TEXTUAL LINKS AS INDICATORS
OF DIFFERENT FUNCTIONAL STYLES

Libuše Dušková

1. The present article is concerned with overt devices of textual cohesion in regard to their capacity for acting as stylistic markers.[1] It aims at showing that textual links differ not only in the representation of the basic types in different functional styles, but that there are also differences in particular items and uses where different styles display comparable representation of the same type of textual link.

Of the different textual links attention is paid to those which are usually treated in hypersyntax, i.e. intersentential ties of a grammatical character.[2] These include devices of coreference and pronominalization (which largely coincide), ellipsis and conjunction, the last being on the borderline between grammar and lexis. Of course, all these points also occur within the sentence, but here they contribute not to textual but to internal sentence cohesion, and hence are left out of account.

1.1. The conception of grammatical devices of textual cohesion is on the whole based on Halliday and Hasan (1976), although no distinction is made between what they call reference (this use of the term is particular to them, the point in question being coreference) and substitution. The reason for treating the two points together is that in practice they largely overlap: both involve a relation between two items, mostly anaphoric between an antecedent and an expression replacing it, prevalently a proform (in the case of coreference the proform may also occur first and point cataphorically forward in the text). They differ mainly in that coreference, apart from proforms, also makes use of definite determiners accompanying noun phrases which may be related to the antecedent only semantically or pragmatically and expressed by different lexical means, whereas substitution invariably involves pronominalization[3] and need not

---

[1] For the concept of stylistic markers, see Enkvist (1964, pp. 41-43) and (1973, pp. 122-126).
[2] For a contrastive treatment of this point in English and Czech, see Dušková (1984).
[3] In Halliday and Hasan (1976, p. 310) the term pronominalization is confined to personal reference within the sentence, which is the usual conception of pronominalization in generative transformational studies. Pronominalization is here regarded as an obligatory process, which presumably hinders the use of the term to refer to the same process across sentence boundaries, where it becomes optional. In textlinguistic literature pronominalization is largely included among the points treated within the framework of a text grammar (cf., e.g., Rieser, 1978; Kuno, 1978).

necessarily be coreferential. There is also a difference in the possibility of repeating the antecedent, which is largely confined to substitution, while in the case of coreference it is an exception rather than the rule (especially within the sentence, cf. Quirk et al., 1985, pp. 863-864).

1.1.1. Accordingly, the first stylistic marker under study is found in endophoric uses of personal pronouns and other substantival proforms (*one, the former, the latter*), possessives, demonstratives (both as determiners and as pronouns), other determiners (the definite article, *such*) and verbal, predicative, clausal and adverbial proforms (*do; do/be so; this, that, it; there, then, here*).

1.1.2. The second stylistic marker is constituted by ellipsis, which is conceived as an incomplete structure derived from a complete structure according to language-specific rules. In other words, ellipsis arises by rule-governed omission of certain elements which are present in the context and can be uniquely recovered. The underlying complete structure coexists alongside the elliptical one.[4] For example, [M: *Did you sleep well?*] X: *Would you expect me to* (sleep well)?[5] (Bond, p. 8)

Ellipsis is to be distinguished on the one hand from unfinished fragmentary sentences like [A: *I warn you.*] *I'll ...* [N: *Go on. Go on.*] (Ayckbourn, p. 30-31), which are not subject to linguistic rules, being due to extraneous factors such as strong emotion, interruption, etc., and on the other hand from utterances lacking regular sentence structure but complete in themselves, without the possibility of being uniquely "filled in" by some missing elements, e.g., *yes, no, all right*, vocatives, greetings, interjections, as well as instances like [S: *Norman.*] N: *What?* [...S: *Will you try ... not to start any more scenes or arguments?*] N: *Me?*[6] (Ayckbourn, p. 32).

1.1.3. As regards the third stylistic marker, conjunction, the present analysis is restricted to what is termed conjuncts in Quirk et al. (1972, pp. 520-523; 1985, pp. 631-647). Conjuncts represent a class of sentence adverbials with the function of conjoining different independent units, in this case sentences or larger stretches of the text. At the same time they explicate the semantic relation obtaining between the two units. Syntactically, conjuncts are distinguished from other (sometimes homonymous) adverbial elements of the sentence by standing outside its structure (i.e. they are not integrated into the syntactic relations of the sentence).

