

Grammatical Cohesive Devices in English

Ning Fang

Shandong Institute of Commerce and Technology, Shandong, 250103, China

ABSTRACT. *Cohesion, one of the most important elements in constituting texture, occupies a significant position in text analysis. Consequently, an analysis of cohesion is of great significance for a thorough and correct understanding of a text. Halliday and Hasan outline a model of cohesion, in which reference, substitution, and ellipsis, conjunction are placed under the category of the grammatical cohesion. This thesis will analyze grammatical cohesive devices. First of all, it will have a brief introduction of text linguistics. Then it will illustrate some basic concepts in discourse analysis: text, discourse, texture, coherence, cohesion. And then, it will explore grammatical cohesive devices: reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction, and their definitions, classifications and functional realization.*

KEYWORDS: *Cohesion, Reference, Substitution, Ellipsis, Conjunction*

1. Introduction

Text linguistics was first put forward in 1967 by H. Weinrich, a German linguist but the development of text linguistics as an independent discipline occurred in the 1970s. From then on, a number of scholars have been concerned of the related topics.

De Beaugrande and Dressier (1981) propose seven defining characteristics of a text, which they call seven standards of textuality. They are intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality, intertextuality, cohesion and coherence.

Texture, put forward by Halliday and Hasan (1976:2) expresses the property of "being a text". They take the view that the primary determinant of whether sets of sentences do or do not constitute a text depends on cohesive relationships within and between the sentences.

Cohesion is the most useful constituent of discourse analysis or text linguistics applicable to translation. Cohesion is the network of lexical, grammatical and other relations which provide links between various parts of the text. Halliday and Hasan categorize five general kinds of cohesive devices that signal textual coherence: reference, ellipsis, substitution, lexical and conjunctive cohesion. Cohesion is the surface relation, it connects together the actual words and expressions that we can see and hear.

Coherence is a network of relations which organize and create a text and the network of conceptual relations which underlie the surface text. These two concepts concern the way stretches of language are connected to each other. In the case of

cohesion stretches of language are connected to each other by virtue of lexical and grammatical dependencies.

The two most important standards of textuality---cohesion and coherence---are distinct from each other but share one crucial characteristic; they both have the function of binding the text together by creating sequences of meanings.

2. Basic Concepts

2.1 Text

2.1.1 The Concept of Text

With regard to what a text is, a number of authors have been concerned to provide a tighter, more formal account of how speakers of English come to identify a text as forming a text (e.g., de Beaugrande&Dressier,1981; Halliday&Hasan,1976; Brown&Yule,1983).These authors are concerned with the principles of connectivity which bind a text together and force co-interpretation.

Brown and Yule (1983:190) hold that TEXT is the verbal record of a communicative event.

Beaugrande and Dressler(1981:3)maintain that a TEXT will be defined as a COMMUNICATIVE OCCURRENCE which meets seven standards of TEXTUALITY If any of these standards is not considered to have been satisfied; the text will not be communicative. Hence, non-communicative texts are treated as non-texts.

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976:1),” The word TEXT is used in linguistics to refer to any passage, spoken or written, of whatever length, that does form a unified whole. A text is a unit of language in use. It is not a grammatical unit, like a clause or a sentence; and it is not defined by its size”. “A text is best regarded as a SEMANTIC unit: a unit not of form but of meaning. Thus it is related to a clause or sentence not by size but by REALIZATION, the coding of one symbolic system in another. A text does not CONSIST Of sentences; it is REALIZED BY or encoded in, sentences” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976:2). “This is by far the most comprehensive treatment of the subject and has become the standard text in this area”(Brown& Yule, 1983:190).

2.1.2 Discourse and Text

Discourse is a general term for examples of language use, i.e. language that has been produced as the result of an act of communication. The term” discourse” is used in two ways, firstly, it refers to all aspects of language organization (whether structural or not) that operate above the level of grammar. Then more specifically, it refers to the level of description that concerns itself with the structure spoken interaction. “Discourse” has been used to refer to a dynamic notion---the process of

text production and text comprehension.

