COHESION AND SEMANTIC UNITY: A COHESIVE ANALYSIS OF THE SELECTED TEXTS BY PAULO COELHO IN TRANSLATION

By

IQRA JABEEN (173-FLL/MSENG/F10)

SUPERVISED BY

Dr. FAUZIA JANJUA

THESIS SUBMITTED

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

FOR THE DEGREE OF

MS

IN ENGLISH

TO

THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY ISLAMABAD

2012

MS
823.009
19C

I English fiction — history and criticism

ii Semantics

iii Theses

Acknowledgement

Bismillahirrohmanirrohim

Praise to Allah Almighty, who has guided and blessed me in completing this research work entitled *Cohesion and Semantic Unity: A Cohesive Analysis of the Selected Short Stories by Paulo Coelho.* Darood and Salam to the prophet Muhammad (S.A.W) who is Rehmat-lil-Alamin.

Firstly, 1 would like to express my sincere gratitude to my very worthy supervisor, Dr. Fauzia Janjua, for providing me with valuable assistance and support all through the processing of this thesis. I am highly grateful to her for the constructive feedback, precious advices and persistent encouragement throughout the planning and progress of my research work. She has been so much kind and cooperative with me that I have no words to thank her goodness.

My sincere appreciation and thanks go to my highly regarded teacher Prof. Muhamamd Athar Ansari, the head of the department of English language and literature, University of Sargodha, for his kind help and moral encouragement. Without his generous support, 1 would not have been able to finish my research work.

I would particularly like to express my love and admiration to my parents for their pray, guidance and true love and my husband for his kind support.

I am truly lucky to have very good friends Aisha Umer , and Amna Khalid Javed who have always been source of inspiration for me.

Abstract

Text analysis describes techniques to unfold functions of language. A text is comprised of linguistic items that form unified whole. For Halliday and Hasan (1976), text is a unit of meaning and it also works as a sample of discourse. Texture is that particular quality of a text which brings cohesive unity in it. Cohesion is the grammatical relation and constitutes a complete set of relationships that denote semantic unity in the text. Whereas a single occurrence of cohesion in text is referred as tie and cohesive analysis of a text is always based on sequential order of its patterning that in turn produce texture. The purpose of this research work is to utilize linguistic principles for making beneficial analysis of text to recognize those non-structural elements which are source of semantic and grammatical unity in the written text. Halliday and Hasan's (1976) taxonomy of referencing, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion was applied on three selected texts by Paulo Coelho to conduct cohesive analysis to show that how cohesive devices in the texts are linking various elements at syntactic and lexical level to transform them into texture that ensures semantic cohesiveness in the discourse. These selected texts have been translated into Standard English by Margaret Jull Costa. Thus these cohesive elements are working within the texts as unity-generating devices and signal cohesion in them. Understanding the function of cohesion in the selected texts would be helpful for students of English as a second or foreign language to interpret the meanings given in the text through "cohesive wholeness".

(Acceptance by the Viva Voce committee)

Title of Thesis <u>Cohesion and semantic unity: A Cohesive analysis of the selected texts by Paulo Coelho in Translation</u>

Name of Student <u>Iqra Jabeen</u>

Registration No. <u>173FLL/MSENG/F10</u>

Accepted by the Department of English language and Literature INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY,ISLAMABAD,in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the master of Philosophy Degree in English with specialization in linguistics.

Viva Voce Committee

_____
Dean

_____
Chairman/Director/Head

_____
External Examiner

_____
Supervisor

_____
Member

21-12-2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of tables

Chapter: I

1.1 Introduction

Text in linguistics refers to any passage of any length, spoken or written, that forms a unified whole. According to Hallidayand Hasan (1976) a text is best regarded as a semantic unit – a unit not of form but of meaning. The semantic cohesion of a text is considered to be a function of its unity.Halliday and Hasan observe that the concept of cohesion is a semantic one and refers to the relation of meaning which exists within text, gives the text texture, and defines the text as text.Texture is that specific quality of a text which transforms it into a semantically cohesive whole.A text can attain semantic and cohesive unity by means of different syntactical and semantic devices.The present study aims to find out the relationship between cohesive devices and semantic unity in a text.

Cohesion is a source of semantic sequence in a text and it is important to see cohesion as a grammatical relationship since it refers to structural substance and lexical relationship and operates on the content within a text or sentence.Halliday and Hasan define cohesion as the meaningful structure which links sentences to form a whole. They maintain that cohesion does not depend on a single item or class and is based on a complete set of relationships in a text which in turn communicate with the help of various overt and covert types of signals to attribute a text its meaningfulness. Cohesion is closely related with coherence because in a text semantic unity can be realized through syntactic linking as well as semantic connections between different paired elements with one presupposing and the other presupposed.Grimes (1975)argues that cohesion is connected with the

1

process of introducing new information while maintaining the sequential link with the previous one too.

Cohesion is a series of clues which signal semantic relationships and unify a text. Halliday and Hasan argue that cohesion occurs in a text when the explanation and interpretation of an element in the text becomes dependent on another element in the same text. The first element, thus, presupposes the other while the other needs to make an effective recourse to the first one to complete the decoding process. In this way both the presupposing and the presupposed elements achieve potential integration into the text and furnish semantic networking.

According to Halliday and Hasan a single occurrence of cohesion or cohesively paired item in a text is called a 'tie'. The present work will attempt to analyze a text in terms of a tie for a systematic account of its patterning which results in a cohesive texture. The primary type of cohesion can be recognized as a correlation between clauses both bound and free whereas the secondary type of cohesion occurs where one element in a given clause corresponds with an element in another clause(O'Toole, 1971).

There are five different kinds of cohesive ties identified by Halliday and Hasan. *Reference* is an affiliation between a linguistic item with another situational and textual item. *Substitution and Ellipsis* occurs, according to Bloor and Bloor (1995), when a lexical item is replaced in writing or communication, without any repetition, with any other available grammatical resource. Substitution and ellipsis are not different in their function as a linguistic link, however, ellipsis differs from substitution in that it substitutes an item with zero(R.Hasan, 1976).*Conjunction* functions as a semantic

cohesive device and function between clauses or different parts of a text to make obvious the semantic patterning(Bloor, 1995). Halliday and Hasan (1976) observe that conjunction is a different type of semantic relation, one which is no longer any kind of search instruction but a specification of the way in which what is to follow is systematically connected to what has gone before. In *Lexical Cohesion*, cohesiveness in a text is achieved through vocabulary selection as it is non-grammatical in its functionality. Further two categories of lexical cohesion are *Reiteration* and *Collocation*(R.Hasan, 1976) .

The present study will employ Halliday and Hasan's theoretical framework to analyze three selected texts by Paulo Coelho to reveal the agglutinating effect of cohesive elements that are responsible for creating semantic unity in a text. The rationale for selecting Paulo Coelho's work is that he is a popular contemporary writer and his work is relevant to the present age.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The present study investigates the nature of semantic unity imparted by linguistics components in a text. The selected texts are analyzed to determine the importance of cohesion as a text forming component. Furthermore, the range of semantic possibilities resulting from the employment of these cohesive devices has also been explored.

1.3 Research Questions

1) What types of cohesive devices are used in the selected short stories of Paulo Coehlo?

2) How these cohesive devices constitute semantic links among the structurally unrelated elements in the linguistic system of a text?

1.4 Delimitation

The study is delimited to three short stories by Paulo Coelho: "In Melbourne", "Looking at others people's garden" and "A visitor arrives from Morocco" from his book "Like the Flowing River". For this purpose, Random selection technique is used in order to give an equal chance to each text in the book.

1.5 Objectives

The objectives of the study are:

- To identify the significance of cohesive devices as non-structural elements constituting semantic unity.

- To discover a relation between grammatical and lexical cohesion to maintain meaningful chronological order in a text.

1.6 Methodology

The present study is explanatory in nature and follows the narrative research method for the cohesive analysis of a text. Halliday and Hasan's Cohesive Device Model (1976) has been applied on the selected short stories by Paulo Coelho.

1.7 Significance of the study

The present study will be significant for interpreting a text in order to develop a better linguistic understanding. It will be beneficial for second language teachers and students of English in understanding multiple meanings of a text. As the selected translated texts meet the standard of English language textuality so the study would also be effective in highlighting the importance of cohesive devices to maintain lexical and grammatical cohesion in the semantic system of a text.

Chapter: II

Literature Review

2.1. Cohesion

Halliday and Hasan define cohesion "as a relationship between two textual elements in which one is interpreted by the other.... Such relationships between words create cohesive "ties" and allow us to differentiate sentences that constitute a "text" from sequences of unrelated sentences" (Bamberg, 1983).

