

## ***Cohesion in Texts: A Discourse Analysis of a News Article in a Magazine***

***Asst. Inst. HIND TAHSEEN HAMEED  
Diyala University/College of Education***

This paper aims to analyse an English text from a magazine for the purpose of identifying cohesive elements in text : which type of cohesion is the most substantive contribution to texture ;and whether this type is effective or not.

Texture is created within text when there are properties of coherence and cohesion, outside of the apparent grammatical structure of the text. Cohesion, the most important principle and criterion of textuality, is the connection or the connectedness manifested when the interpretation of one textual element (a word located in one sentence) is dependent on another element in the text (a word usually but not necessarily in another sentence). Cohesion relates to the “semantic ties” within text whereby a tie is made when there is some dependent link between items that combine to create meaning. Halliday and Hasan (1976) identified five different types of cohesion: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. In the five main types of cohesion ,”the interpretation of a discourse element ,is dependent on another element that can be pointed out in discourse.” (Renkema 1993: 40. (

Using the Newsweek article "Ruins With A View" as a basis, the textual aspect of meaning through cohesion will be analyzed. The principles of referencing, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion put forth by Halliday and Hasan (1976) and Bloor and Bloor (1995) will be applied to the article and will be analyzed to demonstrate the relevance of the cohesive elements that are present in texts which contribute to the overall meaning of the text. Understanding how cohesion functions within text to create semantic links could be beneficial to students of English as a second or foreign language to help “decode” meaning.

### *1. Introduction*

Tas (2007:1) believes that as a means of communication texts play a very important role in getting the meaning across others. Having very different types (literary/expressive, scientific/informative and so on) they are expected to meet the expectation of different-purposed readers. In other words, no matter what type it may be, every text ought to address certain receivers who read it for a specific purpose like to get information, to read for fun etc. He (ibid) adds that

This is not the only way texts come into being; namely, an article in a newspaper, a letter in a magazine, a poem of a poet, a road sign, a conversation between two or more people...are all various kinds of texts which serve for different communicative aims. These are produced for a great many receivers. But here lies an important element: how and for what reason these must be produced and received; and what standards they must have in order to fulfill the communicative aims.

These crucial standards for a satisfying text are the seven standards of textuality without which a text will not mean anything to the receiver. One of these standards is cohesion

### *2. Halliday and Hasan's Resources of Textual Cohesion*

The foundations of text linguistics was laid down by Halliday and Hasan's "Cohesion in English" in 1976. Cohesion is defined as the set of linguistic means we have available for creating texture (Halliday and Hasan, 1976:2), i.e., the property of a text of being an interpretable whole (rather than unconnected sentences). Cohesion occurs "where the interpretation of some element in the text 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." (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 4.)

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), the configuration of cohesion constitutes and defines a text. It incorporates the semantic, lexicogrammatical and structural resources of reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion. Halliday and Hasan view cohesion as a semantic relation based on the central notion of presupposition- one element presupposes another which is located somewhere in the text (anaphora or cataphora) or in the context of situation (exophora) and which is essential for text interpretation. Presupposition is realized at three levels: the semantic level (as in the

case of reference) which has the semantic property of definiteness and specificity, the lexicogrammatical level (as in the case of substitution and ellipsis) and the grammatical level as in the case of conjunctions. The three types of reference (ibid: 31-87): personal, demonstrative and comparative involve presupposition- reference is made to specific information items in the text whose retrieval from elsewhere is crucial for interpretation. Personal reference subsumes personal and possessive pronouns. Demonstratives “this” and “that” make reference to extended text. Particular comparison is also referential in the sense that reference is made to a certain standard by which one thing is said to be superior, inferior or equal. Both ellipsis and substitution (ibid: 88-225) presuppose the existence of certain textual elements. Nominal ellipsis presupposes the head noun, verbal ellipsis may presuppose either the lexical verb or the operator and clausal ellipsis presupposes the entire preceding clause. Nominal substitutes “one” and “thing” presuppose a countable noun and function as heads of the nominal group; the lexical item “same” presupposes the entire nominal group. Verbal substitute “do” presupposes the lexical verb and functions as the head of the verbal group. Substitutes “so” and “not” presuppose an entire clause. The conjunctions which are classified into additives, adversatives, causal and temporal also involve presupposition since they make reference to what precedes and less frequently to what follows and “establish linkage as in the case of the cohesive temporal ties “previously”, “afterwards”, and “meanwhile.”

Lexical cohesion which is the fifth resource of textual cohesion in Halliday and Hasan`s model is defined as the cohesion achieved by the selection of vocabulary (ibid: 274). It is classified into two major subcategories: reiteration and collocation, both of which involve presupposition. Reiteration covers repetition- the lexical recurrence of an item- and the use of synonymy or near synonymy, a super-ordinate or a general term. Collocation: lexical cohesion achieved through the association of lexical items that regularly co-occur within and across the sentence boundaries (ibid: 284) is a more open category which includes lexical items that are interpreted in relation to the existence of other lexical items because of: a) their belonging to an ordered series, b) their relevance to the topic or c) their oppositeness.

### *. Principles of Cohesion*

Cohesion refers to the “non-structural text-forming relations” (Halliday and Hasan ,1976: 7). The concept of cohesion in text is related to semantic ties or “relations of meanings that exist within the text, and that define it as a text” (ibid: 4). Within text, if a previously mentioned item is referred to again and is dependent upon another element, it is considered a tie. Without semantic ties, sentences or utterances would seem to lack any type of relationship to each other and might not be considered text. Halliday and Hasan (ibid: 4) refer to this intertextual link as “the presupposing” and “the presupposed”. For example, “Wash and core six cooking apples. Put them into a fire proof dish.”(ibid): The word “them” presupposes “apples” and provides a semantic tie between the two sentences, thus creating cohesion. Cohesion creates interdependency in text.

### *. Reference*

Referencing cohesion functions to retrieve presupposed information in text and must be identifiable for it to be considered as cohesive. In written text, referencing indicates how the writer introduces participants and keeps track of them throughout the text (Eggin 1994: 95). There are two general types of reference: exophoric referencing, which refers to information from the immediate context of situation ,and endophoric referencing, which refers to information that can be “retrieved” from within the text .It is this endophoric referencing which is the focus of cohesion theory.

Endophoric referencing can be divided into two types: anaphoric ,and cataphoric. Anaphoric refers to any reference that “points backwards” to previously mentioned information in text, when the information needed for the interpretation is in the preceding portion of the text. Cataphoric refers to any reference that “points forward” to information that will be presented later in the text, when the information needed for the interpretation is to be found in the part of the text that follows. For cohesion purposes, anaphoric referencing is the most relevant as it “provides a link with a preceding portion of the text” (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 51.)

