

## COHESIVE DEVICES IN NEWSWRITING

Pavína Šaldová

### 0. Introduction

The question of what constitutes a text has received a great deal of attention and, as a partial answer to the question, the concept of cohesion has long been used in discourse analysis (cf., among others, Halliday and Hasan 1976, Hasan 1984, Hoey 1991, Parsons 1996, Taboada 2000, Martin 2001). Attempts have also been made to relate cohesion to social context through register (Martin 2001).

The relation of cohesion to register had been pointed out by Halliday and Hasan (1976: 23) already in 1976 when they wrote: “The concept of cohesion can ... be usefully supplemented by that of register, since the two together effectively define a text. A text is a passage of discourse which is coherent in these two regards: it is coherent with respect to the context of situation, and therefore consistent in register; and it is coherent with respect to itself and therefore cohesive.”

As reiterated by Halliday (1994: 339), for a text to be coherent “it must deploy the resources of cohesion in ways that are motivated by the register of which it is an instance.” From this we may draw the assumption that cohesion operates differently in variant registers and that cohesive devices used in different text types may vary and may constitute a significant text-type characteristic.

This study thus examines cohesion in news discourse with a twofold objective. Its first goal is to enquire whether there is a relation between cohesive devices and the ‘top-down’ organization of news discourse (cf. below).

“... surface structures that may be used to signal underlying semantic coherence are usually described as properties of cohesion. These are rules and strategies for the establishment of cohesion, and it is important to find out whether news reports in general, or specific types of news topics, display special preferences in the application or deviation from such rules.” (van Dijk 1988b: 11)

The second objective is to study whether there is a difference between two types of newswriting (texts in quality and tabloid newspapers) in the cohesive devices they employ, *ie* to see “the trace of context in the text”, to relate the structure to the genre (cf. Martin 2001).

## 1.

The first section describes the data used in the analysis and briefly discusses the concept of cohesion and the character of newswriting.

### 1.1 Corpus

To analyse cohesive devices in newswriting, I used 18 articles from on-line versions of British newspapers. Because we are also interested in studying whether the social context is traceable in the texts, and if so, in what way, both quality and tabloid newspapers were analyzed: nine articles from *The Guardian* and *The Times* (Texts Q) and nine from *The Mirror* and *The Sun* (Texts T). The articles were selected according to the following criteria: 1) length: length is potentially a property that determines a text-type. For this reason texts of comparable length were chosen. The mean length of all articles was 336 words ( $\pm 10$  words). Set Q consists of 3,028 words, set T of 3,021 words; 2) all articles report on current domestic issues (they are not commentaries, editorials, etc.) and in each an adverbial/temporal adjunct such as *yesterday* or *last night* appears in the very beginning.

### 1.2 Cohesion

In discourse analysis the concept of cohesion has been generally used (to explain why and how texts show coherence within themselves), and although it underwent various modifications and has been criticized, cohesion is still a recognized property of a successful text. The model that has been applied most widely is the Halliday and Hasan model (Halliday and Hasan 1976). This is also the framework that this analysis uses, with some minor modifications.

Basically, for a text to be a text, it must be coherent. Coherence is organization at the level of content (what causes it to make sense with respect to the world). Coherence is also established by texture, which is what holds the text together within itself (not in the relation to the world). Cohesion is a part of the study of texture and could be described as a linguistic marking of coherence.

Cohesion "may crudely be defined as the way certain words or grammatical features of a sentence can connect that sentence to its predecessors (and successors) in a text ... A text is in part organized, in part created, by the presence in each sentence of these elements that require the reader to look to the surrounding sentences for their interpretation" (Hoey 1991: 4). Halliday and Hasan (1976: 4) describe the notion of cohesion as follows: "The concept of cohesion is a semantic one; it refers to relations of meaning that exist within the text, and that define it as a text ... Cohesion occurs where the INTERPRETATION of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one presupposes the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it. When this happens, a relation of cohesion is set up, and two elements, the presupposing and the presupposed, are thereby at least potentially integrated to the text." (This definition seems

to apply well to instances of grammatical cohesion. With lexical cohesion, however, the situation is not as straightforward — cf. below).