Cohesion is a structural and organizational characteristic of a text. Conventionally, in the written form of a language cohesion devices tie a text's ideas together into a meaningful whole by explicitly stating and repeating the information a reader needs (from the author's perspective) within the text" (Beverly E. Cox T. S., May, 1991). According to Tannen cohesion in writing is achieved "through lexicalization and complex syntactic structures which make connectives explicit, and which show relationships between propositions through subordination and other foregrounding or back grounding devices" while in the spoken form a language cohesion depends upon "para-linguistic and non-verbal channels (tone of voice, intonation, prosody, facial expression, and gesture)" (Tannen, 1982).

2.2 Text and Texture

Halliday and Hasan have defined text as *"a sample of discourse"* which is apparently dependent on another discourse for the understanding of its meaning and function while texture is the characteristic of a text which makes it a unified whole.(Tierney,

1984).Halliday and Hasan (1976) elaborate that "the concept of a text is as intuitively powerful as the concept of a sentence we know when a string of sentences makes a text just as we know when a string of words makes a sentence. However, a text is different from a sentence in kind. A text is not characterized by formal structural properties as is the sentence, and therefore it is not perceived as some kind of "supersentence" with a textual syntax" (ibid..).Commenting on the functionality of texture Halliday and Hasan (1976) maintain that "texture consists of both structural and non-structural text-forming relations. Such non-structural elements may link together sentences within the same paragraph or paragraphs within a larger text, and are often referred to as cohesive signals" (Olshtain, 1980).Carrell observes that Halliday and Hasan (1976) treat properties of discourse as language or linguistic properties purely(Carrell, 1982).

According to Halliday and Hasan(1976:1) "If a speaker of English hears or reads a passage of language which is more than one sentence in length, he can normally decide without difficulty whether it forms a unified whole or is just a collection of unrelated sentences ... We know, as a general rule, whether any specimen of our own language constitutes a TEXT or not ...This suggests that there are objective factors involved there must be certain features which are characteristic of texts and not found otherwise ... We shall attempt to identify these, in order to establish what are the properties of texts in English, and what it is that distinguishes a text from a disconnected sequence of sentences (ibid.).

2.3 Ties

Cohesive ties show a series of relations between thoughts and words woven in a text. Cohesive taxonomy helps a reader understand the meaning of a text through reconnecting

and reintegrating the ideas of a writer.These ties are essential for both oral and written *conversation* as well as *communication*. However, in the written form of language their role is more dominating because of the unavailability of external aids. Cohesive aids are important for the reader to construct meaning out of a text and also for the writer to create a comprehendible text. "Thus, the use of cohesive ties represents a continuum rather than a dichotomy between oral and written language; appropriate use depends on the situation" (Beverly E. Cox T. S., 1990).

Studies regarding reading comprehension recommend that the use of cohesive ties provide clues for readers in the process of integrating the textual meanings. Research conducted on writing also suggests that using cohesive ties considerably improves the quality of writing. Halliday and Hasan (1976) state that "cohesive devices appear to be critical in determining the clarity, appropriateness, and comprehensibility that is, the quality of an author's writing" (ibid.) and that "Cohesion describes a linguistic system that extends through the text and binds together larger chunk of discourse, in addition to forming smaller discourse units". Cohesive ties are, therefore, considered a "part of what makes a text coherent; however, these ties are not, by themselves, sufficient to create a coherent text" (Bamberg, 1983).

2.4. Discourse and Cohesion

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976) *discourse* is made up of interrelationship of sentences while these sentences are related to one another in various ways and the *semantic structure* which holds all the sentences together is *cohesion*. "Units of discourse do not have a uniform syntactic structure that can be codified" (HH, p. 7). They believe that even paragraphs are associated with each other through a semantic structure and not

8

a grammatical one. From the perspective of semantic understanding and unification of meaning in a text, they are of the view that the special means (cohesive ties) which a speaker and a writer use to bind together any discourse can well illustrate the meaningfulness and focus of the discourse. Likewise, the effective use of the same cohesive ties will facilitate the reader as well as the listener to decode or comprehend meanings given in the discourse (Holloway, 1981). As mentioned earlier, there are five types of cohesive ties according to Halliday and Hasan's: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion.

It is important to know the topic and genre of a text for creating meaning and particular structures in any discourse and also to know the discourse conventions for creating text. These essential features of structuring text are referred to as the cohesion principle by Halliday and Hsasan and these cohesive ties are the very source of determining texture in a discourse (Celce-Murcia, 1991).

The concept of *cohesion* works as a unity-generating linguistic device in a text. A text seems well knit when its lexical items are closely connected to one another. Halliday and Hasan(1976) argue that lexical cohesion provides a text topic consistency and developing predictability and it guarantees *discourse* its well connectedness with another. Lavid agrees with Halliday and Hasan that lexical cohesion helps in determining the semantic organization of a text (Lavid, 1992). T. A. van Dijk, however, disagrees and argues that these cohesive ties only provide the "local" type of coherence and cannot provide coherence at the "global" or the discourse level (Bamberg, 1983).

2.2 Cohesive Devices and Background of the Research

2.2.1 References

Reference is one of the basic ties for inculcating cohesion in a text. It consists of a word whose understanding and interpretation is insufficient in its isolation and it should be explained in relation to the overall context of a conversation or communication for generating its semantic scope. There are three types of references: personal, demonstrative, and comparative (Anderson, 1983).

Halliday and Hasan (1976) argue that the system of operation must be integrative when referential types are used. "These items are directives indicating that information is to be retrieved from elsewhere ...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 the same thing enters into the discourse a second time"(p. 31). In particular, "cohesion lies in the assumption of continuity of reference on the part of the reader, which is the basis for the interpretation of referential terms. In simple cases of reference we might suppose that a reader does not have a lot of responsibility but when a reference becomes complicated or ambiguous we would expect additional effort to be required and the effects of unfamiliar vocabulary to be more significant" (ibid.).

Reference is considered as the most striking feature to impart cohesion in any discourse and not just a method is undeliberately used for providing continuity in writing. However, some students rely upon repetition of words instead of using reference words. According to Halliday and Hasan, "only repetition is not sufficient for supplying

cohesion in discourse passages rather it often makes them less cohesive and coherent"(Holloway, 1981).

This point has also been illustrated with the help of experiments. Studies have shown that the employment of reference and lexical continuity as cohesive devices really help students in recalling the key elements in any given passage. It has been observed that mere repetition can create confusion and distraction as human mind can easily correspond with the help of cohesion signals like "that", "he" even at places where there are no such signals. "Pointing out references in class is a good idea: students need to know what alternatives to repetition are available for making discourse more unified" (ibid.).

While explaining the functions of references in a cohesive system Halliday and Hasan observe that "In narratives, cohesive devices serve to tie a series of sentences together, thereby creating text by relating the meanings of individual sentences to each other. Cohesive items also increase the texture and interest of text by decreasing repetition of *reference term* ... With knowledge of the semantic relationships between sentences, the audience can interpret them as a unified textual whole" (ibid.).

The reference serves an important cohesive device in the development of a unified narrative. Personal, demonstrative, and comparative references and articles are the basic codes that have been used for the investigation of reference cohesion by comparing the written narratives of two different student groups. It has been observed that reference cohesion considerably contributes in forming the semantic unity and coherence of the examined texts. It is argued that "Reference can go forward or backward, and the distance between the initial referent and the cohesive tie can vary. If the distance is great or if

intervening information is confounding, listener confusion is a likely result and the internal coherence of a text is reduced"(Froma P. Roth, Nancy J. Spekman, and Ellen C. Fye, 1995).

Reference cohesion is the primary form of cohesion that enables children to develop cohesiveness in a text (deVilliers&deVilliers, 1979).Halliday and Hasan observe that "it is through reference cohesion that the referential meaning or identity of an item, established in one part of a text, is referred to in an-other part. That is, it is a cue to the listener/- reader to 'refer elsewhere'" (ibid.).

The research related to the text of filmic language has emphasized the use of references as cohesive ties to make its texture meaningful and unified. In filmic language, flashbacks, foreshadowing, and parallel sequencing are used as referentially cataphoric because mostly the meaning of different shots can be explained through developing their relation with one another sooner or later. However, when different shots are presupposing an earlier one then it will be referentially anaphoric. Edward Dmytryk's Murder, My Sweet (1944) contains examples of this cohesive device. The construction of the film is on a single flashback scene that represents a cataphoric reference.Similarly, when these parts are added up to form a whole it is an anaphoric reference. Jump cuts, unmatched sound and images, and a single or multiple shots in a series without presupposition are examples of exophoric references(Hayward, 1986)

Elision, in the filmic context, depends upon sound conjunction and images that are generated by an overlapping/transgressing of the given sound track. There are three types of cohesion references as regards filmic elision. "In the first part of the elision (first shot),

the sound does not in any evident way connect with the image. The sonorous reference is exophoric; that is to say, in relation to the image, the sound is exterior and cannot be contextualized; it makes no reference whatsoever to the content of this particular image nor to what preceded. When the elision is complete (second shot), then the two other forms of reference come into play simultaneously. By anaphoric reference (once the sound agrees with the image, the meaning of the earlier sound becomes contextualized and comprehensible) it is clear that the reference in the first part of the elision was cataphoric (the sound would be comprehensible a posteriori). The elision creates a weaving in three directions of these three forms of reference: the first (exophoric), because it is without context in the first part of the elision and is on a vertical axis and goes towards the exterior; the two others are horizontal but go in opposing directions within the elision. However, given that the exophoric reference is recuperated and becomes integrated into the elision by subsequent contextualization, the texture that emanates from the cohesive relations is hermetic and without transparence" (ibid.).