There are three main types of cohesive references :personal, demonstrative, and comparative. Personal reference keeps track of function through the speech situation using noun pronouns like “he, him ,she, her”, etc. and possessive determiners like “mine, yours, his,

hers”, etc. Demonstrative reference keeps track of information through location using proximity references like “this, these, that, those, here, there, then, and the”. Comparative reference keeps track of identity and similarity through indirect references using adjectives like “same, equal, similar, different, else, better, more”, etc. and adverbs like “so, such, similarly, otherwise, so , more”, etc. (ibid: 37–39.)

### *. . . Personal reference*

Personal reference items are those items which refer to their referents by specifying their function in the speech situation, recognizing speaker ‘first person’, addressee ‘second person’ and other participant ‘third person.’

Halliday and Hasan (ibid) confirm that the first and second person forms in written language are anaphoric when they occur in quoted direct speech. Conversely, a third person form, while typically anaphoric, may refer exophorically to some person or thing that is present in the context of situation.

Halliday and Hasan point out the generalized exophoric use of the personal pronouns (one, we, you, they, and it) in which the referent is treated as being as it were immanent in all contexts of situation. Since the focus of this paper is mainly on endophoric or textual cohesive reference, this exophoric reference will not be discussed here, as it makes no contribution to the cohesiveness of a text.

### *. . . Demonstratives*

Demonstratives, unlike the personal reference items that refer to their referents by specifying their function in the speech situation, are those items that refer to their referents by specifying their location on a scale of proximity. This proximity may sometimes be metaphorical (i.e. it relates to an abstract object rather than a physical object.)

Halliday and Hasan recognize two types of demonstratives: the adverbial demonstratives and the selective nominal demonstratives. The adverbial demonstratives ‘here’, ‘there’, ‘now’, and ‘then’, according to Halliday and Hasan, refer to the location of a process in space or time. They normally do so directly regardless of the location of person or object that is participating in the process. Adverbial demonstratives usually function as adjuncts in the clause. They never act as elements within the nominal group. They have a secondary function as qualifier (e.g. ‘that man there.’)

The selective nominal demonstratives ‘this’, ‘these’, ‘that’, and ‘those’ along with the definite article ‘the’, on the other hand, refer to the location of a person or an object participating in the process.

### *˘ ˘ ˘ Comparative reference*

In this category, Halliday and Hasan recognize two types: general comparison and particular comparison.

### *˘ ˘ ˘ ˘ General comparison*

Halliday and Hasan define general comparison as a comparison in terms of likeness’ and ‘unlikeness’ where two things, for example, are said to be the ‘same/similar’ or ‘different’. This type of comparison is expressed by a certain class of adjectives and adverbs. The adjectives function in the nominal group either as deictic or epithet. The adverbs function in the clause as adjunct.

Halliday and Hasan believe that the likeness between things which is expressed by

the general comparison may take one of the following three forms:

.˘ Identity, where ‘two things’ are the same thing, as in:

[˘]It’s the same cat as the one we saw yesterday.

.˘ Similarity, where ‘two things’ are like each other, as in:

[˘]It’s a similar cat to the one we saw yesterday.

.˘ Difference (non-likeness), which is a combination of the two previous forms, as in:

[˘]It’s a different cat from the one we saw yesterday.

Halliday and Hasan (1976: 78) argue since likeness is a referential property...(and) a thing cannot just be ‘like’; it must be ‘like something’. Hence comparison is a form of reference”. As always the case with references, the referent of the comparison may be in the situation (exophoric) or in the text (endophoric). If it is endophoric, the reference may be backwards (anaphoric) or forwards (cataphoric), and it may be structural or nonstructural (cohesive). In comparison, it is possible for the comparison to be internal, i.e. the likeness is expressed as a mutual likeness without a referent appearing as a distinct entity. In this case the referent is fully determined by the structure and therefore has no cohesive function.

### *Particular comparison*

Unlike the preceding type 'general comparison' that expresses likeness between things, particular comparison means "comparison that is in respect of quantity and quality" (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 77). It is also expressed by means of ordinary adjectives or adverbs. The adjectives function in the nominal group either as numerative (e.g. 'more' as in 'more cards') or as epithet (e.g. 'better' as in 'better cards'). The adverbs function in either of two ways: either as adjunct in the clause (e.g. 'better' as in 'the others performed better') or as sub-modifier, in which case they occur within an epithet (e.g. 'such' as in 'such good cards') or a numerative (e.g. 'so' as in 'so many words'), or within an adjunct (e.g. 'equally' as in 'the others performed equally badly.')

Particular comparison, like general comparison, is also referential. According to Halliday and Hasan in particular comparison there must be a standard of reference by which one thing is said to be 'superior', 'equal', or 'inferior' in quality or quantity. The reference is either exophoric or endophoric. If it is endophoric, the reference is either cataphoric or anaphoric.

### *Substitution*

Whereas reference functions to link semantic meanings within text, substitution differs in that it operates as a linguistic link at the lexico grammatical level. In Bloor and Bloor (1995: 96), substitution and ellipsis is used when "a speaker or writer wishes to avoid the repetition of a lexical item and is able to draw on one of the grammatical resources of the language to replace the item."

Unlike reference, substitution is a relation between linguistic items such as words or phrases. Reference is a semantic phenomenon; substitution, including ellipsis, is grammatical.

Halliday and Hasan (1976: 90) believe that "since substitution is a grammatical relation [...] the substitute may function as a noun, as a verb, or as a clause". Hence they distinguish three types of substitution: nominal, verbal, and clausal.

The three types of classification for substitution identified by Halliday and Hasan : nominal, verbal and clausal, reflect its grammatical function. When something in text is being substituted, it follows that the substituted item maintains the same structural function as the presupposed item. In nominal substitution, the most typical

substitution words are “one and ones” and they substitute nouns. In verbal substitution, the most common substitute is the verb “do” and is sometimes used in conjunction with “so” as in “do so” and substitute verbs. Halliday and Hasan (ibid:125–126) point out that “do” often operates with the reference items “it” and “that” but still have the main function as a verbal substitute because of its grammatical role. In clausal substitution, an entire clause is substituted and though it may seem to be similar to either nominal or verbal substitution, the difference is the presupposed anaphoric reference.

#### ٢.٢.١ Nominal substitution

According to Halliday and Hasan the substitute ‘one’, including its plural form ones’, always functions as head in the nominal group, and can substitute only for an item which is itself head of a nominal group, as in:

[٤] My axe is too blunt. I must get a sharper one.

The substitute ‘one’ in the second sentence substitutes for the noun ‘axe’ in the first sentence. It would be possible to repeat the noun ‘axe’ in the second sentence to read ‘I must get a sharper axe’. Moreover, the substitute ‘one’ assumes the function of the presupposed item.

#### ٢.٢.٢ Verbal substitution

Unlike the nominal substitute ‘one’, which always operates on the nominal group, the verbal substitution operates on the verbal group. It functions as the head of the verbal group, in the place that is occupied by the lexical verb; and its position is always final in the group.