There has been a degree of confusion in linguistics over the definitions of "text" and "discourse". For some scholars such as Michael Carthy, the term text and discourse are often used interchangeably to refer to language beyond the sentence, that is to say, the study of any utterance or sentence or set of utterances or sentences as part of a context of use, texts may be spoken or written, and they may involve one more text producers.

Widdowson(1978) proposed the distinction "a text is sentences in combination", in contrast with discourse which is the "use of utterances in combination". The text, like the sentence, is "a structured sequence of linguistic expressions forming a unitary whole", in contrast with discourse which is a far broader "structured event manifest in linguistic behavior.

According to Van Dijk, the difference between text and discourse lies in that the former is a theoretical conception related to a language user's competence while the later is a notion realistically perceived and also related to the user's performance. However, Cook holds that text is the linguistic forms in a stretch of language, whose interpretations do not vary with context, while discourse, as opposed to text is `a stretch of language in use, taking on meaning in context for its users and perceived by them as purposeful, meaningful, and connected' Brown&Yule use the word text as a technical term to refer to 'the verbal record of a communicative act'. Enkvist holds discourse is 'text and its situational context' and text is `discourse without context'.

European traditions and Discourse analysis from Anglo-American traditions but they are doing more or less the same thing. Some use the term text analysis to refer to the study of written discourse and the term discourse analysis to talk about the study of spoken discourse.

2.2 Texture

As for TEXTURE, Halliday and Hasan(1976:2)take the view that "A text has texture, and this is what distinguishes it from something that is not a text.. .The texture is provided by the cohesive RELATION".

The concept of texture is entirely appropriate to express the property of "being a text". A text has texture, and this is what distinguishes it from something that is not a text. It derives this texture from the fact that it functions as a unity with respect to its environment.

There are seven defining characteristics of text, the set of standards which applies to all texts that possess communicative value, i.e. function in, and as, discourse. Each of the seven is essential and failure to comply with any one of them constitutes failure overall; the text which lacks any one of these characteristics is not a text but merely an aggregate of words, sounds or letters.

The "standards" have been proposed in order to answer a number of key

questions which the reader (and translator) will need to ask about a text:

- 1). How do the clauses hold together? (cohesion)
- 2). How do the propositions hold together? (coherence)
- 3). Why did the speaker/writer produce this? (intentionality)
- 4). How does the reader take it? (acceptability)
- 5). What does it tell us? (informativity)
- 6). What is the text for? (relevance)
- 7). What other texts does this one resemble? (intertextuality)

An example is proposed by Halliday & Hasan to show the concept of texture. "Wash and core six cooking apples. Put them into a fireproof dish". It is clear that them in the second sentence refers back to the six cooking apples in the first sentence. The function of them gives cohesion to the two sentences, so that we interpret them as a whole; the two sentences together constitute a text. Or rather, they form part of the same text

A text has features of organization which distinguish it from non-text, that is, from a random collection of sentences and paragraphs. These connections are of several kinds. First, there are connections which are established through the arrangement of information within each clause and the way this relates to the arrangement of information in preceding and following clauses and sentences; these contribute mainly to topic development and maintenance through thematic and information structures. Second, there are surface connections which establish interrelationships between persons and events; these allow us to trace participants in a text and to interpret the way in which different parts of the text relate to each other (cohesion). Finally, there are underlying semantic connections which allow us to "make sense" of a text as a unit of meaning; these are dealt with coherence and implicature.

2.3 Cohesion and Coherence

This section is concerned with the two most important standards of textuality, that is, cohesion and coherence, which have attracted much attention of linguists and translation theorists because of their confusing and complex characteristics. So it is necessary to present those various opinions on cohesion and then distinguish between the two concepts cohesion and coherence.

2.3.1 Different Viewpoints of Cohesion

Cohesion, as one of the most important standards of textuality, plays a significant part in the system of a language. It is worth noting that various linguists have proposed many models of cohesion

Baker (2000:180) maintains that " Cohesion is the network of lexical,

grammatical, and other relations which provide links between various parts of a text. Cohesion is a surface relation; it connects together the actual words and expressions that we can see or hear”.