Some of the recent research done in the field has highlighted the importance of pronouns in achieving a unified comprehension. The use of pronouns is effective because they demonstrate the anaphoric process as an element of cohesive ties. This process can be illustrated with the help of a passage from Alice in Wonderland (JohnChapman, 1979).Chapman (1979) observes that the anaphoric perception of pronouns plays an important role in the developmental process of reading: "He reported the results of a pilot study which is part of a larger research project investigating the development of the perception of cohesive ties. It reported the performance of fluent and non-fluent readers on an anaphoric processing task where stories were especially written so as to incorporate

pronouns as indicators of anaphora in as natural a setting as possible. Since that pilot study, which produced encouraging and significant results, a much larger investigation has confirmed that the perception of pronouns as anaphoric vehicles is a significant factor in the development of fluent reading"(ibid.).

Another important feature of cohesion is that it does not consist of a single group of items; instead it forms a set of relationships and uses various covert and overt approaches. "Thus, for example, *reference* is a universal relation between items (nouns) that create cohesion within a text. Different languages employ different signals to create such referential cohesion. Even when they use the pronominal system in seemingly similar ways, various elements may function differently in terms of their cohesive power. Thus in English it is quite common to find that the referential pronoun in the first sentences of a new paragraph refers back to the whole earlier paragraph. In Hebrew, however, one could not do this. It would be necessary to use a phrase such as "all the facts mentioned above" or "everything that was said until now" (Olshtain, 1980).As a result of the employment of cohesive ties a reader has to resort to inferential thinking in order to complete the process of comprehension.

The written texts produced by kindergarten and second grade students also contain evidences of references used as a cohesive device for unified structuring. Sulzby has observed that these texts contain anaphoric and situational references (Sulzby, 1984).

Eiler (1979) argues that reference cohesion is an evidence of the ability to maintain a self-sufficient ("endophoric") text without any assistance of the non-textual

("exophoric") atmosphere. Instead of presupposed and presupposing, Eiler prefers the terms *precursor* and *coherer*(Neuner, 1987).

Hasan (1984) "developed a more complex and complete analysis of cohesion that she refers to as cohesive harmony. Cohesive harmony analysis permits a description not just of mechanistic repetition or linking of ideas, but it allows for the linguistic representation of ideas, experience, phenomena, and interrelationships through the semantic and syntactic conventions of written text. In describing the importance of referencing in securing cohesive agreement she asserts "Cohesive harmony describes how nouns and pronouns can refer to each other through either identity (i.e., reference to the same exact entity) or semantic categories (i.e., reference to something through a relationship such as synonymy, antonymy, hypo-nymy, or meronymy)"(Beverly E. Cox, May, 1991).

To create connectedness in texts, especially in narrative texts, referential link works as the most effective cohesive device.An analysis of G. Stein's story (In Portraits and Prayers) reveals that it is solely the referential link which connects the sentences. "The condition for referential cohesion does not therefore require that all sentences will be about the same topic but that there would be some referential link between them. What needs further specification, however, is whether the referents of any expression in the new sentence can satisfy the requirement of referential link ... The referential cohesive tie cannot, however, be simply stated as requiring that texts should keep talking about the same referent in each sentence. Such a condition is too restrictive and it would allow only for a dull subset of possible cohesive texts" (Reinhart, 1980).

2.2.2 Substitution

Substitution signifies relationship of linguistic items like the connection between words and phrases. Halliday and Hasan (1976) classify substitution as nominal, verbal, and clausal (Holloway, 1981)..

The application of semantic theories to illustrate a unified written structure in pedagogical environments has also been explored. It has been observed that students are aware of the ability of a language to echo structures in a way that provide unify a written text. In this regard *ellipsis* and *substitution* not only help but also guide students to create parallel structures and balanced sentences (ibid.).

The principles of FSP (Functional Sentence Perspective) bring cohesive unity,both lexically and grammatically, to discourses and enable student to recognize, understand, and use cohesive ties. *Substitutions* and *ellipsis* retain a unified functional domain in English because not only they have integrated structures but can also occur in complementary distribution(Halliday M. , An Introduction to Functional Grammar, 1985).

Substitution and ellipsis function like referential cohesion. Halliday and Hasan observe "Substitution is a relation between linguistic items, such as words or phrases; whereas reference is a relation between meanings... ellipsis is simply a kind of substitution; it can be defined as substitution by zero" (p. 89).For reading comprehension, these cohesive devices, including substitution, infer richness and clarity in the given context of any proposition in a text. When the level of cohesion is high then we can easily retrieve the

16

required information with the help of references, substitution, or ellipsis (Anderson, 1983).

In another study, African American writers observe that both narrative and expository structure of a text can be achieved by using syntactic and semantic links (cohesive devices) between different elements in the text. However, lexical devices are more commonly used than elliptical, substitutional, and conjunctive devices (Nathaniel Norment, 1995). Norment observes that "it is important to note the differences in the number of cohesive devices used in the narrative and expository modes. The low- and high-proficiency level writers might use different types of cohesive devices for the differences in the number of cohesive ties reported for each proficiency level. The number and types of sentences used by subjects of different proficiency levels may have produced different syntactic patterns, thus affecting the frequency use of cohesive devices" (ibid.).

2.2.3 Ellipsis

Ellipsis omits an item without losing its understanding and is structural in nature because it works as a referent to presuppose a previous sentence structure that is omitted. The meaning of the omitted word or item can be realized through mental supplication out of the given linguistic context. The omission can result in a structural gap which is taken care of by semantics. Ellipsis occurs in clausal, nominal, and verbal forms(Holloway, 1981) and helps in making a text cohesive. Another study has focused on the role of ellipsis in developing an interaction of meaning with their social function or discourse.Celce-Murcia observes ellipsis plays a very important role in producing the texture of a discourse. (Celce-Murcia, 1991).

17

Cohesion theory has also been applied on filmic text. Bresson's film ("L'Argent") illustrates the use of ellipsis in two different ways. The first function of ellipsis resemble the cinematographic technique of Bressonin which two shots are always separated by a cut and the mise-en-scene hints at something having occurred in between these shots.Secondly, ellipsis is used by Bressonin place of a pan.It has been observed that these ellipses function as synecdoche in the film (Hayward, 1986).

Another study has investigated the students' level of reading ability which helps them write expository texts with functional appropriateness. The study looks at the role of coreferential cohesion devices (ellipsis, pronouns, and comparatives) and observes that good readers use cohesive coreferential devices in a much better way as compared to those who are weak in reading(Beverly E. Cox, May, 1991).

Another study has looked at different types of cohesive ties that are incorporated by students in written argumentative and narrative prose at different learning levels. MaCully (1985) has examined through correlative and multiple regression process the connection between cohesion and the quality of writing. He has observed a relation between quality of writing and four types of cohesive ties which are *ellipsis*, demonstratives references, *lexical repetition* and substitution (Crowhurst, May, 1987).He observes that "The most commonly used kinds of cohesion were repetitions of the same lexical item, pronominals, and demonstratives and the definite article, accounting for 79.2 percent of all ties used. Substitution, ellipsis, and continuative conjunctives occurred infrequently at any grade level. There were significant increases with grade for synonyms and collocation. There were significant decreases with grade for causal and temporal conjunctives and for exophora. For repetition of lexical items, grade 6 scored higher than

grade 10. Decreases between grades were attributed to decreasing use of certain immature connectives. Increases were attributed to older students' more diversified vocabularies and their greater tendency to elaborate their ideas"(ibid.).

2.2.4 Conjunctions

Generally, conjunctions identify the particular way in which given ideas are put in a structure so that they are integrated with the preceding ones. It denotes semantic connectivity between different sentences. According to Halliday and Hasan(1976), words like therefore, so, accordingly, and, but give semantic organization to our concepts and ideas in a text or discourse and thus communicate the cohesive relationship between items through logical structure. Conjunctions have four sub-categories: additive, causative, adversative and temporal (Holloway, 1981).