The relationship between two such elements is called a cohesive tie (cohesive ties are established between elements in the text (endophoric relations), not with elements that have their referent outside the text (exophoric relations)). Halliday and Hasan (1976) classify cohesive ties into **grammatical (reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction)** and **lexical (reiteration and collocation)**. This basic distinction is maintained in our analysis and the respective types of cohesive ties are discussed in section 2.

### 1.3 Newswriting

Story grammarians assume that discourse types have a more or less fixed schematic organization. I follow van Dijk's detailed and complex analyses of newswriting as a text type (van Dijk 1988a, 1988b) to describe briefly the specific properties of the discourse type in question. In his view, news superstructure should interact with news macrostructure (i.e. the topical organization of the message).

The specific organization of a news text can be described as follows (after Duszak 1991). First, the global meaning of the text is revealed at the very onset with the formulation of the headline. Technically speaking, news comprehension has a top-down character: it is an active, anticipation-driven testing of hypotheses. The headline activates a network of knowledge relations, where the basic mental schema is: sb.-did-st.-to-sb. This top-down organization bears strongly on the overall topical structure of the text in that the meaning of the headline is normally reformulated in the first paragraph, and the unfolding narration follows 'inverse macrorules': meanings are specified, particularized and informational details are added. Second, the presentation of topics in a news story is cyclical (discontinuous), that is, topics are brought up, dropped to give way to others, and then picked up again for further elaboration (topics recycling). As a rule, the direction of elaboration proceeds from more general information to more specific. (e.g. in specifying the time: *March* > three paragraphs below *March 19*; *today* > *this morning*). Thirdly, topics in a news story are presented in accordance with their hierarchy of newsworthiness (recency, impact).

All these properties bring about some internal disorganization, hence newswriting can be described as non-narrative. These characteristics are also reflected in the cohesive edifice of the texts. (We can assume that topic recycling yields repetitions, discontinuities block the use of anaphoric pronouns and other proforms, etc.)

## 2. Analysis

In what follows I present the results of my analysis of cohesive ties in the two types of news discourse with the above mentioned twofold objective: to compare the two styles (social contexts) and to relate the categories of cohesive devices appearing in this non-narrative text type to the character of news 'superstructure'.

I analysed the texts in terms of cohesive ties according to the Halliday and Hasan model (1976). In their approach a cohesive tie/link is understood to be a relationship between two items in the text. Ties are classified into grammatical (reference, comparison, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction) and lexical (reiteration and collocation). The present analysis excludes conjunction<sup>1</sup> and collocation<sup>2</sup>.

## 2.1

The overall summary of the 1,361 cohesive ties identified in the texts is presented in Figure 1.

types of cohesive ties	Q(uality)		T(abloid)	
	number of cohesive ties	%	number of cohesive ties	%
<b>GRAMMATICAL DEVICES</b>				
Personal pronouns	91	13.6	151	22.0
Possessive pronouns	38	5.7	39	5.7
Demonstratives as determiners	8	1.2	5	0.7
Demonstratives as proforms	7	1.0	5	0.7
Demonstrative adverbs	1	0.1	8	1.2
Definite articles	83	12.4	109	15.8
Ellipsis	16	2.4	17	2.4
total	244	36.4	334	48.5
<b>LEXICAL DEVICES</b>				
Repetition	287	42.0	221	32.2
Synonym	50	7.5	29	4.2
Superordinate terms	17	2.6	22	3.2
Subordinate terms	7	1.1	3	0.4
Grammatical metaphor	24	3.7	18	2.6
Proper names	44	6.6	61	8.9
total	429	63.6	354	51.5
<b>total</b>	<b>673 / 3028 words</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>688 / 3021 words</b>	<b>100%</b>

Fig. 1

A salient result of this analysis is the fact that both sets of texts contain an almost identical number of cohesive ties (the ratio between the number of words and cohesive ties being 0.22–0.23).<sup>3</sup> Not only in the whole set but throughout the individual texts cohesive ties are distributed evenly. A further step would be to examine other discourse

<sup>1</sup> Conjunction expresses a different kind of relation within a text.

<sup>2</sup> Collocation — I exclude collocation, mainly for the lack of any objective criteria (cf. HASAN 1984, HOEY 1991).

