pronoun *he,* may refer to either of the men in the following example:

Ex. 2.4 President Bush met comedian Rowan Atkinson last week. It was the first time that he had met the "Mr. Bean" in person.

To correctly interpret the pronoun *he*, we would have to know that Rowan Atkinson is *Mr. Bean* in order to discard the interpretation that *he* refers to Rowan Atkinson. Such interpretations can only take place if we treat cohesion as a reader-construct. Our definition of cohesion could be, therefore: “surface markers which are judged by the reader to be connections between different propositions”.

2.5.1. Cohesive Relationships

I agree with Hofmann (1989: 247), who says there are two types of coherence and cohesion phenomena “the use of pronouns & anaphora —& other things”. The former relate antecedent and anaphoric devices and I have called the elements that carry out this function “Re-entry Devices” —surface elements that connect with antecedents in order to provide us with further information about them and introduce new information about participants which have already been mentioned in the text. My hypothesis is that elements which are re-entered in written English, are connected with the discourse topic and serve, therefore, as a connection between each of the arguments and said topic. I also believe that certain patterns of re-entry may be characteristic of certain genres, that is, they may be stylistically relevant. I have decided, however, to eschew “consecutio temporum”, conjunction and other phenomena that secure coherence and cohesion but do not relate antecedent and anaphora, for instance, collocation and the logical sequences proposed by Jordan (1984), Mann & Thompson (1988), Bernárdez (1990), etc., i.e., condition, cause, purpose, etc. as these devices do not refer to the participants in the propositions, which refer to entities outside the text; they show, rather, the logico-temporal relations between propositions and other textual relations outside the scope of cohesion proper.

In the next sections I will be looking at cohesive re-entry devices using as a starting point Halliday & Hasan’s *Cohesion in English* (1976). Halliday & Hasan (1976) state that what differentiates text from non-text is “texture”, and is provided by the relations of cohesion that exist between anaphoric elements and the elements that they refer to. Cohesion is then defined as a semantic concept which refers to the meaning relations that exist within the text and which define it as a text. It belongs to one of the three functional semantic components of language —the textual, or text-forming component in the linguistic system. This is made up of theme and information structures which cover the speaker's organisation of the clause as a message and the non-hierarchical organisation of information on the basis of whether it is new or old.

Cohesion implies that one element in a text depends for its interpretation on another. That is, one element presupposes the existence of another. The term used by Halliday & Hasan (1976) to refer to a single instance of cohesion is a "tie" (1976: 4). In Hoey (1991) the term "link" is employed instead of "tie" as the latter includes cohesive relations that he is not interested in, such as conjunction and collocation. He adds that Halliday & Hasan's definition of "tie" seems "to imply directionality more than link" (Hoey 1991: 52). Halliday & Hasan (1976) divide the cohesive relationships that hold between sentences in the text into five main types: "reference", "substitution", "ellipsis", "conjunction" and "lexical cohesion".

2.5.1.1. Referential Cohesion

Halliday & Hasan (1976) distinguish two main kinds of reference. The main division being between "exophoric", or situational reference, and "endophoric", or textual reference. According to them (1976: 37) a reference item is neither inherently endophoric or exophoric but merely "phoric", i.e. it has the property of reference. This means that a reference item may be either endophoric or exophoric or both. They deal with exophoric reference sparingly as, according to them, only endophoric reference is capable of creating texture. "Referential cohesion" in texts is realised by personal pronouns, including possessive determiners and possessive pronouns, demonstratives, the definite article and comparatives. It is characterised by what Halliday & Hasan (1976) call "continuity of reference", that is, "the same thing enters into the discourse a second time" (1976: 31). So in the following example:

Ex. 2.5 The birds flew down to the trees below. Soon *they* could be heard cooing quietly to each other.

the pronoun *they* does not refer to any birds but to the birds that have previously been mentioned. It would not matter either if the referential item used were not, as in the case above, nominative. The reference in the second sentence could be carried by a possessive determiner as in 2.6a or an objective pronoun as in 2.6b:

Ex. 2.6a Soon *their* quiet cooing could be heard.
2.6b I could see *them* cooing quietly to each other.

Possessive pronouns, like 2.6a above, are doubly anaphoric in that they are both referential and elliptical. In the sentence: *Theirs are beautiful, theirs* refers to a possessor and the thing possessed. Huddleston (1978), in his review of *Cohesion in English,* does not accept Halliday & Hasan's (1976) use of the word "reference" when what is meant is the cohesive relation between a

pronoun and its antecedent. This is due to the fact that reference is traditionally used in the philosophy of language and in most linguistic writings with the meaning of signalling or picking out “a certain entity about which something is being stated” (Huddleston, 1978: 336). So, in the example below:

Ex. 2.7 Look at him!

the pronoun *him* refers, in the traditional sense, to a non-linguistic entity. Halliday & Hasan would classify this as a case of exophoric reference between the pronoun and its antecedent.

Ex. 2.8 John did not come. -Was *he* ill?

In a sentence like 2.8, Huddleston (1978) states that *he* is anaphoric to the linguistic expression *John* but “refers” to John, a non-linguistic entity that is outside the text, in the "situation". For Halliday & Hasan, both the relation between *he* and the linguistic expression *John,* and *he* and the person John, are referential. Huddleston (1978) argues that Halliday & Hasan’s use of the term “reference” is confusing and obviates the difference between antecedent and referent. This view is also shared by Brown & Yule (1986).

Huddleston (1978) next objects to Halliday & Hasan's rigid division of phoric relations into reference, substitution, ellipsis and lexical cohesion. For Halliday & Hasan reference involves a relation on a semantic level. Therefore, a referential anaphor and its antecedent need not have the same syntactic function. Moreover, they also state that replacement of anaphors by their antecedents is not always possible with referential anaphora. So, in 2.9 *His* could not be replaced by its antecedent *Peter.*

Ex. 2.9 Peter went for a walk. His father didn't see him.

Examples like the above are unconvincing, according to Huddleston (1978: 342), as they “depend on purely *surface* identification of anaphor and antecedent”. If the possessive element in *his* was abstracted away, leaving the lexeme HE, replacement would be possible.

Halliday & Hasan's (1976) assertion that there is total identification between a referential anaphor and its antecedent is questioned by Huddleston (1978), who claims that anaphors can contain elements of meaning which are not expressed in the antecedent whether they are pronouns or definite noun phrases. In 2.10 the pronoun *She* gives us extra information i.e. the gender of the grammatical subject. The definite noun phrase in 2.11 tells us that *John* is a *young reporter***.**

Ex. 2.10 The Dean is at home. She has sprained her ankle.
Ex. 2.11 John walked into the room. The young reporter had a wild look in his eye.

Brown & Yule (1983) criticise Halliday & Hasan's conception of endophoric co-reference which requires that the reader look inside the text to find what is being referred to. The implication of this is that no matter how far into a text a reader gets he/she will always have to relate the last reference to the original presupposed item which might precede it by several pages. In some cases the reader would have to go back even further to find the original reference as Chafe (1972) points out. He mentions the Arthur Koestler novel *The case of the midwife toad* in which 105 pages separate an anaphor *the note* and its antecedent *a letter.* According to Chafe, definiteness can be maintained if the context in which the referent is reintroduced is "narrow enough to make the referent identifiable" (1972: 40). Brown & Yule (1983: 200-1) suggest that the reader:

> establishes a referent in his mental representation of the discourse and relates subsequent references to that referent back to his mental representation, rather than to the original verbal expression in the text.

Brown & Yule (1983) support Huddleston's (1984) view that reference does not always involve total identification between antecedent and pronoun as the thing signalled by the antecedent may be different from the object signalled by the pronoun as we can see in 2.12 taken from Halliday & Hasan (1976: 2):

Ex. 2.12 Wash and core six cooking apples. Put them into a fireproof dish.

Brown & Yule (1983) argue that *them* in the second sentence does not simply refer to *six cooking apples*, it now refers to six cooking apples that have been washed and cored. Another example from Hendricks (1976: 69) illustrates this even more clearly: *Mary married a confirmed bachelor and two years later divorced him.* The pronoun *him* cannot be said to simply replace the noun phrase *a confirmed bachelor,* otherwise a semantic anomaly would result: *Mary divorced a confirmed bachelor.* Brown & Yule (1983) disagree with Halliday & Hasan's (1976) view of the cumulative effect of co-reference and suggest that the term should be used to cover not only the replacement of antecedents by pronouns but their modification and amplification throughout a text.

It is my view that, strictly speaking, anaphoric re-entry items do not refer back to entities in the text as such but to mental representations of these entities which exist in the reader's mind. I therefore agree with Hendricks (1976), Brown & Yule (1983) and Givón (1995) that pronouns refer back to entities that

are "accessible", in Givon's words, in "some pre-existing mental structure in the hearer's mind" (1995: 68).

2.5.1.2. Referential Devices

2.5.1.2.1. Pronouns

Personal pronouns are inherently cohesive as they normally refer anaphorically to a preceding item in the text. Although all third person pronouns can be either exophoric or endophoric, Halliday & Hasan (1976) claim that they are assumed to be anaphoric unless they are clearly not so. First and second person forms are normally interpreted exophorically, except in cases of quoted speech like the following:

Ex. 2.13 Before he left he had written a note. It said, "I have gone to the shops, I'll be back in a minute."

The relationship obtaining between third person personal pronouns and their antecedents is quite straightforward as they very rarely add any further meaning to the antecedent except in certain cases, such as when we use a pronoun to refer to, for instance, an author where the reader finds out through the use of a personal pronoun that said author is a woman or a man. The pronoun *it* is special as it can refer to single entities and to whole sentences.

2.5.1.2.2. Demonstrative pronouns

Demonstrative reference is according to Halliday & Hasan (1976), a form of "verbal pointing". The speaker identifies the referent by locating it on a scale of proximity. They differentiate between the selective modifiers/heads: *this*, *these*, *that those* ; the adjuncts: *here*, *there*, *now*, *then;* and the non-selective modifier: *the.* The items *this*, *these*, *here* and *now* are near on a scale of proximity, and *that*, *those*, *there*, and *then* are far. The item *the* is neutral in this aspect. Stoddard (1991: 34) disagrees with Halliday & Hasan's (1976) claim that the definite article is anaphoric by itself. She says the definite article is only a part of a definite noun phrase. In fact the noun is what maintains the semantic connection with the antecedent.

Halliday & Hasan (1976) highlight the important cohesive role played by the demonstratives, when they are used as heads. Instead of referring to a particular item or items, they refer to "the general class denoted by the noun, including but not limited to the particular member or members of that class being referred to in the presupposed item" (1976: 64). The singular pronouns *this* and *that* are

similar to *it* in that they can refer to single entities or to whole sentences. Examples 2.14 and 2.15 from my corpus, refer back to sentences while 2.16 refers back to a single entity:

Ex. 2.14 The other respect in which the Government's caution is justified is that a fresh inquiry would simply not close the issue in the nice, liberal, rational way that we might all ideally prefer. There are two principal reasons for **this**, and they feed off one another. “Unfinished business” February 3 *The Guardian*

Ex. 2.15 Which is why most of the arts bodies welcomed Mr. Blair's speech as the best they could expect in the circumstances. **That** is probably right but it doesn't alter the fact that the huge success of the arts in Britain is based on a mixed economy of public and private money. “Paying the bill for culture” *The Guardian,* February 4

Ex. 2.16 This is an interesting attempt to close the gap between Britain's talent for creativity and our weakness in translating **this** into commercial success. “Paying the bill for culture” *The Guardian,* February 4

With regard to function, however, *this* and *that* are completely different from *it.* It appears that *it* is used to refer to items which are already in focus while, according to McCarthy (1994), “*this* signals a shift of entity or focus of attention to a new focus” and “*that* refers across from the current focus to entities or foci that are non-current, non-central, marginalizable or other-attributed” (McCarthy 1994: 275). The difference between *this* and *that* can be seen in example 2.15. Here we can see how *that* is followed by an adversative clause: “*That* is probably right but it doesn't alter the fact ...” which downplays the import of the content of Mr Blair’s speech.

2.5.1.2.3. Demonstratives determiners

In the following sections I will deal with demonstrative determiners without taking into account the lexical item they precede. I will deal with the lexical items in the section on lexical cohesion although I see noun phrases comprised of determiners and lexical items as units.

Halliday & Hasan (1976) claim that if a demonstrative is used with a noun, the meaning is always identical to that of the antecedent. However, this seems to contradict what they say about the “meaning” that words like *this* or *that* provide, i.e. the sense of proximity or distance. Moreover, they suggest that this/these is preferred when the referent “is in some way associated with the speaker” Halliday & Hasan (1976: 59-60) as in examples 2.17 and 2.18:

Ex. 2.17 Give me that car, at the back.
Ex. 2.18 These are my favourites.

Although McCarthy (1994) did not analyse the cohesive use of pronouns or demonstratives in their role as modifiers, it would seem to follow that *the* + noun phrase has the same unmarked role as *it* while the functions of the demonstratives *this/these* + noun phrase and *that/those* + noun phrase are parallel to that of the pronoun *this* and *that* respectively. However, it is obvious that Anaphoric nouns are more complex than pronouns as they include modifiers and head-words. Pennock & Llácer (1998) found that nouns preceded by the definite article or the demonstratives *this* and *that* were numerous in the role of re-entry items in the scientific articles that they analysed.

2.5.1.2.4. Other definite determiners

In Pennock & Llácer (1998), it was discovered that *such* was the most common determiner preceding anaphoric nouns after *this* and *that*. The meaning of *such* seemed to be almost as neutral as that of the definite article. The determiner *both* obviously is only used when referring to two items at the same time. The use of the indefinite article as part of a re-entry device is a rare phenomenon but must be understood as a rhetorical device for re-entering a stretch of discourse. The noun phrase preceded by the indefinite article must always form part of the same sentence and is usually separated by a dash. We could rewrite the sentence that comes after the dash as a separate sentence beginning with a demonstrative + noun phrase, i.e. "This is a demanding test that ...":

Ex. 2.19 Using these animals we could assay the ability of the chimeric proteins to act on the regulatory elements of target genes in their normal chromosomal positions—**a demanding test** that closely mimics the usual conditions under which these proteins operate. (*The Molecular Architects of Body Design,* 39)

There are determiners that share the general meaning "similarity". These are *other, another,* and *similar,* which, as we saw above, Erkü & Gundel (1986) call "exclusive". The terms *different* and *similar* are seen as akin to *other* and *same* but are also considered to be capable of repetition qua lexical items. They are a case of words which are halfway between grammatical and lexical items.

2.5.1.2.5. Comparatives

Halliday & Hasan (1976: 83) include comparatives in the category of referential cohesion. There are comparatives of identity, similarity, difference, quantity or quality:

Ex. 2.20 "When £8,00 is a minor matter, it must be really large-scale crime that is in question?
"Bigger rackets go on."

They (1976: 79) also include *such* among the comparatives as in 2.21:

Ex. 2.21 "I see nobody on the road," said Alice. "I only wish I had **such** eyes," the King remarked, "To be able to see nobody - and at that distance too!"

However, none of the examples in my corpus seem such clear cut comparatives as the above and are semantically more akin to the determiners *the* and *this*. In example 2.19 from *A New Spin on Pay Policy* the anaphor *such choices,* which re-enters *Labour will freeze top salaries in the public sector for its first year in office,* seems to be a synonym of *these choices* rather than a comparative:

Ex. 2.22 underlying such choices there is a genuine wish to redistribute spending in accordance with a set of socially progressive priorities.

Halliday & Hasan's (1976) view of comparatives as identity of reference items is questioned by Huddleston (1978). He does not agree with them when they claim that *wittier* in the sentence: *Max is intelligent. But Tom is wittier* refers anaphorically to *Max.* If anything, he argues, the comparison is between *Tom* and *Max,* or rather between how witty *Tom* is and how witty *Max* is. It is difficult to see the identity of reference that exists between *wittier* and *Max,* in *Max is intelligent. But Tom is wittier,* that is, between a predicate and an argument. A comparative presupposes an antecedent and is therefore cohesive, but it seems that the cohesiveness of *But Tom is wittier* is the ellipsis of *(than) Max.* For Halliday & Hasan (1976) the comparative in this case relates the predicate of one argument with the predicate of another and therefore the predicate of the second argument is indirectly related to the first argument. I restrict comparative anaphor to two cases:

a) comparatives of quantity or number which refer back to the antecedent as in *She gave me some money. I needed* ***more*** *to buy a*

car/ I needed ***more money*** *to buy a car.* Such sentences are similar to re-entry with pronouns or determiners, i.e., *She gave me some money. I needed* ***it*** *to buy a car. I needed* ***the money*** *to buy a car.* In fact only in the case of ellipsis of the head-word, *money*, could there be any doubt at all that *more* is acting anaphorically.

b) comparatives with A-nouns which refer back to the whole of the preceding text such as Much more research needs to be done before biologists have a good understanding ... ("The Molecular Architects of Body Design", 41).

2.5.1.2. Non-Referential Devices

2.5.1.2.1. Substitution

The items covered under the term "substitution" are *one(s), so* and *not, the same, do, do so.* Halliday & Hasan (1976: 88) claim that the main difference between substitution and reference is that the former is a "relation in wording", and the latter, in meaning. So, for these authors, the relation between a substitute and its antecedent is grammatical and essentially textual, whereas the relation between a reference item and its antecedent is a semantic one. The differences between these two forms of textual cohesion can be seen in examples 2.23, and 2.24:

Ex. 2.23 Peter went for a walk. He didn't get back till late.
Ex. 2.24 Peter's car is too slow. He must get a faster one.

In 2.23 the reference item *He* coheres with *Peter* due to their semantic identity. Moreover, in 2.23 the reference item refers to one particular person, not just anyone called *Peter.* In 2.24, however, *one* has, necessarily, the same structural function as its antecedent. However, semantically, one does not totally identify with its antecedent. In 2.24 *one* does not mean *Peter's car* but a car which is faster than the one *Peter* has. In this way substitutes always introduce a modification of some kind or as Halliday & Hasan (1976) put it, they "repudiate" a part of the antecedent. With regards to substitutes: *one, do, so, not* Hoey claims that they are not frequent in the texts analyzed pointing to the fact that they are characteristic of oral discourse. Huddleston (1978) claims that the opposition between referential anaphora and substitution, which Halliday & Hasan (1976) state is based on the fact that the former involves identity of reference and the latter does not, really depends on the type of noun phrase acting as antecedent. Although substitutive anaphors are never referring expressions and therefore cannot be co-referential with their antecedents, they may signal implicit reference as in 2.25 This is because John is a referring

expression and we understand implicitly that Bill likes the same person as Max likes. In 2.26, however, a new car is not a referring expression, it does not pick out a particular entity, and so the question of co-reference does not arise:

Ex. 2.25 Max likes John and Bill does too.
Ex. 2.26 Max bought a new car and Bill did too.

2.5.1.2.2. Ellipsis

According to Halliday & Hasan (1976), ellipsis and substitution are similar in that both are fundamentally relations between parts of a text. The authors claim that ellipsis is really a case of "zero substitution". Thus, they classify ellipsis according to the kind of items involved: nominal ellipsis, verbal ellipsis and clausal ellipsis. They are careful to distinguish between ellipsis, in which something structurally necessary is omitted, and structurally complete linguistic chunks which leave certain pieces of information unsaid. In 2.47, for example, we have a sentence which abounds in any natural language:

Ex. 2.27 She left after the concert.

Although we might ask ourselves who *She* is and what kind of concert she went to we can hardly say that the sentence is incomplete structurally. Mathews (1981) differentiates between incomplete sentences such as *Don't you think you were driving to fast? Certainly I was...* (my italics) and incomplete utterances, where a sentence is not finished for pragmatic reasons as in *Please, would you mind opening...?* He states that this truncated sentence might suffice if we point at a window while saying it.

I do not reject Halliday & Hasan's (1976) claim that substitution and ellipsis are different from co-reference, i.e., the former relate the antecedent and the subsequent expression because both refer to the same class of entities, while co-reference implies a relationship of identity between the same members of a class, but in my view this distinction, identity of sense and identity of reference is, to a certain extent irrelevant. Throughout this chapter and the one previous to it I have said that an element is cohesive if it can only be fully understood after recourse to its antecedent. Therefore, substitution and ellipsis must fall under the category of cohesive devices even though they are quite different from identity of reference. If one hears the sentence: *I will too,* it is clear that to understand what the person who is speaking is going to do, we need to know the antecedent is. The kind of ellipsis that I am interested in here is nominal ellipsis as in the following example:

Ex. 2.28 I'll have the big apple. He can have the small.