Roger T. Bell(2001:155) points out that, Cohesion---one of the seven standards of textuality---makes use of formal surface features(syntax and lexis)to interact with underlying semantic relations' or `underlying functional coherence' to create textual unity”. In other words, Bell sees that “Cohesion consists of the mutual connection of components of SURFACE TEXT within a sequence of clauses/sentences; the process being signaled by lexicon-syntactic means” (ibid: 165).

Halliday and Hasan(1976:4)state that” The concept of cohesion is a semantic one;it refers to relations of meanings that exists 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 the two elements, the presupposing and the presupposed, are thereby at least potentially integrated into a text”. Halliday and Hasan(1976)claim that cohesion is realized partly through the grammar and partly through the vocabulary. In other words, cohesion can be classified in to two major types: grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion. The former type includes reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction; the latter one consists of reiteration and collocation.

Beaugrande and Dressler (1981:3)hold that” Cohesion concerns the way in which the components of the SURFACE TEXT, i.e. the actual words we hear or see are mutually connected within a sequence. The surface components depend upon each other according to grammatical forms and conventions, such that cohesion rests upon GRAMMATICAL DEPENDENCIES”. That is to say, grammatical connection between verbal elements within cohesion refers to the text. Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) further discuss cohesion within closely-knitted units such as phrases, clauses and sentences where cohesion is upheld by fitting elements into short-range grammatical dependencies, and within long-range stretches of text where the major operation is discovering how already used elements and patterns can be re-used, modified and compacted via devices such as repetition, substitution, omission, and signaling relationships. We can tentatively call “cohesion within the range of a clause”, clausal cohesion, and “cohesion between sentences” textual cohesion. It is textual cohesion that is of our concern in this thesis.

2.3.2 Distinction between Cohesion and Coherence

“Cohesion and coherence are text-centered notions, designating operations that direct at the text materials” (de Beaugrande&Dressier, 1981:7). As two most important standards of textuality, they share one crucial characteristic: “Both have the function of binding the text together by creating sequences of meanings” (Bell,2001:164).In spite of this common property, they are quite distinct from each other.

According to Beaugrande and Dressler(1981:4),”Coherence 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". Baker (2000:218) expresses his opinion on cohesion and coherence like this:

Like cohesion, coherence is a network of relations which organize and create a text: cohesion is the network of surface relations which link words and expressions to other words and expressions in a text, and coherence is the network of conceptual relations which underlie the surface text. Both concern the way stretches of language are connected to each other. In the case of cohesion, stretches of language are connected to each other by virtue of lexical and grammatical dependencies. In the case of coherence, they are connected by virtue of conceptual or meaning dependencies as perceived by language users.

Hoey (1991:12) sums up the difference between cohesion and coherence as follows: "We will assume that cohesion is a property of the text and that coherence is a facet of the reader's evaluation of a text. In other words, cohesion is objective, capable in principle of automatic recognition, while coherence is subjective and judgment concerning it may vary from reader to reader". So it is clear that "cohesion is the surface expression of coherence relations, that it is a device for making conceptual relations explicit (Baker, 2000:218).

It is generally accepted that the mere presence of cohesive markers cannot create a coherent text; cohesive markers have to reflect conceptual relations which make sense. The following example quoted from Enkvist(1978,cited in Baker,2000:218) is a good case in point, showing that a piece of text heavily loaded with cohesive markers is actually incoherent in meaning at all. For example:

I bought a Ford. The car in which President Wilson rode down Champs Elysees was black. Black English has been widely discussed. The discussion between the president ends last week. A week has seven days. Every day I feed my cat. Cats have four legs. The cat is on the mat. Mat has three letters.

In the above example, in spite of the presence of both the grammatical cohesive devices and the lexical cohesive devices, readers cannot normally make sense of the stretches of language because of its lack of the continuity of sense between the sentences. Therefore, Baker (2000: 219) claims that "The main value of cohesive markers seems to be that they can be used to facilitate and possibly control the interpretation of underlying semantic relations".