<sup>3</sup> The ratio in Texts Q is 0.222 and in T 0.227.

types (using the same methodology) to see whether all text types display the same ratio of cohesive devices per length or whether the individual discourse types vary.<sup>4</sup>

These quantitative results seem to suggest that the two text types are very similar in the overall amount of cohesive devices they employ. However, the distribution of the cohesive devices exhibits one notable difference: Texts Q make more frequent use of lexical cohesive devices (65% of all links), whereas in Texts T the proportion is lower (52% of all links).

The following section describes the frequency and usage of the particular cohesive devices (grammatical and lexical, respectively).

### 2.1.1 GRAMMATICAL DEVICES

#### Reference

Reference is divided into personal, demonstrative and comparative.

#### Personal reference

The category of personal reference includes personal and possessive pronouns. Only the third person pronouns are inherently cohesive (they typically refer anaphorically to a preceding item in the text). First and second person forms usually express speech roles and do not normally refer to the text at all. In written language, however, they are anaphoric when they occur in quoted 'direct' speech. In newswriting, such pronouns represent instances of indirect anaphora (*I* still refers to the speaker, but we have to look in the text to find out who the speaker is. *We* is frequently used in a similar fashion, implying a particular group of individuals with which the speaker wishes to identify himself).

The use of pronouns contributes very markedly to the internal cohesion of a text, since it creates a kind of network of lines of reference. "The number and density of such networks is one of the factors which gives to any text its particular flavour or texture." (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 52)

Our texts differ in the amount of personal reference items they employ (Texts Q contain 129 cases of personal reference, Texts T 190 instances).

#### Personal pronouns

The major difference is found in the use of personal pronouns (in Texts Q there are 91 cases, i.e. 13.5% of all cohesive ties, in Text T 151 cases, i.e. 21.9% of all cohesive ties).

The number of possessives is identical in both sets (cf. below). Compared with other genres, e.g. conversation or fiction, newswriting does not make much use of personal pronouns (cf. Longman 1999: 336). Bearing in mind Bernstein's distinction (quoted

<sup>4</sup> Cf. TABOADA (2000), who found the same ratio of cohesive ties in one text type (task-oriented dialogues) even cross-linguistically (in English and Spanish).

after Crystal 1997: 66) between restricted and elaborated codes (in which the latter employs a greater proportion of content words, the former more pronouns), it is not surprising to find that personal pronouns are more frequent in the T texts.<sup>5</sup>

However, to claim that due to the “restricted code” the use of personal pronouns is 1.7 times more frequent in tabloids than in quality newspapers would be an oversimplification. Pronouns are more common in spoken language and therein lies the explanation: a higher proportion of pronouns in the tabloid writing can be related to a higher proportion of direct speech quoted in tabloids. The ratio of pronouns used in text proper and in quotations shows that the major factor which helps to account for the higher number of pronouns used in tabloid writing is the higher proportion of direct speech in tabloids:

personal pronouns (ratio pronouns per words)	Q(uality)	T(abloid)
total	0.030	0.050
pronouns in text proper	0.021 60% of all pronouns appear in text proper	0.028 41% in text proper
pronouns in quotation	0.086 40% in direct speech	0.108 59% in direct speech

Fig. 2

The table (Figure 2) shows that even after separating text proper from quoted speech, there is still a difference between the two types of newswriting which has to be attributed to factors other than the use of direct speech; most probably factors related to the “restricted code” of tabloid writing, such as shorter clauses<sup>6</sup> allowing easier processing, or ‘simple’ subject matter more frequently matching the general concern with individuals and their thoughts and actions as is the case in conversation.

Thus the difference in register is reflected in the higher proportion of direct quotations used in tabloids, together with other properties of this type of writing.<sup>7</sup> As for the relation to the top-down character, what seems to be characteristic is the less frequent use of personal pronouns<sup>8</sup> than in narrative texts: the topics here are dropped and picked up again and the use of other anaphoric devices (namely definite articles and some form of lexical repetition) allows more information to be added, e.g.:

<sup>5</sup> Cf. also the higher frequency of pronoun themes versus lexical content participation in *The Sun* and *The Times* (HAWES and THOMAS 1996: 160).

<sup>6</sup> The mean clause length in Q texts is 10.6 words and in T texts 8.2 words.

<sup>7</sup> I included all occurrences of personal pronouns with endophoric reference. However, not all of them are cohesive devices in the proper sense since some of them have their antecedents within the same sentence. In both sets of data, between 52–53% of all personal pronouns have their antecedent outside the sentence and the ratio is identical in direct speech, which seems to suggest that this distinction is irrelevant.