According to Halliday and Hasan, verbal substitution in English language is made by using the verb ‘do’, as in:

[٥] A: You think Joan already knows?

B: I think everybody does.

The verbal substitute ‘does’, in the second sentence, substitutes for the verb ‘knows’ in the first sentence, and so serves to link the two sentences anaphorically. It will be possible if we maintain the verb ‘knows’ in the second sentence to read: ‘I think everybody knows.’

Moreover, the verbal substitute ‘do’ can also substitute for a verb plus certain other elements in the clause, as in:

He never really succeeded in his ambitions. He might have done, one felt, had it not been for the restlessness of his nature.

The verbal substitute ‘done’ in the second sentence substitutes not only for the verb ‘succeeded’ in the first sentence but also all the other elements accompanying the verb in the clause ‘succeeded in his ambitions

‘

### *~ Clausal substitution*

Unlike the two preceding substitution types, nominal substitute ‘one’- which always operates on the nominal group, and verbal substitute ‘do’- which always operates on the verbal group, clausal substitute ‘so’ and the negative form ‘not’ operate on the entire clause, i.e. they do not presuppose a noun or a verb but the entire clause, as in:

- [^]a. Is there going to be an earthquake? - It says so.  
b. Has everyone gone home? - I hope not.

In the above examples, it can be seen that the clausal substitute ‘so’ in the second sentence of example (a) presupposes the whole of the clause ‘there’s going to be an earthquake’, and in (b) the negative form ‘not’ in the second example presupposes the whole of the clause ‘everyone gone home.’

### *~ Ellipsis*

Like substitution, ellipsis is a grammatical rather than semantic relationship, i.e. it expresses the grammatical relation between words, phrases or clauses in a text. Ellipsis is said to be a special case of ‘substitution’, in which an item (or items) is substituted by zero (?-item.)

Though substitution and ellipsis are similar in their function as the linguistic link of cohesion, ellipsis differs in that it is “substitution by zero”.(Halliday and Hasan,1976: 142). Ellipsis refers to a presupposed anaphoric item although the reference is not through a “place-marker” like in substitution. The presupposed item is understood through its structural link. As it is a structural link, ellipsis operates through nominal, verbal and clausal levels. Halliday and Hasan further classify ellipsis in systemic linguistic terminology as deictic, numerative, epithet, classifier, and qualifier.

Halliday and Hasan believe(1976:142 )that although the two cohesive categories, substitution and ellipsis, both express the same relation between parts of a text, they should be treated separately because “they are two different kinds of structural mechanism, and hence show rather different patterns” (1976:142).For them, the notion ‘ellipsis’ is:

[...]something 'left unsaid'. There is no implication here that what is unsaid is not understood; on the contrary, 'unsaid' implies 'but understood nevertheless', and another way of referring to ellipsis is in fact as something understood, where understood is used in the special sense of 'going without saying'..... (Halliday and Hasan: 142)

Halliday and Hasan argue that since language does not function in isolation, i.e. it functions, as text in actual situation of use, there are always some sources available for the hearer/reader to interpret a sentence that is contained in the sentence itself. These sources, which are needed to supplement 'what is left unsaid', are two different kinds: only one of these is associated with ellipsis; i.e. where there is some presupposition in the structure of what is to be supplied. The following examples express this:

[V]Hardly anyone left the country before the war.

In the above sentence there is information left unsaid. In order to interpret it, we should probably want to know whether 'country' meant 'rural areas' or 'national unit'; if the latter, which country was referred to, and whether 'left' meant 'emigrated' or 'went abroad on holiday'; which war; whether 'hardly anyone' referred to the whole population, or a given social or family group; and so on. All this is relevant information to understand this sentence. But there is nothing in the structure of the sentence to suggest that it has been left out. The structure is not such as to presuppose any preceding text.

The notion of ellipsis is not used to refer to any and every instance in which there is some information that the speaker/writer has to supply from his own evidence, but rather to sentences, clauses, etc. whose structure is such as to presuppose some preceding item, which then serves as the source of the missing information.

Like substitution, ellipsis is a relation within the text, and in many instances the presupposed item is present in the preceding text, i.e. ellipsis is normally an anaphoric relation. Occasionally the presupposition in an elliptical structure may be exophoric, i.e. in the context of situation. Halliday and Hasan distinguish three types of ellipsis: nominal, verbal, and clausal.

### . . . *Nominal ellipsis*

Halliday and Hasan define nominal ellipsis as the one which operates on the nominal group. The structure of the nominal group consists of a head with optional modifier. The modifying elements include some which precede the head, known as 'premodifiers', and some which follow it, known as 'postmodifiers'. The former usually consist of a deictic, numerative, epithet, or a classifier, whereas the latter consist of only a qualifier, as in:

[^]These two fast electric trains with pantographs...

The Head of the nominal group is the noun 'trains'. Within the modifier, 'these' has the function of deictic, 'two' numerative, 'fast' epithet, and 'electric' classifier, while 'with pantographs' is a qualifier.

[^]Which last longer, the curved rods or the straight rods?

-The straight ? are less likely to break

### . . . *Verbal ellipsis*

Unlike nominal ellipsis, which always operates on the nominal group, verbal ellipsis, as the name implies, operates on the verbal group. The structure of the verbal group usually expresses its systemic features, i.e. the choices that are being made within the verbal group system, such as:

.^Finiteness: finite or non-finite:

-If finite: indicative or imperative

-If indicative: modal or non-modal

.^Polarity: positive or negative

.^Voice: active or passive

.^Tense: past ,present or future

Halliday and Hasan believe that an elliptical verbal group is one whose structure does not fully express its systemic features; they have to be recovered by presupposition, as in:

[^]What have you been doing? - ? Swimming

In the elliptical verbal group 'swimming', there is only one lexical element, and that is the verb itself 'swim'. The presupposition 'have been swimming' express all the features of the verbal group that is presupposed by the elliptical verbal group: finite, indicative, nonmodal ,positive, active and 'present in past in present.'

### ٢.٣.٣ Clausal ellipsis

Clausal ellipsis is a very complicated relation; there is no clear-cut distinction between verbal ellipsis and clausal ellipsis. The former involves the omission of other elements in the structure of the clause besides verbal ones. Within this context, Halliday and Hasan (1976: 194) state that:

Verbal ellipsis is always accompanied by the omission of the related clause elements, these that are in the same part of the clause as the relevant portion of the verbal group. So in operator ellipsis, where there is omission of the finite part of the verbal group, the subject is also omitted; in lexical ellipsis, where there is omission of the non-finite part of the verbal group, all complements and adjuncts are also omitted.

### ٢.٣.٤ Conjunction

The main cohesive category 'conjunction' involves the use of formal markers to relate sentences, clauses and paragraphs to each other. Conjunction signals the way the writer wants the reader to relate what is about to be said to what has been said before.