My interest in substitutes is similar. Although there are various kinds of substitution, I will focus on nominal substitution, which is almost identical to nominal ellipsis except for the element *one/ones*: Take the following example in which it is clear that if we did not hear the antecedent, we would have to ask *Blue what?:*

Ex. 2.29 John likes the red scarf. Pete wants a blue one

2.5.2. Lexical Cohesion

Halliday & Hasan (1976), albeit very briefly, discuss lexical cohesion, or, in other words, the reiteration of the same lexical item or of semantically similar lexical items. They use the term "collocation" to refer to the regular co-occurrence of lexical items such as *office, desk,* etc. Hoey (1991: 7) criticises the term collocation as primarily manifestations of lexical relations that only in a secondary sense act in a textual sense. Huddleston (1978) is unwilling to subsume this phenomena under the concept of Anaphora which he defines as "the relation between an Anaphora and an Antecedent" although he admits that lexical coherence does "make the text cohere in some very general sense" (1978: 351). Hasan (1984) herself later acknowledges the weakness of the collocational category and concludes:

> While I firmly believe that behind the notion of collocation is an intuitive reality, I have come to accept the fact that unless we can unpack the details of the relations involved in collocation in the Firthian sense, it is best to avoid the category in research. The problems of inter-subjective reliability cannot be ignored. (Hasan 1984: 195)

A major weakness of Halliday & Hasan's (1976) section on lexical cohesion is that there seems to be contradiction between what they say about reference and substitution. For instance, they offer the following examples of a loose kind of identity involving lexical repetition:

Ex. 2.30 Why does this little boy have to wriggle all the time?
Boys always wiggle. (1976: 282)

The relation between *boy* and *Boys* is not one of identity, that is, *Boys* does not refer anaphorically to *boy,* nevertheless, the cohesive force which exists is due to the fact that, apart from the formal similarity, both items have the

following features in common: + human, + male, - adult. According to Halliday & Hasan (1976: 284):

> reference is irrelevant to lexical cohesion. It is not by virtue of any referential relation that there is a cohesive force set up between the two occurrences of a lexical item; rather, the cohesion exists as a direct relation between the forms themselves …

Stotsky (1983: 435) criticises this apparent contradiction:

> Although they [Halliday & Hasan] state initially that reiterated items are related through a common referent, they later suggest that it is not necessary for two lexical occurrences to have the same referent in order for them to be cohesive

However, if we can understand *Boys alwa*ys wriggle to mean *Boys (like this boy)* always wriggle, we could say that it is cohesive (see indirect anaphors below).

Tyler (1994), following various authors (Morgan 1978; Morgan & Sellner 1980; Green & Morgan 1981; Green 1989) does not agree with Halliday & Hasan's (1976) view of lexical cohesion as it confuses lexical repetition and other types of anaphoric reference with what must naturally occur when one stays on one topic and adheres to "general pragmatic principles" (Tyler 1994: 672).

Halliday & Hasan (1976) state that there are four types of lexically cohesive relations. The first two, that is, "same referent" and "inclusive" are "identity of reference" relations, in other words they are related to reference items such as pronouns and demonstratives. They claim that the last two, "exclusive" and "unrelated", are "identity of sense" relations, in other words, they are related to substitution and ellipsis. Examples of each are given below:

Ex. 2.31 (i) same referent
Carol Thatcher sent off the £32 she …
Bachelor girl Carol was taken to court …

Ex. 2.32 (ii) inclusive
Carol Thatcher sent off the £32 she …
"It is unhelpful that *prominent citizens* …

Ex. 2.33 (iii) exclusive
Carol Thatcher sent off the £32 she …
Other famous people do what they are supposed to on time.

Ex. 2.34 (iv) unrelated (1976: 288)
The girl was raped by her best friend's father.
Most girls who are raped …

The first three of the relations above, are, in my opinion, examples of strong cohesion in that they refer to an outside referent. The last one is a more collocational referent, which is regarded by many as a weak form of coherence. In Halliday & Hasan's *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective* (1985) lexical cohesion is given the name co-extension, e.g. the relation obtaining between words from the same semantic field such as *gold, silver, copper,* etc. Halliday & Hasan's (1985) first observation is that lexical items like *gold, silver,* etc. are intrinsically related. There is no need for exophoric reference as we do not need any other knowledge, besides our knowledge of the language to interpret them. However, the problem of how to delimit the notion of co-extension arises. Although it is true that the relation between *gold* and *silver* cannot be denied it is also undeniably true that the lexical items *fire* and *wood* are related in meaning too, if only in an associative way. The solution to this is found by specifying what is meant by sense-relation. If there is real cohesion between antecedent and anaphor, it is an identity relation and if it is like the relation between *gold* and *silver,* it is a similarity relation.

2.5.2.1. Types of Lexical Cohesion Based on Semantic Relations between Anaphor and Antecedent

Halliday & Hasan (1985) propose a semantic division of identity relations into the following fields: "synonymy", "hyponymy", and "antonymy" a new term "meronymy". The first is too well known to warrant any space here although I will look at the difference between synonymy and text equivalents below. Hyponomy is also a well-known term. A special kind is made up of nouns such as *man*, *creature, thing, stuff, matter, move, question, idea* and *fact* (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 27). Bolinger (1977) points out that general nouns must be virtually empty of content because if they are not they sound rather odd. Dillon (1981: 96) gives the following example taken from Carpenter & Just (1977):

Ex. 2.35 How did you know that shark was after you?
I could see
i. the creature's outline in the water
ii.**?** the fish's outline in the water

With regard to antonomy, many authors (Stotsky 1983; Halliday & Hasan 1989; Hoey 1991) include it in their inventory of re-entry devices. However, I do not accept that the antonymy that Hoey (1991), for instance, envisages between words like *arrive* and *leave,* is cohesive antonymy at all. The fact that

some entities *arrive* and others *leave* has nothing to do with cohesion and may simply be a random occurrence. In the following example, *that variation* seems to be triggered by *the results are not (constant),* which may look like a case of antonymy but is really a case of synonymy, that is, *results that are not constant* = varying results = *that variation:*

Ex. 2.36 The fundamental process is constant, but the results are not: humans, flies and worms represent a wide range of body designs.
Noting that variation, biologists have supposed that the molecular architects of body form . . . *The Molecular Architects of Body Design,* 36

If we are, indeed, faced with a case of cohesive antonymy, that is, if the relationship between the re-entry device and the antecedent is one of identity, then this may be due to “irony” or another type of rhetorical device called “oxymoron” although I suspect that synonymy underlies all these relationships.

Meronomy refers to a part-whole relation obtaining between lexical items as in the case of *man - leg - foot.* The relation between *leg* and *foot* is called co-meronymy, that is the parts of a superordinate term, in this case, *man.* Various authors have given alternative names for meronymy:

Dressler (1970)	semantic anaphora
Hetzron (1970: 913)	definiteness by entailment
Lybbert (1972 14)	componential replacement
Chafe (1972 1974)	inherent (part-whole) features of lexical items

Another term included by Halliday & Hasan (1985) is “repetition”, that is, the same word used two or more times. We have already seen the term *repetition* several times. But what exactly does repetition refer to, i.e., does it mean exact repetition of form, is derivation allowed, for instance? Do we mean the repetition of meaning, i.e., synonymy? To count as repetition, should we require repetition of both form and meaning? And if a repeated term is accompanied by other words, is that counted as repetition? Bublitz (1988) uses both semantic and formal criteria. Repetition for him is, therefore, the word-for-word reproduction of an element, frequently a sequence of words, which occurs, if not in the immediately preceding vicinity, then at least in the immediately preceding contribution of either the speaker himself, which is a special case, or his fellow-speaker (1988: 356). He does admit that reference shift and minor changes or variations of form can be tolerated. This is just as well as such restrictions would reduce repetition to the mere reiteration of proper nouns.

The definition of other researchers is considerably wider. Tannen (1989) states that there are two poles of repetition: “exact repetition” and “paraphrase”.

Normally however, "repetition occurs with variation (…) such as questions transformed into statements, statements changed into questions, repetition with a single word or phrase changed, and repetition with change of person or tense" (Tannen 1989: 54).

We now have to ask ourselves whether repetition is cohesive or not? Some consider the mere act of repeating a word as a sign of text cohesion, a type of lexical cohesion. A stricter view of lexical cohesion, which I hold, would only consider that the repeated term is cohesive if it refers specifically to a particular antecedent or group of antecedents. This question is linked to the issue of whether repetition presupposes intentionality. I maintain that researchers have no choice as to whether they should include all the repetition in a text as at least potentially cohesive because it would be almost impossible to decide whether the author of a text has used repetition deliberately or not.

Several authors, Rimmon-Kenan (1980), McCarthy (1987) and Hoey (1991) have pointed out that repetition, even exact repetition, may involve some change. The same word used to refer to the same referent may incorporate change as the context in which the word is found is different. This is similar to what Brown & Yule (1983) affirm but they refer to changes in the referent itself and not to the context it is in. Hoey is at pains to find ways to filter out cases of false or chance repetition. He claims that the following questions should be asked to find out if repetition between a pair of words is accidental or not:

a. Do they have common or related context? or
b. Do the items share common relationships with neighbouring lexical items? or
c. Is there whole or partial parallelism between the contexts of the items?

In certain cases there may be a word or words with several meanings in the same text. In such cases, we are not really dealing with repetition proper which entails the repetition of form and meaning. Most texts include cases of "complex lexical repetition". This includes instances of two lexical items which are not identical in form but share a lexical morpheme and identical words that have different grammatical functions.

Can re-entry of a word be considered repetition if the word has been altered slightly or if it is accompanied by modifiers or by new modifiers? Hoey (1991: 170-1) states that there may be lexical expansion or reduction or, according to Stotsky (1983) even derivation. Again, my answer would be that a slightly altertered word can be classed as repetition but only if the re-entered word refers back to a specific antecedent . For example if a sentence such as *Mr. Blair won the election* was followed *by Mr. Blair's wife was very pleased,* I would consider the second underlined expression as repetition of the first. If however, the sentence *I met a very interesting man last week was followed* by

He is the first person to live on a man-made moon orbiting Venus I would not deem the second *man* to be a case of repetition, nor cohesive.

There are two main types of repetition: with and without determiners. As the analysis of the second type must include the determiners that precede the noun phrase, it is more complex than the first. Most of the examples of lexical repetition without determiners are proper nouns such as *Carol Thatcher* → *Carol Thatcher.* Lexical equivalence without determiners can include extra information as *Prof. W. Nicholas Knight* which refers back to *Wesleyan University English professor,* although the opposite case is often encountered, i.e. *Carol Thatcher* can be followed by *Carol.*

I consider repetition to be a narrower concept than that employed by other researchers who do not differentiate between formal repetition and repetition of content. Repetition means that the re-entered word must be the same or very similar to its antecedent in form and must refer to the same referent. If the form is very different we would be faced with a case of text equivalence.

Finally Halliday & Hasan (1985) mention "instantial semblance" which they define as the cohesive devices which are found in a single text, and are specific to that text only. They offer the following example "all my pleasures are like yesterdays" (1985: 81), in which the similes *pleasures* and *yesterdays* are text-specific synonyms. To a certain extent, as Anderson & Shiffrin (1980) affirm, every word we utter or write is instantiated by the context it is used in. That is, no word has full meaning until it appears in a context. Until then it has many possible or potential means. Instantial semblance, Halliday & Hasan (1985: 81), or "text meaning", Hoey (1991), simply means an expression that can only be understood by recourse to the antecedent because without it the meaning of the expression is ambiguous:

> Without our being aware of it, each occurrence of a lexical item carries with it its own textual history (..) that will provide the context within which the item will be incarnated on this particular occasion. This environment determines the "instantial meaning or text meaning, of the item, a meaning which is unique to each specific instance. (Hoey 1991: 8).

Hoey mentions three kinds of instantial meaning "equivalence": ***the sailor*** *was* ***their daddy****,* ***you*** *be* ***the patient****, I'll be the doctor;* "naming": ***the dog*** *was called* ***Toto****, they named* ***the dog Fluffy****;* and instantial semblance ***the deck*** *was like* ***a pool*** (Hoey 1991: 8). In my opinion, none of these constitute anaphoric expressions because the antecedent and the referring expression are in the same clause. Nonetheless, at least one of these terms, instantial semblance, could be cohesive. I cannot think of an example of the first two that would meet my requirement that the anaphoric device appear in a different clause from its

antecedent. Henceforth I will call supra-clausal instantial semblance “text-synonyms”.

The category of lexical equivalence includes some of the items seen below, i.e., metaphor, tropes, and what I call near-synonymy, that is, a word that could be used in many contexts and understood as a synonymous expression with regards to its antecedent. The first three examples 2.37, 2.38 and 2.39 below do not need much explanation. I will just say that near repetition is simply a matter of wording but the referent the expression refers to is the same.

The difference between 2.40, 2.41 and 2.42 is a little more complicated. I understand that lexical equivalence can be understood as synonymous with a previous expression because they belong to the same text and are co-referential. At the same time the two expressions should be synonymous without too much recourse to a complicated explanation as to why they are co-referential. This can be understood better if we look at the example below. While *revenue* and *poll tax* are not text-book synonyms they can be understood as equivalents in the text. Metaphors and tropes on the other hand may also depend on the text to be understood as co-referential but on the surface appear to have nothing to do with each other, and it is only after a certain amount of cognitive effort that they can be understood as equivalents. The difference between tropes and metaphors is that tropes are deliberate contradictions on the part of the speaker or writer and are normally pejorative:

Ex. 2.37	Exact Repetition:	John Major	>	John Major
Ex. 2.38	Near repetition:	John Major	>	Mr. Major
Ex. 2.39	Synonymy	The automobile	>	The car
Ex. 2.40	Text-synonym	revenue	>	poll tax
Ex. 2.41	Metaphor	My wife	>	Light of my life
Ex. 2.42	Tropes	John	>	That pig!

Erkü & Gundel (1986) include examples of text equivalence under the heading: “indirect anaphora”. They claim that there are three main kinds, inclusive and exclusive. The inclusive type, examples 2.43 and 2.44, occurs when “some sort of part-whole relation exists between the referent of the anaphoric expression and that of its trigger or antecedent in the discourse context” (Erkü & Gundel 1986: 534). The second type, example 2.45, is “exclusive” and “the referent of the anaphoric noun phrase is part of a larger set which also includes the referent of the antecedent or the extralinguistic trigger” (Erkü & Gundel 1986: 535). This type of indirect anaphora involves modifiers such as *similar, other* and the expression *the rest:*

Ex. 2.43 This requires activation of the data bus and similar tag.

Ex. 2.44 The data transfer is executed while the processor is executing other instructions.

Ex. 2.45 The ant daubs part of her burden onto a cocoon and passes the rest to a thirsty larva. (Erkü & Gundel 1986: 535)

Another type is called “created”, that is “the anaphoric phrase is not linked to any single noun phrase or extralinguistic object. Rather, its referent is inferred from one or more whole propositions or events” (Erkü & Gundel 1986: 535):

Ex. 2.46 The transmitters and receivers enable transmissions of data. *The transmitted data* is ...

Ex. 2.47 They gave some of the meat away. *The act* may seem trifling from a human standpoint. (Erkü & Gundel 1986: 535)

This is similar to “Semantic field anaphora”, which, according to Hetzron (1970), comprises a series of “system nouns” *theft, war, problem,* and sentence concepts “that entail the existence of *thief, victim, stolen object; belligerents, causus belli, victor, solution*, and *subject, predicate,* respectively. If a system noun has been mentioned in the discourse, later occurrences of the entailed nouns will have the definite article, even if their identity is not known ...” (Hetzron 1970, 913f).

Indirect anaphors (the example Erkü & Gundel (1986) provide below would be called meronomy by Halliday & Hasan 1985) may even be indefinite, that is, the noun phrase may be preceded by an indefinite article as in:

Ex. 2.48 The wheel was broken. A spoke was missing.

It follows, although this line is not pursued by Erkü and Gundel (1986), that if indefinite count nouns can act as indefinite anaphoric expressions, the same must be true of indefinite mass nouns:

Ex. 2.49 You spend all your money, you act the fool, you don’t know whether you are coming or going. *Love* could easily be described as temporary insanity.

Ex. 2.50 (Barry’s mother throws his guitar down the stairs)
Barry says: *Anger* is not the best way to solve this problem.

The word *love* can only be fully understood by seeing it as an indirect anaphoric re-entry of the content of the preceding sentence. Mass nouns can also be indirectly anaphoric when they refer to a situation as in example 2.49. But can we also use the plural of count nouns without determiners to refer anaphorically? See my examples 2.51 to 2.53:

Ex. 2.51 The F16 and the F18 are beautiful. *Warplanes,* as someone once said, are also works of art.

Ex. 2.52 Instruments of mass destruction may be aesthetically attractive. *Warplanes,* as someone once said, are also works of art.

Ex. 2.53 What comes out of the factories of MacDonald Douglas and British Aerospace may be aesthetically pleasing. *Warplanes,* as someone once said, are also works of art.

In the first two examples, *warplanes* is a direct anaphor, whereas in the last one it is indirect. Once again, the plural of mass nouns without determiners can also be used to refer exophorically to participants in an extralinguistic context:

Ex. 2.54 Barry's two sons are fighting over a toy.
Barry says: "*Boys* do fight from time to time".

Ex. 2.55 There is the sound of shouting "hit him, hit him" from the playground. Headmaster ironically: "*Young boys* must get rid of their excess energy some way".

In the second sentence of example 2.54, *boys* may be described as a direct anaphor, whereas, in the second it is indirect as no boys can be seen, that is, the term has to be inferred. This shows that there are many cases of noun phrases with or without determiners that can refer back to an antecedent. Each time a possible a noun phrase is encountered, the researcher must determine whether it is an anaphoric tie or not by looking at the co-text.

A special type of "created" indirect anaphors, "Anaphoric Nouns", were identified by Francis (1986) in the monograph of the same name. In her analysis of A-nouns in newspaper editorials, she found that these noun phrases, a combination of structure and content words, play a part in holding the text together while at the same time developing it. The difference between A-nouns and general nouns is that A-nouns refer to whole stretches of language, not to single noun phrases. To achieve A-noun status Francis (1986: 3) claims that a noun:

> must be functioning as a pro-form and as such be anaphorically cohesive devices, referring metadiscursively to a stretch of discourse preceding it in terms of how the writer chooses to label or interpret the latter for the purposes of his/her argument. In other words [they] must be presented as synonymous with the proposition(s) immediately preceding.

Francis (1986) insists on the fact that cohesion in A-nouns must be of the strong variety, not just resemblance. The semantic classification of A-nouns proposed by Francis (1986) is as follows. She distinguishes four groups of words which she calls "metadiscursive nouns". The first of these is made up of

"utterance" nouns. This group is itself subdivided into "illocutionary" nouns related to performative verbs such as *accusation, criticism, disclosure, emphasis,* etc. and rather more general verbal activity nouns such as: *account, corollary, discussion, etc*. A second group, "cognition" nouns, includes words such as *abstraction, comparison, fabrication, insight,* etc. The third group encompasses text nouns: *passage, section, words,* etc. The fourth group, "ownerless" nouns, is problematic as it includes words such as *fact* and *issues* which are not "associated with a particular writer or source" (Francis 1986: 17) and exist in the world outside discourse. A way of distinguishing between cognition nouns and ownerless nouns is that we can precede the former with possessive, as in *her claim,* but not with the latter **her fact*, for example.

Metadiscursive nouns
1. Utterance nouns
illocutionary nouns, nouns related to performative verbs, verbal activity nouns
2. Cognition nouns
3. Text nouns
4. Ownerless nouns

At the end of the monograph Francis tentatively proposes the existence of a large group of "non-metadiscursive" A-nouns that could be linked to different text types. She suggests that there would be a large number of such A-nouns. The type she had in mind were made up of the following head-words: *development, stage, process, event, step, incident, move, conditions, situation,* etc. The editorial texts from Francis's corpus are, according to her, quite rich in metadiscursive A-nouns, which are revealed as a characteristic of that genre.

2.6. Re-entry devices and style

To what extent can re-entry items be characteristic of a genre, or "group style", to use Hendricks' (1976) expression, and what variations in their use due to the information structure of a text? Hatakeyama *et al* (1985), Crystal & Davy (1969) and Hendricks (1976) believe that cohesion and coherence are genre-specific to some degree. In this section I will explore the reasons for using different types of re-entry and the stylistic impact they may have. For example, re-entry of antecedents which have already been mentioned serves the purpose of abbreviating "old information". Hendricks (1976), Goffman (1981) say that if this were not done the repetition of "old" elements would become unacceptable. He cites an example offered by Paduçeva (1968: 228):

Ex. 2.56 The English writer Walter Scott was born in Scotland. Having graduated from a university the English writer Walter Scott attended the bar.