3. English Grammatical Cohesive Devices

Halliday and Hansan(1976) identify five main cohesive devices in English: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. Of all these, reference, substitution, and ellipsis are placed under the category of grammatical cohesion. Conjunction is on the borderline of grammatical cohesion and lexical

cohesion. It is “mainly grammatical, but with a lexical component in it”(Halliday & Hasan, 1976: 6). For the sake of convenience, conjunction is also included in the category of grammatical cohesion, which fall into the research cope of the present paper.

3.1 Reference

This section mainly focuses on the first type of grammatical cohesion-reference, which is “a relation between meanings.

3.1.1 Reference Defined and Classified

In Halliday and Hasan's model of cohesion, reference is used in a similar but more restricted way. “Instead of denoting a direct relationship between words and extra-linguistic objects, reference is limited here to the relationship of identity which holds between two linguistic expressions” (ibid.:181).

Halliday and Hasan(1976:31)state that” There are certain items in every language which have the property of reference, in the specific sense in which we are using here; that is to say, in stead of being interpreted semantically in their own right, they make reference to something else for their interpretation”..”It is the specific nature of the information that is signaled for retrieval that characterizes reference as a form of grammatical cohesion. In the case of reference, the information to be retrieved is the referential meaning, the identity of the particular thing or class of things that is being referred to; and the cohesion lies in the continuity of reference, whereby he same thing enters into the discourse a second time” (Halliday&Hasan, 1976:31). Look at the following examples:

(1) Gudrun sat down in silence. Her mouth was shut close, her face averted. She was regretting bitterly that she had ever come back.(DH Lawrence: Women in Love)

(2) Jane I swearing a red hat today. And Mary is wearing the same hast as she is.

In (1), the exact meanings of the possessive determiner “her” in the second sentence and the person pronoun “she” in the third sentence depend on their referent. To interpret them semantically, it is essential to find out the item they refer to in the surrounding text. Here, it is obvious that “her” and “she” both refer anaphorically to “Gudrun” in the first sentence. In (2), the referent of the comparison is in the text. This anaphoric reference is not determined by the structure and therefore, as always, has cohesive function.

3.1.2 Cohesive Function of Reference

Reference items can not be explained in their own right; they direct the reader to look elsewhere to for their interpretation, where their interpretation depends on the context of situation, the reference is said to be exophoric; where their interpretation depends upon the surrounding text, the reference is said to be endophoric, which includes anaphoric reference (referring to a thing in the preceding text) and

cataphoric reference (referring to a thing in the following text).

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976:18), "Exophoric reference is not cohesive, since it does not bind the two elements together into a text". They further confirm the idea by saying that "Exophoric reference contributes to the CREATION of text, in that it links the language with the context of situation; but it does not contribute to the INTEGRATION of one passage with another so that the two together form part of the SAME text. Hence it does not contribute directly to cohesion"(1976:37). Endophoric reference takes on cohesive function because reference item presupposes the existence of referent, and its specific meanings should be identified in the preceding or the following part of the text.

3.1.3 Types of Reference

In English, reference items can be classified into the following three types: personal reference, demonstrative reference, and comparative reference.

3.1.3.1 Personal Reference

"Personal reference is reference by means of function in the speech situation, through the category of PERSON" (Halliday & Hasan, 1976:37). "The category of personals includes the three classes of personal pronouns, possessive determiners (usually called possessive adjectives), and possessive pronouns" (ibid.:43). In the system of person, first and second person forms do not normally refer to the text at all; their referents are defined by the speech roles of speaker and hearer, and hence they are normally interpreted exophorically by reference to the situation. Only the third person is inherently cohesive, in that a third person form typically refers anaphorically to a preceding item in the text. For example:

(3) Mr. Bingley was good looking and gentleman like; he had a pleasant countenance, and easy, unaffected manners. His sisters were fine women, with an air of decided fashion. (Jane Austen: *Pride and Prejudice*)

In (3), the pronoun "he" and the possessive determiners "his" both refer anaphorically to Mr. Bingley. Both of them are referring back to the fearful man appeared in the preceding text.