1.2. The three stylistic markers were investigated in four samples of text representing two functional styles, informal conversation (samples C_1 and C_2) as reflected in two contemporary plays, and scientific writing (S_1 linguistics and S_2

---

[4] This conception essentially corresponds to what is termed standard ellipsis in Quirk et al. (1985, pp. 885-889). Another clear type of ellipsis, represented by instances like (I) *Can't find either of them* (Ayckbourn, p. 38). (Did) *Somebody call?* (Ayckbourn, p. 37), does not fall within the scope of the present study, since it is confined to intrasentential structure.

[5] The context of the point being demonstrated is presented in square brackets. The omitted elements in an elliptical sentence are added, unitalicized, in round brackets.

[6] For a more detailed treatment of irregular sentences and nonsentences, see Dušková (1991).

psychology) (see Samples). The temporal span of the samples does not exceed ten years, all four having first appeared between 1972 and 1982.

The first point to arise was a measure of length so that comparable stretches of text might be obtained for subsequent analysis. Considering the aim of the present study, intersentential cohesion as a stylistic marker, a measure that readily presents itself is the number of sentences. However, even a cursory glance at the two kinds of samples shows that the units constituting conversation and scientific writing are very different. While the latter consists almost exclusively of regular sentences, the former contains a considerable number of what Quirk et al. (1985, pp. 838-853) call irregular sentences and nonsentences, of the kind illustrated in 1.1.2. Consequently, recourse was taken to the number of words, determined so as to provide at least a hundred sentences, which results in samples of 3,500 words each.

2. The distribution of regular sentences, irregular sentences and nonsentences is shown in Table 1. The column "regular sentences" presents the number of sentences with regular sentence structure, delimited by an initial capital letter and final full stop. That is, colons and semicolons were regarded as intrasentential punctuation marks. It is worth noting that in scientific writing semicolons are fairly common (21 in S_1 and 19 in S_2, the respective number of colons being 4 and 2). On the other hand in the two conversation samples these punctuation marks are almost entirely lacking (there is only 1 colon in C_1).

The conception of ellipsis, unfinished sentences and nonelliptical irregular or nonsentence structures has been explained in 1.1.2.

2.1. The figures in Table 1 show that scientific writing and conversation differ both in sentence length and in sentence structure. The former is characterized by a much greater sentence length, the average number of words per sentence in S_1 being 33.9 and in S_2 26.1 as compared with 6.9 in C_1 and 6.0 in C_2. As regards sentence structure, scientific writing appears to be much more homogeneous insofar as it is composed almost exclusively of regular sentences; the eight nonsentence structures are found only in headings of sections (e.g., *Introduction, Iconic Memory, Text and Meaning*, etc.). In conversation, on the other hand, the percentage of irregular sentences and nonsentences appears to be considerable (14.5 in C_1 and 35.3 in C_2).

2.2. Table 2 shows the overall distribution of the three stylistic markers in the four samples. In both functional styles the most frequent cohesive tie is coreference and substitution (76.1% in scientific writing and 69.3% in conversation). Ellipsis ranks second in conversation (20.9%) but last in scientific writing (1.5%), the order of conjuncts being also reversed: 22.4% in scientific writing and 9.8% in conversation.

2.2.1. The greatest difference is found in the representation of ellipsis, which appears to be characteristic of conversation, all occurrences except 4

115

(i.e. 95.7%) being provided by the conversation samples. Moreover, there is a basic difference in the type of ellipsis found in S_1 on the one hand and in C_1 and C_2 on the other hand. All instances of ellipsis in scientific writing represent ellipsis within the noun phrase of the following kind: [...*selections in these three areas of meaning potential.*] *The ideational* (area of meaning potential) *represents the potential of the system for the speaker as an observer* (Halliday, p. 127). Apart from the elliptical noun phrase, the four sentences listed under ellipsis in Table 2 have regular sentence structure; therefore, they do not appear in the column of elliptical sentences in Table 1. On the contrary, in the instances of ellipsis in conversation elliptical construction mostly results in irregular sentence structure, regardless of whether the ellipsis occurs in the utterance of the same speaker or in the response of his interlocutor, cf. [*I'll be glad when you've all gone home.*] *I really will* (Ayckbourn, p. 30). [R: *It's not your back, is it?*] S: *Not at the moment* (Ayckbourn, p. 34). On the whole, ellipsis in conversation is slightly more frequent in responses than in utterances of the same speaker (47 as against 41 instances).