Although repetition of antecedents is often avoided in written texts this depends on the genre. For some genres elegant variation through synonomy, for instance, is not contemplated. Crystal & Davy (1969: 203) state that in the language of legal documents "it is not simply that referential pronouns are avoided only where their use could raise genuine confusion; they seem to be eschewed as a species". Legal documents seem to forward the idea that the word is the thing, which goes against a major tenet of semantics. This kind of repetition is called "strong reiteration" by Lybbert (1970: 6).

According to Paduçeva, (1968) there are three aspects to take into account when re-entering entities. The "unambiguity" of the anaphoric relation between the antecedent and the re-entry device is paramount (this is indeed the case in legal texts), second, re-entry must provide "economy" of means of expression while at the same time constituting "diversity" of means of expression -mainly as a way to avoid repetition —in itself a stylistic device. She states that these tendencies often enter into contradiction and that in different styles one tendency may prevail over another. Hendricks states that in those cases in which "ambiguity is not a factor, choice between a pronoun and a definite noun (or a proper noun, which is inherently definite) can be a clear-cut stylistic option" (1976: 80). Paduçeva (1968) divides re-entry devices into two groups, syntactic and semantic. These constitute the first opportunity for stylistic choice. Syntactic anaphora involves pronouns; semantic anaphora comprises phrases such as *the woman* which may refer back to the phrase *a beautiful young woman with blue eyes and black hair*.

Gleeson (1965) remarks that the relation between a proper noun used as a re-entry device and its antecedent constitutes a "tighter" relationship than the "looser" relationship achieved by a pronouns. Semantic anaphora can often be employed to add to the amount of information contained in the initial name instead of diminishing it, for instance, *this science* used to refer to *linguistics.* A writer can thus make the stylistic choice of giving more or less information about a participant in a subsequent proposition. If a lot of information is given about a participant at the beginning of a text —for instance, in the pre- and post-modification of the noun, the references back to the entity may all be carried out using pronouns. The writer, may prefer, on the other hand, to supply extra information little by little throughout the text. In this case Paduçeva (1968: 229) states that the sources for this increase of information are either the preceding text and/or "the information which can be supposed to be a part of the language competence of a language user". In other words, the writer often has the choice

of repeating a term or can fall back on his/her knowledge as a competent language user and employ a term which is synonymous or in some way semantically related. Paduçeva is ambiguous about whether such "knowledge" should include both knowledge of the semantic make-up of words and world knowledge. I will assume that it covers in any particular instance either or both types of knowledge.

Hendricks (1976) mentions the kind of "drop-by-drop" supply of information that is typical of newspapers. This procedure is what Dillon (1981:97) calls "stereoscoping", that is, "using different words to refer to the same thing: persons, personages and characters". A major function of redescription of this kind is (Dillon 1981: 97):

> to add more information about the thing, semicovertly, as it were. Newscasters and some sportswriters are fond of this usage; these days many articles about Henry Kissinger introduce him by name and switch to the former Secretary of State, a property that is often relevant to the news item and that people can be reminded of in this fashion.

We can understand semantic re-entry of the kind seen above as a selection from a set or paradigm. According to Jakobson (1988) there are two main tendencies used by writers to re-enter what has already been mentioned: metaphor and metonymy. Jakobson (1988: 57-58) claims the use of either is a stylistic choice in itself. Hendricks (1976) points out that Jakobson (1988) sees the use of semantic anaphora as a preference for the metonymic pole of language over the metaphoric pole. In other words, when we choose *the former Secretary of State* instead of repeating *Dr Kissinger* we are choosing a part of what Henry Kissinger is known to be.

The main choice of re-entering information seems to be through pronouns and other pro-forms and through noun phrases. The way information is re-entered may have stylistic causes or may be due to more basic linguistic functions. We will, therefore, look first at the default contexts in which pro-forms and noun phrases are found. Using pronouns or other referring expressions depends to a great extent on position. According to Fox (1987: 18-19) there are three basic subcomponents to take into account when choosing a re-entry item:

> 1 The first mention of a referent in a sequence is done with a full NP.
> 2 After the first mention of a referent, a pronoun is used to display an understanding of the sequence as not yet closed.
> 3. A full NP is used to display an understanding of the preceding sequence containing other mentions of the same referent as closed.

Givón (1995: 71) states that there are signals of "maximal continuity" in text, e.g., zero anaphora, unstressed pronouns; and what she terms signals of "discontinuity", e.g., stressed pronouns and full lexical nouns, a combination of grammatical elements and lexical elements, i.e. definite noun phrases with definite nouns or demonstratives. The need for both grammatical and lexical cues, that is, the use of discontinuity signals when a change in "topical referent" is to be carried out, is due to the need to facilitate the reader's search for an antecedent in "some extant mental representation" (Givón 1995: 94). Givón claims that when re-entry through noun phrases is triggered, the lexical elements involved save cognitive effort as we do not have to create information that has already been created and stored in "episodic text" (a temporary construction that is needed before a trace is created in episodic memory).

Herein lies the main difference between these and grammatical anaphoric re-entry devices with regard to storage, i.e., lexical elements may be preserved in episodic memory whereas grammatical items are purged as they are a "here-and-now mechanism" that "helps contextualize clausal information in its *current* communicative context: current speech situation, current goals, current perspective, current text, current thematic structure" (Givón 1995: 106).

If there is no change in topic, pronouns become default after the first mention of a referent and furthermore show that the referent is still in focus. Exceptions to this rule can be found in literary texts where pronouns are used first to give the reader a greater feeling of intimacy (Turner 1973: 85). The use of pronouns for anaphoric reference is easily explained if we think of pronouns as the most "economic" form of re-entering referents if there is no ambiguity. Pronouns are used when the referent is "in focus" (Grosz 1977); "in consciousness" (Chafe 1976; Dillon 1981 and Reichman 1981); "textually evoked" (Prince 1981); or "high in topicality" (Givón 1983).

Anaphoric devices are a guide to the reader and it should, therefore, be clear what the pronominal re-entry device is referring back to. There are signals in propositions that may tell us if a noun phrase or a pronoun will subsequently be used (Fox 1987: 96):

> the more likely it is that a proposition containing mention of a referent will be elaborated in some way, the more that proposition is treated as a source for pronominal anaphora, hence the more likely it is that the next mention of the referent will be done with a pronoun

A pronoun can, exceptionally, be used to refer back to a referent which is not immediately preceding if it "accomplishes smaller subgoals", that is, the pronoun *it,* could refer to a component of an entity that had already been mentioned, or if preceded by a digression marker.

Fox (1987) states that the main reason for using full noun phrases is when the previous referent is understood to be closed, that is, it is no longer the active topic. She goes on to mention more specific reasons for the use of noun phrases in conversation. The first is "disagreement", that is, when the interlocutors disagree about "the facts referring to a participant (Fox 1987: 62); "overt recognitionals", when interlocuters are "overtly discussing the recognizability of a referent" (Fox 1987: 64-65); "assessments", especially when the assessment of a referent is negative; and frame-evoked pronouns, that is, pronouns which are generated by an active frame (See section on frame-generated anaphora below).

In the next example two people are talking about buying a book and the pronoun *he* in the last line is generated by the previous mention of B's wish to purchase a book (Fox 1987: 66-67):

Ex. 2.57

B.	En I wentuh buy a book the other day I//went hh went=
A.	(mm)
B.	=downtuh N.Y.U. tuh get it becuz it's the only place thet car//ries the book.
A.	Mmm
A.	Mmh
B.	Tch! En it wz twun::ty do::lliz
A.	Oh my god.
B.	Yeuh he- ez he wz handlin me the book en he tol' me twunny dolliz

Fox (1987) next discusses other cases in which noun phrases are used instead of pronouns. For instance, noun phrases do tend to be used after paragraph breaks. Hofmann (1989: 246) agrees that paragraph breaks are important but that pronouns cannot be used to refer back across paragraphs unless they act like bridges:

> An anaphoric pronoun can be used only if there is a unique antecedent preceding it in the paragraph, or if there is none, that it is coreferential with the topic of the preceding paragraph.

However, Fox (1987) claims that rhetorical structures such as "issue adjuncts", "further description" and "classification", which she describes as non-structural factors, are an even more important cause of the use of noun phrases.

Fox (1987: 143) points to generic factors that dictate when pronouns or noun phrases are used. She claims that the use of NPs, even when the referent is in the preceding clause, is much more common in expository texts than in

conversation where pronouns are used much more. She goes so far as to claim that the use of noun phrases or not is to a large extent, genre-specific. In general she says written texts are more sensitive to some kind of linear distance and the need to identify parts of a text hierarchically. According to Fox (1987: 144), this is due to the fact that the reader cannot ask for clarification and the writer is aware of this. "Further description" is triggered also by the need to convey a large amount of information in a short space. Although Fox does not mention any specific genres, she does say that noun phrases in "further description" are "associated with generic conventions of particular text-types" (Fox 1987: 151). She adds that "classification" "might have something to do with stylistic variety and colorfulness of phrasing" (Fox 1987: 151).

It is clear that even though Fox (1987) sees anaphoric re-entry as a phenomenon that is determined to a certain extent by the dictates of a particular language, which she wishes to discover, she has to admit that anaphora is subject to factors of style and genre. This intuition is supported by the comparative study of fictional and non-fictional texts carried out by Stoddard (1991). She discovered that there are twice as many noun phrases in non-fiction as compared to short stories. Pronouns in short stories, on the other hand, are twice as common as in non-fiction (Stoddard 1991: 56-57) while most personal pronouns are edited out in non-fiction. These authors seem to lend support to the idea that my hypothesis that re-entry patterns may be characteristic of a genre may be true.

2.7. Personal Taxonomy of Re-entry Devices

In this section I will offer a personal taxonomy of re-entry devices in order to carry out my analysis of the corpus. The approach I have chosen has been influenced by many of the authors I have mentioned to a greater or lesser degree. However, my main bias is towards those authors who, like Halliday & Hasan (1978, 1985) and Hoey (1991), emphasise the surface of discourse, that is, those researchers who are interested in discovering what the surface manifestations of discourse can tell us about how people communicate. This is not to say that I reject the approach of other authors like van Dijk (1972, 1977, 1989) and Kintsch (1974, 1991, 1995) who have a more mentalistic approach to discourse but I think that de Beaugrande's warning that "we must guard against allowing the text to vanish behind mental processes" (de Beaugrande & Dressler 1981: 35) is useful if we wish to discover what real texts have to say to us.

2.7.1. Pronouns

The pronoun section is quite straightforward. **P1** refers to personal pronouns such as *he, she, it.* The second person plural pronoun *we* is also included when an antecedent appears in the text. The only problem with regards to pronouns is sifting out the cases of *it* which are of the sentential variety and the many examples of existential or introductory *it.*

Ex. 2.58 *A New Spin on Pay Policy*	P4 L20	he	P4 L20	A progressive chancellor	P1
Ex. 2.59 *A New Spin on Pay Policy*	P1 L6	his efforts	P1 L6	Mr. Brown	P2
Ex. 2.60 *A New Spin on Pay Policy*	P3 L11	It	PP	Previous Paragraph	P4

P2 refers to re-entry items carried out through possessive pronouns such as *his, her its.* The elements accompanying **P2**s are explained further on in this chapter. **P4** refers to "sentential it", that is, when the pronoun *it* refers to a whole clause, sentence or paragraph.. **P3**s are reflexive pronouns which are not truly anaphoric as they always occur within the same clause. I have, therefore, not taken them into account.

2.7.2. Lexical Repetition

The next group is made up of what I call lexical repetition. **L1a** is simply lexical repetition such as *Mr Brown* when it is used to refer back to a previous mention of *Mr Brown.* **L1b** refers to relationships in which one of the elements includes the antecedent but is not a straightforward case of part/whole relationship. In the text *Kids Alone: Who Minds?* the term *employers* covers *far too few family-friendly employers* but is not a superordinate, because it is, in fact repetition, but not simple repetition. In other words, there exists what looks like exact surface repetition but the referents are different. This is very similar to an **L3a**, which I explain below. However, the link between this kind of re-entry phenomenon and its antecedent is of the hyponym/superordinate type and no surface resemblance is required:

Ex. 2.61 *A New Spin on Pay Policy*	P1 L1	No interview with Gordon Brown	HL	Mr. Brown	L1a
Ex. 2.62 *Labour's Inspector*	P7 L19	all Education Secretaries	P2 L5	Gillian Shephard, Education Secretary	L1b

One of the problems identifying lexical repetition was to decide exactly what is meant by repetition. Above I explained that repetition refers both to exact repetition and repetition with modification, as long as there is an identity relationship between anaphora and antecedent. Another case is the genitive, for example, should *Mr Blair's article* be regarded in part as repetition of an earlier mention of *Mr Blair?* In my opinion it should be as it is not only a case of nearly exact repetition but also refers to the same person. I have counted all cases of this type as repetition of the noun which carries the genitive case with one exception an example of which may be *Mr Blair's article,* if it refers to an article written by Mr Blair that has already been mentioned before. In this case, the head-word would be *article* and *Mr Blair* is seen as being associated syntagmatically with it. **L1a** also includes those entities that are accompanied by a different item from the original. That means that *Tony Blair,* for example, would be classed as repetition of *Mr Blair,* as the person, i.e., referent, is the same. Further cases of what I call repetition are more problematic. If we take the case of *Labour policy* which comes after the antecedent *Labour.* It is cleart that although there is exact repetition of *Labour,* it is obvious that *Labour policy* is *a policy* not a party. If we split the noun phrase into *Labour* and *policy,* then *Labour* would be an exact repetition of the antecedent *Labour.* I analyse *Labour policy* as a case of repetition, in the case of *Labour* and treat *policy* as bound to *Labour* through what I term "possessive word order modification".

This is similar to what happens in the phrase *Tony Blair's commitment,* in the editorial *Constitutional Clash,* in which *Tony Blair* is an antecedent. *Tony Blair* is an entity in its own right and it is accompanied by *commitment* through a genitive relationship. Of course, the whole noun phrase goes beyond *Tony Blair* but I feel it would be wrong to say that this referent is merely acting as an adjective, that is, a predicate in semantic terms. Underneath the surface, we have two elements, that is, *Tony Blair* and *commitment.*

If we take this idea a little further we can see that there are words such as *constitutional* as in *constitutional change* which are analogous to *Labour policy* except that they undergo a slight change with respect to surface form. We say *constitutional change,* not **constitution change.* However, the relationship is the same at a deeper level. Therefore I regard *constitutional* as a repetition of *constitution.* As with the example above, we have two underlying referents: *the constitution* and *change*. Another example of what I mean can be seen in the phrase *conservative defence policy* I treat the adjective *conservative* here as a repetition of an antecedent noun *conservative,* or as a synonym of *Tories*. I do this because *conservative defence policy* could be rewritten as *the defence policy of the conservatives* (or conservative party). In other words, they are only different superficially. However, to be classed as repetition of the **L1a** type, there must be some kind of surface resemblance. In this respect I agree with

Hoey (1983) that surface relations are of great importance. At the same time, nevertheless, I take into account, like Huddleston (1978, 1980, 1984), that, in certain cases, differences in surface form are easily accounted for when looking for possible cohesive ties by scratching the surface a little.

Ex. 2.63 *Constitutional Clash*	P6 L26	The depth of			SA
	P6 L26	Tony Blair's commitment	P5 L22	Tony Blair	L1a
	P6 L26	Tony Blair's commitment to restoring local government			SAG

I realise that the definitions of **L1a** and **L1b** may be controversial and that a stricter view of repetition would change the outcome of the analysis of the corpus in that there would undoubtedly be fewer cases of repetition. However, I feel that I have come to a compromise between surface identity and inference that is more conservative than radical and, more importantly, nearer to the reality that the reader perceives.

2.7.3. Text Equivalents

The next group of ties are text equivalents or instantial equivalents not preceded by determiners. This is a complex group that includes all those ties **without** determiners which are not simple lexical repetitions. These have been given the code **L2a**. An example, can be found in the text *Fight the Battle of Ideas* in which *misfortunes* is a text equivalent of *all of Britain's ills,* which means that only in this text are they equivalents and that the former refers back to the latter. The difference between **L1a**s and **L2a**s is that in the latter there is no need for surface similarity at all. The relationship **L2b** cannot, therefore, exist as this kind of relationship would require surface resemblance, which does not occur here as the relationship obtained is through text equivalence. The relationship **L2c** cannot exist either as a determiner is always necessary; the equivalent with a determiner is a **DNF2c**:

Ex. 2.64 *Guessing Milosevic's Next Move*	P2 L13	chauvinist sentiment	P2 L9	Serb nationalism	L2a

2.7.4. Hyponyms and Superordinates

The next group of re-entry items, belonging to the lexical repetition group, is made up of ties which involve relationships of superordination and hyponymy. These are given the code **L3a**. An example of this is the following from the text

Fight the Battle of Ideas. Here, *income tax* is seen to be a hyponym of the expression *such policies.* As we saw above, **L3a** does not require surface resemblance. An **L1c** is not possible as exclusive relations always requires a determiner such as *similar, other, another.*

Ex. 2.65 *Cook Finds the Right Recipe for Europe*	P6 L22	the French and German political elites	HL	Europe	L3

2.7.5. Synonyms

The semantic relationship of synonymy is given the code **L5**. The only difference between these and **L2s** is that **L5s** are considered to be dictionary synonyms rather than the *ad hoc* relations maintained by **L2s** and their antecedents. There are two possible kinds of relationships of synonymy, **L5a,** which is simple synonymy and **L5b**, which comprises relationships of inclusiveness. **L5c** which would cover relationships of synonymy coupled with exclusiveness, does not exist as it would require a determiner such as *another, other,* etc:

Ex. 2.66 *Cook Finds the Right Recipe for Europe*	P3 L8	the euro	P1 L2	a single currency	L5a

2.7.6. Determiner Noun Phrases

The determiner noun phrases are a numerous group and include all noun phrases that are preceded by a determiner. They can have the same function as the lexical repetition group. The only difference in some cases is the presence of the determiner.

2.7.6.1. Lexical Repetition with Determiners

The **DNF1a** type is the same as the **L1a** type but preceded by a determiner, i.e., *the battle at hand,* has the antecedent *the battle* in the editorial *Fight the Battle of Ideas.* In many cases the difference between **DNF1a** and **L1a** is very small as can be seen above. We can see that the antecedent itself is a definite noun phrase, that it is the repetition of the whole phrase including the definite article. Indeed, many definite anaphors are compulsory, e.g., in the same editorial *The Conservatives,* which has *The Conservatives* as its antecedent we can see that the noun phrase plus determiner is compulsory. This is not always the case. At times there is an indefinite noun phrase without a determiner or the indefinite article *a/an* followed by a definite noun phrase. This is the classical

case of an entity being entered and then followed by a definite noun phrase, e.g. *a girl* followed by *the girl.* However, this is the exception rather than the norm in the texts I have looked at:

Ex. 2.67 *Guessing Milosevic's Next Move*	P2 L9	the Kosovo card	HL	Kosovo	DNF1a the
	P2 L9	the Kosovo card			SAW

Most anaphoric noun phrases preceded by definite determiners have definite antecedents. Following Erkü & Gundel (1986) I have included indefinite articles as anaphoric items. The difference between definite and indefinite is often blurred. This can be seen in the editorial *Cook Finds the Right Recipe for Europe.* In this editorial which is about Britain joining the monetary union the terms *the Euro* and *a single currency* are synonyms. Both are used as re-entry items and it seems that wherever we find *the Euro* can replace it by *a single currency* and vice-versa.

Ex. 2.68 A British government which is not opposed to a single currency in principle should be fighting fiercely to influence and reform the EMU project before taking the plunge.

Determiner noun phrases are divided into Metadiscursive Noun Phrases (**MDNF**) and Non-metadiscurisve Noun Phrases (**NMDNF**) as outlined by Francis (1986) above.

2.7.6.2. Text Equivalents with Determiners

The **DNF2a** groups are what I call "text equivalents", that is, they are synonyms of text antecedents but only within the text in question. They are similar to **L2**s but happen to be preceded by determiners. I would put forward that if they are in opposition to any other type of re-entry items, it would be **DNF1a**s and **L1**as. In my analysis, I distinguish between metadiscursive determiner noun phrases and non-metadiscursive noun phrases, which I explained in the preceding chapter.