3.1.3.2 Demonstrative Reference

"Demonstrative reference is reference by means of location, on a scale of PROXIMITY" (Halliday & Hasan, 1976:37). Demonstrative reference is essentially a form of verbal pointing. The speaker identifies the referent by locating it on a scale of proximity. The demonstratives in English can be classified into normal: "this", "that", "these" and "those"; adverbial: "here", "there", "now" and "then"; and determiner: "the". "In general this, "these" and "here" imply proximity to the speaker; that, "those" and "there" imply distance from the speaker, which may or may not involve proximity to the addressee--the meaning is 'near you, or not near either of us, but at any rate not near me'" (Halliday & Hasan, 1976:58-59). The definite article's function is to "signal definiteness, without itself contributing to the

definition” (ibid: 74). “It merely indicates that the item in question is specific and identifiable; that somewhere the information necessary for identifying it is recoverable either in the situation or in the text. The reference is either exophoric or enophoric”(ibid.:71). For example:

(4) At last we came to the door of a room, and she said, “Go in.” I answered, more in shyness than in politeness, “After you, miss.” To this, she returned:” Don’t be ridiculous, boy; I am not going in.” And scornfully walked away, and--what was worse---took the candle with her. This was very uncomfortable, and I was half-afraid. (Charles Dickens: Great Expectation s)

In (4), there occur two demonstrative reference items “this”, with the first one referring backward to the words spoken by “I”, the narrator (or protagonist) of the novel, and these condone referring back both to the words spoken and to the conduct done, by the young conductress. In this case, the two reference items both imply proximity to the narrator himself, with these condone explicitly carries the narrator's personal feelings.

3.1.3.3 Comparative Reference

“Comparative reference is indirect reference by means of IDENTITY or SIMILARITY” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976:37). According to Haliday and Hasan (1976), comparison is put under the following two categories: general comparison and particular comparison. General comparison is one that is simply in terms of likeness and unlikeness, without respect to any particular property, and is expressed by a certain class of adjectives functioning in the nominal group either as deictic or as epithet and adverbs functioning in the clause as adjunct. Particular comparison is one that is in respect of quantity or quality and is expressed by means of adjectives and adverbs in some comparative form. For example:

(5) Joe's blue eyes turned a little watery; he rubbed, first one of them, and then the other, in a most uncongenial and uncomfortable manner, with the round knob on the top of the poker. (Charles Dickens: Great Expectations)

In (5), the reference item “other” indicates that this is a reference of general comparison. And the meaning of” the other” is to be interpreted by taking” Joe's blue eyes” and “one of them” as the reference point. These comparative reference items make the parts of text closely connected with each other.

3.2 Substitution

This section mainly focuses on the second type of grammatical cohesion— substitution, which is “a relation between linguistic items, such as words or phrases”(Halliday&Hasan,19 76:89).

3.2.1 Substitution Defined and Classified

Substitution, another type of cohesive relation, can be thought of as “the

Grammatical Cohesion in English and Chinese Translation replacement of one item by another” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976:88). Substitution is a relation in the wording rather than in the meaning.” It is a relation between linguistic items, such as words or phrases. In terms of the linguistic system, it is a relation on the lexicogrammatical level, the level of grammar and vocabulary, or linguistic, form” (ibid: 89). Generally speaking, the substitute item has the same structural function as that for which it substitutes.

Unlike reference, the meaning of which can be summarized by the term co-interpretation, indicating that there is a semantic link between the reference item and that which it presupposes and that the interpretation of the reference item depends in some way on that of the presupposed, substitution is a formal relation, in which a form (word or words) is specified through the use of a grammatical signal indicating that it is to be recovered from what has gone before. “The source of recovery is the text, so that the relation of substitution is basically an endophoric one. It is inherently cohesive, since it is the preceding text that provides the relevant environment in which the presupposed item is located” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976:308). From the point of view of textual cohesion, of course, substitution resembles reference in being potentially anaphoric, and hence constituting a link between parts of a text. But substitution is essentially confined to the text because of its being a verbal relation.