2.2.2. The devices of coreference and substitution are presented in Table 3.

The figures for verbal and adverbial proforms are too low to allow generalization, but even so, the occurrence of *here* in scientific writing alone is presumably not incidental. It should be pointed out that *here* is listed among adverbial proforms on formal grounds, its typical function in scientific writing being to refer summarizingly to a stretch of text, e.g., [*Consider a traditional story as it is told by a mother to her child at bedtime.*] *Here the context of situation is on two levels* (Halliday, p. 125). Similarly the occurrence of verbal proforms only in conversation appears to indicate at least a tendency for this point to characterize conversation rather than scientific writing.

A major difference between conversation and scientific writing concerns exophoric vs. endophoric use of forms that have both these functions. Although exophoric uses have not been registered because of having no cohesive force, each item had to be considered with respect to qualifying or not qualifying as a textual link. In conversation many exophoric uses are found among demonstratives and adverbs with primary deictic function, e.g., *You want these mats?* (Ayckbourn, p. 34) *You go up the end there* (Ayckbourn, p. 38). *She lives down here now* (Bond, p. 6). Similarly *this evening, this house*, etc. There is also exophoric reference by personal pronouns,[7] e.g., [*Norman goes to the door and passes Reg coming in. 'Evening, Reg, old sport'. Norman slaps Reg on the back and exits.*] Reg: *What's up with him?* (Ayckbourn, p. 33) Here *him* refers exophorically to Norman.

---

[7] The correctness of the exophora/endophora distinction drawn by Halliday and Hasan has been (at least partly) questioned by Brown and Yule (1987, pp. 199-201), who suggest that "the processor 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" (pp. 200-201). The complexity of the endophora/exophora distinction in the present study appears mainly in instances which are vague in this respect.

In scientific writing, on the other hand, exophoric reference is rare. Apart from instances like *This chapter* (Coltheart, p. 64) there is exophoric use of *one* referring to the general human agent: ... *if one is focussing attention on the text* (Halliday, p. 127).

Moreover, there are also differences in endophoric uses of pronouns and determiners. In scientific writing *he* and *his* are often used to refer to a generic person regardless of sex, e.g., to nouns like *subject, speaker, child.*

Another typical feature of scientific writing is clausal reference by *this* (25 occurrences in S_1 and S_2 as against 2 in C_1 and C_2), e.g., *Nevertheless, they could report virtually all the items in the indicated row. This showed conclusively that* ... (Coltheart, p. 65). Where the same stretch of text is referred to twice, the first reference is made by *this*, the second by *it: What may be happening is that the subject begins to process all the material as soon as possible, but when the cue occurs he switches to the cued material and selectively processes it. This is not consistent with von Wright's observation, but it is consistent with the results of* ... (Coltheart, p. 67).

A similar pattern is found in consecutive reference to a noun phrase: *Are these* (= Hymes' categories) *to be thought of as descriptive categories ...?Or are they predictive concepts providing a means for ...?* (Halliday, p. 129) This pattern presumably reflects the diminishing degree of prominence of the content being referred to.

On the contrary, in conversation clausal reference is predominantly realized by *that* and *it* (38 and 41 occurrences, respectively), cf. S: *No, I don't hate you, Norman.* N: *Thank you. Thank you for that, at least* (Ayckbourn, p. 32). *You've resigned yourself as if you were meeting fate. It's not like you* (Bond, p. 10).

The reference of *it* is occasionally vague: it is not clear what exactly is being referred to, whether the preceding context, or a part of it, or the situation of utterance, e.g., [R: *You've not got the shakes again, have you?* S: *You ought to know me by now, Reg. I can't bear these sort of atmospheres* ... R: *Well, sit down. Have a rest for a second.* S...: *How can I possibly sit down?* R: *All right, stand up. Suit yourself.* ... S: *We're going to need two more chairs.* ... R: *All right, I'll look for chairs. Don't worry, keep calm.*] *It'll be all right* (Ayckbourn, p. 34).