Ex. 2.69 *Labour Aims at the Top*	P1 L5	these groups	P1 L4	judges, top civil servants and senior military officers	NMDNF2a these

DNF2bs do not exist as surface resemblance is required. By nature text equivalents do not hold any resemblance to their antecedents. **DNF2c**'s are definite noun phrases that contain words such as *other* and *another* discussed

above. Though there is no identity of reference between a **DNF2c** and its antecedent, it is clear that one needs to know the antecedent to decode the **DNF2c** itself. An example appears in *Give the New Pressure Parties a Good Airing* text in which *many other issues* refers back to *their position:*

Ex. 2. 70 *Irreversible Opt-In*	P2 L12	Two other measures are under discussion	P2 L11	Three directives have been passed	NMDNF2c

2.7.6.3. Hyponyms and Superordinates with Determiners

DNF3a's are similar to **L3a**'s in that there is a part/whole relationship, the only difference between the two being the presence of a determiner in the case of the former. In the *Lords on Target* text we find an example where *the loss of livelihood in a licensed business* is included in *the forthcoming deprivation of freedom:*

Ex. 2.71 *Going, Going*	P1 L3	a blanket export ban	P1 L2	the more draconian the restrictions that are set on legitimate exports	NMDNF3a indefinite article

2.7.6.4. Synonyms with Determiners

DNF5a's are the equivalent of **L5a**'s and refer to the use of dictionary synonyms to re-enter antecedents. In the text *Backing our Boys,* the phrase *the Services* is a common synonym for *British Armed Forces.*

Ex. 2.72 *Cook Finds the Right Recipe for Europe*	P9 L38	the euro	P9 L37	a single currency	DNF5a the

2.7.7. Pro-forms

Pro-forms (**Pro**) are made up of all the words that can take the place of a noun or noun phrase except the demonstratives which are dealt with separately. In *The Cook Currency* text the tie *many,* a pro-form, is used to re-enter the antecedent *Labour leaders.*

Ex. 2.73 *A New Spin on Pay Policy*	P4 L19	Another is that to freeze this particular set of salary increases	P4 L17	The problems	Pro-form another

2.7.8. Demonstrative Pronoun Reference

DPR's or Demonstrative pronoun reference items are pro-forms too but I have given them a separate status as they are more numerous than the pro-forms mentioned above. It is also clear that they are related to the definite noun phrases introduced by demonstrative determiners. This is a limited group of pro-forms *this, that, these* and *those*.

Ex. 2.74 *Labour Aims at the Top*	P1 L1	that	P1 L1	If Tony Blair and Gordon Brown consider that ... the increased level of pay that Parliament	DPR that

2.7.9. Substitution and Ellipsis

I have only found two kinds of substitution in my corpus, e.g., nominal **S1** and verbal **S2**. Examples of both are found below. The phrase *a difficult one* re-enters *The lesson for local legislators* in the text *Going, Going: Sotheby's must act fast before its reputation has wholly gone.* In the text *Nawaz Sharif's Landslide* the phrase *doing so,* an **S2**, re-enters *can only be removed by a two-thirds majority:*

Ex. 2.75 *Labour Inspector*	P3 L9	different ones	P2 L5	five-year-old tests	S1

Ellipsis, or zero substitution, which I call **E1** is deemed to be a special type of re-entry as we often have to refer back to entities to understand the meaning of the current expression. An example from *The Cook Currency* text shows that the only way to understand the tie *The smallest hint* is by recourse to the antecedent *Labour politicians.*

Ex. 2.76 *A New Spin on Pay Policy*	P4 L20	more money	P3 L12	public spending total	E1 (for public spending)

2.7.10. Comparatives

The next set of re-entry devices are the comparatives. There has been a certain amount of discussion about whether comparison is an identity of sense relationship or an identity of reference relationship. For instance, in the case of *further damage,* from the editorial *Fight the Battle of Ideas,* only recourse to the antecedent can explain what the damage referred to is: *The Conservatives are ... the monocausal explanation for all of Britain's ills.*

Ex. 2.77 *Cook Finds the Right Recipe for Europe*	P10 L43	further economic convergence	P6 L21	Monetary union	C1

2.7.11. Pseudo-cohesive or "Connex" Relationships

I will now discuss other types of possible sources of cohesion that I have not included above. These cases have been discussed in previous chapters so I will look at them very briefly here, explaining why they haven't been included in my analysis.

2.7.12. Collocation

Cases of collocation are those which involve two entities which are related but only because they belong to the same semantic field. For example, we have collocational association between *easy answers* which is followed by the phrase *These are the questions.* We cannot say that *questions* re-enter *answers* but it is undeniable that they are linked to a certain extent. This kind of relationship has not been taken into account when looking at the lexical density (Ure 1971) of cohesive items in each text as it would open up the floodgates to almost any kind of "cohesive" relationship as discussed in previous chapters. In the following example, which occurs right at the beginning of the editorial, the *full-time working mothers* is a case of collocation because it has nothing to do with the *Guardian Women* in the first line.

Ex. 2.78 *Kids Alone. Who Minds?*	P1 L1	Guardian Women			Ø
	P1 L1	your sinks	P1 L1	Guardian Women	P2
	P1 L2	Two full-time working mothers			CR (employment)

2.7.13. Homophoric Reference

Homophoric reference has not been included here as it is dubious whether a phrase such as *the Queen* is cohesive in a text, if it does not have an antecedent inside the text. In this respect I have followed Halliday & Hasan (1976). However, if, for instance, a country is mentioned, i.e., *Pakistan,* I have counted references to institutions in that particular text as examples of ellipsis.

Ex. 2.79 *Labour Aims at the Top*	P1 L5	the private sector			Homophoric

2.7.14. Exophoric Time Expressions

I have not included exophoric time expressions such as *yesterday, today,* etc., unless they are repeated and can then be seen as endophoric reference.

Ex. 2.80 *Stand by the Rock*	P1 L1	last week			ETE

2.7.15. Resemblance to Previous Expression

This type of repetition is not anaphoric as it does not constitute a link between two entities. It refers to the fact that two adjectives , such as *quick* may appear in two noun phrases as in *quick entry* and *quick research.* Although there is no anaphoric connection, we can say that there is some kind of very weak connection through resemblance.

Ex. 2.81 *Cook Finds the Right Recipe*	P9 L35	quick decision-making	P9 L35		RPE
	P9 L35	quick persuading	P9 L35		RPE

2.7.16. Untriggered Elements

There are, of course, elements in any text which do not have an antecedent, in other words they are new to the text. These entities will be marked with the symbol Ø.

Ex. 2.82 *Edging Towards the Euro*	P2 L9	the reality of market forces			Ø

As these are not anaphoric entities, they have not been included in the statistical analysis of the texts.

3. RESEARCH HYPOTHESES AND METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

My research approach is influenced to a great extent by Halliday & Hasan (1976), Halliday & Hasan (1985), Parson (1990), and Hoey (1991) from both a theoretical and methodological point of view as I would like to think of my work as, *mutatis mutandi,* an exploration of their view of discourse. This will be seen in the hypotheses that underly my research, which acknowledge the importance of surface phenomena while not ignoring the coherence below the surface of discourse.

3.2. Hypotheses

It will be evident from my hypotheses that the mainstay of my analysis involves re-entry devices such as pronouns, repetition, lexical equivalence, substitution The inclusion of specific hypotheses concerning Discourse Topic (DT) arises as I believe that re-entry devices are linked to the DT. This is because these devices are themselves evidence of the continuity of a DT.

It has to be said right from the beginning that all the hypotheses in this dissertation derive from a single macro-hypothesis, namely, that one set of differences between newspaper editorials and other types of written communication, although of a more subtle nature than most, is that their information structure is different and that said structure affects the type and number of cohesive devices in this sub-genre. This belief underlies a hypothesis of an even more general kind, set out in the introduction, that each genre must at some, or all levels, be manifested by surface features peculiar to it. In other words, the bottom line is that genre is ultimately evident at the surface of discourse.

Although some of the hypotheses in this research spring from the macro-hypotheses I have outlined above, which I held to be true before starting the analysis of my corpus, it must be said that some of the more specific hypotheses were suggested by the findings during the analysis itself. The deductive method, after all, relies to a great extent on knowledge of the object of analysis. Therefore, the data, I found during the analysis of my corpus fed the deductive process which led me to posit further hypotheses, which, in turn, suggested the carrying out of further analysis.

In the following sections I will proceed to enumerate my six main hypotheses. Two of these, hypotheses four and five, have been divided into three and two separate hypotheses respectively due to the fact that they are intimately related and can be proved, or otherwise, through the same methods of analysis.

- **Hypothesis 1**: the relative frequency and typology of re-entry items will be similar for all the editorials, irrespective of the newspaper they come from.
- **Hypothesis 2**: patterns of cohesion are linked in some way to the information structure of the editorial. This means, for example, that if an editorial is introduced by a text-initial “topic sentence”, the lexical weight of re-entry items would be patterned in a similar way in all editorials with this kind of structure. This might seem to contradict my first hypothesis that the patterns of re-entry items will be similar in all editorials. However, I believe that notwithstanding the similarities, there will be different types of editorial with regard to organization and goals and this will be manifested in the re-entry patterns.
- **Hypothesis 3**: certain re-entry devices are more common in some types of editorials than in others. This hypothesis differs from the last in that here the choice of re-entry item depends on subject matter, or any other factor other than the organization of information.
- **Hypothesis 4**: I have three main hypotheses with regards to metadiscursive nouns, which I will label 4a, 4b and 4c. The first (4a) was suggested by Francis (1986) namely, that metadiscursive A-nouns <u>are</u> characteristic of editorials. Hypotheses 4b and 4c have been suggested by my own work in this field. Hypothesis 4b suggests to me that “the” and “this” are the most common kind of determiner preceding A-nouns precisely because a unified DT signifies continuity. Hypothesis 4c leads me to see a relationship between demonstrative pronoun reference and A-noun reference, both in function and in similarity of the determiners/pronouns used.

- **Hypothesis 5**: with regards to the length of text and re-entry items I have two hypotheses: (5a) that the greater the length of a text, the greater the number of pronouns. This hypothesis is based on the fact that editorials normally have one main topic, hence there should be more continuity-of-reference re-entry items, that is, pronouns; (5b) that differences in paragraph length will be manifested in the type and/or number of re-entry devices used. This stems from the belief that the use of short paragraphs shows that focus is continually changing from one entity to another. In either case, length would be of importance with regards to re-entry patterns.
- **Hypothesis 6**: that pronoun boundary-jumping may occur but that this is uncommon in the editorial genre and should only occur when short paragraphs are common. This hypothesis has arisen due to the fact that only tabloid editorials contain shorter paragraphs and that a wealth of short paragraphs may have more to do with making reading easier than a wish to make the paragraph a way of dividing an editorial into sub-topics.

3.3. Research Methodology

The research methodology has been divided into two sections. The first section is comprised of the way the corpus was collected, and the second is made up of an explanation of the procedure followed in the design of the analysis to be carried out on the corpus.

3.3.1. Selection of the Corpus

The first decision made with regards to the selection of the corpus was what editorial texts were to be analyzed and how many. (See tables 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4) The editorials used in the main analysis are underlined. As I pointed out in the introduction, there are two main types of newspapers in Britain, the broadsheets and the tabloids. Each has a different readership and they are vastly different with regards to many linguistic and non-linguistic parameters. Therefore, broadsheets belong to an easily identifiable group of newspapers whose very physical appearance and familiarity with the public makes them stand out from the tabloids. The fact that broadsheets make up an homogenous group from the point of view of audience, physical appearance, and the type of texts that they contain led me to choose them as the object of this study as they belong to a distinct genre, or sub-genre. As Wallace states (1977: 49 [cited in Jucker 1992]):

The restricted language of newspapers, *journalese,* is an excellent subject for empirical research into register variation, because it forms a large convenient corpus, contains several registers, all associated by certain shared features, and is recognized as such by those who use it. Thus we can examine not only the variation in features, but also how the users of this language view what is appropriate to it.

	# words	Date
Stand by the rock	566	Monday, February 3
Constitutional Clash	550	Monday, February 3
Mystic Mug	505	Monday, February 3
The Cook Currency	640	Tuesday, February 4
Milosevic & Friends	580	Tuesday, February 4
Foul Play	487	Tuesday, February 4
Labour's Inspector	605	Wednesday, February 5
Pakistan's Opportunity	584	Wednesday, February 5
The Swiss War	479	Wednesday, February 5
Going, Going	573	Thursday, February 6
Irreversible Opt-In	567	Thursday, February 6
The Two Clintons	539	Thursday, February 6
A sage speaks on Nato	588	Friday, February 7
Callaghan And Cripps	584	Friday, February 7
Art And Craft	532	Friday, February 7

Table 3.1: The Times

	# words	Date
Unfinished business	822	Monday, February 3
It's strictly personal	299	Monday, February 3
Kids alone: who minds?	619	Tuesday, February 4
Edging towards the Euro	513	Tuesday, February 4
Paying the bill for culture	330	Tuesday, February 4
Nawaz Sharif's landslide	622	Wednesday, February 5
High minded in high places	516	Wednesday, February 5
London wins all	323	Wednesday, February 5
A new spin on pay policy	628	Thursday, February 6
The double sword of justice	522	Thursday, February 6
When a flutter becomes a habit	346	Thursday, February 6
The role of a university	610	Friday, February 7
Guessing Milosevic's next move	498	Friday, February 7
Sotheby's under the hammer	322	Friday, February 7

Table 3 .2: The Guardian

Several researchers (e.g. Crystal & Davy 1969; Wallace 1977, Pennock 1994) have compared broadsheets with tabloids despite the enormous differences between them. I feel that though this is feasible with newspaper reports, it is very difficult in the case of the editorials due to lack of homogeneity necessary for the analysis I have in mind. Once tabloid newspapers were rejected, the next decision was what broadsheets to include in my corpus. I chose British broadsheets as I am more familiar with them and they were more readily available. Jucker (1992: 2) states that using only British papers also guarantees more homogeneity:

> The limitation of my corpus to British national dailies is intended to ensure a maximum of coherence within the corpus, and it should guarantee comparability of different texts within the corpus.

	# words	Date
Uniforms, yes:	910	Monday, February 3
A plug for the sea breeze	99	Monday, February 3
Cook finds the right recipe for Europe	953	Tuesday, February 4
A game of two bureaucracies	115	Tuesday, February 4
Mental illness needs a broader treatment	955	Wednesday, February 5
Are we a nation of fibbers?	147	Wednesday, February 5
Receiving you muffled and unclear, Mr.	966	Thursday, February 6
Offshore and unwelcome	104	Thursday, February 6
Give the new pressure parties a good airing	917	Friday, February 7
Mad Dogs and teenage drinkers	105	Friday, February 7

Table 3.3: The Independent

	# words	Date
Backing our boys	513	Monday, February 3
Poison we must live with	437	Monday, February 3
Pet hate	212	Monday, February 3
Fight the battle of ideas	519	Tuesday, February 4
Pakistan fails to vote	486	Tuesday, February 4
A Tory Messenger?	319	Tuesday, February 4
Have the debate	572	Wednesday, February 5
Milosevic at Bay	401	Wednesday, February 5
Woodhead and bad heads	390	Wednesday, February 5
Labour aims at the top	515	Thursday, February 6
Lords on target	433	Thursday, February 6
The liabilities of OJ Simpson	421	Thursday, February 6
A single menace	530	Friday, February 7
Privatise the Tube	505	Friday, February 7
More Pamelas, please	318	Friday, February 7

Table 3.4: The Telegraph

The next step involved resolving whether to include the weekend editions of the broadsheet newspapers or not. My decision not to make them part of my corpus was influenced by the fact that weekend papers are recognised as being different from the dailies and including both in my corpus would have meant having a more heterogeneous group of texts. My choice was also motivated by the fact that the material featured in the weekend papers is often of a more light-hearted nature, which might influence their linguistic make-up.

Once the decision to use only daily broadsheets was made, I had to consider which of these editorials to collect. In order to gather as homogeneous a group of texts as possible I had already decided to select editorials from one week of the year. Such a corpus would be homogeneous in chronological terms and would ensure that the newspapers chosen would be selected on a totally arbitrary basis as I had no control over the editorials that would appear. Picking individual editorials over a longer period of time might have meant being able to choose the editorials that suited my purposes and could jeopardise the impartiality of my choice. As I wished to study re-entry items in broadsheets and not broadsheets which featured a particular subject matter, the more random the selection was, the better it suited my objectives. All the editorials are from the week starting Monday the 3rd of February, 1997 to Friday the 7th. That the corpus is made up of editorials from this week is simply due to the fact that it coincides with a visit I made to Britain.

My next task was to decide on how many editorials to analyse. As the analysis I had envisaged required a very laborious analysis of the editorials I did not wish to include all the broadsheet editorials that week. Basing my choice on Bolívar (1994), who points out that the first two editorials in broadsheet newspapers normally deal with the most important issues of the day and are more complex (Bolívar 1994:156), I selected only these from *The Times, The Guardian,* and *The Telegraph* for my main analyses. This procedure could not be carried out with *The Independent* as the first three normally carry three editorials while *The Independent* features only main editorial per day followed by a very short, and usually humorous one-paragraph editorial.

However, as the main editorials in *The Independent* are, on average, a third longer than those of the other newspapers, I chose all five editorials from this newspaper for that week, which came to a total of 4701 words. Using this number also as the basis for choice of editorials from the other newspapers I chose eight editorials from each of the other three. This meant discarding the third editorial from *The Times, The Guardian,* and *The Telegraph* and the editorials from one day of the chosen week. The editorials from *The Times* and *The Telegraph* are from the 3rd to the 6th of February while those from *The Guardian* are from the 4th to the 7th. The reason for this was to make the number of words from each broadsheet as similar as possible.

The total number of words contained in the editorials was the following: *Independent* 4701; *Times:* 4665; *Telegraph:* 3876; *Guardian:* 4528. The number of editorials amounted to twenty-nine. All the editorials from the week beginning the third of February were analysed in the study on pronoun paragraph jumping as this required a less laborious type of analysis.

3.3.2. Computers and the analysis of the corpus

Many useful and fascinating analyses are carried out using computers and concordancer programmes. The type of research carried out using computers may, therefore, include many hundreds or thousands of texts and over a million words. However, computers have their limitations. The reason they could not be used for the search for the stylistically relevant features that I wished to perform stems from the unavailability of a parsing system which can be trained to discover the relationship between, for example “the iron chancellor” and “Gordon Brown”, as this includes encyclopaedic knowledge that no commercially available concordancer is able to cope with. To exemplify the limitations of computer use, let us take the case of Reid (1992), who carried out a study on four cohesion devices. His analysis was limited to the use of subordinate conjunction openers, that is those conjunctions that appear at the beginning of a sentence as these always follow a full stop and a space, something a computer can understand. As he points out (Reid 1992: 82): “inner sentence subordinate conjunctions occur as several parts of speech; as a consequence they cannot be identified accurately by the WWB”. This problem is small compared to some of the decisions that have to be made with regard to what constitute re-entry items and antecedents in a complex editorial text. The limitations of computer programmes analysis of texts are also outlined by Jucker (1992).

Taking these disadvantages into account, I feel that the thorough analysis of twenty-nine editorials is a large enough sample to provide reliable data on the re-entry items in this sub-genre.

3.3.3. Methodology of Analysis

Once the corpus had been chosen, each of the twenty-nine editorials was analyzed to discover whether a clear DT could be identified, as I stated in objective two of this dissertation. The DTs were identified by isolating the proposition, or propositions, which encapsulated most clearly the macro-structure of the editorial. As there is no formal way of doing this, i.e. no algorithm capable of carrying out such a complex analysis, I had to use my intuition as an informed reader.

After the identification of the Discourse Topics the twenty-nine texts were parsed in order to identify the noun phrases including deverbal noun phrases and pronouns in each text. This was done in order to discover the typology of re-entry items to be found in editorials, the most common ones that appeared, possible stylistic reasons for using one type instead of another, and whether length of text affects the choice of re-entry items.

Parsing was also a necessary preliminary analysis in order to find out whether hypotheses four was true, that is, what the default determiners are for A-nouns and whether metadiscursive nouns are characteristic of editorials. The method I have used to discover whether hypothesis five was correct, also necessitated the parsing of the editorials as described above. The identification of pronoun re-entry items was carried out to discover whether Givon's hypothesis, that pronouns rarely cross paragraph boundaries, was true. Finally, while identifying re-entry items I simultaneously identified the syntagmatic associations that accompany them. What follows is the way parsing was carried out. The first stage of parsing was performed as seen below to discover both re-entry devices and the elements connected to them through syntagmatic association :

INDEPENDENT
Cook finds the right recipe for Europe

> (P1L1) Probably we will stay out in the first wave; probably we will enter by 2002. (P1L2) That is how Robin Cook would like us to read his latest comments on British entry to a single currency. (P1L3) It sounds like a cautious compromise. (P1L4) It is. (P1L5) But don't knock it.

As we can observe in the excerpt from the analysis above, I identified all the noun phrases and pronouns in the text. This preliminary analysis was carried out so that the noun phrases which were acting as re-entry devices could be determined. During the second stage, each of the noun phrases was then pasted onto a table like table 3.5 below. The headlines or the sub-headlines in the texts were not counted as re-entry ties. In the case of the headline this is obvious as it can have no endophoric antecedent.