<sup>8</sup> The relative distance between the members in identity chains could be one of the properties which lead to the less frequent use of personal pronouns and distinguish this type of non-narrative writing from other discourse types.

*Dome to be pop arena: The Government has today given away for free the ill-fated Millenium Dome ... This afternoon, Lord Falconer confirmed that the Meridian Delta consortium was taking over the troubled Greenwich, south London, attraction.*

#### Possessives

Possessives, as another means of expressing personal reference, function as possessive determiners or as possessive proforms. Only the former were found in our data. Unlike personal pronouns, possessives are equally frequent in both corpora (in Texts Q there were 38 instances, corresponding to 5.6% of all ties, and in Texts T 39 cases, equalling 5.7% of all ties).

In text proper there seems to be no quantitative difference (the ratio being 0.011). In direct speech, however, possessive pronouns are more frequent in quality newspapers (0.024 in Texts Q as opposed to the ratio of 0.0184 in Texts T), which is the reverse situation compared to personal pronouns.

Although in text proper there is no contrast in frequency of possessive determiners, their usage exhibits one notable difference: 16% of Q possessive pronouns are used as cohesive devices par excellence, their antecedent not occurring within the same sentence. This usage, that is, possessives with antecedents outside the sentence, does not appear in the T texts. It could, therefore, be claimed tentatively that tabloid newswriting does not use possessives as a cohesive device.<sup>9</sup> This phenomenon is possibly attributable to a ‘higher style’ of quality newspaper writing because the interpretation of a possessive whose antecedent is not present in the same sentence requires more processing.

#### Demonstrative reference

Demonstrative reference is a kind of verbal pointing and can thus be used to refer anaphorically to entities in the text or portions of text.

Demonstrative pronouns can be used both as determiners and as proforms.<sup>10</sup>

In tabloids, demonstratives as determiners only appeared in direct speech, and their reference had been originally exophoric, e.g. “... returned to this country”, “... in this constabulatory”. This process resembles first and second person pronouns in that the reader has to find out what the demonstrative refers to. In all examples the referent can be found in the immediately preceding text. In texts T, the demonstrative was often used to introduce a more general word, such as *this operation*, *this evil*, which refer to a larger portion of text and are close to the use of demonstratives as proforms. This usage was not found in the Q texts.

Demonstratives functioning as a proform appear only in quoted direct speech (there is one instance of reported indirect speech: *He said this would be illegal*): “*This is sensible.*”, “*This was absolutely unacceptable...*”, “... in doing that he...”

<sup>9</sup> Overall, 24% of all possessives in Texts Q have their antecedent outside the sentence, while in Texts T it is only 13%.

<sup>10</sup> For the number of occurrences, cf. Figure 1.

None has an NP as its referent, all have clausal antecedents or they refer to a larger portion of text.

The fact that demonstrative proforms are not numerous in texts proper could possibly be related to the character of newswriting in that full NPs are preferred in the retaking of topics. The explanation of their use in quoted direct speech can be found in the fact that they usually directly follow and often they literally repeat the contents of the passage and the demonstrative can be easily interpreted. Again, the fact that they do not appear in the text, but only in direct speech points to the fact that newswriting does not favour “empty” NPs, instead it uses repetition with elaboration.<sup>11</sup>

### *The*

“The definite article has no content. It merely indicates that the item in question IS specific and identifiable; that somewhere the information necessary for identifying is recoverable.” (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 71) Where is this information to be sought? Again, either in the situation or in the text. In newswriting, in some cases, the identification of whether the article is anaphoric or situational appears to be distinct from fiction or conversation. The reason for this “difficulty” is the above mentioned activated framework the reader has and the knowledge of the real world (in fiction the referent can be traced down, in conversation the speaker’s assumptions about the hearer’s knowledge can be readily adjusted). In newswriting, however, beliefs may differ between the writer and the reader and therefore local coherence may also be subjective. “Propositions may cohere for the writer but not for the reader. This is crucial in the analysis of news discourse, in which vast amounts of social and political knowledge and beliefs are presupposed by the journalist ... discourse does not have coherence, but is assigned coherence by language users.” (van Dijk 1988a: 62)

For example, the occurrence of *Tony Blair — the Prime Minister* cannot be automatically treated as anaphoric definite article unless we know that they share the same referent (*the* could be exophoric). It would be interesting to study mechanisms that allow the correct interpretation even for readers who do not have this prior knowledge. (In our data, these cases are treated as an anaphoric use of the article.)