The existence of specific patterns in paragraph writing that are indispensible for logical construction and balanced composition have been explored. The extent to which cohesive devices are responsible for the balanced development ofa paragraph has also been analyzed. Topic development, as realized by Halliday and Hasan (1967), can be attained by using surface cohesive patterns.Halliday's (1967, 1977) model of the relations of context and text and age-related changes among variables of context/text has also been studied. The study investigates cohesion and theme structure in students' discourse. Results indicate that in narrative descriptions, students use more additive conjunctions than temporal ones (A. D. Pellegrini, 1984).

Halliday and Hasan's(1976) taxonomy has been applied to argumentative and narrative texts produced by students of 6,10, and 12 grades to find out the types of cohesive ties used by students at different levels. A decrease in the use of *causal conjunctions* affected with grade difference while differences in the use *temporal conjunctions* are affected with both grade and mode but this is found only in the narrative mode. In argumentative mode, there is no such difference of grade in the use of *temporal conjunctions.* Moreover, the use of additive as well as *adversative conjunctions* also signifies the same hidden difference (Crowhurst, May, 1987).

Joseph Williams and Rosemary Hake (1979) have used Halliday and Hasan's conjunctive cohesive devices in designing some exercises of imitative nature that consist of pairs of complex and relational sentences. The purpose of these exercises is to draw the attention of students to consciously incorporate these devices to determine their semantic effect in writing. The results have shown that these conjunctive devices are helpful in enhancing the writing abilities of students (Holloway, 1981).

For Halliday and Hasan's technical term 'conjunction' (as a cohesive device) there is another term 'transition' coined by Winterowd (1970). Halliday and Hasan (1976) classify these conjunctive devices or transitions in four basic categories that are:additive, adversative, causative, and temporal. Winterowd agrees with Halliday and Hasan that the semantic relation of one sentence with the preceding one is of an implied and expressive nature. He expands on their model and presents adversative transitions in a different way and offers a temporary list regarding the relations that can be found between sentences. This list includes examples of *sequence, restatement, exemplification, premise, conclusion, similarity and addition.*Winterowd (1970) terms these transitions as

"observative" while Halliday and Hasan (1976) mark them as *"adversative"* but, practically, they signify the identical logical relation between different clauses (Fahnestock, 1983).

Walmsley (1977) has studied the affectability of conjunctions on students' ability of reading comprehension.He observes the effect of a particular kind of conjunctions like the use of and, or,and, because in a sentence relation. Similarly, Hagerup-Neilsen (1977) argues that the use of conjunctions facilitates students in reading process when the text appears unfamiliar to them.Pearson (1974-75) argues that the higher type of cohesion that can only be acquired through the union of prepositions (working as conjunctions) for the connecting of longer and explanatory sentences further enhances the ability to recall a text (Anderson, 1983).

2.2.5 Lexical Cohesion

Lexical cohesion is used to connect specific as well as general words. This kind of cohesion is denoted by the selection of vocabulary and not by using any structural device. It works as a device of semantic linking in larger chunks of writing.This type of cohesion includes either 'the reiteration' where an item gets repeated or used as a synonym or 'collocation'. Lexical cohesion is one of the essential resources of cohesion and illustrates its fundamental thematic aspect as highlighted by Halliday and Hasan.

William Boyd's 1982 short story "My Girl in Skin-Tight Jeans" has been analyzed using the elements of discourse coherence.*Reiteration* is observed throughout the text as a *lexical cohesive device* that creates a global meaningful effect in the text. Prominently, *structural, propositional, and lexical repetition* is observed regarding the description of

21

the girl, the drinking scene, and the denouement of the story which again contributes to the cohesiveness of the text. So far as discourse coherence is concerned it is specified with the contrastive use of emotional and gloomy language in the text. This consistent use, according to Halliday and Hasan(1976), semantically *collocates* to achieve the desired effect of cohesiveness in the story (Alonso, 2003).

Coherence in this short story has also been explored from Van Dijk's (1977) perspective who concentrates on the macrostructural level and the semantic viewpoint. He observes that "there are various signs of coherence in the story, basically connected with the phenomena of language selection and strategic large-scope recurrence...Thus, if reiteration of, let us say, a lexical element, which in principle and at the local level acts primarily as a cohesive device as defined by Halliday and Hasan(1976), is upheld throughout the totality of a text of considerable length, its use may become significant for the establishment of coherence, as it will help to develop an inherent discursive trait which will serve to define the global meaning of the text and will favour its interpretation as a coherent whole. There exists interaction between all mutually relevant components of any textual unit (in this particular case cohesion and coherence)" (ibid.).

Research has also been done on the semantic meaningfulness of metaphor based languages. Phrases such as "your best platter" and "beautifully presented"exhibit *lexical cohesion* as 'best' and 'beautifully' cohere with their paired phrase/word respectively. This relation can also be viewed in the light of two other cohesive relations that are defined by Halliday and Hasan (1976) as *substitution and collocation*. The above mentioned groups of words show *substitutive relation* as one can be substituted for

another without disturbing the syntactic unity of the text. In the same way each term in the group of words forms a *collocative* relation with the very next term and also preserves semantic unification.

Chekhov's 1894 short story "Student" has also been analyzed in terms of structure and style. Halliday and Hasan's concept of cohesion has been applied to observe the semantic unity, lexical repetition, collocation, and substitution in the short story.According to this model of cohesion the formal features of paragraphs and verses such as the use of parallelism, contrastive adjuncts, and syntactic patterns, linking words, the phonological features of style, and the use of rhythmic and intonation patterns can be analyzed using lexical and semantic cohesion. In Chekhov's short story it has been observed that "Grammatically,there is a major cohesion (e.g. the relationship between bound clauses and free clauses) and a minor cohesion (where one element of the structure of a clause or group may 'correspond' to an element in another clause or group). As one moves outside the sentence to study the paragraph, the cohesion will inevitably become less formal and more contextual" (O'Toole, 1971).

Crowhurst (1987) has "examined the use of cohesive devices in narrative and argumentative writing at three grade levels (6, 10, and 12). She found that narrative writing was superior to argumentative writing in terms of the numbers and percentages of cohesive ties at all three grade levels.This was attributed in part to different levels of lexical familiarity or depth associated with the topics of the compositions"(Beverly E. Cox, May, 1991).

The ability to produce a lexically cohesive text has also been analyzed with regards to the grade level of students. It has been observed that "increases in lexical cohesion generally rely on knowledge of vocabulary, concepts, and semantic hierarchies. Older children would normally be expected to have larger vocabularies and more conceptual knowledge, as well as more experiences with exposition. In all likelihood, it would be expected that greater use of lexical cohesion would be positively correlated with grade level" (ibid.). Ten essays (five of good quality and five of poor) are studied using Halliday and Hasan's model of cohesion and it is observed that cohesive devices such as references and conjunctions are used more extensively in good essays. Halliday and Hasan observe that "This is the cohesion signaled by the use of synonyms, superordinates, subordinates, general nouns, complementaries, and collocations. This cohesion, in other words, is signaled by vocabulary selection, rather than by structural devices. While lexical cohesion is the most difficult to specify due to the innumerable ways word meanings can be related to one another and can co-occur, it is clearly an important source of cohesion in text. It is the variable most strongly related to Halliday and Hasan's concept of the fundamental thematic nature regarding cohesion as well as "texture" (Anderson, 1983).

Peter Freebody and Richard C. Anderson(1983)have studied the effect of textual cohesion on the comprehension ability of students concerning different reading passages. The study makes general hypothesis about high and low cohesion and the effect vocabulary has on it. The study shows that, to some extent, vocabulary effects comprehension and the understanding of a text as difficult words adversely affect comprehension. However, high cohesion minimizes the effect of difficult vocabulary on

24

comprehension while difficult vocabulary decreases the level of comprehension when cohesion is low.Morgan and Sellner (1980) argue that cohesion effects the comprehension and understanding of a text and the mere knowledge of words is insufficient for an overall textual understanding (ibid.).

Dale W. Holloway used Halliday and Hasan's model of cohesion to teach writing skills to students. He devised exercises to teach students semantic networking around a word (e.g. Marry; women, mother, family member) which helped them produce cohesive texts (Holloway, 1981).

"Substantiation for the importance of lexical cohesion to readers comes from experimental psychologists Simon Garrod and Anthony Sanford (1977). They conducted an experiment in 1977 to determine the "semantic distance" between related words. Acting on their results, they proposed a model for the workings of memory while a person is reading, a model that shows how words with "semantic overlap" (e.g., "vehicle" and "bus") are stored together in memory when they refer to the same thing. As long as the same topic is being discussed, Garrod and Sanford theorize, the reader's mind is "open" for semantic variances on a particular concept. When the topic changes, the reader requires that the concept, if repeated, must be referred to directly or the reader will probably not immediately recognize the referent" (ibid.).