However, with regards to the sub-heading, I took the decision that even if they had an antecedent in the preceding headline I would not count it, as I consider the headline and the sub-heading as part of a unit and that the reader perceives it as such. Moreover, I believe that both headline and subheading, always in this order, are perceived almost simultaneously when the reader is searching for an article, or other type of text, to read. Therefore, the headline and sub-heading were used purely as antecedents. This view is also the one held by Bell (1991: 187):

> Unlike the lead, the headline is a stand-alone unit. It simply abstracts the story, it does not have to begin it. While the lead may carry new information which does not recur in the story proper, the headline is entirely derivable from the story.

For this reason the headline and the sub-heading are not included in the body of the table. The first column of table 3.5 is the line and paragraph number, followed by the second column which indicates the re-entry device. In this space the pronoun or noun phrase is noted down and I indicate if it is a re-entry item or not. The third column is the line and paragraph number of the antecedent to the potential re-entry item. The fourth column includes the possible antecedent for the potential tie. Notice, for example, that the first re-entry item in this particular text is *we,* found in line one of paragraph one, and it refers back to *we* in the same line and paragraph. The fifth and final column is the type of re-entry item. In the case of the tie we have just mentioned P1 refers to pronoun reference.

Using this columnar method it is quite easy to see the tie, the antecedent it refers back to, and the type of relationship between the antecedent and the tie. There are times when it is difficult to say exactly what the nature of the anaphoric antecedent is. When this happens, Lakoff's (1976: 295) concept of anaphoric hierarchy is useful as there are degrees of definiteness. They are — going from more to less definite: proper names, definite descriptions, epithets and pronouns.

If an expression contains two types of re-entry device, only the one higher up in the hierarchy will be counted. For example, *his article* is a text equivalent of *Mr Blair's article* and at the same time *his* refers back to *Mr Blair.* Only the tie between *his article* and the antecedent *article* is taken into consideration as it is a definite description. Another example is *our forces* which could be triggered because it homophorically refers to Britain but it is also a text equivalent of *British Armed Forces.*

The process of finding antecedents is effectuated for each pronoun or noun phrase in the whole text. This way it is possible to see how many re-entry items there are and what kind of ties they constitute. Problems can be encountered when parsing the text as it is sometimes difficult to ascertain whether certain long noun phrases were to be treated as one unit or could be divided up into several noun phrases. In the example above, *his latest comments on British entry to a single currency*, both *British entry* and *a single currency* are dependent on the noun phrase *his latest comments.* I therefore treat this as a unit. This is important as it can change the analysis of the text as well as alter the number of "ties" that are found. The subordinate noun phrases associated with re-entry items were analyzed as SAs, that is, cases of "syntagmatic association". In table 3.5 we can see that *British entry* is associated

syntagmatically with *his latest comments.* Although **SA**s are not re-entry items they are introduced by them and provide new information.

Cook finds the right recipe for Europe				
	Tie		Antecedent	Type
P1 L1	we			ER
P1 L1	the first wave			Ø
P1 L1	we	P1 L1	we	P1
P1 L2	his latest comments on British entry to a single currency	P1 L2	Robin Cook	P2
P1 L2	his latest comments on British entry to a single currency			SA
P1 L2	his latest comments on British entry to a single currency			SA

Table 3.5: Type of Analysis Carried Out

The ties I have chosen can be divided into several groups, which were described in the last chapter. The first main group is made up of pronouns. These are relatively straightforward and no further explanation is necessary as to what they are. The second group is made up of re-entry items which are not preceded by determiners. The next group is made up of re-entry items preceded by determiners. These three main groups are followed by substitution and ellipsis.

The next set of re-entry items, pronoun determiners, have been separated from pronouns proper as they include meanings of distance and proximity. This is also the case of a diverse family of re-entry items which I call pro-forms. Finally, I include the comparatives. Each type of re-entry item has been given an abbreviated form, or code, so as to save space in the analysis of the texts.

3.3.4. Elements accompanying re-entry devices

Another task I have set myself is to look at the way new information is introduced by re-entry items. Although the main function of re-entry items is to maintain an entity in focus, it is also true that they must inevitably add new information. It is my hypothesis that the way new information is introduced in this way will be dictated to a certain extent by the type of editorial it is found in. To determine whether this is true I have classified the elements that accompany re-entry devices into three main types: SA, SAG and SAW. SA stands for syntagmatic association, that is, the part of the noun phrase that accompanies

the re-entry device, either preceding or following it. **SAG** is a more specific type of syntagmatic association which refers to those elements that are connected by the genitive, such as *position* in table 3.6:

P11 L47	Mr. Cook's position	P8 L32	Robin Cook	L1a
P11 L47	Mr. Cook's position			SAG

Table 3.6: Syntagmatic Association

Here we see that the re-entry device *Mr Cook* that is linked to *Robin Cook,* an example of lexical repetition, introduces the new information, i.e., the word *position.* The final kind of syntagmatic association that I have identified is the SAW, that is, a re-entry device followed by an entity that is tied through a relationship obtained by virtue of word-order:

P3 L8	a Labour government	P2 L6	Labour	L1a
P3 L8	Labour government			SAW

Table 3.7: Syntagmatic Association

In this example we can see how the new information is entered through its relation with the re-entry device *Labour,* which, like *Mr Cook* is also a case of lexical repetition.

Once each re-entry device is identified and recorded on the tables, the procedure I use to find the relative weight of each is to count the number of each type. These figures were then included on a Microsoft Excel spread sheet. The number of each particular item is then divided by the total number of words in each text and then multiplied by one hundred. In this way the lexical density for each item is obtained. Each re-entry item was counted as one even if it includes more than one word. For instance, *New Labour,* which is made up of two words is counted as one re-entry item for the antecedent *Labour* as it constitutes a unit. Therefore the real lexical density of a particular re-entry item, with regard to the total number of words per text, is actually greater than shown in the tables but this is of no importance in my analysis as I am interested in comparing the lexical density of each type of re-entry item to see which are the most common and not the actual lexical density of the re-entry items with regard to the total number of words. The comparison I wish to make is between

re-entry devices and not between re-entry devices and the other elements that make up a text.

	The Guardian *A Spin on Pay Policy*	
Total	628	
Paragraphs Word/Para	4 157	
Sentence Word/Sent	22 28,5454545	
P1	10	1,59235669
	-0,2068966	-0,0311334
P2	6	0,95541401
	-1,4827586	-0,2729838
P4	3	0,47770701
	2,68965517	0,43518869
L1a	19	3,02547771
	4,5862069	0,64426264
L1b	0	0

Table 3.8: Re-entry Density

Looking at the lexical density of each item is merely a useful guide to their use. For instance, five cases of P1s in a text of 800 words is not the same as the same number of P1s in a text of 400 words. By finding the lexical density of each item, I wish to prove that certain types of re-entry items are more important than others. As I said in the introduction, a greater number of a particular re-entry item in one or all texts is stylistically significant. Winter (1979: 3) sums this up succinctly in the following paragraph:

> A style may be said to be characterised by a pattern of recurrent selections from the inventory of optional features of a language. Various types of selection can be found: complete exclusion of an optional element, obligatory inclusion of a feature optional elsewhere, varying degrees of inclusion of a specific variant without complete elimination of competing features.

After this process, the average weight of each re-entry type was ascertained for all twenty-nine texts. The average was then subtracted from each text to find how far each editorial deviated from the mean with regard to a particular re-entry item. So, if the average lexical density of P1 for the twenty-nine editorials is 1,62349 and the lexical density of P1 is 1,59235669 for the editorial *A New Spin on Pay,* the deviation is -0,3113331.

Table 3.8 above is an excerpt from the analysis carried out in the Excel 5 spreadsheet to come to conclusions with regards to hypotheses one, three and four, which are all related to the number and typology of re-entry items. Once all the occurrences of each re-entry device are entered into the table, the lexical density of each item can then be compared on the chart to see which are the most common. The same procedure as described above for all the re-entry items is carried out with the A-nouns.

A Spin on Pay Policy (Guardian)					
MDNF the	1	0,15923567	NMDNF the	6	0,95541401
(+/- Average)		-1,6860024	(+/- Average)		0,22193904
MDNF this	1	0,15923567	NMDNF this	1	0,15923567
(+/- Average)		0,11368129	(+/- Average)		0,0094669
MDNF that	0	0	NMDNF that	1	0,15923567
(+/- Average)		-0,0293714	(+/- Average)		0,09685429
MDNF these	0	0	NMDNF these	0	0
(+/- Average)		-0,0066957	(+/- Average)		-0,0520239
MDNF those	0	0	NMDNF those	0	0
(+/- Average)		-0,0062696	(+/- Average)		-0,0132787
MDNF a/an	0	0	NMDNF a/an	1	0,15923567
(+/- Average)		-0,0060924	(+/- Average)		-0,0248755
MDNF such	1	0,15923567	NMDNF such	1	0,15923567
(+/- Average)		0,12281625	(+/- Average)		0,05912475
MDNF others	0	0	NMDNF others		0
(+/- Average)	0	-0,0259569	(+/- Average)		-0,1974225

Table 3.9: Metadiscursive & Non-metadiscursive A-nouns

With regard to A-nouns, each text was also analyzed to see which A-nouns are metadiscursive (MDNF) and which were non-metadiscursive (NMDNF). It is then relatively simple to find out which type is more common. Information was gathered on the editorials belonging to each newspaper and then the results from each were compared; table 3.9. At the same time as this analysis was performed the numbers of each type of determiner was also calculated for each type of A-noun, that is, meta- and non-metadiscursive.

The methodology in this chapter was designed to test my hypotheses and to carry out the objectives which derived from these. In the next chapter we will see the results of the analysis of the editorials.

4. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1. Preamble

This chapter comprises the results both from the close reading of the editorials in the corpus and the Excel 5 spreadsheet and the conclusions I have reached. In the first part of this chapter I will discuss the results of the data from the corpus in the same order as the hypotheses that I set out in the last chapter. In the final sections of the chapter I will look at my results from a wider perspective and compare them to research on other types of texts.

4.2. Types of Re-entry Items

One of the main aims of this book, as I mentioned in the introduction, and in setting out my first hypothesis, is to discover what re-entry devices are used in broadsheet editorials and which are the most common. The results I have obtained are to be found in the form of tables. Table 4.1. contains the findings of my analysis to discover whether the use of re-entry devices is similar in all the editorials. The most numerous re-entry items are found at the beginning of the table and the least numerous at the end.

The first interesting finding is that items L1a, L2a, DNF1a, L3, DNF2a, P1, P2, E1, DPR together make up just over 93% of all re-entry devices. We can say, therefore, that the rest of the items are of much less importance as they only account for a little under seven percent of all the re-entry items. The findings in table 4.1 seem to indicate that there is a remarkable degree of similarity between the broadsheet editorials. In three papers L1a, DNF2a and P1 are found to be the most frequent re-entry devices and in the same order. This order is altered in *The Independent* but if we look at the tables closely we will see that the six most frequent items (L1a, DNF2a, P1, E1, DNF1and P2) are common to all four newspapers! Such results seem to point to the conclusion that the type and number of re-entry items are a characteristic of genre.

Guardian			**Telegraph**			**Times**			**Independent**		
Type	LD	%	Type	LD	%	Type	LD	%	Type	LD	%
L1a	2,44	22,8	L1a	1,93	17,2	L1a	3,29	25,9	P1	1,89	19,9
DNF2a	1,58	14,8	DNF2a	1,9	16,9	DNF2a	1,57	12,4	L1a	1,6	16,9
P1	1,5	14	P1	1,64	14,6	P1	1,56	12,3	P2	1,15	12,1
E1	1,15	10,8	P2	1,4	12,4	E1	1,4	11	DNF2a	1,02	10,8
DNF1a	1,02	9,56	E1	0,95	8,42	P2	1,35	10,6	DNF1a	0,92	9,74
P2	0,99	9,26	DNF1a	0,82	7,27	DNF1a	1,07	8,44	E1	0,87	9,18
L2a	0,64	6,03	L3	0,81	7,22	L2a	0,83	6,54	L3	0,7	7,38
L3	0,6	5,61	L2a	0,76	6,74	L3	0,68	5,37	DPR	0,47	4,96
DPR	0,3	2,76	DPR	0,47	4,21	DPR	0,26	2,01	L2a	0,27	2,9
C1	0,09	0,83	C1	0,13	1,16	PRO	0,14	1,13	L5a	0,17	1,78
P4	0,08	0,75	DNF2c	0,08	0,72	DNF2c	0,13	1	P4	0,08	0,88
L1b	0,06	0,61	DNF3a	0,08	0,69	L5a	0,1	0,82	DNF2c	0,06	0,68
PRO	0,06	0,61	PRO	0,07	0,66	S1	0,08	0,67	S1	0,06	0,67
DNF2c	0,06	0,57	S2	0,06	0,51	DNF3a	0,07	0,53	C1	0,06	0,67
L5a	0,05	0,45	L1b	0,05	0,47	L1b	0,06	0,49	PRO	0,04	0,45
S1	0,05	0,45	L5a	0,05	0,43	DNF5a	0,02	0,18	DNF5a	0,04	0,44
S2	0,02	0,19	DNF1c	0,03	0,26	S2	0,02	0,17	DNF1c	0,02	0,23
DNF1c	0	0	DNF5a	0,02	0,22	C1	0,02	0,17	DNF3a	0,02	0,23
DNF3a	0	0	P4	0,02	0,19	P4	0	0	C2	0,02	0,23
DNF5a	0	0	C2	0	0	DNF1c	0	0	L1b	0,02	0,22
C2	0	0	S1	0	0	C2	0	0	S2	0	0

Table 4.1

Table 4.2 below shows the averages of the most common re-entry items. From this table we can see that the most common re-entry devices are made up of lexical repetition followed by text equivalents (preceded by determiners) and pronoun re-entry. At the other end of the scale we can see that substitution and comparative reference is scarce in this type of text, confirming what Halliday & Hasan (1976) claim, i.e., that substitution is not common in formal written texts. No such claims were made for comparative reference but we can see that they are among the least numerous devices. Pro-forms are also quite scarce as is sentential “it”. We also gather from the results that most of the pro-forms are personal and demonstrative pronouns.

What is also evident is that most lexical repetition and determiner noun phrases are of type “a”, that is, they are text equivalents and not inclusive and exclusive relations which are type “b” and “c”. It is also evident that synonymy (L5 and DNF5), that is, dictionary type synonymy is not at all common (text equivalence, e.g. L2a & DNF2a, is found much more often). All together,

dictionary synonymy and the devices in the preceding paragraph make up less than 7% of the total number of re-entry devices.

TYPE	%
L1a	20,75
P1	15,2
DNF2a	13,77
P2	11,1
E1	9,9
DNF1a	8,76
L3	6,39
L2a	5,55
DPR	3,5

Table 4.2: Most Common Re-entry Devices

4.3. Differences between Broadsheets

The Independent is the only newspaper with a larger number of pronouns than L1a. This may be due to the length of the texts, which require *this*, the least unobtrusive of all re-entry items. In fact, if we look at the pronouns, in general terms they increase with the average length of text, except in the case of *The Telegraph.* This apparent contradiction, *The Telegraph* has the shortest average text-length, may be due to other factors, such as number of participants in the text, and the fact that it is the broadsheet which is most like a tabloid, with regard to the treatment of the news.

4.4. Re-entry Patterns and Information Structure

To discover whether the way information is structured in the editorials in my corpus affects the patterns of re-entry, which is my second hypothesis, it is necessary to identify the DT. This was carried out through a close reading of each editorial. In most of the texts the DT was identified without undue difficulty. This task was facilitated when the topic was clearly stated in the headlines.

In both *The Guardian* and *The Times* DTs are relatively obvious as they are synonymous with the proposition contained in the headline. Also noteworthy is the fact that in these two newspapers the headline is always followed by a sub-heading. The headlines in *The Telegraph* are rather more cryptic as are those in *The Independent* and thus can only be identified with a possible DT through a

process of inference. In *The Guardian* most of the editorials are “rounded off” by a recap of the main topic. This rhetorical pattern is not followed by the other newspapers.

It could be argued that if the DT is contained in the headline, then the DT is text initial. However, in my opinion, the headline is part of the editorial but in a certain sense it is also set apart from the main body (see Bell 1991 in chapter 3). The role of the headline may be seen as that of a signal designed to catch the reader's attention. This would explain why the DT may be found in the headline and then again in the first paragraph. If the headline were acting as a DT and could also be found in the text, this would constitute a case of tautology. Therefore I conclude that the presence of the DT in the headline or sub-heading does not preclude the appearance of the DT in the rest of the text. What becomes evident, in any case, is that the DT is not necessarily to be found at the beginning of the texts proper, although in some cases it can be identified with the headline. In this aspect editorials differ considerably from newspaper reports:

> Unlike argumentatively structured discourse, such as scholarly papers, where the important conclusion comes at the end, and unlike weekly news articles, which may express an opinion at the end, news in the daily press is organised by the principle of relevance or importance, along a dimension of decreasing prominence with respect to the macrostructure. This means that one can read only the headlines or the lead, or only some part of the discourse, and still process the most important information. (van Dijk 1983: 34-5)

According to van Dijk (1983), text-initial DTs are characteristic of newspaper reports but from the analysis of my corpus, this is not true of editorials. Of the twenty-nine editorials, seventeen either have late, medial, or diffuse DTs. What is more, there are few, if any, cases of a clear topic sentence which encapsulates the DT.

I believe that the setting out of the topic early on is not so important in editorials as the topic is already familiar through the news report which has already, it is assumed, been read by the reader. Therefore the reader may be conversant with the topic and already interested enough in it to want to read the newspaper's opinion about it. The editorial may be akin to the weekly news articles that van Dijk (1983) mentions in the extract above. The fact that editorials are not obliged to present a text-initial discourse topic could account for both the diffuseness of some of the editorials’ DTs and their late occurrence. In other words, the make-up and position of a DT is an element in this genre. Another discovery that can be made from the interpretation of the Excel tables is that the editorials which are basically descriptive, i.e., those on national or international politics, usually have a clear protagonist and early DT entry. The

more essay-like editorials, which approach a problem outside the area of everyday politics all have medial (one case), or late DT entry and no main protagonist. This seems to be a rhetorical device that constitutes the norm for editorials of this nature.

The articles which I consider to belong to the essay-like group are the following: *Going, Going, High Minded in High Places, Kids Alone: Who Minds?, The Double Sword of Justice, The Role of a University, Mental illness needs a broader treatment, Uniforms, Yes, Give the New Pressure Parties a Good Airing* and *Poison we Must Live with.* Therefore, it would seem that subject matter may be the major factor which affects the position of the DT. Other factors, such as the rhetorical pattern the writer wishes to imbue the editorial with may also affect DT.

4.4.1. DT and Differences between Broadsheets

With regard to similarities between the newspapers, *The Guardian* and *The Times* are the most regular when we look at the connection between the position of the DT and the appearance, or not, of an explicit protagonist. The co-occurrence of early DT and explicit protagonist and late DT and diffuse protagonist pair up neatly in these two newspapers. In *The Guardian* and *The Times* all the editorials have one of either of these patterns, except in the case of *Pakistan's Opportunity,* which has late DT and a clear protagonist. Moreover, in the case of *The Guardian,* all the editorials that do show a more essay-like quality share the same characteristics, namely late DT and non-explicit protagonist. There seems, therefore, to be a clear rhetorical pattern appearing. With regard to *The Independent* and *The Telegraph,* the situation is much more complicated with early, medial and final DTs occurring alongside both explicit or non-explicit protagonists. This may have to do with the cryptic headlines that can be found in these two broadsheets and may ultimately be linked to the writing styles of the authors of the editorials.

4.4.2. DTs and Re-entry Devices

Once the DT of each editorial was identified and it was clear whether there was a protagonist or not in each text, the next stage was to ascertain the truth of hypothesis two, that is, to discover if the structure of the editorial had any influence on the lexical density of re-entry items. To do this I looked at the total lexical density of all the re-entry devices in each text. My hypothesis is that the clearer the protagonist and the earlier a topic is entered, the greater the lexical density of re-entry items. To determine whether this was so, I looked at what stage the topic was introduced and whether there was a main protagonist in the

editorials. This information was then compared to the presence of re-entry devices.