Anaphoric use of definite articles with antecedents in the text is more numerous in the T corpus (in Q texts there were 82 instances, 12% of all ties, in T set 109 instances, 16%). A more detailed analysis would be needed to account for these differences. Also, as we saw in the case of the demonstrative pronouns, definite articles can refer to a clause or a large portion of text, when they determine a general noun or a noun that is used to summarize the situation (*the deal, the situation*).

<sup>11</sup> *That* is usually treated as having an NP as its referent or a clause or a large portion of text. Nevertheless, it can refer only to a part of NP: *Prince Harry has glandular fever — called the kissing disease because that is how it is usually passed on. where that* is an anaphoric device (pronominal), referring only to a part of the whole NP *the kissing disease*, namely *kissing*. This instance is an example of how flexible English is in allocating items that are cohesive into different syntactic positions. The flexibility is due to the morphological and/or syntactic neutrality of lexical items (*kissing* can be a modifier as well as a syntactic noun or a participle).

### Demonstrative adverbs

There are four of these (*here, there, now* and *then*), although *now* is rarely cohesive. In our data, a demonstrative adverb as a cohesive device occurred mostly in tabloid writing — 8 instances found both in quoted speech as well as in text proper.<sup>12</sup> We can tentatively assume that quality newswriting does not make use of demonstrative adverbs as cohesive devices, possibly because this discourse type disfavours the use of ‘empty’ NPs (this is ‘against’ the top-down nature of the news discourse since an elaboration on the facts that are presented is usually preferred and also due to the discontinuities in the text).

**Comparative reference** sets up the relation of contrast. Comparison was not encountered in the data, which can be probably attributed to the cyclical character of newswriting — it restates the facts rather than relates them to some preceding facts.

### Substitution and ellipsis

Another type of anaphoric cohesive relation is substitution and ellipsis, which can be regarded as variants of the same type of cohesive relation (cf. Halliday 1994: 317, Halliday and Hasan 1976). No instance of this cohesive device appears in the data, except the ellipses of the subject in sentences containing clauses with identical subjects. (This usage could be disregarded as a cohesive device because the tie occurs within a sentence). Both texts display a similar proportion of omitted subjects — cf. Figure 1.

The absence of ellipsis and substitution can also be viewed as specific to news discourse. The genre makes scarce use of these devices because of the low information load they convey. We have seen that entities are picked up, elaborated and extended, to provide more information through modification or use of synonyms or more specific items. (If substitution and ellipsis occurred in newswriting, it would probably be in quoted direct speech but not in text proper. However, larger data would be needed to support this claim.)

### 2.1.2 LEXICAL DEVICES

Grammatical classes of cohesive ties share the property of being all anaphoric, i.e. they are all ways of repeating. This is also true of much of the category that Halliday and Hasan (1976) label *lexical cohesion*.<sup>13</sup> Under this heading they include a variety of semantic relationships that can exist between lexical items, clustering them into two broad subclasses: *reiteration* and *collocation*.

As its name suggests, it is the reiteration category that is concerned with repetition, and it covers a range of ways in which one lexical item may be understood to conjure

<sup>12</sup> The only instance found in quality newspapers was present in quoted speech.

<sup>13</sup> According to HOEY (1991): the crucial point seems to lie in the fact that grammatical devices (reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction) are markers of textual relations, while the various types of lexical reiteration are in the first place types of *lexical* relation and only secondarily markers of textual relation.

up the sense of an earlier item. Most obviously (but also, as we shall see, most frequently), a lexical item exactly repeats an earlier item. Alternatively, an item may be in the relation of synonymy with an earlier item, or it can be reiterated by a word with more general (or more specific) meaning.<sup>14</sup>

These relations were classified as repetition, synonymy, superordinate term, subordinate term and proper names<sup>15</sup>.

It has been mentioned that the two discourse types differ in the number of lexical cohesive devices they employ. Figure 1 shows that quality newspapers employ more lexical devices than tabloid writing: in Texts Q there were 445 instances and in Texts T 369 cases (66% and 52%, respectively, of all cohesive ties).