It has been observed that in a cohesive text "A sentence has clearly defined grammatical features. These serve to provide a structure which makes possible cohesiveness among its constituents. When we consider a group of sentences which we judge to cohere as a text,

25

we need to look for those features of the text that serve to bind the sentences together into a semantic whole. The use of demonstratives and pronouns, the repetition of key words, the use of elliptic phrases requiring information in other sentences for their interpretation, conjunctives and the use of lexically related words dispersed through the text are examples of the sort of cohesive elements we find in texts". Halliday and Hasan classify these cohesive relationships as "reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion"(Kittay, 1984). They argue that coherence in a text can be realized through the destiny of all cohesive ties which then establish a network of meaning in a given text.

Chapter: III
Methodology

People usually communicate in any language by means of texts. We, in general, express our needs, feelings by using text orally or in writing. We speak, read, listen, and write text. Text is the basis for any discipline such as literature, science, politics, etc.Cohesion is one of the important features of a text and has a pervasive effect in creating the unity of a text.

3.1 Research Method

This research is applied and explanatory in nature. It uses both qualitative and quantitative research designs and follows narrative research method by applying the cohesion model of Halliday and Hasan (1976) which outlines five different cohesive devices:

      (1)   Reference

      (2)   Substitution

      (3)   Ellipsis

      (4)   Conjunction

      (5)   Lexical cohesion

These cohesive devices and the analytic procedure the present research will employ are explained as under.

1. References

These are certain items which refer to some other element in a text for the sake of their own interpretation because they cannot be interpreted in isolation.Halliday and Hasan

think that all languages have certain items which hold the basic property of being used as a reference. For example, the English language uses such items in the form of personal, demonstrative, and comparative references.

Personal references are items which refer to any referent by highlighting its role/function in a particular speech situation through recognizing participants as 'first person', 'second person' 'third person', and an addressee. Personal references are further classified as endophoric, exophoric, anaphoric and cataphoric. Halliday and Hasan think that *demonstratives* are of two types: the adverbial demonstratives and the selective nominal demonstratives. Under *comparative references* they have defined two types of references namely general comparison and particular comparison.

2. Substitution

Substitutions show grammatical relations between different linguistic items e.g. words and phrases. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 90) argue that "since substitution is a grammatical relation [...] the substitute may function as a noun, as a verb, or as a clause". They have mentioned three kinds of substitutions.

In *nominal substitution* they argue that the substitute 'word' always works as the head of a nominal group in both its singular and plural forms and it can only be substituted for another head of the nominal. In *verbal substitution* the head of a verbal group is substituted and the lexical verbs take over their place, however they always occur in the final position in a verbal group. *Clausal substitution* uses 'so' and 'not' (as negative form) to substitute for a whole clause as these items function not for a nominal or a

28

verbal group only as in the above mentioned two types of substitutions but for the entire clause.

3. Ellipsis

It is, like substitution, a grammatical relation which specifies a relation between words, phrases or clauses in a text. These always highlight some presupposition in a sentence or a text structure about what is supplied. Halliday and Hasan define three kinds of ellipsis.

Nominal Ellipsis deals with the nominal groups. *Verbal ellipsis* is related with verbal groups. It is difficult to differentiate between verbal and clausal ellipsis. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 194) observe that in *operator ellipsis* subject and finite part of the VG is omitted; in *lexical ellipsis*, non-finite portion of the VG, complements, and adjunct can be omitted.

4. Conjunctions

It is a different type of a cohesive category that utilizes formal markers to join sentences, clauses, and even paragraphs. According to Halliday and Hasan, these are indirect cohesive devices as their role is to explain certain meanings that presuppose some other component's presence in a given discourse. They have classified conjunctions into four different types depending on their different cohesive relations in a discourse.

Halliday and Hasan term words such as 'and', 'nor', and 'or' as *'additive'* conjunctions. Expressions like 'similarly' 'in the same way' 'likewise' 'that is' 'for instance' 'incidentally' and 'by the way' are also classified as additive conjunctions. They argue that *adversative relation* means 'opposite to expectation'. These expectations can be an outcome of what is being said or the communication process between a speaker

29

and a hearer. They think that *causal relation* can be expressed by using the words 'so', 'therefore', 'thus', 'hence', 'consequently', and many other expressions like 'as a result (of that)', 'in or as a consequence (of that)', 'because of this/that'. Mostly 'and' is combined with all of these words. *Temporal* relation can be expressed by words like 'then', 'afterwards' 'and then', 'after that' 'next', 'sequentially' and many other expressions.

5. Lexical Cohesion

Lexical cohesion is "the cohesive effect achieved by the selection of vocabulary" (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 274).They argue that between grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion lies the border line where general nouns perform the cohesive function. The general nouns are lexico-grammatical in nature and like other reference items can refer to the situation both 'exophorically' and 'endophorically'. They think that the use of the general noun with a determiner is like a *reference item* and in order to perform a cohesive function these will always be followed by an additional modifier.Halliday and Hasan define two further categories of lexical cohesion which are given below.

According to them, in *'Reiteration'* a lexical item points back to another with which it is related by means of a common referent. Such lexical item is referred to as a reiterated item and it can be in the form of a repetition, a synonym, near synonym, a general word, or a super ordinate. *'Collocation'* is the primary base for lexical cohesion and is achieved not only through the reiteration devices but also through the following categories: complementaries (e.g. day←night), antonyms (e.g. good←bad), pairs of words, co-hyponyms of the same superordinate [e.g. potato ← peas (both hyponyms of

30

vegetables)], words like part to whole (e.g. computer ←mouse), part to part (e.g. keypad←number) and so on.

3.2. Sampling:

The present study uses the random sampling method for the collection of textual data from Paulo Coelho's "Like the Flowing River." I have selected three texts: "In Melbourne", "Looking at others people's garden", and "A visitor arrives from Morocco." The selected texts are rich in spiritual and moral base which requires conveying of meanings in various ways. Thus the variety of textual data helps me explore these narratives from multiple perspectives.

3.3. Data Analysis:

The collected data is analyzed at five levels of cohesion: references, substitution, ellipsis, conjunctions, and lexical cohesion along with the identification of further internal classified levels of these cohesive devices in the selected texts. Analysis are given in a tabulated form, under certain headings, with respect to the number and frequency of the occurrence of each device in the texts along with citation of the number of relevant lines with which these devices are linking cohesive connection. These identified devices along with connected lines are analyzed to investigate both grammatical and lexical linking within the selected texts to seek an overall cohesiveness and semantic unity.

3.4. Discussion:

After discovering cohesive devices and their semantic linking syntactically and numerically in the selected texts the researcher has also provided an interpretive description and discussion of the textual meanings. This research testifies how cohesion as a relation of meaning creates unity

31

and texture in the selected texts with the help of five cohesive ties and ensures their semantic unity.

Chapter: IV

Analysis

4.1 Cohesive Analysis

The present analysis is based on Halliday and Hasan's (1976) taxonomy of linguistic features which create unity in a text. They define 'text' as an integrated whole comprised of linguistic items. Text can also be identified as a sample of discourse. Texture of a text is the characteristic which imparts wholeness and unity to it. The non-structural elements of the texture link sentences collectively within a paragraph or within any lager unit of a text (Olshtain, 1980).

Halliday and Hasan (1976) argue that the semantic structure which holds sentences together in a text is called "cohesion".Cohesion consists of a set of relationships in a text. A single instance of cohesion in a text is called a 'tie'. Semantic unity in a text can be acquired through syntactic as well as semantic links between various elements found in pairs. The major type of cohesion can be identified as a relationship between bound and free clauses while the minor type of cohesion occurs where an element within the structure of a given clause/group may show 'correspondence' with an element given in another type of clause/group (O'Toole, 1971) .

In their model of cohesion, Halliday and Hasan have classified cohesive ties into five categories: references, substitution, ellipsis, conjunctions, and lexical cohesion. The present research will analyze three selected texts "In Melbourne", "Looking at others people's garden" and "A visitor arrives from Morocco" by Paulo Coelho using this model of cohesion. Moreover, the internally classified levels of basic cohesion have also been

analyzed in the present cohesive analysis for determining the all-encompassing effect of cohesive ties in generating the chronological order of the thought sequences and semantic unity in the selected texts.

4.2 Scheme of Analysis:

Firstly, the texts of these texts have been classified at the clause level. The numbers of clauses in these texts are identified to further analyze the level of cohesion.

Secondly, all the recognized clauses are allocated numbering according to the line sequence of each text separately for making the analysis more systematic and sequential as regards the classification of cohesive taxonomy. Thus,the numbers of lines are equivalent to the numbers of clauses in each text.

Thirdly, with the help of the allocated numbers to the clauses, five basic levels of cohesion references, substitution, ellipsis, conjunctions and lexical cohesion are identified. Further internal levels of these cohesive devices have also been identified in these texts.

Fourthly, to make the analyses more organized, the description has been organized in tables of both numbers and frequencies of occurrences of each cohesive device along with the listing of number of relevant lines in the text where these devices are found.

Fifthly, to analyze cohesion as unity-generating device, these devices along with the respective lines are further traced out with connected line numerically in anaphoric and cataphoric ways to describe their semantic linking.