	DT	Protagonist	Re-entry
Constitutional Clash	Late	No	-
Going, Going	Late	No	-
Irreversible Opt-In	Late	No	-
Labour's Inspector	Early	Yes	+
Milosevic & Friends	Early	Yes	+
Pakistan's Opportunity	Late	Yes	+
Stand by the rock	Early	Yes	+
The Cook Currency	Late	Yes	+

Table 4.3: Times Editorials

	DT	Protagonist	Re-entry
A new spin on pay policy	Early	Yes	+
Edging towards the Euro	Early	Yes	+
Guessing Milosevic's next move	Medial	Yes	+
High minded in high places	Late	No	Ø
Kids alone: who minds?	Diffuse	No	-
Nawaz Sharif's landslide	Early	Yes	+
The double sword of justice	Late	No	-
The role of a university	Late	No	-

Table 4.4: Guardian Editorials

	DT	Protagonist	Re-entry
Backing our boys	Early	Yes	+
Fight the battle of ideas	Late	Two	-
Have the debate	Diffuse	Several	+
Labour aims at the top	Early	Yes	Ø
Lords on target	Early	No	Ø
Milosevic at Bay	Diffuse	Yes	-
Pakistan fails to vote	Medial	No	-
Poison we must live with	Late	No	-

Table 4.5 Telegraph Editorials

	DT	Protagonist	Re-entry
Cook finds the right recipe for Europe	Early	Yes	+
Give the new pressure parties a good airing	Medial	No	-
Mental illness needs a broader treatment	Mid-final	No	-
Receiving you muffled and unclear, Mr.	Late	Yes	-
Uniforms, yes:	Late	Yes	+

Table 4.6: Independent Editorials

In the above tables, 4.3 to 4.8, the (+) symbol means that there is an above-average number of re-entry device and (-) signals a relative lack of these devices. Tables 4.3 to 4.7 show the results for each newspaper. From the analysis carried out I found that there is, in most cases, a correlation between early DT entry coupled with the existence of a main protagonist and an above average use of re-entry. If we look at table 4.7 (with examples from all of the newspapers) we can see that where there is early DT and a clear protagonist, an above-average presence of re-entry can be detected.

Editorials	DT	Protagonist	Re-entry
Labour's Inspector	Early	Yes	+
Milosevic & Friends	Early	Yes	+
Stand by the rock	Early	Yes	+
A new spin on pay policy	Early	Yes	+
Edging towards the Euro	Early	Yes	+
Nawaz Sharif's landslide	Early	Yes	+
Cook finds the right recipe for Europe	Early	Yes	+

Table 4.7: Early DT

Editorials	DT	Protagonist	Re-entry
Labour's Inspector	Early	Yes	+
Milosevic & Friends	Early	Yes	+
Pakistan's Opportunity	Late	Yes	+
Stand by the rock	Early	Yes	+
The Cook Currency	Late	Yes	+
A new spin on pay policy	Early	Yes	+
Edging towards the Euro	Early	Yes	+
Guessing Milosevic's next move	Medial	Yes	+
Nawaz Sharif's landslide	Early	Yes	+
Cook finds the right recipe for Europe	Early	Yes	+
Receiving you muffled and unclear, Mr.	Final	Yes	-
Uniforms, yes:	Late	Yes	+
Backing our boys	Early	Yes	+
Milosevic at Bay	Diffuse	Yes	-
Labour aims at the top	Early	Yes	Ø

Table 4.8: Position of DT

Apparently, from the tables there exists a clear link between early DT and the appearance of a clear protagonist where there are high levels of re-entry (see also table 4.8). It seems, nevertheless, that the characteristic which is most likely to trigger a high amount of re-entry is an explicit protagonist. Of fifteen

cases where an explicit protagonist appears, twelve are accompanied by high lexical density of re-entry items.

Of the three which have below-average continuity, two of these cases may be explained by the later occurrence of the DT, leaving only one case, *Labour Aims at Top* with early DT and explicit protagonist with low continuity. On the other hand, of twelve cases of where there seems to be no clear protagonist, only one has an above-average number of continuity devices: *Irreversible Opt-In.*

4.5. Other Factors Influencing the Patterns of Re-entry

The results linked to hypothesis three are varied and refer to individual texts rather than the editorial corpus as a whole. After gathering the data on re-entry items, it becomes evident that certain re-entry are more predominant in some texts than others.

4.5.1. Ellipsis

Several editorials have a higher than normal incidence of ellipsis. This is the case in three editorials: *Edging Towards the Euro, Pakistan's Opportunity,* and *The Cook Currency.* In *Edging Towards the Euro* it can be seen that ellipsis of the verb *join* often occurs, whereas in *The Cook Currency,* the word most often elided is *single currency.* In the case of *Pakistan's Opportunity,* the word elided most is *Pakistan* itself, although elision of *the elections* is also noticeable. In all three editorials, the words elided are probably the most important single words in the text and they also figure clearly in the headline.

4.5.2. Hyponyms

With regard to hyponyms (L3 & DNF3) the highest levels can be found in *Pakistan Fails to Vote, Labour Aims at the Top, High Minded in High Places, Cook Finds the Right Recipe* and *Give the New Pressure Parties a Good Airing.* Hyponyms are used to list members of sets, such as countries in Asia and types of political problems in the case of *Pakistan Fails to Vote;* components of British institutions in *Labour Aims at the Top;* members of a list of guests and the stories that have come out of the meeting in *High Minded in High Places;* and member-countries of the European Union in *Cook Finds the Right Recipe.* In the editorial *Give the New Pressure Parties a Good Airing,* hyponyms are used to name different types of pressure parties. It seems, therefore, that hyponyms are used mainly to make members of a set explicit, often in the form of a list.

4.5.3. Pronouns

An above average use of pronouns is found in those editorials which centre on a particular individual, such as *Cook's Recipe, Have the Debate, Guessing Milosevic's Game, Labour Aim at Top, Milosevic and Friends, Nawaz Sharif's Landslide and Muffled and Unclear.* All the above editorials have one explicit protagonist except *Have the Debate,* which has various. Therefore, the presence of a higher than average number of pronouns could be due to this factor. Nevertheless, not all the editorials in the corpus with a single individual named in the title have a lot of pronouns. This is the case of *Milosevic at Bay,* which is about Milosevic but has a diffuse DT.

4.5.4. Metadiscursive Nouns

As I mentioned in the last chapter, I wished to discover whether metadiscursive A-nouns, which are an important re-entry device in editorials, according to Francis (1986), are indeed characteristic of the editorial genre. This meant looking at both the head words of metadiscursive and non-metadiscursive A-nouns and the determiners that precede them.

4.5.4.1. Metadiscursive and Non-metadiscursive A-noun Headwords

As we saw in chapter two A-nouns are made up of determiners and headwords. In this section I will look at headwords to determine the number of meta- and non-metadiscursive A-nouns. According to Francis (1986: 3) the latter "are an extremely prevalent feature of this kind of discourse". From the results of my analysis I identify a number of metadiscursive A-nouns (see table 4.9). A total of forty from twenty-nine articles can be found.

Item	#	Item	#	Item	#	Item	#	Item	#
issue	6	message	2	claim	1	list	1	rhetoric	1
approach	4	proposal(s)	2	concession	1	matter	1	rumour	1
assertion(s)	2	question(s)	2	conclusion	1	phrase	1	thinking	1
commitment	2	statement	2	doubts	1	posture	1	verdict	1
decision	2	argument	1	idea	1	reason	1	version	1

Table 4. 9: Metadiscursive Heads

I would not use to the expression "extremely prevalent" to describe an average of just under two metadiscursive anaphoric noun per text. However, editorials in which statements, either written or spoken are discussed have a

relatively large number of metadiscursive A-nouns. For example, *A New Spin on Pay Policy* discusses an announcement made by the then shadow Chancellor George Brown; *Constitutional Clash* looks at proposed reforms to the constitution; *Fight the Battle of Ideas* discusses the Tories' campaign message; *Stand by the Rock* criticises the Spanish Minister, Abel Matute's proposals for Gibraltar; and *The Role of a University* goes over the results from the Dearing Committee on higher education.

There are one hundred and eighty-two distinct non-metadiscursive A-noun heads. In all two hundred and forty cases of these nouns appear —counting those that appear more than once. These far outweigh the metadiscursive nouns. From the results, I think we can safely say that one of the answers to the research question connected to hypothesis three is that metadiscursive A-nouns are present in most editorials but they cannot be said to be prevalent except in editorials which centre on statements. Another finding from my analysis confirms that Francis (1986) seems to have identified most of the metadiscursive headwords as I have only been able to find three metadiscursive heads, *posture*, *reason* and *rumour,* that she had not mentioned in the above article.

Item	#	Item	#	Item	#	Item	#
country	8	way	4	coalition	2	rate	2
case	5	Chancellor	3	election(s)	2	region	2
group(s)	5	law(s)	3	grounds	2	sector	2
legislation	5	move	3	leader(s)	2	study	2
party	5	option	3	package	2	defendant (the)	2
government	4	project	3	policy	2	Prime Minister (the)	2
system	4	absence	2	politician	2	trend	2
thing(s)	4	charge(s)	2	protection	2		

Table 4. 10: Non-Metadiscursive Heads

4.5.4.2. Non-metadiscursive A-nouns

Francis (1986) does not look at non-metadiscursive nouns but invites researchers to analyse them in editorials and other genres. With regard to the headwords of non-metadiscursive A-nouns, these are too numerous to be included here. In table 4.10 above I include only those non-metadiscursive A-noun heads which occur more than once. It will be seen that many of them are re-entries for people or institutions such as *Prime Minister* or *Chancellor.* Some are obviously to be found only in articles about politics, such as *politician, party, policy;* others when laws or court cases are being discussed, i.e., *law, bill, legislation, charge(s);* There may be a group, however, which transcend

specific topics, i.e. *issue, case, system, thing(s), way, move, option, project, package, grounds.* These are of interest to everyone, not just those interested in the newspaper genre as they are the general words that Halliday & Hasan (1976) talk about.

It would seem that the determiners preceding metadiscursive A-nouns (table 4.11) are slightly different from those that appear before non-metadiscursive nouns. There appears to be a larger number of determiners that signal strong deixis, such as *this.* This may be due to the fact that the writer wishes to signal that his/her commentary is important.

On the other hand, of the non-metadiscursive nouns (table 4.12), 48% are preceded by *the;* 10% by *this;* only 4% by *that;* 13,16 by *a/an* and 6% by *such.* The rest of the determiners do not go over five per cent. The surprising result here is the number of A-nouns preceded by the indefinite article (see table 4.12).

Metadiscursive A-Nouns	%
MDNF the	29,9590741
MDNF this	20,6518414
MDNF that	12,712233
MDNF these	2,92756898
MDNF those	2,43242387
MDNF a/an	2,43242387
MDNF such	15,2368801
MDNF others	13,6475547

Table 4. 11: Metadiscursive A-Noun Determiners

	%
NMDNF the	47,9398376
NMDNF this	10,0086666
NMDNF that	4,20906246
NMDNF these	3,51848053
NMDNF those	0,82287561
NMDNF a/an	13,0737732
NMDNF such	6,26320801
NMDNF others	14,1640959

Table 4. 12: Non-Metadiscursive A-Noun Determiners

With regard to the total lexical weight of A-nouns (table 4.13), the values for each newspaper are the following, *The Guardian* 1,63, *The Telegraph* 2,04, *The Times* 1,8 and *The Independent* 1,17%. The lexical weight of the metadiscursive and non-metadiscursive A-nouns taken separately can also be seen in table 4.13.

	Guardian	Telegraph	Times	Independent
Meta A-nouns	0,24	0,23	0,3	0,15
Non-meta A-nouns	1,39	1,81	1,5	1,02
A-nouns	1,63	2,04	1,8	1,17

Table 4. 13: A-nouns per Newspaper

As we can see the lexical weight of the non-metadiscursive A-nouns far outweighs that of their metadiscursive counterparts. The extremely low values for *The Times* may be due to the simple fact that very few texts in which statements were commented on appeared in the selected corpus. On the other hand, it might show a stylistic preference for other ways of referring to verbal actions. Only further research could shed light on this issue.

4.5.4.3. Demonstrative Pronoun Reference

One of the hypotheses related to A-nouns is that DPRs are related to metadiscursive A-nouns. Certainly, from the analysis it does seem that they are similar in that the majority of A-nouns are preceded by strong determiners such as *this, that, these,* etc., in the case of the metadiscursive A-nouns, or consist of *this* in the case of the demonstrative pronouns.

The results also how that *this* is the most common demonstrative pronoun followed by *that, these* and *those.* This is true except in the case of *The Telegraph* in whose articles *that* is more common. With regards to the overall weight of demonstrative pronoun reference, *The Telegraph* is first, followed by *The Independent, The Guardian* and *The Times.*

Another piece of evidence seems to point to the relationship between DPRs and A-nouns. It appears that when there is a large number of A-nouns such as in *A New Spin on Pay Policy, Guessing Milosevic's, Lords on Target, Milosevic at Bay, Pakistan Fails to Vote, Poison we Must Live with" and Stand by the Rock,* there is often a correspondingly lower number of DPRs. The opposite is also true. A large number of DPRs as in *Backing our Boys, Give the Pressure Parties a Chance,* and *Labour Aim at the Top,* means there is a lower number of A-nouns. This would seem to prove that there is a relationship between these re-

entry devices, that is, if an author uses a high number of one type this precludes the abundant use of the other.

4.6. Length of Text and Re-entry

If we compare the results of the Excel spreadsheet for each newspaper we see that the total lexical density of re-entry items has nothing to do with the length of the text. In fact the broadsheet with the largest average number of words has the lowest total lexical density of re-entry items of all the newspapers.

	Guardian	Telegraph	Times	Independent
Lexical Density	10,704	11,27435	12,7	9,52

Table 4. 14: Lexical Density of Re-Entry Devices

With regards to length of text and the use of pronouns (table 4.15), I have found that there is a correlation between average length of text and the number of pronouns present, except in the case of *The Telegraph,* which has the shortest editorials coupled with the highest lexical density for pronouns.

Such a clear picture cannot be seen with regards to individual texts as there are many factors that can affect the results, such as the number of protagonists and whether the DT is text initial as we have seen above. However, over a series of texts the general tendency is for there to be more pronouns in long texts.

	Guardian	Telegraph	Times	Independent
	P1	P1	P1	P1
Average Lexical Density	1,5	1,64	1,56	1,89
Average Length of Text	566	484,5	583,125	940,2

Table 4. 15: Pronouns and Length of Text

I have found no correlation at all between paragraph boundaries and the use of pronouns. My hypothesis was that more paragraphs would mean a lower number of pronouns as Givón (1995) suggests. She claims that continuing with a particular entity usually requires the use of pronouns. Therefore, the greater the number of paragraphs the fewer the pronouns we should find. If we look at table 4.16 above, we will see, on the contrary, that the newspaper with the highest number of pronouns is in fact the one with the greatest number of paragraphs, that is, *The Independent.* Conclusive evidence has not been found

to back up the hypothesis that more paragraphs should mean fewer pronouns. The reason may be that paragraphs are merely a graphic device to make reading the editorials easier.

Guardian	Telegraph	Times	Independent	
4528	3876	4665	4701	Total number of words
566	484,5	583,125	940,2	Average length of editorial
3,5	4,875	6,5	11	Average number of paragraphs
167,6875	98,4583333	93,9153274	86,9369697	Average length paragraph
23,875	22,625	24,75	44,8	Average number of sentences
24,1476936	22,3071956	24,4627732	21,0812376	Average length of sentences
1,5	1,64	1,56	1,89	Lexical density of p1

Table 4. 16: Paragraphs and Pronouns

4.7. Pronouns and Paragraph Boundaries

The results in the last section may tie in with hypothesis six, i.e., that the occurrence of pronouns spanning paragraph boundaries is not common in editorials. Here the results are mixed.

The Times	
Milosevic and Friends	Of his success in securing
Pakistan's opportunity	They chose a politician
The Cook Currency	One newspaper portrayed them
The Independent	
Cook finds the right recipe for Europe	If it works,
Give the new pressure parties an airing	with that off the agenda
Mental illness needs a broader treatment	He certainly deserves
The Telegraph	
Backing our boys	Much of his critique
Poison we must live with	If it is enacted
More Pamelas, please	Above all, her success
The liabilities of OJ Simpson	This is true
The Guardian	
When a flutter becomes a habit	But none of this justifies a lottery

Table 4. 17: Paragraph spanning Pronouns

As we can see from table 4.17 above there are several cases of pronouns referring across paragraph boundaries. In this particular case I looked at all the texts, that is, the main corpus and all the other editorials gathered the week from

the 3rd to the 7th of February. I discover three cases in *The Times* and *The Independent* and four in *The Telegraph.* Only one can be found in *The Guardian.*

Taking into account that the first three have more paragraphs per editorial than the latter, it reinforced my idea that paragraphs are not necessarily sub-topic boundaries. This leads me to the conclusion that the division of the editorials into paragraphs is not due to rhetorical reasons but is a way, presumably, of making the editorials look less formidable to the reader by splitting them up into more manageable sections. According to Unger (1996: 403) paragraph breaks merely tell the reader that the information in the next paragraph is a little more loosely connected to the previous paragraph than the information contained in it. In any case, it is important to take into account that there were very few cases of paragraph boundary violation considering that the average number of paragraphs in the case of *The Independent* alone was eleven (see table 4.17 above).

4.8. Conclusions

The conclusions in this chapter are derived from the results suggested by the data above but will be discussed in a slightly different order. The discussion of the results will, moreover, range further than the remarks made in the preceding paragraphs in order to view them from a wider perspective.

4.8.1. Differences Between Broadsheets: Correlations Between Linguistic and Extra-linguistic Factors

The data gleaned from the analysis of the type and number of re-entry items shows that a small number of these devices makes up over 93% of the total. The fact that there is so much similarity among the broadsheets cannot be put down to mere accident and shows clearly the homogeneity of the members of the broadsheet genre with regard to said devices. In spite of this fact, small but significant differences in the use of re-entry items among the broadsheets can be detected. The two broadsheets which seem to be less central from a genre point of view are *The Independent* and *The Telegraph*. These two, for example, show the greatest differences in the density of pronouns. The former has the longest editorials and the greatest lexical density of pronouns while the latter has the shortest editorials but the second highest lexical density of pronouns. These factors appear to correlate with extra-linguistic differences. For example, each of these broadsheets differs from *The Guardian* and *The Times* with respect to length of text, *The Independent* has much longer editorials while those from *The*

Telegraph are considerably shorter. They also differ in one other major extra-linguistic feature. In the case of *The Independent* there is only one main editorial and in the case of *The Telegraph*, its treatment of the news is more tabloid-like. Therefore *The Telegraph* shares with *The Guardian* and *The Times* the characteristics of having three editorials a day, while *The Independent* is like the last two in that is more like a broadsheet in its treatment of the news. These differences appear to indicate that the editorials in *The Independent* and *The Telegraph* are essentially more marginal examples of broadsheet editorials while those of *The Guardian* and *The Times* are more typical of this sub-genre. *The Independent* is a newer and, possibly, more innovative newspaper than its counterparts. The appearance of only one main editorial and a very much shorter, often light-hearted piece, that follows this, is evidence of this fact. On the other hand, *The Telegraph* is closer to the tabloids with regard to the length of the editorials, the treatment of the news, and for other reasons that I mentioned in the sections on genre (see Bell 1991: 107-108). Jucker also includes *The Telegraph* in the "down-market" bracket of broadsheets. Thus, the results from the analysis of the corpus seem to point to at least one linguistic difference —a greater number of pronouns— being linked to a non-linguistic dimension, i.e., the fact that both *The Telegraph* and *The Independent* are marginal types of broadsheets compared to *The Guardian* and *The Independent.*

4.8.2. Patterns of Re-entry in Broadsheets

The second set of results from table 4.1 refers to the specific types of re-entry devices used in all the broadsheets. The first of these results clearly show that both repetition with and without determiners and text equivalents with and without determiners are normally of type a. I am inclined to think that these results might be found in other text types, that is, at least in written texts that share Biber's (1988) dimensions 4 and 6 (see introduction). This conviction comes from having looked at cohesive relations in other essay-like texts. It would surprise me if major differences were found in texts which are similar to editorials as re-entry devices are such a basic part of discourse and are not subject to as much change as heavily semanticized words. The a-type: L1**a**, L2**a**, DNF1**a**, DNF2**a**, which Halliday & Hasan (1976: 288) call "same reference" lexical cohesion, would, therefore, seem to be the default type of semantic relations that re-entry devices hold with their antecedents.

Such empirical evidence is of capital importance as it is not only an important result but vindicates the close analysis of this corpus. It seems to show, in spite of the many possible semantic relations that can be utilised, that simple reference identity, probably the most straightforward of all the relations between antecedent and re-entry item, is the most common.

Only two individual editorials stand out for their use of exclusive relations, that is type c, which are represented by DNF1**c** and DNF2**c**. They are: *Give the New Pressure Parties a Good Airing* and *Poison we Must Live with,* both of which talk about different parties and radical groups respectively. The common denominator is subject matter, which dictates, to a certain extent, what type of re-entry is employed. We have seen in Table 4.1 that this type of semantic linking is not very common at all. This means that exclusive semantic relations are, in this type of text, quite marked. This markedness is probably attenuated by the subject matter, which lends itself to the use of the c-type. The evidence also seems underline the fact that an extra-linguistic factor, namely sticking to one main protagonist through "same referent" relations, is the norm for this genre. Once more, a linguistic choice, —a-type relations— have an extra-linguistic counterpart.