Compare also the explicit enquiry about what is being referred to: [A: *Oh, yes, they* (= the chairs) *fell to bits... Everything does that in this house. Wood worm or old age.* R: *You should get that treated.*] A: *Old age, you mean?* (Ayckbourn, p. 34) There is an incorrect reference in [R: *Somebody's saucepan seems to be getting rather agitated out there.*] S: *Did you turn it down?* (Ayckbourn, p. 35) The second speaker obviously refers to the burner of the gas ring on which the contents of the saucepan are cooking.

Almost all examples of coreference in the four samples represent anaphoric relation. An example of cataphora occurs in C_2: *It was rather unfortunate.*

Believe it or not, I was attempting unsuccessfully to give him lessons on how to woo you (Ayckbourn, p. 36). Another appears in S_2 after a colon.

2.2.3. The last point under discussion is summarized in Table 4. With a few exceptions the figures for particular conjuncts are too low to be used as conclusive evidence. The occurrence of a particular conjunct only in one sample is largely incidental (e.g., *consequently* in S_2 and not in S_1, *hence* in S_1 and not in S_2, *otherwise* only in C_1, but there are 4 occurrences in S_2 after a semicolon, etc.).

The only safe conclusion to be drawn is that conjuncts are more characteristic of scientific writing than of conversation, which is due to the character of scientific communication: the need for clarity and unambiguousness calls for explicit expression of all relevant semantic relations, including intersentential ones.

The distribution of conjuncts in the four samples presented in Table 4 largely confirms the stylistic characteristics assigned to particular conjuncts in grammars and dictionaries (e.g. *nevertheless, hence, consequently* formal, *anyway, well, on top of everything* informal; *so* and *also* appear in both sets of material).

The most frequent conjunct in conversation *well* (16 occurrences) is a polyfunctional device whose conjunctive function awaits detailed investigation. In Quirk et al. (1972) it is treated as an initiator distinguished from, and hence not included among, conjuncts (p. 274). In Quirk et al. (1985), however, it does receive the status of conjunct (p. 635-636, 1469-1470). Similarly *of course* is presented only as an attitudinal disjunct in Quirk et al. (1972, p. 675).

2.2.4. As regards the density of the cohesive ties under study the absolute figures are higher for conversation than for scientific writing (420 and 264, respectively). However, if we consider the number of sentences in the four samples, even if limited to that of regular sentences, we find higher density in the two scientific samples. Table 5 shows the density of cohesive ties to be more than twice higher in scientific writing than in conversation (1.15 as against 0.52 cohesive ties per sentence). This is again a consequence of the character of scientific communication.

In both sets of samples a cohesive tie usually refers to the sentence that immediately precedes (in conversation it may also involve a change of the speaker). Occasionally, however, there are one or two intervening sentences, e.g., *... you may not even care for the man. You've never really said one way or the other. We've always assumed you and Tom, Tom and you. Presumably you wouldn't have him round here at all if you didn't* (care for him) (Ayckbourn, p. 36).

The distribution of the ties is partly uneven in that a sentence may have more than one tie, e.g., *However, in attempting to find such an explanation ...* (Coltheart, p. 65). [X: *Are the telephones working?* D: *Yes.*] X: *They didn't two*

years ago (Bond, p. 6). On the other hand all samples contain passages without the grammatical cohesive ties under consideration. For example:

A: *Where am I sitting?* S: *You're here, Tom. Sit here.* R: *Annie, you should be sitting here. You are the hostess* (Ayckbourn, p. 38).

It is characteristic of the adult language system that the text it engenders is not tied to the immediate scenario as its relevant environment. The context of situation of a text may be entirely remote from what is happening around the act of speaking or writing (Halliday, p. 125).

3. The results of the foregoing tentative probe may be summarized as follows. Grammatical cohesive ties, coreference and substitution, ellipsis, conjuncts, have considerable capacity for indicating functional style. While ellipsis appears to characterize conversation, conjuncts are more frequent in scientific writing. Coreference and substitution display differences mainly in the means of clausal reference and in the treatment of sex distinctions. The density of cohesive ties appears to be significantly higher in scientific writing, which is presumably due to the character of scientific communication. The lower density of grammatical cohesive ties in conversation is in turn probably connected with frequent occasion for exophoric reference.