4.3 Analysis at reference level of text one "In Melbourne":

Table 1. Personal references in "In Melbourne"

Line No	Reference	Line reference No	Referenced Item
1	My	1	Main appearance
2	It	2	Ten o'clock
3	I am	4	"To be interviewed"
5	I	3,4	I...interviewed
5	My	3,4	I...interviewed
6	Me	4	Interviewed
7	Me	4	Interviewed
7	I can	5	"I onto the platform"
7	I am	5	"I onto the platform"
7	He	4	John Felton
8	Me	4	Interviewed
8	Me	4	Interviewed
8	I	3,4	"To be interviewed"
9	He	4	John Felton
12	I	3,4	(one) "To be interviewed"
14	I	3,4	"To be interviewed"
14	I	3,4	"To be interviewed"
15	I am	4	John Felton

35

16	You	3,4	"To be interviewed"
17	It	14	What I write
17	You	4	John Felton
17	Me	3,4	"To be interviewed"
17	My	3,4	"To be interviewed"
20	You	4	John Felton
20	I	3,4	"To be interviewed"
21	I	4	John Felton
21	I've	4	John Felton
21	your	3,4	"To be interviewed"
21	I	4	John Felton
22	them	21	"Two of your books"
23	We	3,4	John Felton +(one) " to be interviewed"

Table 2. Demonstrative references "In Melbourne"

Line No	Reference	Line reference No	Referenced Item
1	This	1	"... My main appearance"
1	The writers'	1,2	Writers'/ "festival in Melbourne "
3	the morning	2	10 o'clock
3	There	2	"festival in Melbourne"
5	The platform	3,4	(where) "To be interviewed"
9	that	9,10	Reply, answer
10	there	2	"festival in Melbourne"
11	The audience	11	Audience/Every one
11	That	11,12	"Something is wrong"
12,13	The only	13	Possible action
15	That's	14,15	"What I write"/irrelevant
16	The other	16	"Other Way round"
19	That advice	17,18	"Confucius says: ....."
22	Them	21	"Two of your books"
24	The lines	24	"Lines of battle"
24	The audience	11,2	Audience/Everyone/ " (in)festival in Melbourne"
25	The atmosphere	5	Atmosphere/ "Onto the platform"
25,26	The interview	3.4	"I..interviewed by....john Felon"
27	The result	25,26	Result/The interview

Table 3. Comparative references in "In Melbourne"

Line No	Reference	Line reference No	Referenced Item
7	"Before I can Finish"	7-8	Never let me complete answer rather interrupts me
14	"Do you like?"	7,14	What I write (books) as compare to what I'm saying
16	"Not the other way round"	15,16	Here to interview you (only)
20	"Do you like?"	7,14,20,21	What I write (books) as compare to what I'm saying

The cohesive devices found in the first text are given in table 1. There are 31 instances of personal pronouns such as "I" which appears 13 times, "me" 5 times, "you" 2 times, "he" 2 times, and "it " also two times. Each of the possessive pronouns "your", "them' and "me" have been used once. A total of 19 demonstrative pronouns, given in table 2, have been used in the text out of which the determiner "the" has been used 11 times. "That" is used 4 times, "there" twice, while "this" and "them" have been used once only. The description of comparative pronouns is given in table 3: in line 7 "before I can finish", in line 14 "do you like", in line 16 "not the other way round", and in line 20 "again "do you like".

4.4 Analysis at reference level of text two "Looking at others people's garden"

Table 4. Personal references in "Looking at others people's garden"

Line No	Reference	Line reference No	Referenced Item
1	you	1	Presuppose (people)
2	He	1	Fool
2	yours	1	Presuppose (people)
3	we	1	You, Presuppose (people +human being)
3	our	3	We (human being, people)
4	we	3	We (human being, people)
4	our	3	We (human being, people)
5	He	4	(our) neighbour
5	Himself	4	(our) neighbour
6	He	4	(our) neighbour
8	we	3	We (human being, people)
8	We (will)	3	We (human being, people)
9	Him	4	(our) neighbour
9	Our	3	We (human being, people)
10	Our	8,3	We (human being, people) + (our) neighbour
10	We	3	We (human being, people)
11	We	3	We (human being, people)
12	We (will)	3	We (human being, people)
14	We (will)	3	We (human being, people)

16	We	3	We (human being, people)
17	us	3	We (human being, people)
18	Our	3	We (human being, people)
19	His	18	The fool

Table 5. Demonstrative references in "Looking at others people's garden"

Line No	Reference	Line reference No	Referenced Item
1,2	"The only one"	1	Intellect (s)
3	The garden	3	(Garden) of our life
4	There	4,5	"Garden of our life"/("neighbor on one side") spying
8	This	4,5	Neigbbour /who is spying
9	The garden	3,9	"Garden of our life"
11	The earth	3,9,11	Earth/garden/that we cultivated
12	That	13	"Each centimeter of earth"
13	That	13,14	"Only the patient hand"
13,14	The patient	14	"Patient hand of the gardener"
14	The gardener	14	Gardener/can decipher
15	The sun	15	sun
15	The rain	15	rain

15,16	The seasons	15,16	The seasons
16	That	16,17,4	"Head peering at us"/neighbour
17	The hedge	17	hedge
18	The fool	18,4	Fool/ our neighbour

Table 6. Comparative references in "Looking at others people's garden"

Line No	Reference	Line reference No	Referenced Item
1,2	"But the only one"	1,3	Intellect as compare to thousand intellects
6	"Likes to give advice"	5,6	(neighbor) "Capable of growing anything but likes to give advice only"
8	"What this neighbor is saying"	8-9	"If we listen to him ,....we will end up working"
14,15	"No longer pay attention"	14-17	Instead (doing work) concentrate only on that peering head
19	"Never tends his own"	18,19	(neighbor)Loves togive advices rather than tending his own plants

The cohesive devices found in the second text are given in table 4. There are 23 instances of personal pronouns in this story: "we" is used 9 times, "our" 5 times, "he" 3 times, while "you" and "us" are used once only. Four possessive pronouns "your", "him", "his", and "himself" have been used. Table 5 highlights the 16 demonstrative references found in the text. The determiner "the" has been used 11 times, "that" 3 times, while "this" and

41

"there" appear once only. There are five comparative references used in this text which are highlighted in table 6. Item number one, "but the only one" is found in line 1 and 2, the second one "likes to give advice" in line 6, the third one "what this neighbor" in line 8, the fourth one "no longer pay attention" in lines 14 and 15, and the fifth one "never tends his own" is found in line 19.

4.5 Analysis at reference level of text three"A visitor arrives from Morocco":

Table 7. Personal references in "A visitor arrives from Morocco"

Line No	Reference	Line reference No	Referenced Item
1	Me	1	Supposed protagonist of the story (I)
5	Her	4	Eve
9	you	4	Eve
10	your	4	Eve's (man)
11	He	17	Adam
12	Me	4	Eve
14	He	17	Adam
15	Him	4,5	The Serpent
15	He	4,5	The Serpent
15	Her	4	Eve
17	She's	11,19	Other women /lovely women
17	Her	11,19	Other women/lovely women
19	She	4	Eve
19	She	4	Eve
20	Her	4	Eve
22	His	22	anyone
23	Her	22	anyone

Table 8. Demonstrative references in "A visitor arrives from Morocco"

Line No	Reference	Line reference No	Referenced Item
4	The garden	4	Garden of Eden
4,5	The serpent	4,5	Serpent(Satan)
6	This apple	6	Apple
6	The serpent	6	Serpent(Satan)
9	This apple	9	Apple
9	The serpent	9	Serpent(Satan)
13	The serpent	13	Serpent(Satan)
16	The top	16	"Top of a hill"
17	That cave	16,17	"well on the top of a hill"
17	There	17	well/"top of a hill"
18	The water	18,19	Water of well
18,19	The well	18,19	Well for water
19,20	The apple	19,20	Apple
20	The serpent	20	Serpent(Satan)
21	This	2,22	Desert tribe(s)/"same Moroccan tribe"
23	The water	23,19	Water of well

Table 9. Comparative references in "A visitor arrives from Morocco"

Line No	Reference	Line reference No	Referenced Item
10	"More beautiful"	10,11	Eve need to look more beautiful than other women
11	"No other women"	11,12	Adam has no other women but Eve
21	"Same Moroccan tribe"	21,2	As mentioned earlier the story of desert tribe(s)

There are 17 personal references used in this textwhich are given in table 7. "He" and "she" appear thrice, "me" twice, while "you" is used only once in this story. The possessive pronoun "her" is used 5 times while "his", "him", and "your" are used once only. Table 8 highlights 16 demonstrative pronouns used in the text. The determiner "the" has been used 11 times, "this" 3 times while "there" and "that" are used once. The comparative references used in this text are highlighted in table 9 and these are "more beautiful" in line 10, "no other women" in line 11, and "same Morocco tribe" in line 21.