With regard to the differences between re-entry with and without determiners there actually seems to be very little difference between them. Before carrying out the analysis and reflecting on the results, I held the belief that repetition and text-equivalence with determiners were radically different from L1 and L2 without determiners. My hypothesis was that repetition would be a characteristic of continuity while text equivalence would be typical of more essay-like texts. There is no evidence to support this. I now believe that both are varieties of continuity devices.

It became clear to me, for instance, that the differences are often a question of usage. For example, the Conservative party or its members are nearly always referred to as *the Conservatives* or *the Tories,* whereas the Labour party is generally referred to as *Labour.* This applies to both new entries of these entities and when they are re-entered. I would compare this conclusion to my thoughts with respect to what constitutes repetition. To recapitulate, I said that repetition, L1 and DNF1, can include surface differences and still be regarded as repetition as long as there is some resemblance. Of course, "some resemblance" leaves a lot of room for manoeuvre but as in many problems of definition in linguistics it will have to suffice. To continue with the analogy with repetition, I would argue that we must admit that *Labour* without a determiner is very similar to *the Conservatives* which does have one and that the presence or absence of the determiner is a question of usage with respect to a particular lexical item and not a textual issue at all.

Usage, or collocation —but not in the cohesive sense— also has an important role to play in the use of the indefinite article as a re-entry items. In a few cases, such as *a single currency,* it is clear that this noun phrase, preceded by an indefinite article, is just as definite as *the euro* and does, without a doubt, refer back to an antecedent in the preceding text. There are, it must be said, borderline cases such as *a Labour government* in which the Labour government

mentioned is (or at least was at the time of the writing of the editorial) a virtual government. However, I believe it would be too strict to say that the *Labour government* in this text had nothing to do with the antecedent *Labour* in both *The Cook Currency* and *Edging towards the Euro.* It is not a non-referential anaphora such as the Evans' example below in which neither the antecedent or re-entry item refer to a real entity outside the text such as "Every man loves his mother" (Evans 1980: 337).

An important discovery from the analysis of the data was that re-entry through L2, that is, text equivalence is by far more important than re-entry through L5, or dictionary synonyms. Evidence of this kind shows that texts have an inner life which is completely divorced from that of the words collected by the lexicographer and the relationships that obtain between them. Further research into L2 should highlight the most common kinds of relationships between these devices and their antecedents. I said above that "same referent" anaphora is by far the most common kind of relation but this does not tell us anything about the exact type of semantic relationship that is held between elements. I suspect, however, that the synonymous relationships through encyclopaedic knowledge of the type: Gordon Brown = the iron chancellor, or Mr Blair = the leader of the opposition, will be more common than tropes or meronymy, for example.

The results appear to show that certain types of re-entry are found in greater quantities in editorials that deal with a certain subject matter. This was the case with ellipsis, hyponyms, and pronouns. In general terms it was difficult to find correlations between subject matter and the use of a particular re-entry item. It seems clear, however, that ellipsis is used heavily in editorials in which the word most often elided features in the headline. Notwithstanding this fact, using ellipsis is not mechanical; there does seem to be a choice. For example, ellipsis is used frequently in *Pakistan's Opportunity* but not in *Pakistan Fails to Vote,* both of which are about the same subject matter and feature the word *Pakistan* in the title. Moreover, ellipsis probably can appear in greater than average amounts even in articles that do not feature the word that is elided in the title.

Subject matter also has a lot to do with the appearance, or otherwise, of hyponyms, which are found mostly in editorials in which sets of entities are found. It seems logical that when part-whole, or member-set relationships are clearly present in the conceptual nature of the text that superordinates and hyponyms will appear.

Apparently the use of a larger than normal number of pronouns is not dependent on subject matter. It is, in fact, dependent, not on what the editorial is about, but the way a subject is dealt with, that is, if there is a single protagonist. But even this is not a guarantee that pronouns will be used extensively. In the

article *Milosevic at Bay,* which is mainly about Milosevic himself, pronouns are not found in large quantities.

We can see that the type of re-entry item employed does not depend on straightforward stimuli. It is my feeling that in one particular text there may be several factors that complicate the situation, i.e., a text may be about one particular protagonist in one or two paragraphs but may deal with related issues in others. With regard to the use of pronouns, for example, an author might prefer to use a person's name instead of a pronoun. Depending on the person re-entered, for example, if he or she is well-known or not, there may be various possibilities, the use of a pronoun, the person's name, his or her job, and even tropes. The reasons for using one or the other can be varied and would depend on a multitude of factors.

4.8.3. DT and Re-entry

My hypothesis that the structure of an editorial is influenced by the lexical density of re-entry items proved to be true. The presence of an early explicit DT and an explicit protagonist seem to be decisive in this respect, an explicit protagonist being the most important factor. The more diffuse an editorial, that is, if the editorial is not about a chain of events connected to an explicit protagonist, the lower the lexical density that exists. Therefore, if we look at the lexical density of a text, it might be possible to predict whether it has a tight or loose structure, or vice-versa. Moreover, we might be able to predict that editorials with a looser kind of structure, and therefore a lower lexical density with regards to re-entry, are more essay-like and further from the opinion-on-a-piece-of-news type which seem to make up the majority of the editorials in my corpus.

It is also evident that *The Guardian* and *The Times* are much more regular as far as the pairs Early DT/Explicit Protagonist and Late DT/No Protagonist are concerned. *The Telegraph* and *The Independent* are much more erratic in this sense. This re-enforces my idea that the latter pair are more marginal examples of broadsheets than the former.

4.8.4. Metadiscursive Nouns

The results of the analysis show that metadiscursive A-nouns in editorials are not as common as Francis (1986: 1995) suggested. They are in fact only found in abundance in editorials that feature the reporting of statements. Given this situation, I decided to compare these results with those from Pennock & Llácer (1998) to see whether metadiscursive nouns could in any way be described as typical of editorials. The comparison involved, apart from the

newspaper corpus, ten articles on diverse subjects from the magazine *Scientific American.*

The main reason for comparing editorial broadsheets and the articles from the above magazine is that a similar, though not identical type of analysis was carried out on both types of texts. The *Scientific American* texts were analyzed solely to see the role of A-nouns. Another reason was that although *Scientific American* has a more restricted audience than broadsheet editorials, it is also read by an educated and probably relatively affluent minority, as in the case of broadsheets.

With regards to text typology, the scientific articles in *Scientific American* are expository texts and not of the opinion type, which is the case of the editorial genre. However, I feel that both text-types share enough characteristics for a comparison to be useful. For example, both use argumentative structures arranged logically as part of their rhetorical structure. My original feeling was that analysis of A-nouns in the scientific genre would provide very different results from those found in editorials. However, this proves to be wrong. If we look at the relative frequency of metadiscursive and non-metadiscursive A-nouns in both genres, it can be observed that in the *Scientific American* corpus of a total of 271 A-nouns only 55 are metadiscursive, while 216 were non-metadiscursive nouns. Surprisingly we can see from table 4.18 below, that metadiscursive A-nouns are actually more common in the scientific articles analyzed than in the broadsheets. This raises even more questions about whether metadiscursive A-nouns are so predominant in editorials and indeed whether they can be seen as characteristic of this genre at all.

	Scientific American	Editorials
meta	20,295202952	13,074204947
non-meta	79,704797048	86,925795053

Table 4. 18: A-Nouns in Two Genres

To continue with this line of inquiry I looked at metadiscursive headwords to determine whether there were any major differences between the two corpora there. Only four were common to both of my corpora: *approach, conclusion, idea, reason* and, therefore, transcend one genre. Within the editorial genre, several metadiscursive A-nouns occur in more than one text: *issue, approach, assertion, decision, message, proposal, question, statement.* This must mean that such A-nouns go beyond editorials about one subject matter and can, therefore, be compared to other groups with a limited number of members such as conjunctions and sentence connectors. I also discovered A-nouns which are common to the scientific-article genre. Some metadiscursive A-nouns do **not**

appear in both genres(e.g., *decision, claim, doubts, matter, verdict*) but could conceivably do so. That they do not is probably due to the size of the corpus. However, it seems improbable that words like *rhetoric* or *rumour* would be used in the scientific texts.

If we compare the non-metadiscursive heads found in the editorials with those of *Scientific American,* we find that only eighteen coincide. This is a small number if we consider the relatively large amount that can be found in both types of text. However, just as with the metadiscursive headwords, the fact that some do not occur can probably be put down to chance as it would be very easy to think of occasions on which they could be used. To give examples of headwords that I believe would appear in both genres if a larger corpus were analysed, observe the following headwords, which are found only in either the editorials or the scientific texts. These are just those from the first four letters of the alphabet: *aim* (ED), *appearance* (SA), *arrangement* (SA), *choices* (ED), *combination* (ED), *design* (SA). From the evidence, and given the variety of non-metadiscursive A-nouns, it would be risky to say that any word, no matter how technical it might look, could not find its way into an editorial as they may deal with many diverse subjects.

The results of the analysis show that A-nouns are akin to function words and have an important part in signalling cohesion. The headwords i.e., *issue, case, system, thing(s), way, move, option, project, package, grounds,* which are found in articles and editorials on diverse subjects are the general words that Halliday & Hasan (1976) mention.

If we look at the determiners preceding A-nouns, we can observe that in the case of metadiscursive nouns as opposed to non-metadiscursive nouns, there seems to be a larger number of determiners that signal strong deixis, such as *this* and *these.* Although Pennock & Llácer's (1998) analysis of A-noun determiners in scientific texts did not separate meta- from non-metadiscursive nouns, the results from this article show that in the case of scientific texts *this* is predominant even among A-nouns as a whole, which is not the case in the editorials.

In both genres there is a predominant use of the definite article and the proximity determiners *this/these.* This can be explained if we remember that one of the main roles of A-nouns is referential continuity and so the presence of a large number of the unmarked form *the* is logical as it simply marks an entity as having been mentioned before. The large number of occurrences of *this/these,* while similar to *the,* is used to focus more emphatically on an entity. Therefore, what is added in the case of these determiners is the desire to bring to the foreground the preceding text and signal it as important in the discourse. If the main functions of A-nouns are referential continuity and bringing entities into focus so that they can be discussed in more detail, then it is quite clear that

that/those should be far less numerous when used with A-nouns. The function of *that/those* is to focus on an entity or idea in order to marginalize it as McCarthy (1994) points out.

Graph 4.1

The determiner *such* is also a predominant determiner preceding A-nouns in editorials and scientific texts. This would also seem to suggest that the types of determiners preceding A-nouns cross genre boundaries. The large number of A-nouns preceded by *such* suggests to me that it has a similar function to *this/these*. In many cases *such* seems to be interchangeable with either without any noticeable change of meaning. This is the reason I do not include such among the comparatives (see chapter two) as Halliday & Hasan suggested (1976: 79). The differences between the demonstratives are often complex and conclusions hard to come by, and that, according to Lakoff (1976), is something of an understatement. Many of the ideas we have about determiners are still, to a great extent, intuitional.

The data with respect to DPRs suggests that there is a connection between them and the determiners preceding A-nouns. I found that both DPRs and A-nouns are often preceded by *this,* which seems to suggest that the functions of both metadiscursive A-nouns and DPRs are connected. The fact is that the relation between these two devices has been noticed by several researchers. What I have discovered is that the equivalent of "non-reference *this"* (Dillon 1981: 94) with respect to metadiscursive A-nouns is the determiner *this.* It

appears that both DPRs and Metadiscursive A-nouns feature *this* and thus focus more strongly on the meaning of the antecedent. On the other hand non-metadiscursive nouns in the editorial corpus are usually preceded by *the,* which is neutral with regards to focus.

The choice of DPRs or metadiscursive A-nouns seems to be a matter of personal style. I have found no evidence that the use of DPRs is due to subject matter or structure. Nevertheless, it may be that A-nouns are preferred when the antecedent is less obvious and the relationship has to be made more explicit using a determiner plus headword.

4.8.5. Re-entry Items and Length of Text

My hypothesis that length of text would be an important factor in the use of re-entry items was borne out only in part. It appears that *The Independent,* which has the longest texts of all has the lowest total lexical density for re-entry items. The reasons for this are open to conjecture. From a purely subjective point of view I would say that the editorials in *The Independent* are generally "looser" than other broadsheets even when they deal with one major protagonist and the DT is text-initial. They seem to be wider-ranging than the other broadsheets, which may ultimately have something to do with their length. The conclusions with regards to the presence of pronouns and length of text are indecisive. The broadsheets with longer editorials seem to have more pronouns except in the case of *The Telegraph,* which has more than both *The Guardian* and *The Times* even though it is has the shortest editorials. I regard this as another piece of evidence pointing to the tabloid nature of this newspaper.

The hypothesis that a higher density of paragraphs should yield fewer pronouns was not backed up by the evidence. Moreover, if more paragraphs should mean fewer pronouns, the opposite case should also be true, i.e., that the larger the number of paragraphs the more noun phrases used as re-entry items should be found. However, I have not carried out an analysis with regards to noun phrases as these would necessarily include items appearing in the text for the first time, which is outside the parameters of this study.

4.9. Concluding Remarks

To sum up, it seems clear that genre-specific re-entry patterns do exist in newspaper editorials and they depend, to a certain extent, on subject matter and information structure. What is more important is that these patterns correlate with extra-linguistic features. This fact is worth highlighting as it is this type of correlation which is often so important if we wish to claim that a particular set

of texts do indeed belong to a particular genre. Clearly broadsheet editorials form a sub-genre of which there are more central and more marginal members.

The obvious way forward from a research point of view would seem to be the analysis of other genres to discover the patterns of re-entry devices and attempt to find similarities and differences between said patterns and those found in broadsheet editorials. This would enhance what we already know about this and other genres. Another possible direction for research would be to compare re-entry items in English and Spanish. What work has been done in this area has usually taken the form of decontextualized examples taken from literary texts (see Fernández 1951, Mederos 1988) but see Pennock & Suau (1999) for a contrastive study of English and Spanish.

The detailed analysis of texts is an important job if we are to have a greater understanding of how they work. Even though this work will never be finished; in the words of Sinclair (1991: 8):

> It has never been anticipated that a close study of text will solve the problems of description, but merely that it will indicate more clearly what problems there are to solve

the analysis of real texts is, in my opinion, well worth undertaking if we are to connect theory with authentic texts in the real world.

5. REFERENCES

Allen, J. 1987. *Natural Language Understanding.* Menlo Park, California: The Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Company.

Anderson, R. C. & Z. Shiffrin 1980. The meaning of words in context. In Spiro, Bruce, & Brewer 1980: 31-348.

Beech, J. & A. Colley (eds) 1987. *Cognitive Approaches to Reading.* Chichester, New York, etc.: John Wiley & Sons.

Bell, A. 1991. *The Language of News Media.* Basil Blackwell, Ltd.

Benson, D. & W. S. Greaves (eds) 1985. *Systemic Perspectives on Discourse, I: Selected Theoretical Papers from the 9th International Systemic Workshop.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Bernárdez, E. 1990. Las macroestucturas textuales como objeto de estudio lingüístico. *Actas de las 1 Jornadas de Lengua y Literatura Inglesa y Norteamericana.* Logroño: Colegio Universitario.

Bhatia, V. K. 1993. *Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings.* Harlow, Burnt Mill: Longman.

Biber, D. 1985. Investigating macroscopic textual variation through multifeature/multidimensional analyses. *Linguistics, 23,* 155-178.

Biber, D. 1986. Spoken and written textual dimensions in English: Resolving the contradictory findings. *Language,* 62: 384-414.

Biber, D. 1988. *Variation Across Speech and Writing.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Biber, D. 1995. *Dimensions of Register Variation: a Cross-linguistic Comparison.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blass, R. 1986. Cohesion, coherence and relevance. *Notes on Linguistics, 34,* Dept. of Linguistics, Univ. College, London and Summer Institure of Linguistics, 41-64.

Bolinger, D. 1977. *Pronouns and Repeated Nouns.* Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Bolívar, Adriana 1994. *Discurso e Interacción en el Texto Escrito.* Caracas: Universidad Central de Venezuela.

Bolívar, Adriana 1995. The structure of newspaper editorials. In M. Coulthard 1995: 276-294.

Bou Franch, P. 1992. *Estrategias de Comunicación y Secuencias Tópicas en el Discurso Conversacional de Estudiantes Españoles de Inglés. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Universitat de València.*

Brown G. & G. Yule. 1983. *Discourse analisis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bühler, K. 1967. *Teoría del lenguaje.* Madrid: Revista de Occidente.

Butler, C. 1985. *Statistics in Linguistics.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Carrell, P. L. 1987. Content and formal schemata in ESL reading. *TESOL Quarterly,* Vol 21, No. 3., 461-481.

Carter, R. & W. Nash. 1990. *Seeing Through Language: An Introduction to Styles of English Writing.* Oxford and Cambridge, MA.: Basil Blackwell.

Chafe, W. L. 1972. Discourse structure and human knowledge. In Carroll & Linde 1972: 11-23.

Chafe, W. L. 1976. Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. In Li 1976: 25-35.

Charolles, M. 1985. Text connexity, text coherence and text interpretation processing. In Charolles, Petöfi & Sözer 1986: 1-15.Charolles, M., J. S. Petöfi & E. Sözer (eds) 1986. *Research in Text Connexity and Text Coherence: A Survey.* Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.

Cole, P. (ed) 1981. *Radical Pragmatics.* New York: Academic Pres

Conte, M. E., J. S. Petöfi, E Sozer (eds) 1984. *Text and Discourse Connectedness: Proceedings of the Conference on Connexity and Coherence, Urbino, July 16-21.* Amsterdam; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.

Cornish, F. 1986. *Anaphoric Relations in English and French: A Discourse Perspective.* London: Croom Helm.

Corum, C. 1973. Anaphoric peninsulas. *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society,* Chicago: University of Chicago Department of Linguistics, 89-97.

Coulthard, M. (ed) 1992. *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis.* London: Routledge.

Coulthard, M. (ed) 1994. *Advances in Written Text Analysis.* London: Routledge.

Coulthard, M., & M. Montgomery. (eds) 1981. *Studies in Discourse Analysis.* London, Boston and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Coupland, N., J. Coupland, H. Giles & K. Henwood 1988. Accommodating the elderly: invoking and extending a theory. *Language in Society 17/1:* 1-41.

Couture, B. (ed) 1986. *Functional Approaches to Writing Research Perspectives.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Crystal, D. *A Dictionary of Linguistics & Phonetics.* London: Blackwell

Crystal, D. & D. Davy. 1969. *Investigating English Style.* London: Longman.

Cuddon, J. A. 1977 *A Dictionary of Literary Terms,* Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books.

de Beaugrande, R. & W. Dressler. 1981. *Introduction to Text Linguistics.* London: Longman.

Dillon, G. L. 1981. *Constructing Texts: Elements of a Theory of Composition and Style.* Bloomington: Indiana Universtiy Press.

Dixon, J. 1987 The question of genres. In Reid 1987: 9-21.

Downing, A. 1996. Register and/or genre? In Vázquez & Hornero 1996: 11-28.

Dressler, W. 1970. Towards a semantic deep structure of discourse grammar. *Papers from the Sixth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society.* Dept. Of Linguistics, University of Chicago, 202-209.

Dressler, W. (ed) 1978. *Current Trends in Text Linguistics.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Edmonson, W. 1981. *Spoken Discourse: A Model for Analysis.* Burnt Mill, Harlow: Longman.

Eggington, W. & T. Ricento 1983. Discourse analysis as a pedagogical tool. *California Asociation of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, 9,* 74-83.

Eggins, S. 1994. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics.* London: Pinter Publishers.

Enkvist, N. E. 1964. On defining style. In Spencer: 1964: 3-56.

Erkü, F. & J. Gundel 1986. The pragmatics of indirect anaphors. In Vershueren 1986: 533- 545.

Ervin-Tripp, S. M. 1968. An analysis of the interaction of language, topic and listener. In Fishman 1968: 192-211.

Ervin-Tripp, S. M. 1972. On sociolinguistic rules: Alternation and co-occurrence. In Gumperz & Hymes 1972: 213-250.

Evans, G. 1980. Pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry, Volume 11,* Number 2 , Spring, 337-362.

Ewer, J. R. 1979. *The Modals in Formal Scientific Discourse: Function, Meaning and Use.* Santiago, Chile: Research Report, Department of English.

Fairclough, N. 1995. *Media Discourse.* London, New York, etc.: Edward Arnold

Findler, N. (ed) 1979. *Associative Networks. The Representation and Use of Knowledge in Computers.* New York: Academic Press.