From the perspective of information structure, the substitute item replaces old information that has been mentioned before, thus making new information more prominent. At the textual level, substitution also plays an important part in connecting parts of text together because substitution passes contrastive information so as to fulfill its cohesive function. For example:

(6) My axe is too blunt. I must get a sharper one. (Halliday & Hasan, 1976 :89)

This is a typical instance of cohesion through substitution, where the meaning is “a non-identical member of the identical class” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976:307). “one” substitutes “axe” in the given instance, but there is no referential identity between “axe” and “one”. The continuity lies not in the meaning but in the form. In this particular case, the substitute item “one” is a marker to signal that there is some form of redefinition or at least some new specification is to be added to the original one. So generally speaking the substitute item has to be accompanied by some defining modifier. “The process of defining has the effect of repudiating whatever is not carried over in the presupposition relation: the new definition is contrastive with respect to the original one”(ibid: 95).

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), the different types of substitution are defined grammatically rather than semantically and the criterion is the grammatical function of the substitute item. So there are three types of substitution in English, namely nominal substitution, verbal substitution and clausal substitution.

3.2.2 Cohesive Function of Substitution

As a common language phenomenon, substitution occurs not only at the

sentential level but at the textual level as well. At the sentential level, the major function of substitution is to avoid repetition and to play the role of intrasentential cohesion. This, however, does not concern us here in the thesis. What we are most concerned is the cohesive function of substitution at the textual level. Substitution closely connects together the sentences of a text through the index relations between the substitute item and the presupposed. And the occurrence of the, substitute item presupposes the existence of the presupposed. Therefore, the readers have to refer back to the previous text to find out the language elements that have been substituted. In addition, the cohesive function of substitution is also realized through passing contrastive information in the text. On the whole, the vast majority of instances of substitution in question are endophoric and the vast majority of them are anaphoric. Cataphoric or exophoric substitution is fairly rare.

3.2.3 Types of Substitution

3.2.3.1 Nominal Substitution

In English, the most commonly used nominal substitutes are "one", "ones" and "same". The substitute "one/ones" always functions as Head of a nominal group, can substitute only for an item which is itself Head of a nominal group. "one" is used to substitute a singular countable noun that is presupposed and "ones" plural ones. The nominal substitute "one/ones" is always accompanied by some modifying element which functions as defining in the particular context. For example:

(7) These are all Dracula movies.-- Get me some documentary ones.

In (7), "ones" substitutes the plural noun "movies" in the preceding sentence and is also modified by the element "documentary". So in both cases, the original nouns are redefined in some way.

Another nominal substitute in English is "same", which is typically accompanied by the definite article "the". Unlike the substitute "one", which presupposes only the noun Head, "the same" presupposes an entire nominal group including any modifying elements. For example:

(8) --- John's father planted apple trees last year.

---He plans to grow the same this year.

In (8), the item "the same" substitutes the entire nominal group "apple trees" in the preceding sentence.

3.2.3.2 Verbal Substitution

According to Halliday and Hasan(1976:112),the verbal substitute in English is "do". This operates as head of a verbal group, in the place that is occupied by the lexical verb; and its position is always final in the group. Since English has inflectional changes such as number and tense, it is not surprising to see the singular form "does" and the past tense form "did" serve as verbal substitutes in specific context. For example:

(9) —"I see your design, Bingley," said his friend.

—"You dislike an argument, and want to silence this,,

—"Perhaps I do. Arguments are too much like disputes. If you and Miss Bennet will defer yours till I am out of the room, I shall be very thankful; and then you may say whatever you like of me."(Jane Austen: *Pride and Prejudice*)

Here in the above example, "do" substitutes for "dislike an argument and want to silence this" in the previous sentence, and so serves to link the two sentences by anaphora and makes contribution to cohesion within a text.