References

BROWN, G. – YULE, G. (1987): *Discourse Analysis,* Cambridge.
DUŠKOVÁ, L. (1984): "A Contrastive View of Grammatical Means of Textual Cohesion", In: *Linguistica* X, *Text and the Pragmatic Aspects of Language,* Ústav pro jazyk český, Prague, pp. 141-162.
DUŠKOVÁ, L. (1991): "An Attempt at a Classification of Irregular Sentences and Nonsentences", *Prague Studies in English* 19, *Acta Universitatis Carolinae - Philologica* 1, pp. 71-81.
ENKVIST, N. E. (1964): "On Defining Style", In: *Linguistics and Style,* London, pp. 1-56.
ENKVIST, N. E. (1973): *Linguistic Stylistics,* the Hague–Paris.
HALLIDAY, M. A. K. – HASAN, R. (1976): *Cohesion in English,* London.
KUNO, S. (1978): "Generative Discourse Analysis in America", In: W. U. Dressler (ed.), *Current Trends in Textlinguistics,* Berlin–New York, pp. 275-294.
QUIRK, R. – GREENBAUM, S. – LEECH, G. – SVARTVIK, J. (1972): *A Grammar of Contemporary English,* London.
QUIRK, R. – GREENBAUM, S. – LEECH, G. – SVARTVIK, J. (1985): *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language,* London.
RIESER, H. (1978): "On the Development of Text Grammar", In: W. U. Dressler (ed.), *Current Trends in Textlinguistics,* Berlin–New York, pp. 6-20.

Samples

A. AYCKBOURN (1975): *The Norman Conquests, Table Manners* (Act II, pp. 29-40), London.
E. BOND (1982): *Summer and Fables, Summer* (Act I, pp. 1-14), London.
M. COLTHEART (1980; 1st ed. 1972): "Visual Information Processing", In: *New Horizons in Psychology* 2, Harmondsworth (pp. 64-72).
M. A. K. HALLIDAY (1975): *Learning How to Mean – Explorations in the Development of Language* (pp. 123-131), London.

Table 1

	Regular sentences		Irregular sentences and nonsentences									Total	
			elliptical sentences		unfinished sentences		other irregular or nonsentence structures		total				
	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%	
S_1	100	97.1	--	--	--	–	3	2.9	3	2.9	103	100	
S_2	129	96.3	–	–	–	–	5	3.7	5	3.7	134	100	
total	229	96.6	–	–	–	–	8	3.4	8	3.4	237	100	
C_1	430	85.5	28	5.6	2	0.4	43	8.5	73	14.5	503	100	
C_2	372	64.7	60	10.4	16	2.8	127	22.1	203	35.3	575	100	
total	802	74.4	88	8.1	18	1.7	170	15.8	276	25.6	1,078	100	
total	1,031	78.4	88	6.7	18	1.7	178	13.5	284	21.6	1,315	100	

Table 2

	Coreference and substitution		Ellipsis		Conjuncts		Total	
	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%
S_1	85	73.9	4	3.5	26	22.6	115	100
S_2	116	77.9	–	–	33	22.1	149	100
total	201	76.1	4	1.5	59	22.4	264	100
C_1	178	80.5	28	12.7	15	6.8	221	100
C_2	113	56.8	60	30.2	26	13.0	199	100
total	291	69.3	88	20.9	41	9.8	420	100

Table 3 Coreference and substitution

		S_1		S_2		total		C_1		C_2		total		total	
		abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%	abs.	%
substantival proforms	personal pronouns	21	4.3	12	2.4	33	6.7	105	21.4	50	10.1	155	31.5	188	38.2
	possessive pronouns	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	0.2	–	–	1	0.2	1	0.2
	demonstrative pronouns	8	1.6	1	0.2	9	1.8	1	0.2	6	1.3	7	1.5	16	3.3
	one	1	0.2	–	–	1	0.2	4	0.8	–	–	4	0.8	5	1.0
	the former the latter	2	0.4	–	–	2	0.4	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	0.4
coreferential determiners	demonstrative	14	2.9	33	6.7	47	9.6	4	0.8	2	0.4	6	1.2	53	10.8
	definite article	8	1.6	54	11.0	62	12.6	10	2.0	2	0.4	12	2.4	74	15.0
	possessive	5	1.0	2	0.4	7	1.4	11	2.2	1	0.2	12	2.4	19	3.8
	such	5	1.0	2	0.4	7	1.4	1	0.2	–	–	1	0.2	8	1.6
clausal proforms	*this*	16	3.3	9	1.8	25	5.1	1	0.2	1	0.2	2	0.4	27	5.5
	that	–	–	–	–	–	–	15	3.1	23	4.7	38	7.8	38	7.8
	it	2	0.4	1	0.2	3	0.6	17	3.5	24	4.9	41	8.4	44	9.0
verbal proforms	*do*	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	0.2	4	0.8	5	1.0	5	1.0
	be / do so	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	0.4	–	–	2	0.4	2	0.4
adverbial proforms	*here*	3	0.6	2	0.4	5	1.0	–	–	–	–	–	–	5	1.0
	there	–	–	–	–	–	–	3	0.6	–	–	3	0.6	3	0.6
	then	–	–	–	–	–	–	2	0.4	–	–	2	0.4	2	0.4
total		85	17.3	116	23.5	201	40.8	178	36.2	113	23.0	291	59.2	492	100.0