This kind of cohesive relation is different in nature from the other cohesive relations; i.e. reference, substitution, and ellipsis. In this context, Halliday and Hasan (1976: 226) say that:

Conjunctive elements are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their specific meanings; they are not primary 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.

Conjunction, as described by Bloor and Bloor (1995: 98) acts as a "cohesive tie between clauses or sections of text in such a way as to demonstrate a meaningful pattern between them", though Halliday and Hasan (1976: 227) indicate that "conjunctive relations are not tied to any particular sequence in the expression."

Therefore, amongst the cohesion forming devices within text, conjunction is the least directly identifiable relation. Conjunction acts as a semantic cohesive tie within text in four categories: additive, adversative, causal and temporal. Additive conjunction acts to structurally coordinate or link by adding to the presupposed item and are signaled through "and, also, too, furthermore, additionally", etc.

Additive conjunction may also act to negate the presupposed item and is signalled by “nor, and...not, either, neither”, etc. Adversative conjunctions act to indicate “contrary to expectation” (ibid: 250) and are signaled by “yet, though, only, but, in fact, rather”, etc. Causal conjunction expresses “result, reason and purpose” and is signaled by “so, then, for, because, for this reason, as a result, in this respect, etc.”. The last conjunctive category is temporal and links by signaling sequence or time. Some sample temporal conjunctive signals are “then, next, after that, next day, until then, at the same time, at this point”, etc.

### *~ ~ ~ Additive Conjunction*

Under this heading ‘additive’, Halliday and Hasan group the words ‘and’, ‘or’ and ‘nor’. They believe that these words are all used cohesively, as conjunctions; and all of them are classified as additive.

All the three, (‘and’, ‘or’, and ‘nor’), may express either the external or the internal type of conjunctive relation. In the additive context there may be no very clear difference between the two; but when ‘and’ is used alone as a cohesive item, as distinct from ‘and then’, etc., it often seems to have the sense of ‘there is something more to be said’, Halliday and Hasan (1976: 235) believe that the typical context for the conjunctive ‘and’ is one in which there is a total or almost total shift in the participants from one sentence to the next, and yet the two sentences are very definitely part of a text, The negative form of the additive relation is expressed simply as ‘nor’, as in ‘nor can I’. Halliday and Hasan believe that besides ‘nor’ there are various other composite expressions with more or less the same meaning ‘or else’ as expansion of ‘or’, According to Halliday and Hasan, the expanded forms with ‘either’ have an additional element of explicitness in them, a sense of ‘and what is more’. This is considered internal because the speaker is using an expression to express his attitude to or evaluation of what he is saying.

Halliday and Hasan (1976: 246) believe that there are specifically some forms of the ‘and’ relation occurring only in an internal sense, for instance, that of ‘there is yet another point to be taken in connection with the previous one’. There are a large number of conjunctive expressions that have just this meaning, e.g.: further, furthermore, again, also, moreover, what is more, etc. These expressions are said to give rhetorical flavor, Under this heading,

additive, Halliday and Hasan include forms such as ‘similarly’, ‘likewise’, and ‘in the same way’. They believe that these forms are related to the additive because of their semantic similarity; the source of cohesion is the comparison of what is being said with what has gone before.

These forms are used by the speaker to assert that a point is being reinforced or a new one added to the same effect; the relevance of the presupposing sentence is its similarity of import to the presupposed one.

### *~ ~ ~ Adversative Conjunction*

Halliday and Hasan believe that the basic meaning of the adversative relation is ‘contrary to expectation’. The source of expectation is either the content of what is being said, or the communication process, the speaker-hearer situation. If it is the former, the cohesion is on the external plane; and if it is on the latter, the cohesion is on the internal plane.

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976: 50), an external adversative relation is expressed in its simple form by the words ‘yet.’

In English, the conjunctions ‘but’, ‘however’, and ‘though’ are very similar to ‘yet’. ‘But’ differs from ‘yet’, in that ‘but’ contains the element ‘and’ as one of its components, whereas ‘yet’ does not. For this reason it is not unusual to find sentences beginning ‘and yet’, but never ‘and but.’

### *~ ~ ~ Causal Conjunction*

According to Halliday and Hasan, the simple form of causal relation is expressed by the words ‘so’, ‘thus’, ‘hence’, ‘therefore’, ‘consequently’, and a number of expressions like ‘as a result (of that)’, ‘because of that’, ‘in consequence (of that)’. All these words and expressions regularly combine with initial ‘and.’

Under the heading of causal relations, Halliday and Hasan include the specific ones of result, reason and purpose. These are not distinguished in the simplest form of expression ; ‘so’, for example, means ‘as a result of this’, ‘for this reason’, and ‘for this purpose’. When expressed as prepositional phrases, on the other hand, they tend to be distinct.

Halliday and Hasan believe that the distinction between the external and internal types of cohesion tends to be a little less clear-cut in the context of causal relations than it is in the other contexts, because the

notion of cause already involves some degree of interpretation by the speaker. The simple forms ‘thus’, ‘hence’, and ‘therefore’ all occur regularly in an internal sense, implying some kind of reasoning or argument from a premise; in the same meaning we find expressions like ‘arising out of this’, ‘following from this’, ‘it follows that’, ‘from this it appears that.’

### *. . . Temporal Conjunction*

According to Halliday and Hasan, the relation between the theses of two successive sentences may be simply one of sequence in time: the one is subsequent to the other. This temporal relation is expressed by words such as ‘then’, ‘and then’, ‘next’, ‘afterwards’, ‘after that’, ‘sequentially’ and a number of other expressions.

Halliday and Hasan believe that the temporal relation may be made more specific by the presence of an additional component in the meaning, as well as that of succession in time.

So, for example, we may have ‘then + immediately’ (at once, thereupon, on which); ‘then +after an interval’ (soon, presently, later, after a time); ‘then + repetition’ (next time, on other occasion); ‘then + a specific time interval’ (next day, five minutes later) and so on.

### *. . . Lexical Cohesion*

Another type of cohesion, coacting with reference to create texture, is lexical cohesion (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). Lexical cohesion is the central device for making texts hang together experientially, defining the aboutness of a text (ibid.)

Lexical cohesion differs from the other cohesive elements in text in that it is non-grammatical. Lexical cohesion refers to the “cohesive effect achieved by the selection of vocabulary” (ibid: 274). The two basic categories of lexical cohesion are reiteration and collocation. Reiteration pertains to the repetition of a lexical item, either directly or through the use of a synonym, a superordinate or a generally related word. Collocation pertains to lexical items that are likely to be found together within the same text. Collocation occurs when a pair of words are not necessarily dependent upon the same semantic relationship but rather they tend to occur within the same lexical environment (ibid: 286). The closer lexical items are to each other between sentences, the stronger the cohesive effect.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) classify reiteration into four types: the same word, a synonym/near-synonym, a superordinate, and a general word. For example, 'a boy' can be replaced in the following sentences with 'the boy' (the same word), 'the lad' (a synonym/near-synonym), 'the child' (a superordinate), and 'the idiot' (a general word) (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 279–80). Meanwhile, they recognize collocation as an important part of creating cohesion in connected text.