### Repetition

A simple repetition of a lexical item is the most frequent type of reiteration — 287 (65%) of all lexical devices identified in Q texts and 221 (60%) in T texts.

The most frequent case of repetition is a *verbatim* repetition of an item in the same phrasal form — an NP is repeated as an identical NP.

However, other patterns also occur.<sup>16</sup> The following table lists other possible occurrences of repeated items as they were identified in our data:

Repetition	Q(uality)		T(abloid)	
		%		%
L1a	129	44.9	86	38.9
L1b	44	15.3	42	19
L1c	25	8.7	19	8.6
L1d	34	11.8	22	10
L1e	5	1.7	0	0
L1f	12	4.2	19	8.6
L1g	14	4.9	16	7.2
L1h	24	8.4	17	7.7
	287	100%	221	100%

Fig. 3

L1a: item reappears *verbatim*

L1b: a lexical item reappears in the modifier function with a head realized by a lexical item which is discourse new (*police — police officers*). This process is supposedly highly productive in the news writing because it allows the 'top-down' elaboration. Compared to the opposite direction L1c, the assumption was that L1c should be less frequent in news writing than L1b because of lower information load (L1b: 15–19%, L1c: 9% of all repeated items).

<sup>14</sup> The boundary between reiteration by superordinate and reiteration by general word is extremely fuzzy.

<sup>15</sup> Proper names could be regarded as a simple repetition, but in my view they behave differently in some respects.

<sup>16</sup> An interesting explanation of how lexical repetition contributes to coherence is found in TYLER's article where she claims that mere lexical repetition is not significant unless it serves a certain purpose: "One way of establishing that a new lexical item should be treated as being synonymous with an established lexical item is repetition of modifying words and phrases which were previously associated with the established lexical item." (TYLER 1994: 685)

L1c: a lexical item which was a modified head reappears as a head, but without a modifier (*the family friend — the friend*).

L1d: a potentially very interesting category because it combines two items that had appeared independently in the preceding discourse and could have the effect resembling chain interaction.

L1e: another combinatory possibility in which an item which was a modifier, is now a head and is modified by an element which is discourse new (1.7% in Q and 0% in T texts).

L1f: an item was a modifier and now is a head and is not modified (4.2% in Q texts and 8.6% in T texts).

L1g: an item reappears with a modifier, before it had none, modifier is discourse new (4.9% in Q, 7.2 in T).

L1h: the same item reappears with a different modifier: (8.4% in Q and 7.7% in T).

42% of all cohesive links in Texts Q are repetitions, in Texts T they represent 32% of all links. News discourse often employs not a simple repetition of an item (*I saw a man. The man ...*), but repetition of items in different syntactic positions within an NP, which might be, in some cases, compared to chain interaction (as described in Hasan 1984). The strategy of combining various items, or of adding extra modifiers (or heads) seems to serve well the goal of providing more information in the direction 'top-down', allowing a more detailed specification in the lower stage (e.g. *police — police officers, model — top-model*). 55% of all repeated items in the Q set and 61% in the T set are repetitions which occur in different syntactic configurations, basically with modifiers or as modifiers.<sup>17</sup>

As has been mentioned, 45% of repeated items (19% of all links) in Texts Q and 39% (12% of all links) in Texts T reappear repeated with no modification. The majority of the repeated lexical items, however, reappear in a different environment.

Another type of lexical reiteration is what Halliday (1994) termed **grammatical metaphor**. This category contains lexical items that are morphologically related (e.g. *allegation — allegedly* or nominalizations *sb. accused sb. of st. — the accusation*). Although nominalization phenomena are potentially very efficient in cohesion,<sup>18</sup> they do not occur in our data. Other types of grammatical metaphor account for 5.4% of all lexical ties in Texts Q and 4.9% in Texts T.

**Synonyms** as cohesive devices differ from the preceding type of reiteration in that synonymy as such is a problematic concept (cf. collocation) when we want to express the extent of its usage in numbers. However, there is a difference in the amount of

<sup>17</sup> In using the NPs that are paraphrases it is possible to "provide the reader with additional glimpses at the veiled object under discussion, in the hope that multiple peeks will allow the listener to establish a closer approximation of the image in the speaker's mind." (TYLER 1994: 685). — "Once an interpretation is established, the lexical item is repeated not just because the speaker remains on topic — ... — but because using the lexical item with the established interpretation cuts down on the risk of the listener assigning a different interpretation to the lexical item than that established by the speaker. Used in this manner, lexical repetition may also reduce the amount of processing ... However, ..., paraphrase is also valued." (TYLER 1994: 686).