3.2.3.3 Clausal Substitution

As Halliday and Hasan(1976)point out, clausal substitution is the type of substitution in which what is presupposed is not an element within the clause but an entire clause. And clausal substitution is classified into three types in terms of the environment in which it takes place, namely, substitution of reported clauses, substitution of conditional clauses and substitution of modalized clauses. In each of these three environments it may take either of two forms, positive or negative; the positive is expressed by "so", the negative by "not". For example:

(10) —"Well, you have been crying, Miss Jane Eyre, can you tell me what about? Have you any pain?"

—"N o, sir ."

—"O h! I dare say she is crying because she could not go out with Miss in the carriage," interposed Bessie.

—"Surely not! Why, she is too old for such pettishness."

—"I thought so too; and my self-esteem being wounded by the false charge, I answered promptly, "I never cried for such a thing in my life. I hate going out in the carriage. I cry because I am miserable." (Charlotte Bronte: *Jane Eyre*)

In the above example (10), the reoccur two types of clausal substitution: substitution of a reported clause and substitution of a modalized clause. The positive form "so" substitutes for the clause "She is too old for such pettishness". The modal adverb "surely" is followed by the negative form of the clausal substitute "not", which substitutes for "She is crying not because she could not go out with Miss in the carriage".

(11) We should recognize the p lace when we come to it. -- -Yes, but supposing not: then what do we do? (Halliday& Hasan, 19 76 :13 4)

In (11), the negative form "not" substitutes for the clause "we don't recognize the place when we come to it". It is evident that these clausal substitutes not only contribute to the overall cohesion of the text but also make the text much more concise and succinct.

3.3 Ellipsis

This section mainly focuses on the third type of grammatical cohesion—ellipsis, a special case of substitution, that is, “substitution by zero”, which is also “a relation between linguistic items”(Halliday&Hasan,1976:89).

3.3.1 Ellipsis Defined and Classified

According to Halliday and Hasan(1976:144),ellipsis occurs when something that is structurally necessary left unsaid; there is a sense of incompleteness associated with it. And the essential characteristic of ellipsis is that something which is present in the selection of underlying options is omitted in the structure-whether or not the resulting structure is in itself incomplete. Like substitution, ellipsis is a relation within the text, and in the great majority of instances the presupposed item is present in preceding text. That is to say, ellipsis is normally a anaphoric relation. The difference between substitution and ellipsis is that in the former a substitution counter occurs in the slot, and this must therefore be deleted if the presupposed item is replaced, whereas in the latter the slot is empty(ibid:145). In this issue, ellipsis also defined as substitution by zero and substitution as explicit ellipsis (ibid.:317). So put it in a simple way, ellipsis involves the omission of an item. In other words, in ellipsis, an item is replaced by nothing (Baker,2000:187).

Ellipsis is a very common language phenomenon because it conforms to the economy principle of language use. As this economy principle suggests, in the process of language, people tend to convey as much information as possible with as fewer language units as possible. In other words, on the pre-condition that the communicative functions fulfilled, it is natural for people to arrange language in an economical way. That is because in language communication if the speaker employs economical ways of expression, it will reduce not only the speaker’s burden on coding, but also the hearer's burden of decoding. Leech (1983) regards the economy principle as a significant part of textual rhetoric and demands the use of concise expressions so long as no ambiguity arises.

On the whole, ellipsis corresponds to the general principle of language. Far from accusing difficulties in understanding, it helps improve the efficiency of language, communication instead. Language communication happens in certain context, so it is unnecessary to repeat the shared information provided by the linguistic context and the situational context. From the perspective of information structure, the elements omitted are the given information that can often be inferred from the context and the elements left are new information or important information that the speaker intends to convey. Therefore, ellipsis, on the one hand, makes the language more concise; on the other hand, makes new information become more prominent, and hence better communication effects. In the meantime, because the elements omitted must be found out from the surrounding text, ellipsis thus possesses the function of textual cohesion. For example:

(12) The children had called. Neither of them could make it home again this year for her birthday, though it was her sixty-seventh. She understood, as she always did.