Collocation refers to the semantic and structural relation among words, which native speakers can use subconsciously for comprehension or production of a text. They argue the case of collocation as follows:

The cohesive effect ... depends not so much on any systematic relationship as on their tendency to share the same lexical environment, to occur in COLLOCATION with one another. In general, any two lexical items having similar patterns of collocation – that is, tending to appear in similar context – will generate a cohesive force if they occur in adjacent sentences. (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 286)

In its simplest incarnation lexical cohesion operates with repetition, either simple string repetition or repetition by means of inflectional and derivational variants of the word contracting a cohesive tie. The more complex types of lexical cohesion work on the basis of the semantic relationships between words in terms of sense relations, such as synonymy, hyponymy, antonymy and metonymy (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 278–282.)

#### ٢.٤.١) Reiteration

Repetition (often involving reference) occurs when certain words repeat throughout the text, when an expression is paraphrased or a synonym is used.

[١٠] A conference will be held on national environmental policy. At this the issue of salination will play an important role.

Synonymy (often involving reference)

Hyponymy (e.g. relation of “dog” to “dalmatian“

Metonymy (parts vs. whole; superordinate relation)

Antonymy (white vs. black)

General Word (I don't like these things very much. things = such movies)

### *. . . Collocation*

Collocation is the second type of lexical cohesion and deals with the relationships between words on the basis of the fact that these often occur in the same surroundings. By this type of cohesion the readers' background knowledge about the subject in hand plays an important role in the perception of lexical-collocational relationships. These can be text as well as context-bound, which means that words and phrases related in the text do not necessarily relate in any other texts as well.

#### *. Text Analysis of a News Article*

A reprint of the article "Ruins With A View" from Newsweek magazine, is provided in Appendix 1 with line numbers, which is the basis for this text analysis.

Newsweek, a weekly news magazine, covers topics ranging from U.S. affairs to world affairs, society and the arts, business and health. The article appeared in the international edition for September 4, 2001 in the "Europe" section. The article focuses on the changing European countryside due to the "migration" of urban professionals either buying old homes and farms in rural villages as second homes or buying them as primary residences. The style of writing is journalistic and presents facts as well as the advantages and disadvantages of the trend. It was written to be read, therefore much of the relevant information the reader might need is either contained within the text or in supplementary maps, photos, and charts. Overall, the article is informative, entertaining and relatively easy to read. The text is very cohesive, mainly due to lexical cohesion and referencing. As previously stated, cohesiveness in text creates texture and texture is due to the semantic ties that exist between clauses and sentences. Halliday and Hasan (ibid:297) refer to texture in text as either being "tight", which means that there are many cohesive ties, or "loose", which means that there would be fewer cohesive ties, with variances of both in the same text within and across paragraph boundaries. Starting with referencing and finishing with lexical cohesion, the textual analysis will prove that cohesion is an important aspect for creating meaning within text.

### *~ . Reference*

In the article, there were eighteen incidences of personal references, twenty-four incidences of demonstrative references, and five incidences of conjunctive references. Of the personal references, fourteen of them were through the use of personal pronouns and four were “it” references of either facts or things. All of the examples listed in Appendix 2 are examples of anaphoric reference, the most relevant kind of referencing for cohesion within text. All of the examples of personal references cited exist as ties to presupposed participants and occur outside of the referring clause. Halliday attests that this type of referencing is the most cohesive (Halliday 1994: 312). Personal referencing in text acts to keep track of participants throughout the text. For example, in line 7, the “his wife and four children” refers back to Peter Rockwell in lines 5–6. In line 8, the reference “fix them” refers back to line 6 to indicate the stone houses that Peter Rockwell purchased in Italy. In line 11, “they” refers back to the local people in line 10.

Halliday refers to demonstrative referencing as “verbal pointing” to indicate a “scale of proximity” to the presupposed reference (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 57). With regards to the use of “the” as a demonstrative reference, seventeen out of twenty-four demonstrative references were noted. The use of “the”, commonly referred to as a definite article, acts to specifically identify and therefore is “semantically selective” (ibid: 71). Because the text is written, the references are mostly endophoric and in all but one case, anaphoric, which creates a cohesive textual environment. In line 8, “the Rome-based artist” refers back to Peter Rockwell in lines 5–6. In lines 37–38, “the urban migrants” and line 42, “the urban rich”, both refer back to line 27 to identify the urban professionals who are buying up rural properties. In line 51, “the change” refers back to the demographic shift in line 49, which includes the modernizing, mechanizing and enlarging of farms which caused farmers to quit farming after World War II.

There were only five incidences of comparative referencing in the article.

The role of comparative references acts to show similarity or likeness, which in itself, is a referential property (ibid: 78). Of the examples cited, all of them are non-structural and therefore cohesively significant. In line 5, “the newer sounds” compares the traditional

sounds of rural life, that of tractors, cicadas, and cows to the modern sounds of the start-up chime of a computer and the sound of an artist sculpting in lines 1–2. In line 30, “so many British” refers to the 90% increase in the number buying rural properties in France and Italy as compared to a year earlier in lines 28–29.

### *~ . Substitution and Ellipsis*

Substitution and ellipsis are very characteristic features of spoken text and is usually confined to “contiguous passages” (Halliday 1994: 310) but of course exist within written text so that the presupposed reference is not unnecessarily repeated. Because of this anaphoric referencing function, it creates a sense of cohesion throughout the passage. In the article, there was only one notation of substitution. In line 131, “do that” was interpreted to be a substitution for “ask that the church bells not be rung so early in the morning” in line 130. Regarding ellipsis, something is left “unsaid” in the passage and the reader must supply the missing information. Because most cases of ellipsis are anaphoric to something written in a previous clause, the effect is highly cohesive. For example, in lines 16–17, “coming back” refers to line 16 in which the elliptical reference to the children of farmers are returning to the farms that their parents quit. In line 37, “the stampede” can be interpreted as an elliptical reference to the preceding paragraph that conveys the feeling that there is a rush to buy up rural European properties. In lines 115–116, “local employees” refers to the employees of the four high tech companies mentioned in line 114. (See Appendices 1 & 3)

### *~ ~ Conjunction*

Halliday defines conjunction as “a clause or clause complex, or some longer stretch of text, (which) may be related to what follows it by one or other of a specific set of semantic relations” (ibid: 310). In the article, there were nine notations of conjunction. While referencing, substitution and ellipsis are cohesive because of their specific anaphoric references, conjunction is different in that it does not necessarily create a semantic tie with just one part of the text.