4.6 Analysis at substitution and ellipsis level of text one:

Table 10:Substitution in "In Melbourne"

Line No	Word/clause + substitution category	Line substitution No	Substituted Item
9	Reply (verbal)	10	Answer (verbal)
20	"Do you like what I write?"(clausal)	21	"No/don't"

Verbal Substitution: "When I *reply*,

he says something like 'that wasn't a very clear *answer*."

Clausal Substitution: " Do you like what I write?"

"*No*, I *don't.* "

Table 11:Ellipsis in "In Melbourne"

Line No	Word/clause +Ellipsis category	Line ellipsis No	Elliptical Item
1	My (nominal)	---	Presuppose name of protagonist
24	Drawn (verbal)	27	result (Presuppose)

Nominal Ellipsis: "This is *my* main appearance at the writer's festival in Melbourne. "

Presupposes elliptically protagonist *name*

Verbal Ellipsis: "The lines of battle have been *drawn.* "

Elliptically presuppose *"result* "*that* is in line 27 "...is pleased with the *result.* "

4.7 Analysis at substitution and ellipsis level of text two:

Table 12:Substitution in "Looking at others people's garden"

Line No	Word/clause + substitution category	Line substitution No	Substituted Item
1	Thousand intellects (Nominal)	2	one

Nominal substitution: " 'You can give a fool a _thousand intellects,_

but the only _one_ he will want is yours.'"

Table 13:Ellipsis in "Looking at others people's garden"

Line No	Ellipsis category	Line ellipsis No	Elliptical Item
3	Garden (nominal)	4	One side(ø)

In ellipsis an item is usually substituted by a zero-item such as in above example

Nominal ellipsis: "When we start planting the _garden_ of our life,

We glance to _one side_ (ø-of the garden) and notices the neighbour is there,spying."

Note: elliptical item is 'garden'

47

4.8 Analysis at substitution and ellipsis level of text three:

Table 14:Substitution in "A visitor arrives from Morocco"

Line No	Word/clause + substitution category	Line substitution No	Substituted Item
9-10	" You need to look more beautiful for your man" (clausal)	11	*"No, I don't"*

Clausal substitution: " 'You need to look more beautiful for your man'."

"No, I don't"

Note: The whole clause is substituted with *No, Don't* .

Table 15:Ellipsis in"A visitor arrives from Morocco"

Line No	Ellipsis category	Line ellipsis No	Elliptical Item
6	Eat (verbal)	8	Refused

Verbal Ellipsis: " *'Eat* this apple,' said the serpent."

" Eve, who had been properly instructed by God, *refused*."

Note: *refused* presupposes elliptically her answer that she does not want to eat.

4.9 Analysis at conjunctive level of text one

Table 16: Conjunctions in "In Melbourne"

Additive conjunctions

Line No	Reference	Line reference No	Referenced Item
3	and	2,3	"..in the morning…."/"..packed audience."
6	and	6,7	"..introduces…."/"asking me questions."
8	and	7,8	"He interrupts …..,"/"….another question."
9	(Something) like	9,10	"That wasn't a very clear answer."
12	and	12,13	"I remember….."/ "…possible action."
19	and	19,20	"Let's follow….."/ "……absolutely clear"
21	and	21,22	"I've read……………"/ "……both of them."
25	and	24,25	"The audience…"/ "..becomes electric"
26	and	25-27	"…The interview… "/ "…pleased with the .result."

Adversative conjunctions

Line No	Reference	Line reference No	Referenced Item
17	but	15-17	"That's irrelevant……."/ "…it is relevant"

Temporal conjunctions

Line No	Reference	Line reference	Referenced Item

49

		No	
23	Now	23	"Fine/we can continue."

Table 16 illustrates the ten conjunctions used in this text. The additive conjunction "(something) like" is used once in line 9 while "and" is used 8 times in lines 3, 6,8, 12,19,21,25, and 26. The adversative conjunction "but" is used once in line 17. The temporal conjunction 'but' is used once in line 23.

4.10 Analysis at conjunctive level of text two:

Table 17:Conjunctions in "Looking at others people's garden"

Additive conjunctions			
Line No	Reference	Line reference No	Referenced Item
4	And	4	"We glance..."/ "..neighbour is there.."
7	And	7	"..fertilize thoughts"/ "...achievements."
9	And	8-10	"...End up working"/ "..ourneighbour's idea."
11	And	10-12	"..we cultivate with so much sweat/....so many blessing."
15	And	14-16	....the rain/the season
Adversative conjunctions			
Line No	Reference	Line reference No	Referenced Item
1	But	1-2	"Thousand intellect/the only one"
6	But	5-6	"Capable of growing"/ "likes to give advice"

Table 17 illustrates the seven conjunctions used in this text. The additive conjunction "and" is used 5 times in lines 4,7,9,11, and 15 while the adversative conjunction "but" is used twice in lines 1 and 6.

4.11 Analysis at conjunctive level of text three:

Table 18: Conjunctions in "A visitor arrives from Morocco"

Additive conjunctions			
Line No	Reference	Line reference No	Referenced Item
1	and	1-2	"A visitor from Morocco" /"....curious story"
18	and	18-19	"Eve leaned over"/ "..water of the well"
23	and	21-23	"A return to paradise...."/ "feels no fear."
Adversative conjunctions			
Line No	Reference	Line reference No	Referenced Item
12	but	11-12	"..no other women/me.(Eve)"

Table 18 illustrates the four conjunctive devices used in this text. The additive conjunction "and" is used thrice in lines 1, 18, and 23 while the adversative conjunction "but" is used once in line 12.

4.12 Analysis at lexical level of text one:

Table 19:Lexical Cohesion Summary in "In Melbourne"

Interview
Interviewed, introduces,asking,questions,saying , interrupts,asks,question,reply, says,answer,the audience,ask,irrelevant,replies,interview,,relevant,says ,real debate
Human feelings
Feelings of apprehension, feeling of unease,like,like,hated, (audience) relaxes, (every one) pleased
write
Writers,writer,write,write,
Clear
Very clear, be clear, absolutely clear
Time expression
10 o'clock, morning, before, five minutes, now, continue

The items of lexical cohesion present in this text are given in table 19. Three general categories of superordiantes have been specified" "interview", "Human traits", and "Time expression" and the terms related to these superordinates are given in the table. The repetitive terms have also been described along with the number of repetitions of the item like the lexeme "write" is written four times and the word "clear" three times.

4.13 Analysis at lexical level of text two:

Table 20:Lexical Cohesion Summary in "Looking at others people's garden"

Garden
Planting/garden/growing/sow/fertilize/water/garden/earth/cultivate/sweat/fertilize/fertiliz ed/earth/garderner/sun/rain/season/garden/ plants
Human traits
Intellect(s)/Glance/Spying/likes/actions/thoughts/achievements/patient hand/peering/attention/concentrate/loves/tends/ listen/saying
Give
Give/give/giving
Forget
Forget/forgetting
Numbers/quantity
Thousand/one/one (side)/each (centimeter)/so much/so many
Neighbour
Neighbour/neighbour/neighbour's
Fool
Fool/fool
advice
Advice/advice
End up
End up/ end up

Table 20provides a description of both the super ordinates and the repetitive terms used in this text.The word categories "garden", "human traits", and "numbers" are highlighted along with the detailed description of the related lexical terms. The repetitive terms have also been described along with the number of repetitions of the item like the words "give" and "neighbor" are repeated thrice while "forget", "advice", and "fool" are repeated twice.

4.14 Analysis at lexical level of text three:

Table 21:Lexical Cohesion Summary in "A visitor arrives from Morocco"

Serpent
The serpent/the serpent / the serpent/the serpent/ the ser pent
Apple
This apple/ this apple /the apple
Eve
Eve/Eve/Eve/Eve/Eve
Eat
Eat/ eat/ ate
Water
The water /the water
well
A well/ the well
women
Other women/ lovely women
Women qualities
Beautiful/ lovely
Morocco
Morocco /Moroccan
Tribe
Tribes/ tribe

reflect
Reflected/ reflection

There is only one superordinate used in this text: "women traits." This superordinate along with its related terms is given in table 21. The repetitive terms have also been described along with the number of repetitions of the item like the word "eve" is repeated five times, "apple" and "eat" three times while "water", "Morocco", "reflect","well", and "tribe" have been repeated twice.

Chapter: V

Discussion

5.1 References

Eggins (1994) defines references as the strategy of an author with which he introduces

participants and then keeps track of all these throughout a text. According to Halliday and

Hasan (1976) references in a text can be interpreted in relation to the whole context of the

text or conversation.