Flood, J. (ed) *Understanding Reading Comprehension.* Delaware: International Reading Association.

Ford, M., J. W. Bresan & R. M. Kaplan 1982. A competence based theory of syntactic closure. In Bresnan 1982: 35-63.

Foucault, M. 1972. *The Archeology of Knowledge and the Discourse of Language.* Trans. by S. M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Harper.

Fowler, R. 1993. *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press.* London, etc.: Routledge.

Fox, B. 1987. *Discourse Structure and Anaphora. Written and Conversational English.* Cambrige: Cambridge University Press.

Francis, G. 1986. *Anaphoric nouns.* Birmingham: ELR.

Francis, G. 1995. Labelling discourse: an aspect of nominal-group cohesion. In Coulthard 1995: 83-101.

Fraser, C. & K. R. Scherer (eds) 1982. *Advances in the Social Psychology of Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gernsbacher, M. A. & T. Givón. 1995. *Coherence in Spontaneous Text.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Giles, H. & P. F. Powesland 1975. *Speech Styles and Social Evaluation.* London: Academic Press.

Giles, H., A. Mulac, J. J. Bradac & P. Johnson 1987. Speech accomodation theory: the first decade and beyond. In McLaughlin 1987: 13-48.

Giora, R. 1984 Notes towards a theory of text coherence. *Poetics Today,* 6: 699-715.

Giora, R. 1985. What's a coherent text ? In Charolles, Petöfi & Sözer 1985: 16-35.

Givón, T. (ed) 1983. *Topic Continuity in Discourse.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Givón , T. 1995. Coherence in text vs. coherence in mind. In Gernsbacher & Givón 1995: 59-115.

Goatley, A. 1994 Register and the redemption of relevance theory. *Pragmatics,* 4, 2: 139-182.

Goffman, E. 1981. *Forms of Talk.* Oxford: OUP.

Graesser, A. C. & G. H. Bower (eds) 1990. *Inferences and Text Comprehension.* San Diego, etc.: Academic Press. Green, G. & J. Morgan 1981. Pragmatics, grammar and discourse. In Cole 1981: 167-181.

Green, G. 1989. *Pragmatics and Natural Language Understanding.* Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.

Gregori-Signes, C. 2000. *A Genre Based Approach to Daytime Talk on Television.* Valencia: SELL Monographs.

Grosz, B. 1977. The representation and use of focus in dialogue understanding. *Stanford Research Institute Technical Notes 5.*

Gumperz, J. J. & D. Hymes (eds) 1972. *Directions in Sociolinguistics; The Ethnography of Communication.* New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.

Halliday, M. A. K. 1979. Differences between spoken and written language: some implications for literacy teaching. In Page, Elkins, & O'Connor 1979: 37-52.

Halliday, M. A. K. 1985. Dimensions of Discourse analysis: grammar. In 1985 *Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Vol. 2.* London: Academic Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. 1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (2nd ed.) London, Melbourne, Auckland: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. & R. Hasan 1976. *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman.

Halliday, M. A. K. & R. Hasan 1980. Text and context: aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective. *Sophia Linguistica, Working Papers in Linguistics,* 6, 4-91.

Halliday, M. A. K. & R. Hasan. 1985. *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social Semiotic Perspective.* Oxford: OUP.

Hamp-Lyons, L. (ed) 1991. *Assessing ESL Writing in Academic Contexts*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Hasan, R. 1971. Rime and reason in literature. In Chatman 1971: 15-31.

Hasan, R. 1978. Text in the Systemic-functional model. In Dressler 1978: 369-390.

Hasan, R. 1984. Coherence and cohesive harmony. In Flood 1984: 181-219.

Hatakeyama, K., J. S. Petöfi & E. Sözer 1985. Text, connexity, cohesion, coherence. In M. Charolles, J. S. Petöfi & E. Sözer 1985: 36-105.

Hattim, B & I. Mason. 1990. *Discourse and the Translator.* Burnt Millow, Harlow: Longman.

Healy, A. F., S. M. Kosslyn, & R. M. Shiffrin (eds) 1991. *From Learning Processes to Cognitive Processes: Essays in Honor of William K. Estes.* Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum,

Helm, J. (ed) 1967. *Essays on the verbal and visual arts.* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Hendricks, W. O. 1976. *Grammars of Style and Styles of Grammar.* Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.

Hetzron, R. 1970. Nonverbal sentences and degrees of definiteness in Hungarian. *Language,* 46, 899-927.

Hinds, J. 1979. Organizational patterns in discourse. In T. Givón, (ed) *Syntax and Semantics Volume 12: Discourse and Syntax.* New York: Academic Press.

Hobbs, J. R. 1979. Coherence and coreference. *Cognitive Science,* 3: 67-90.

Hoey, M. 1983. *On the Surface of Discourse.* London: George Allen & Unwin.

Hoey, M. 1991. *Patterns of Lexis in Text.* Oxford University Press.

Hofmann, T. R. 1989. Paragraphs and anaphora. *Journal of Pragmatics 13,* North Holland, 239-250.

Huddleston, R. (1978) On classifying anaphoric relations. *Lingua* 45: 333-54.

Hughes, G. 1988. *Words in Time.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Jakobson, R. 1988. The metaphoric and metonymic poles. In Lodge 1988: 57-61.

Johnstone, B. 1987. An Introduction. *Text,* 7, 205-214.

Jordan, M. P. 1984. *Fundamentals of Technical Description.* Malabar, Florida: Robert E. Krieger Pub.Co.

Jordan, M. P. 1995. Pragmatic, stylistic and grammatical limitations on choice: A study of cause-effect signalling in English. Paper presented at the 7th International Systemic Functional Workshop, Univ. Valencia, Spain.

Jucker, A. H. 1986 *News Interviews: A Pragmalinguistic Analysis.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Jucker, A. H. 1992. *Social Stylistics: Syntactic Variation in British Newspapers.* Berlin and New York. : Mouton de Gruyter.

Keenen, E. O. & B. B: Shieffelin 1976. Topics as a discourse notion: A study of topic in the conversations of children and adults. In Li 1976: 335-384.

Kintsch, W. 1974. *The Representation of Meaning in Memory.* Hillsdale, N. J. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kintsch, W. 1991. How readers construct situation models for stories: The role of syntactic cues and causal inferences. In Healy, Kosslyn, & Shiffrin 1991: 261-78,

Kintsch, W. 1995. How readers construct situation models for stories: The role of syntactic cues and causal inferences. In Gernsbacher & Givón 1995: 139-160.

Kress, G. 1985. *The Linguistic Expression of Social Meaning: Discourse, Genre, Text.* Geelong, Vic.: Deakin University Press.

Labov, W. 1968. *The Social Stratification of English in New York City*. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Labov, W. & J. Waletzky 1967. Narrative analysis. Oral versions of personal experience. In Helm 1967: 12-44.

Labov, W. 1972. *Language in the Inner City.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lakoff, R. 1976. Remarks on *This* and *That. Proceedings of the Tenth Regional Meeting of th Chicago Linguistic Society,* 345-56.

Li, C. N. (ed.) 1976. *Subject and Topic.* New York: Academic Press.

Lodge, D. (ed) 1988. *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader.* London & New York: Longman.

Lybbert, E.K. 1972. Substitutes as 'replacements'. *Linguistics 91,* 5-16.

McLaughlin, M. L. (ed) 1987. *Communication Yearbook 10.* Beverly Hills: Sage.

Mann, W. C. & Thompson, S. A. 1988. Rhetorical structure theory: Toward a functional theory of text organization. *Text.* 8/3: 243-281.

Martin, J. 1992. *English Text: System and Stucture.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

McCarthy, M. 1987. Some vocabulary patterns in conversation. In R. Carter & M. McCarthy 1987: 181-200.

McCarthy, M. 1994 *It this* and *that*. In Coulthard 1994: 267-275.

Mederos Martín, H. 1988. *Procedimientos de Cohesion en Español Contemporáneo.* Diputación Insular de Tenerife.

Metzing, M. 1975. *Frame Conceptions and Text Understanding*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Meyer, B. & G. E. Rice 1982. The interaction of reader strategies and the organization of text. *Text, 2(1):* 155-92.

Morgan, J. L. 1978. Two kinds of convention in indirect speech acts. In Cole 1978: 261-280.

Morgan, J. L. & M. B. Sellner. 1980. Discourse and linguistic theory. In Spiro, Bruce, & Brewer 1980: 165-200.

Newmark, P. 1988 *A Textbook of Translation.* London: Prentice Hall.

Oostdijk, N. & P. de Haan (eds) 1994. *Corpus-based Research into Language.* Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Paduçeva, E. V. 1968. Anaphoric relations and their representation in the deep structure of a text. *Proceedings of the Tenth International Congress of Linguistics,* 224-232. The Hague: Mouton.

Parsons, G. 1990. *A Comparative Study of the Writing of Scientific Texts. Focusing on Cohesion and Coherence.* Nottingham: Depart. of English Studies University of Nottingham.

Pennock, B. & E. Llacer 1998. Textual coherence and the teaching of scientific English. Valencia: *Studies in English Language and Linguistics,* 129-145.

Pennock, B. & A. Suau 1999. Text Coherence And Pragmatic Failure. *Cuaderns de Filologia.* Valencia: Facultat de Filología, UVEG.

Perfetti, C. A. & S. R. Goldman. 1974. Thematization and sentence retrieval. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Bhaaviour* 13: 70-9.

Perren, G. E. & J. L. M. Trim (eds) 1971. *Applications of linguistics: selected papers of the Second International Congress of Applied Linguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Petöfi, J. S. (ed) 1988. *Text and Discourse Constitution. Empirical Aspects, Theoretical Approaches.* Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Petöfi, J. S. & E. Sozer (eds) 1983: *Papers in Text Linguistics.* Hamburg: Buske.

Prince, E. 1981. Toward a taxonomy of given-new information. In Cole 1981: 183-211.

Randquist, M. G. 1985. The barely visible glue. Some aspects of textual connectedness. In Charolles, Petöfi & Sözer 1985: 189-218. Reid I. (ed) 1987. *The Place of Genre in Learning: Current Debates.* Deakin University: Centre for Studies in Literary Education, Deakin University.

Reid, J. 1992. A computer text analysis of four cohesion devices in English discourse by native and nonnative writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 1* (2), 79-107.

Reinhart, T. 1980. Conditions of coherence. *Poetics Today* 1(4):61-180.

Reinhart, T. (1981) Pragmatics and Linguistics: An analysis of sentence topic. *Philosophica* 27: 1, 53-59.

Reiß, K, y J. Vermeer 1976. *Texttyp und Übersetzungsmethode. Der Operative Text.* Regensburg: Scriptor Verlag Kronberg.

Rigau i Oliver, G. 1981. *Gramàtica del Discurs.* Bellaterra: UAB.

Rimmon-Kenan, S. 1980. The paradoxical status of repetition. *Poetics Today.* 1/4: 151-159.

Schank, R. C., & R. P. Abelson. 1977. *Scripts, Plans, Goals and Understanding.* Hillsdale, N. J. : Lawrence Erlbaum.

Shepherd, S., C. 1990. Functions of Repetition: Variation in Narrative and Conversational Discourse. In Edmundson, Feagin, & Mulhlausler 1990: 629-638.

Silberstein, S. 1994. *Techniques and Resources in Teaching Reading.* New York: Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, J. 1991. *Corpus, concordance, collocation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, J. & M. Coulthard. 1975. *Towards an Analysis of Discourse.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spiro, R. J., B. C. Bruce, & W. F. Brewer (eds) 1980. *Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension: Perspectives from Cognitive Psychology, Linguistics, Artificial Intelligence and Education. Psychology of Reading.* Hillsdale, N. J. : Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Stoddard, S. E. 1991 *Text and Texture: Patterns of Cohesion.* Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Pub. Corp.

Stotsky, W. 1983. Types of lexical cohesion in expository writing: implications for developing the vocabulary of academic discourse. *College Composition and Communication 34/4:* 430-446.

Stubbs, M. *Discourse Analysis.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swales, J. 1981. Aspects of article introductions (Aston ESP Research Report No. 1) University of Aston, Birmingham, England.

Swales, J. 1985. A genre-based approach to language across the curriculum. Paper given at RELC Conference, Singapore.

Swales, J. M. 1990. *Genre Analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tadros, A. 1981. Prediction in Economics Text. *Discourse Analysis Monographs, 10.* English Language Research. Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

Tannen, D. 1987. Repetition in conversation: Towards a poetics of talk. *Language,* 63, 3: 575-605.

Tannen, D. 1989. *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue and Imagery in Conversational Discourse.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thakerer, J., H. Giles & J. Cheshire 1982. Psychological and linguistic parameters of speech accommodation theory. In Fraser & Scherer 1982: 205-55.

Todorov, T. 1991. *Genres in Discourse.* Porter, C. (trans) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trabasso, T., S. Suh & P. Payton. 1995. Explanatory coherence in understanding and talking about events. In M. A. Gernsbacher & T. Givón (eds), 189-214.

Trudgill, P. 1974. *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction.* New York: Penguin.

Turner, G. W. 1973. *Stylistics.* Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books.

Tyler, A. 1994. The role of repetition in perceptions of discourse coherence. *Journal of Pragmatics 21,* 671-688.

Unger, C. 1996. The scope of discourse connectives: implications for discourse organization. *Journal of Linguistics,* 32: 403-438.

Ure, J. N. 1971. Lexical density and register differentiation. In Perren & Trim 1971: 131-145. van Dijk T. A. 1972. *Some aspects of Text Grammars.* The Hague: Mouton.

van Dijk, T. A. 1977. *Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse.* London & New York: Longman.

van Dijk, T. A. 1983. Discourse analysis: Its development and application to the structure of news. In *Journal of Communication, Spring 1983.*

van Dijk, T. A. 1988. *Macrostructures.* Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

van Dijk, T. A. & W. Kintsch, 1983. *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension.* New York: Academic Press.

Vázquez, I & A. Hornero (eds) 1996. *Current Issues in Genre Theory.* Zaragoza: Mira Editores.

Vázquez, I. 1996. Register, Genre and Linguistic Choice. In Vázquez & Hornero 1996: 29-50.

Ventola, E. 1987. *The Structure of Social Interaction: A Systemic Approach to the Semiotics of Service Encounters.* London: Francis Pinter.

Wales, K. 1989. *A Dictionary of Stylistics.* London & New York: Longman.

Wallace, W. D. 1977. How registers register: A study in the language of news and sports. *Studies in Linguistic Sciences* 7.1: 46-78.

Wardaugh, R. 1986. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Werlich, E. 1983. *A Text Grammar of English.* Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.

Widdowson, H. G. 1975. *Stylistics and the Teaching of Literature.* London: Longman.

Winston, P. 1977. *Artificial Intelligence.* Rowley Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Winter, E.O. 1977. A clause relation approach to English texts: a study of some predictive liexical items in written discourse. *Instructional Science* 6/1: 1-92.

Winter, E.O. 1979. Replacement as a fundamental function of the sentence in context. *Forum Linguisticum* 4/2: 95-133.

Wittgenstein, L. (1918) *Tractatus Logico Philosophicus.* New York: The Humanities Press [1961].

INDEX

accommodation theory, 14
Anaphora, 45
anaphoric nouns, 41, 53, 81
antonymy, 47
audience design, 14
Bell, 12, 14, 15, 16, 77, 86, 98
Bernárdez, 35
Bhatia, 16, 19
Biber, 10, 12, 20, 21, 22, 98
Bolinger, 47
Bolívar, 12, 19, 20, 74
broadsheets, 13, 14, 15, 71, 73, 74, 87, 97, 98, 101, 102, 105
Brown & Yule, 26, 27, 30
Carpenter & Just, 47
Carter & Nash, 9
coherence, 25
cohesion, 25
collocation, 35, 36, 45, 67
comparatives, 42, 66
completeness, 26
computer analysis, 75
connex expressions, 33
consecutio temporum, 33, 35
continuity of reference, 36
corpus, 71
Coupland et al., 14
Crystal & Davy, 9, 12, 14, 15, 54, 55
cue phrases, 32
Chafe, 38
de Beaugrande & Dressler, 25
demonstrative pronoun reference, 66, 94
demonstrative pronouns, 39, 84
determiner noun phrases, 63, 84
digression markers, 32
Dillon, 47, 56, 104
discourse management, 29
discourse topic, 17, 29, 69, 76, 85
Dixon, 10
Downing, 10
editorial genre, 22
Eggington & Ricento, 31
Eggins, 10
ellipsis, 44, 66, 90
endophoric, 36
Erkü & Gundel, 41
Ervin-Tripp, 31
exophoric, 36
exophoric time expressions, 68
Fairclough, 11
feature articles, 16
Fernández, 106
follow, 20
Foucault, 29
Fowler, 12, 17
Fox, 56, 57, 58, 59
frame, 28
frames, 27
framing moves, 32
Francis, 53, 54, 64, 91, 92, 101
genre, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22
Giles & Powesland, 14
Giles et al., 14
Giora, 30, 31, 32
Givón, 38, 57, 96

Gleeson, 55
goal, 12
Goatley, 12
Goffman, 54
Green & Morgan, 46
Gregori-Signes, 10
group style, 54
Halliday, 9
Halliday & Hasan, 26, 35, 69, 84, 104
Halliday & Hasan's, 44
Hasan, 11
Hatakeyama et al., 27, 28
Hattim & Mason, 29
headline, 76, 77
Hendricks, 38, 54, 55, 56
Hetzron, 52
Hinds, 31
Hoey, 25, 47, 69
Hofmann, 35
homophoric reference, 67
Huddleston, 36, 37, 38, 42, 43, 45, 62
hyponyms, 90, 100
hyponymy, 47, 62
identity of reference, 46
identity of sense, 46
indefinite article, 64
indirect anaphora, 51
instantial semblance, 50
intertextuality, 26
Jakobson, 56
Johnstone, 29
Jordan, 35
Jucker, 12, 13, 14, 71, 73, 75, 98
Keenan & Shieffelin, 30
Kintsch, 59
knowledge structures, 26
Kress, 10
Labov, 14
Labov & Waletzky, 19
Lakoff, 77
lead, 20
length of text, 71
lexical cohesion, 36, 37, 40, 45, 46, 47, 49
lexical density, 79, 80, 81, 87, 90, 95, 97, 101, 105
lexical repetition, 60, 84
link, 36
Lybbert, 55
macrostructure, 30
Mann & Thompson, 35
Martin, 10
McCarthy, 40, 41, 49, 103
Mederos, 106
mental representation, 27, 28, 31, 33, 38, 57
meronymy, 47
Metadiscursive Noun Phrases, 64
metadiscursive nouns, 53, 70, 91
metaphor, 51
mind-set, 31
Morgan & Sellner, 46
news reports, 14, 16
newspaper editorials, 9
non-metadiscurisve noun phrases, 64
non-metadiscursive A-nouns, 54, 91
noun phrases, 58, 76
Paduçeva, 54, 55
paragraph boundaries, 96
paragraph breaks, 58
Parson, 69
Pennock & Llácer, 101
Pennock & Suau, 106
Petöfi, 25
possessive determiner, 36
possessive pronouns, 36, 60
Prince, 57
pro-forms, 65
pronouns, 38, 60, 76, 91, 95
proposition, 31
Randquist, 26
re-entry, 9, 77
re-entry devices, 83, 84, 85, 87, 94, 98, 105

referential cohesion, 36
register, 10, 11, 22, 72
Reichman, 57
Reid, 75
Reinhart, 31
repetition, 29, 98, 99
repetition, exact, 61
resemblance to previous
expression, 68
Rimmon-Kenan, 49
Scientific America, 102
script, 18, 27
Schank & Abelson, 17, 18, 26, 27
sentential it, 60, 84
Sinclair, 19, 106
Sinclair & Coulthard, 19, 32
Stalnaker, 32
Stoddard, 34, 39, 59
Stotsky, 46, 47, 49
strong connexity, 33
strong reiteration, 55
style, 10
substitution, 43, 66
sub-topics, 32
surface cohesion, 28
synonymy, 47, 63, 85
syntagmatic association, 78
system nouns, 52
tabloids, 13
Tadros, 19
Tannen, 29, 48
text equivalents, 62
textlinguistics, 26
text-synonyms, 51
texture, 26
Thakerer et al., 14
tie, 36
ties, 77
Todorov, 10
topic sentence, 31, 70
topic shift, 32
tropes, 51
Trudgill, 10
Turner, 57
Tyler, 46
Unger, 97
untriggered elements, 68
valuate, 20
van Dijk, 25, 30, 32, 86
Ventola, 10
Wallace, 71
Wardaugh, 10
weird semantics, 28
weird syntax, 28
Werlich, 28, 31
Widdowson, 9, 10
Winter, 80
world fragment, 28
zero substitution, 44