<sup>18</sup> This observation brings about a whole range of questions of how cohesion is achieved through morphological (word-formation) and/or syntactic processes, such as nominalizations. Besides the purely lexical aspect of word-formation process, grammatical metaphors allow stylistic variation and make it possible to refer to contents of clauses from different points of view. This phenomenon contributes markedly to text cohesion.

synonyms used in both discourse types: synonyms are more frequent in quality writing (7.4% of all cohesive devices in Q texts and 2.4% in T texts). This result can again be correlated with the more elaborate style of quality newspaper writing.

A similar difficulty as with synonyms is encountered in determining the amount of **superordinate and subordinate terms**. However, in this respect, the two sets of data do not differ dramatically. The assumption that can be derived from the 'more general to more specific' organization of information would suggest that subordinate lexical items should be used frequently. Nevertheless, these cases are hard to determine because in some cases the reiterated subordinate item is subordinated in the system of the English lexicon as such, and in many other cases the subordination follows from the real world situation.<sup>19</sup> The same applies to superordinate items, because many of these fall into the grey area between their use as generic terms on the one hand and as synonyms on the other. They can also be compared to the means of substitution (they can potentially refer to a part of text) or demonstrative reference (in combination with a definite article). I considered only cases where they had a noun as an antecedent. A separate category could be formed by nouns whose function is to summarize (*the deal, the operation, the ...*). This summarizing function definitely plays an important role in text-forming. In our analysis these items were disregarded (with the exception of the definite article).

The last category subsumed under lexical cohesion (reiteration) contains **proper nouns**. This group is treated separately for various reasons: proper names behave differently with respect to the use of other anaphoric devices, such as articles; their reference could be considered as exophoric (although we are not interested in reference at this point), etc. The dilemma of how to deal with proper names can be illustrated by the following identity chain: *Harry<sub>1</sub> — he — Harry<sub>2</sub>* (the index signals the order of appearance). These items are members of an identity chain, where the tie between *Harry<sub>1</sub> — he* is a grammatical one. But what is the nature of the relationship between *he* and *Harry<sub>2</sub>*? It is not cataphoric because *he* is anaphoric to the first *Harry*. It is not lexical either. It could be understood as a grammatical relationship based on identity of reference and proper nouns could thus be treated as other NPs, i.e. as employing a grammatical device to express referential identity, in this case a null article. On the other hand, the interpretation of *Harry<sub>n</sub>* is not dependent on *he*, therefore we should not consider this item as a cohesive tie. It is not possible to interpret the second *Harry* automatically as having the same referent as the preceding pronoun. Therefore the relationship that holds between the two is based on identity of reference, which is not signalled grammatically. Also, there are constraints on how close *Harry<sub>1</sub>* and *Harry<sub>2</sub>* can stand (definitely not within one sentence — cf. the binding theory).

<sup>19</sup> The relations between items in newswriting could be in many cases analysed in terms of the relationship *whole — part*.

We may view the phenomenon as a much simpler mechanism: the reader has already established an identity for a referent named *Harry* and unless indicated otherwise, all *Harrys* in the text are interpreted as the same person. This would suggest that there is no cohesive tie between *he* and *Harry* and no tie even between *Harry<sub>1</sub> — Harry<sub>2</sub>* (we do not need to recur to the previous *Harry* for the interpretation of the next one).

Relexicalization (repetition of the same subject in various forms) is plentiful in proper names and it would be interesting to compare the two sets of data. The assumption is that proper names in tabloid writing are modified more frequently (because this type of writing is more judgmental). The following identity chains illustrate some examples of this process, which serves the 'top-down' elaboration and information unfolding: e.g. *Cherie Blair — Cherie Booth — the PM's wife — Cherie*; or *Jordan — mega-boobs model Jordan — the 34 ff star — Jordan, 24 — Jordan, real name Katie Price — Katie — Jordan*; or *Blair — Tony Blair* etc.