Always had. Always would.(J. Waller: The Bridges of Madison County)

In the above example, the reoccur two elliptical structure “Always had” and “Always would”. Their complete forms are “She had always understood” and “She would always understand” respectively. It is clear that ellipsis across sentence boundaries avoids repetition, gives prominence to new information, and closely connected the sentences within a text.

Halliday and Hasan(1976) classify the English ellipsis into the following three types: nominal ellipsis, verbal ellipsis, and clausal ellipsis. Nominal ellipsis means omission within the nominal group, omission of the head, or of a head with optional modification, or of a nominal group itself. Verbal ellipsis includes lexical ellipsis in which the lexical verb is missing from the verbal group and operator ellipsis which involves only the omission of operator while the lexical verbal ways remain intact.

3.3.2 Cohesive Function of Ellipsis

The elliptical structure is syntactic incomplete to certain extent, but this is does not mean that the elliptical structure is incomprehensible because the hearer can trace the elements omitted from the surrounding text. That is to say, where there is ellipsis, there is a presupposition. The elements that the speaker intends to omit must have already existed in the preceding text. And the hearer has to refer back for the elements omitted to make the elliptical structure complete. It is the presupposition relationship between elliptical structure and the elements omitted that contributes to the textual cohesion.

3.4 Conjunction

This section mainly focuses on the last type of grammatical cohesion— conjunction, which signals relations between chunks of information. The definition, classification and the cohesive function of conjunction are introduced first, and then the differences of conjunction between English and Chinese are discussed in detail.

3.4.1 Conjunction Defined and Classified

According to Halliday and Hasan(1976),conjunction is the fourth and final type of grammatical cohesive device. It does not simply express the anaphoric relation. “Conjunctive elements are cohesive not themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their specific meanings; they are not primarily devices for reaching out into the preceding (or following) text, but they express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse” (ibid.:226). “Conjunction is a quite different type of semantic relation, one which is a specification of the way in which what is to follow is systematically connected to what has gone before” (ibid.:227). To put it simply, conjunction is a way to connect what is to be said with what has already been said before. It involves the use of formal markers to link clauses, sentences and paragraphs to each other. Since conjunctive elements themselves in the discourse have their definite meanings, with the help of these conjunctive

elements, we can understand the semantic relations between sentences and even predict the semantic meanings of the succeeding sentences in logic.

Halliday and Hasan(1976)classify conjunction into the following four types: additive (and, and also, nor, or, or else, etc.), adversative (yet, though, only, but, however, etc.), causal (so, hen, hence, therefore, consequently, etc.), and temporal (then, next, after that, at the same time, previously, etc.).Then later in his book *An introduction to Functional Grammar*, Halliday (1985) adopts a more scientific and systematic classification based on the logical-semantic relations. He classifies conjunction into elaboration, extension and enhancement to improve his earlier one.

3.4.2 Cohesive Function of Conjunction

Conjunctive relation represents certain semantic links between sentences within a text. Some conjunctive relations are explicit by virtue of formal markers and some are implicit by using zero markers. As Hu (2001) points out, in certain cases, a text without any conjunctive elements may be coherent when the logic relations between text elements are clear or necessary information is indicated in the situational context.

For example:

(13) “He is a sweet tempered, amiable, charming man. He can not know what Mr. Darcy is.”

(Jane Austen: *Pride and Prejudice*)

In (13), there is no conjunctive element, but the causal relation between the sentences is very obvious.

4. Conclusion

From the analysis of the grammatical cohesive devices in English, cohesion is part of the system of a language. The potential for cohesion lies in the systematic resources of references, ellipsis and so on that are built into the language itself. The actualization of cohesion in any given instance, however, depends not merely on the selection of some option from within these resources, but also on the presence of some other element which resolves the presupposition that this sets up.

References

- [1] Beaugrande, R. de and Dressler, W. 1981. *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- [2] Brown, G. and Yule, G.1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [3] Cook, G 1989. *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [4] Halliday, M. A. K. and Hasan, R. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- [5] Halliday, M. A. K. and Hasan, R. 1985. *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a social-semiotic perspective*. Victoria: Deakin University Press.