Conjunction acts to link meaning across a larger boundary of text. However, in this article, the retrieval of conjunctive information does not require the reader to go back too far in the passage to identify the presupposed reference. For example, in line 2, “But there are other

sounds...” links back directly with the sounds of the tractor, the cicadas, and the cows in the preceding sentence. In line 34, “And developers are buying up the countryside...” links back to lines 27–35 in which “millions of white-collar professionals” are buying up the countryside. Overall, though conjunction functions extremely well to create cohesion in text, it was not used very often in this article. (See Appendices 1 & 3)

### *~ ~ Lexical Cohesion*

Lexical cohesion differs from the other cohesive devices of referencing, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction in that it is a non-grammatical function. Through the use of vocabulary, cohesion exists when ties between lexical items can be identified. In the article *Ruins With A View*, this proved to be the most cohesive element. Whether it was through the different forms of reiteration or through collocation, a clearly identifiable choice of lexical patterns is very apparent. Reiteration refers to the repetition of a lexical item though the repetition may not exactly match the presupposed lexical item. Reiteration can take the form of repetition of the same word or through the use of a synonym, antonym, metonymy, or hyponym. Collocation differs from reiteration in that it refers not to a semantic relationship between words but rather it refers to the tendency of words to “share the same lexical environment” (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 286). In Appendix 4, a general word list is used to generalize the overall patterns of lexical cohesion from the article. Over 21 general categories of lexis were identified.

Of the categories, the largest in terms of quantity of either reiterated or collocated lexis seems to be agriculture, nationalities, countries, regions, communities and temporal expressions. Because of the inexact nature of collocation, some lexical items appear across different categories, depending on their function within the text. For example, “rural” appears in the “communities” category because of its reference to rural communities while it also appears in the “rural” category which includes lexis like rustic, quaint, and hamlet. This categorization is purely subjective.

The first lexical patterns relate to sound. “Drones”, “chirp”, “lows”, “chime”, “chink”, and “snatches of chat” were identified as hyponyms of “sound”. “Summer” was identified to be a collocation of “August heat” which appeared in the previous sentence. “Sculptor” appears

twice within the same paragraph so repetition was the notation. Later, “artist” appears and that was identified to be a hyponym of “sculptor”. Another lexical pattern that sets up the general theme for the article are the agricultural references. “Tractor”, “countryside”, “farms” and “ex-sharecropper” all appear to identify what will become a reoccurring theme throughout the text of the article.

From the lexical cohesion analysis of this article, a very tight pattern of cohesion was identified. The topic of the article, that of urban professionals buying up rural properties in Europe, is clearly organized through the lexical selection. Repetition through synonymous lexical items and collocation is very dominant and creates what Halliday and Hasan call texture in text

### *~ Conclusion*

Cohesion analysis has shown what principles exist that create semantic links within text between sentence and paragraph boundaries. Cohesion in texts creates one kind of texture through the ties that coordinate ideas and experiences and texture is one of the three meta-functions for creating meaning within language. The most often cited type of cohesion is reference. Another type of cohesion which function to create texture, is lexical cohesion. Lexical cohesion is the central device for making texts hang together experientially. Therefore ,the textual analysis proves that cohesion is an important aspect for creating meaning within text.

## References

- Bloor, T. and Bloor, M. 1995. *The Functional Analysis of English*. London: Arnold
- Egins, S. 1994. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Pinter
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, R. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman group Ltd.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold
- Renkema, J. 1993. *Discourse Studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tas, Nedim. (2005). ANALYSIS OF A TEXT FROM A NEWSPAPER.
- Power, Carla. "Ruins With A View: Urban professionals are buying up Europe's rustic properties .And they don't like the smell of pigs." Newsweek magazine. Sep 4, 2001.

### Appendix 1:

#### Ruins With A View

by Carla Power

Newsweek International Edition, September 4, 2001

Urban professionals are buying up Europe's rustic properties.

And they don't like the smell of pigs.

In the August heat on a Tuscan hillside, a tractor drones, cicadas chirp, and the odd cow lows. But there are other sounds of summer in the Italian countryside- the Windows 98 chime as a laptop boots up, the chink of a sculptor's chisel on stone and snatches of chat in English. The newer sounds came after American sculptor Peter Rockwell bought a few 14th-century stone houses abandoned by farmers after World War II. With his wife Cynthia and four children the Rome-based artist started to fix them up as a place for vacations.

The earlier summers felt like camping trips- the houses had medieval plumbing and no electricity. "The local people considered us insane for buying the place," recalls Rockwell. "They were busy building cement things in towns".

Twenty-one years ago the Rockwells were practically the only non-Italians for miles. Today Americans, Britons, and Germans have bought ruins with views all over Tuscany. Wealthier Italians

whose parents quit farms for the cities in the 60's are coming back. Hardscrabble poverty has given way to relative wealth- both international and local. The newsstand in the tiny town near the Rockwells now sells the International Herald Tribune, and the ex-sharecropper down the mountain coolly ticks off the merits of Thailand as a holiday destination.

Globalization has shrunk the world, and that includes the distance

between Europe's countryside and cities. Today the quest for quaint

rubble amid olive groves is practically a rite of passage: a strong economy, new technology and budget air fares have turned the dream

of clean air, cheap wine and a stress-free lifestyle into a reality for

Europe's urban professionals. Millions of white-collar professionals

are buying properties in no-collar zones. In the past year, the number

of Britons buying second homes in France and Italy has risen by 10 percent, according to the Abbey Nationalbank. So many British

have settled in the winegrowing region outside Florence that wags have dubbed it Chiantishire. Germans have purchased 20 percent of the homes on the Balearic island of Mallorca. Americans are thronging to Umbria, Tuscany and Provence. And developers are buying up the countryside to build golf courses, hotels and leisure centers.

The stampede has triggered debates about whether the urban migrants will help or hurt rural Europe. Small-town mayors and shopkeepers argue that new blood from the city boosts the local economy, improves local services and helps preserves local buildings and culture. But others worry that Europe's countryside has become a playground for the urban rich. Countryside advocates

and farmers' unions argue that rich city folk drive up house prices and don't make for a sustainable rural economy. Says Jim Connolly who founded Resettlement Rural Ireland, an organization devoted to repopulating the Irish countryside: "A new summer home is like another nail in the coffin of [a rural] community".

The new urban migrants are reaping the rewards of one of the great

~ demographic shifts of the past century. After World War II, Europe's

~ agricultural sector radically reformed by modernizing, mechanizing and enlarging farms. The change meant a drastic reduction in the need for semiskilled agricultural labor and triggered a mass migration to Europe's cities. Forty years ago one in five people of Europe's labor force worked the land. Today farmers and farm laborers make up a scant 5 percent of the European Union's work force. Those who still work the land rely on subsidies from their governments or the European Union, or turn to agrotourism, catering

~ to visitors who want farm holidays. In Ireland the average farm income during the late 1990s was £11,000, with four in 10 farmers surveyed earning less than £5,000. In Britain, a mere 2 percent of the labor force works the land. In Spain, the Spanish

Environmental

~ Ministry estimates that there are some 3,000 abandoned villages whose residents have given up on farming and moved to cities.