The role of proper names in the discourse of news media is a special one. They may be viewed as contributing to text coherence, though not based in the text itself, but rather as a general principle of a coherent account of the relationships in the real world.

We can assume that the news genre relies more than fiction on the readers' knowledge of the world for interpretation of the participants. This also depends on the subject matter. If an article is about a prominent politician whose life is discussed often, then the writer can introduce entities and rely on their "exophoric" identification. In fiction, on the other hand, everyone has the same starting point and therefore the entities are interpreted as dependent on other elements in the text. Often, it is the whole context of a situation that provides clues for the identification of participants. However, cohesion is only concerned with textual clues.

### 3. Conclusion

Although the concept of cohesion is more complex than mere itemizing of the cohesive ties in a text, this analysis of cohesive devices in the two types of news discourse (British quality and tabloid articles) suggests that the number of cohesive devices that occur in this text type is constant and could potentially be a manifestation of some property of a discourse type (e.g. together with chain characteristics). In order for this to be determined, more data and data representing other genres need to be examined.

On the other hand, each of the types seems to prefer different kinds of cohesive devices (there are more lexical ties in quality newspapers than in tabloids). A qualitative rather than quantitative approach should be applied to account for the differences in the use of pronouns, articles, demonstrative adverbs or synonyms. Our results indicate that different genres display different patterns of cohesion.

The use of particular cohesive devices can, to some extent, be correlated to the overall organizational character of newswriting, which can be described as having a 'top-down' character and as being thus an example of a non-narrative text (e.g. absence of ellipsis and substitution, no use of demonstrative proforms with NP antecedents,

patterns of repetition or relexicalization, the mechanism of frequent reiteration, which may well be taken as a form of compensation for some internal disorganization, etc.). Analyses of other types of discourse would be necessary to determine which of these tendencies are significant and truly characteristic of newswriting.

### References

- CRYSTAL, D. (1997), *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Blackwell.
- DUSZAK, A. (1991), "Schematic and topical categories in news story reconstruction." *Text* 11 (4), Walter de Gruyter, pp. 503–522.
- HALLIDAY, M.A.K. and R. HASAN (1976), *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- HALLIDAY, M.A.K. (1994), *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- HASAN, R. (1984), "Coherence and Cohesive Harmony" in James Flood (ed.), *Understanding Reading Comprehension*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association, pp. 181–219.
- HAWES, T. and S. THOMAS (1996), "Rhetorical uses of theme in newspaper editorials." *World Englishes*, vol. 15. No. 2, pp. 159–170.
- HOEY, M. (1991), *Patterns of Lexis in Text*. Oxford University Press.
- Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Longman 1999.
- MARTIN, J.R. (2001), "Cohesion and Texture" in D. Shiffrin, D. Tannen and H. Hamman (eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Malden, Mass: Blackwell, pp. 35–53.
- PARSONS, G. (1996), "The development of the concept of cohesive harmony" in *Meaning and form: Systemic functional interpretations (Meaning and choice in language: Studies for Michael Halliday)*. Ed. by M. Berry, Ch. Butler, R. Fawcett & G. Huang, N.J. Norwood: Ablex, pp. 585–99.
- TABOADA, M. (2000), "Cohesion as a Measure in Generic Analysis" in A. Melby and A. Lommel (eds.), *LACUS Forum XXVI*. Fullerton, C.A.: The Linguistic Association of Canada and the United States, pp. 35–49.
- TYLER, A. (1994), "The role of repetition in perceptions of discourse coherence." *Journal of Pragmatics* 21, pp. 671–688.
- VAN DIJK, T. (1988a), *News as Discourse*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- VAN DIJK, T. (1988b), *News Analysis — Case Studies of International and National News in the Press*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.

### Prostředky koheze v novinovém zpravodajství

#### Résumé

Studie porovnává prostředky textové koheze ve dvou typech novinových článků (britských 'quality' a 'tabloid'). Překvapivým výsledkem je stejný počet kohezních prostředků v obou souborech dat. Kvalitativně se ovšem kohezní prostředky v obou typech diskurzu liší. Kromě porovnání dvou různých stylových žánrů (různých společenských kontextů) analýza kohezních prostředků vyskytujících se v novinových článcích také částečně umožňuje charakterizovat vlastnosti a strukturu tohoto typu nenarativního textu.