Table 4 Conjuncts

		S_1	S_2	total	C_1	C_2	total	total
concessive	*however*	3	9	12	–	1	1	13
	on the other hand	–	2	2	–	–	–	2
	nevertheless	–	1	1	–	–	–	1
	yet	–	–	–	1	–	1	1
	in any case	1	–	1	–	–	–	1
	anyway	–	–	–	2	1	3	3
resultive	*thus*	–	8	8	–	–	–	8
	consequently	–	1	1	–	–	–	1
	therefore	1	2	3	–	–	–	3
	hence	1	–	1	–	–	–	1
	so	3	–	3	2	2	4	7
	now	–	1	1	–	–	–	1
	of course	–	–	–	1	–	1	1
appositional	*in other words*	3	–	3	–	–	–	3
	for example	1	–	1	1	–	1	2
	that is to say	–	–	–	1	–	1	1
	in particular	–	1	1	–	–	–	1
enumerative	*first of all*	1	1	2	–	–	–	2
	firstly	–	1	1	–	–	–	1
	at first	1	–	1	1	–	1	2
	in the first place	2	–	2	–	1	1	3
	secondly	1	2	3	–	–	–	3
	in the second place	1	–	1	–	–	–	1
	thirdly	–	1	1	–	–	–	1
	later	1	–	1	–	–	–	1
reinforcing	*also*	2	1	3	1	1	2	5
	furthermore	–	1	1	–	–	–	1
	on top of everything	–	–	–	1	–	1	1
	inferential *then*	–	1	1	1	4	5	6
	otherwise	–	–	–	1	–	1	1
transitional	*well*	–	–	–	2	14	16	16
	now	–	–	–	–	2	2	2
temporal transition	*meanwhile*	1	–	1	–	–	–	1
equative	*in the same way*	1	–	1	–	–	–	1
antithetic	*on the one hand*	1	–	1	–	–	–	1
	on the other hand	1	–	1	–	–	–	1
total		26	33	59	15	26	41	100

Table 5

	Number of regular sentences	Number of cohesive ties	Average number of cohesive ties per sentence
S_1	100	115	1.15
S_2	129	149	1.15
total	229	264	1.15
C_1	430	221	0.51
C_2	372	199	0.53
total	802	420	0.52

Prostředky textové koheze jako indikátory
různých funkčních stylů
Résumé

Článek předkládá výsledky stylistického výzkumu textové koheze, který byl proveden na dvou druzích textu, konverzačním a odborném. Z prostředků textové koheze se výzkum soustředil na elipsu, spojovací prostředky (konjunkty), koreferenci a substituci. Největší rozdíl byl zjištěn ve výskytu elipsy, která naprosto převládá v konverzaci. Naopak konjunkty jsou nejčastější v odborném stylu. Pokud jde o koreferenci a substituci, odborný text se liší od konverzace jednak v prostředcích odkazování na větné a delší úseky, jednak v odkazování na generickou osobu. Hustota prostředků textové koheze je v odborném stylu podstatně vyšší než v konverzaci, což patrně souvisí s povahou odborné komunikace. Ukázaly se též výrazné rozdíly v zastoupení pravidelných a nepravidelných vět a nevětných struktur. Zatímco v odborném textu se vyskytují téměř výlučně jen věty s pravidelnou strukturou, v konverzaci tvoří věty s nepravidelnou strukturou a nevětné útvary čtvrtinu textu.