Who

~ will fill all these tumbledown villages in the Algarve or Umbria if not the Brits, Dutch or Americans? Now the middleclass are buying

~ fixer-uppers with three bedrooms for prices that would barely buy a

~ closet in New York or London. "The only problem now is that we don't have enough houses," says Homard Townsend, a real-estate agent in Luberon in the south of France.

~ Urbanites who make a break with the cities encourage others to

~ come. Peter Mayle's "A Year in Provence" lingered at the top of the best-seller lists for months, and Francis Maye's book on fixing up an old villa in Tuscany spawned not only a sequel, but its own desk calendar. Laura Skoler, a New York philanthropist who has been coming to Luberon for the past decade, organizes trips for other Americans keen on discovering Provence- but she doesn't want them all to move there. "I hesitate to bring people here," she says. "It's so wonderful that I want to keep it a secret".

~ The Umbrian hill town of Todi was one secret that spread quickly

~ particularly among Britons and Americans. When New Yorker Laura

~ Richardson came to Todi in 1985, the village shops didn't sell

Kleenex and there were two real-estate agents in town. Five years later there were 14 of them, some whose “offices” were a car and a mobile phone. Many locals obligingly sold up, using the money to move to modern apartments on the outskirts of town. “Today it’s rare that an Italian from Todi could ever get the scratch together to buy where their grandparents lived,” says Richardson.

Paradoxically, it’s sometimes the city folk who may help protect the landscape and culture. Tuscany and Umbria’s strict preservation laws stipulate that if you buy a historic structure, you must restore it faithfully to its original design. Alessandro and Chiara di Paola, a Roman couple who bought a hamlet outside Todi “for nothing”, lovingly restored it; today aging couples come back to see the restoration. In Luberon, Laura Skoler throws bouillabaisse parties. Andrew Currie, a retired British apple farmer, has taken

to giving lectures to local olive growers on cultivation. “[The foreigners] become guardians of the local heritage,” says Roland Baud of SAFER, a French demographic institute. “They take French culture on as their own“.

The tech revolution has also helped skilled professionals move from town to rural areas. High-speed trains mean that money managers can commute daily from jobs in skyscrapers to dream cottages. E-mail lets CEOs send memos from Umbrian hamlets to Manhattan. Some Britons buying second homes in France have taken to bringing their own Sky Television decoders so that they can get their cable favorites.

Pierre Pages of the chamber of commerce in Mende, in the southern French region of Lozere, hopes the Internet revolution will help level the inequities in rural and urban economies. He estimates that around 20 percent of new IT companies won’t

have to rely on urban infrastructures. That’s an encouraging statistic for

regions like Lozere, which, with 14 people per square kilometer has the sparsest population in the country. In the last eight months four high-tech companies have moved from Paris to “The Green Desert,” lured by cheap rents and lovely countryside. Local employees who don’t want to leave the region have a vested interest in the business’s success. Lionel Boudoussier, CEO of the online accounting firm AGT, was born in Lozere and wanted to stay, but moved when he couldn’t find a decent job. After seven

years working in the financial sector in Paris, he took a 50 percent pay cut and moved back to set up his business. Now he does all this work- with 650 clients all over Europe- on the Internet. From his offices outside town, he can see cows.

But as some new migrants have discovered, not all is peaceful in the country. In Britain, some recent migrants have sued farmers over the smell of their pigs, or complained to neighbors about the early rooster's crow. The German expatriates who bought derelict farmhouses by the sea in the Mani region of Greece didn't appreciate

the timing of pieties at the local church. "The Germans in Horioudaki have asked that the church bells stop ringing so early in the morning," complains one Mani resident. "They can do that because they're all German." The locals are quick to fight back. Last year residents on Mallorca passed out pamphlets urging fellow

Spaniards to say "No to German Colonialism" and started an Association

for the defense of Majorca. In 1998 the Balearic Islands' regional parliament passed laws requiring businesses advertising or

labeling products in foreign languages to provide parallel labels in Spanish or Catalan. And earlier this summer environmentalists picketed model Claudia Schiffer's holiday home with CLAUDIA OUT! signs, claiming her villa blocks access to a 16th-century fortress on the Mediterranean.

When big money gets involved, the sense of being colonized by outsiders can become even more blatant. The 4,000 odd golf courses that now dot Europe were frequently built on what was once farmland. In Kinsale, County Cork, developers paid £250,000

for the Old Head, a craggy peninsula jutting off the Irish coast with 200 acres of scrub grazing land and fields. A farmer owned that land and grazed his sheep there, and locals used to freely ramble through the remains of a 13th century castle to the bluffs. Since developers spent millions to create the Old Head Golf

Links

the land is off-limits not only to the ramblers and farmers but to everyone else. It's open only to overseas residents – 90 percent of who are American – who pay \$50,000 for lifetime membership in addition to annual fees. An American flag flies at the main gate and Americans don't even have to change money; the bar takes

dollars. Says fisherman Jerome Lordon, “The developers just swept in with their permits, burned off the heather and dumped tons of soil over all that life and history“.

But even as the old way of rural life fades, there remains a collective memory of the European countryside that won’t seem to die. Even American companies like Disney are working to preserve it. Minutes from the main entrance to Disneyland Paris in the Val d’Europe, the company has underwritten the expansion of nearby hamlets amid rolling cornfi elds and crumbling churches, developments that are scheduled to be home to 38,000 people by 2015. Only minutes from Paris, there ‘s the pastel-pretty “French village” of Apollonia, purpose-built, complete with apartments, town houses, a boulangerie and a Thai restaurant. Anglophiles can opt for “English cottages”; shoppers will soon be able to frequent La Vallee, modeled on villages in the Brie region but housing 70 factory outlets.

Country life, however bowdlerized, seems to suit Jean-Jacques Maillot. “In Paris, it’s metro, boulet, dodo [subway, work, sleep],” says Maillot who has a place in the Disney-spawned development at Serris. Up the street Jean Marx is playing petanque in front of the brand-new house he bought last November. “It’s good to be out of the cite“. He hesitates. “Well, I guess they’ve sort of made a cite here. But it’s more fl at.” Maillot has a point. With more and more city types fleeing for the country, it’s getting harder and harder to tell where the city ends and the countryside begins.

## Appendix 2:

### Referencing Summary

#### Personal references

Line Referenced item	Reference	Line Reference
----------------------	-----------	----------------

his (wife and...)	5-6
Peter Rockwell	
) fix) them	6
stone houses	
us	7
Rockwell family	
they	10
local people	
their (governments)	54-55
farm laborers	
I/she	74
Laura Skoler	
it	75
Luberon	
them	82
real estate agents	
they/their (own)	96-97
the foreigners	
he	107
Pierre Pages	
he	117
Lionel Boudoussier	
his (business)/his (work)	117
Lionel Boudoussier	
his (offices), he	117
Lionel Boudoussier	
they/they're	129
the Germans	
It's (open)	150
Old Head golf links	
) preserve) it	160
countryside	
he	174
Jean Marx	
it's (more flat)	173
Serris	
Demonstrative references	
Line Reference	Line Reference
Referenced item	
the Rome-based artist	5-6
Peter Rockwell	



the cite	172
Paris	
Comparative references	
Line Reference	Line Reference
Referenced item	
the newer sounds	3–5
Windows 98 chime/chink of a ...chisel	
the earlier summers	13
Twenty-one years ago	
So many British	28–29
the number of Britons....	
other Americans	74
Laura Skoler	
it's more flat	173
Serris is flatter than Paris	

**Appendix 3:**  
**Substitution / Ellipsis / Conjunction Summary**

Substitution		
Line Reference	Line Reference	
Substituted information		
do that	130	
ask that the church bells....		
Ellipsis		
Line Reference	Line Reference	
Ellipsed information		
coming back	16	
to the farms they quit		
Hardscrabble poverty	16	
on the quit farms		
the stampede	27–36	
to buy and develop land/property		
not enough houses	66	
fixer-uppers (to buy or sell(		
to come	70	
urbanites (with them...cities(		
the landscape and the culture	entire article theme	
rural Europe/rural villages		

<i>d d</i> their own	98	
culture		
" " ~ " " ~ local employees	114	
of the four high tech companies		
" " <i>d -</i> " " . wanted to stay	118	
in Lozere		
" " <i>d</i> a decent job	118	
in Lozere		
" " ~ discovered	general	
after moving to the countryside		
" " ~ migrants	general	
from urban areas		
" " ~ big money gets involved	general	
in the develop. of the countryside		
" " ~ main gate	150	
of the Old Head golf links		
" " ~ - swept in	145	
to the area		
" " ~ But it's more flat	173	
Serris is flatter than Paris.		
Conjunction		
Line	Reference	Line Reference
Conjunction reference		
But there are...		1-2
a tractor drones, cicadas chirp...		
And developers are...		27-35
Millions of ... professionals...		
But others...		38-39 ...
mayors and shopkeepers...		
Now the middle class...		48-53
The demographic shift... villages.		
Five years later...		80-81
When... in 1985		
Now he does...		119-120
After seven years working...		
And earlier this summer		133-135
Last year.../ In 1998....		
<i>d</i> But even as the old way		general
...migration.. urban professionals		
" " ~ - " " ~ But it's more fl at.		172-173
Serris and Paris		

**Appendix 4:  
Lexical Cohesion Summary**

**)NOTE: Repetition of lexis is due to repetition in the text(.**

**Sounds:**

**drone/chirp/low/chime/chink/snatches of chat/crow/ringing/**

**Ruins:**

**ruins/rubble/derelict**

**farmhouses/abandoned/tumbledown/remains/crumbling**

**Rural:**

**rustic/quaint/rural/rural/rustic properties/stone houses/hamlet/villages**

**Agriculture:**

**farmer/farmer's unions/agricultural sector/agricultural**

**labor/farmers/farm laborers/**

**work the land/work the land/farm income/farmers/farming/apple**

**farmer/olive growers/**

**cultivation/farmers/farmland/rustic/tractor/cow/farmers/cows/pigs/roos**

**ter/work force/**

**farm laborers**

**Holidays:**

**vacations/camping trips/agro tourism/farm holidays**

**Vacation homes:**

**second homes/summer home/dream cottages/second homes/holiday**

**home/villa**

**Nationalities/ people:**

**Americans/Britons/Germans/Italians/Britons/British/Irish/Spanish/Brit  
s/Dutch/**

**Americans/Americans/Britons/Americans/New**

**Yorker/Italian/Roman/British/**

**French/French/Britons/French/German/Germans/German/Spaniards/**

**German**

**Europe/ countries:**

**Europe/France/Italy/Europe/Europe's/Ireland/Europe's/Europe's/Spai  
n/France/France/**

**Britain/Greece**

**Area/ regions:**

**Tuscany/Umbria/Provence/Algarve/Umbria/Provence/Tuscany/Provenc  
e/Umbrian/**

**Tuscany/Umbria/Umbrian/Manhattan/Lozere/Lozere/regions/"The  
Green Desert"**

**region/Lozere/Europe/Mani/Mani/Mallorca/Majorca/the Balearic  
Islands/**

**Cities/ towns:**

Florence/New York/London/Luberon/New  
York/Luberon/Todi/Todi/Todi/Luberon/  
Manhattan/Mende/Paris/Horioudaki/Kinsale

**Buildings:**

houses/villa/farmhouses/second home/dream  
cottages/fortress/castle/stonehouses/  
skyscrapers/villa/

**Purchase:**

buying/buying/buying/buying up/buying/buy/sell/sold up/buy/buy/

**Communities:**

countryside/cites/countryside/rural/small/town/city/countryside/country  
side/cities/  
villages/cities/villages/cities/village/hamlets/rural/urban/urban/countrys  
ide/

outside town/countryside/local/local/local/locals/rural/local  
employees/locals/hamlet

**Temporal expressions:**

today/today/today/after WWII/21 years ago/in the 60's/in the past  
year/after WW

II/past century/forty years ago/for the past decade/in 1985/in the last  
eight months/

earlier this summer/

**Urban people:**

urban professionals/white-collar professionals/no-collar zone/urban  
migrants/

urban rich/rich city folk/new urban migrants/urbanites/city  
folk/migrant/migrants/

expatriates/foreigners/outside/urban migrants/migration/

**Business:**

skilled professional/money managers/CEOs/big money

**Technology:**

tech revolution/high speed trains/email/Internet revolution/IT  
companies/

high tech companies/the Internet

**Economy:**

economy/economy/farm income/middle class/prices/house prices/  
rural and local economies/big money

**Leisure:**

golf courses/hotels/leisure centers/playground/golf courses/Old Head  
Golf Links

**Restore:**

**fix up/fixer-uppers/fixing up/restore/restoration/preserve**

**Family:**

**wife/children/couple/couple/**

**Other:**

**real estate agent/real estate agents/**

**best seller list/book/sequel**

**make a break/move/**

**secret/secret/**

**the quest/discover/discovered/**

**the money/the scratch/big money**

**historic structure/restore/restored/restoration/**

**for nothing/cheap/**

**culture/culture/(cultivation(**

**job/working/pay cut/work/work force/labor force**

**Colonialism/colonized**