Endophoric references are helpful in defining and understanding the structure of a text

and are divided into: anaphoric that involves a reference to the preceding text; and

cataphoric that involves a reference to the succeeding text. Exophoric reference furnishes

a relationship between a given item in a text and anything which exists in a real-life

situation beyond the boundaries of the text. The use of these references in a text is not

only a source of curiosity for a reader but also it develops semantic connectivity among

different structural items in a text.

5.1.1 Text one

In the first excerpt of "In Melbourne", a cataphoric reference is used in line 14.The word

'write' in "what I write?" refers to "books" in line 21.While the use of same word 'write'

in line 20 showsan anaphoric relation to the previous word 'write 'in line 14 and a

cataphoric relation to 'books' in line 21. Likewise, the use of 'he' in lines 7 and 9, and

the use of 'you' in line 14 show an anaphoric relation to the name "John Felton" in line 4.

An exophoric reference is found in lines 18 and 19 where the quote "whenever possible,

be clear" not only shows a semantic relation to the present debate but also refers to a

situation outside the text. These semantic links inside and outside the text create the meaningful texture of and unity in the text.

There are thirty one instances of the usage of personal pronouns in this text. The pronoun "I" has been used 13 times out of which 9 times it refers to the protagonist of the text who is "to be interviewed" and 4 times it is used for the one who is interviewing i.e. 'John Felton'. The anaphoric and cataphoric uses of this pronoun impart preciseness and a semantic connectivity in the narrative. The pronoun "we" appears only once in line 23 where it is used to refer to both the protagonist and John Felton while the pronoun 'me' is used 5 times in the textfor "I (person to be interviewed)" in line 6, 7, 8, and 17 as an anaphoric reference. Personal reference "He" is also used to refer to 'John Felton' in lines 7 and 9. "You" is used to denote 'John Felton' twice. The pronoun "it" appears twice in line 2 where it is used to specify time while in line 17 it refers to what has been written by the main protagonist. The use of all these pronouns has transformed the text into unified whole.

There are also occurrences of possessive pronouns in this text. For example, in line 1 "my" is presupposing the 'main protagonist' in a cataphoric sense as the name of the person is not mentioned. However in line 17 the same possessive pronoun is used as an anaphoric reference to denote the person "to be interviewed'. The use of "them" in line 22 refers to (inanimate things) 'two books' written by the protagonist. "Your" in line 21 is also denotes the person "to be interviewed". These references produce a semantic harmony in the text and weave it into a cohesive whole that facilitates the readers.

THE demonstrative references have been used nineteen times in this text. Eleven times the determiner "the" is used. Twice it is used to specify "audience" in lines 11 and 24 thereby integrating it into the semantic structure of the text. The rest of the nine times it used for words like "writes, morning, platform, only, other, lines, atmosphere, interview and result" to put them into a united structure of semantic prominence within the text. Moreover, the use of "there" in line 3 and 10 refers back to denote "Festival in Melbourne".

The use of "this" in the first line highlights the "main appearance" of the protagonist, whose name is not mentioned, in the texture of the text. The demonstrative "that" is used three times: in line 9 it signifies the "reply" of the one being interviewed; in line 11 it refers to show "something is wrong" and in line 15 it refers back to "what I write" (by the protagonist).The use of the demonstrative "this" and "that" enhances the meaningful understanding of different items in the text with relation to the whole understanding of the text.

Four instances of comparative references have been noticed in this text. These references demonstrate the similarity and dissimilarity of semantic understanding in a text which in turn adds to the meaningful structure and unity of the text.For example in line 7 "before I finish" refers comparatively to what he (protagonist) wants to say but the interviewer interrupts him due to some personal bias.Here it signifies the lack of patience and on the part of the interviewer. In lines 14 and 20 "Do you like" denotes the protagonist's wish to know whether "J.Felton" likes his books more than his answers. In the same way, in line 16 "not the other way round" is uttered by the interviewer to tell the fellow that he would not like to engage in anything besides the agenda of the interview. All these comparative

references structure the misunderstanding of temperaments between the interviewee and interviewer in the story.

5.1.2 Text two:

In the second text "Looking at others people's garden", backward as well as forward references can be found. In line 3 the word "garden" is a cataphoric reference not to a typical garden but to the "garden of our life". This cataphoric reference is used throughout the text, thus, providing the semantic link for a better understanding of thoughts and ideas related to this phenomenon. In line 4 the phrase "one side" is an anaphoric reference to the same "garden." In line 10, the word "forgetting" is used as an anaphoric reference to "cultivated...much sweat....so many blessings." In line 6, the word "advice" points forward to "sow actions....fertilize thoughts...water achievements" which in themselves, for their accomplishment of meaning, also serve as exophoric references in the text as their true understanding and application comes from real life experiences. These exophoric references strengthen the semantic understanding of the text and helps bind it together as a cohesive whole

There are twenty three instances of personal pronouns in the text out of which "we" is used nine times in lines 3, 4, 8, 8, 10, 11,12,14, and 15 and "our" five times in lines 3, 4, 9, 10, and 18. In all of these instances the pronouns refer back to the presupposed addressee "people/ human beings" in an exophoric sense. The pronoun "he" is used thrice in lines 2,5, and 6. Twice in lines 5 and 6 it refers back to "our neighbour" while in line 4 and 2 it refers back to the "fool" in line 1. The pronoun"you" and "us" in lines 1 and 18 respectively refer back as exophoric references to the presupposed addressee "people.",

61

Mostly the pronouns refer to the common addressee "people /human being" thereby giving the text the unification of meaning.

There are also instances of possessive pronouns in this text.In line 2 the possessive pronoun "your" is used to refer back to the presupposed addressee "people" in line 1 while "him and himself" in lines 5 and 9 refer back to "(our) neighbor" in line 4.Another possessive pronoun "his" in line 19 refers back to "the fool" in line 18. These forward and backward cohesive references minimize the need of repetition and provide the uniformity of meaningfulness in the text.

Demonstrative pronouns have been used sixteen times in this text. In line 8the demonstrative pronoun "this" is used to specify the "neighbor" who is spying. In line 4 "there" is used to refer back to the "garden of our life." "That" is used thrice in the text in lines 12, 13, and 16 to highlight and link the information.In line 12 it relates information to "each centimeter of earth", in line 13 to "the patient hand" and in line 16 "that head peering at us" links information back to "neighbour" in line 4. The determiner "the" is used eleven times in the text.Twice in lines 3 and 9 it refers to the "garden" as it is not a usual garden but the garden of life and in line 14 to the "gardener" as man himself is looking after it with the help of God. In line 1 "the" refers to "intellect", in line 12 to the "earth," the garden of life, in lines 13 and 14 to the "patient" which marks out the hand of a human being working as a gardener, in lines 15, 15, and 16 to rain, the sun, and the seasons (of life), in line 17 to the "hedge" around the garden of life for the protection and in line 18 to the "fool". These demonstrative pronouns only link information to its right track but also lock the texture of the text in a cohesive whole.

Comparative references are used five times in this story. In lines 1 and 2 the phrase "but the only one" shows one intellect which is desired by the fool as compared to the thousand other intellects that he is offered. In line 6 the phrase "likes to gives advice" denotes the neighbor's activity that he is capable of working but prefers to advise only. Similarly, in line 19 the phrase "never tends his own" refers back to the situation in line 6 and denotes the same activity of the neighbor.

In line 8 the phrase "what this neighbor is saying" shows the comparative effect of listing to what he says as by doing this you will be unable to do your work. Likewise, in lines 14 and 15 the phrase "no longer pay attention" connects back the information with the previous comparison in line 8 that the comparative effect of paying attention on peering head (neighbour's doing as well as saying) will divert your attention completely from your own working. These comparative references with little differences of lexical arrangements givethe text the connectivity of meaning.

5.1.3 Text three:

In the third text "A visitor arrives from Morocco", the use of a cataphoric reference in line 3 "original sin" refers to the activity in lines 19 and 20 that "She immediately ate the apple ...." Likewise in line 21 the phrase "same Morocco tribe" shows an explicit anaphoric reference to "certain desert tribe(s)" in line 3. These cohesive references help develop unified semantic links in the text weaving it into a unanimous semantic chain. Apart from this,an exophoric reference is used in line 7 where the phrase "instructed by God" generalizes God's instruction for all human beings in all the walks of their lives. It not only enhances the semantic understanding of the text but also connects it with its overall semantic unity.

63

Personal pronouns have been used seventeen times in this text. The pronoun "he" is used thrice in lines 11, 14, and 15.In lines 11 and 14 it refers to "Adam" in line 17 whereas, in line 15 it refers back to "the serpent" in lines 4 and 5. The pronoun "She" is also used thrice In line 19 it refers back to "Eve" in line 4 while in line 17 it connects with "other women /lovely women" in lines 11 and 19. The pronoun "Me" in line 12 is an anaphoric reference to "Eve" in line 4 but in line 1 it refers to the "supposed listener/protagonist of the text (I)". The pronoun "you" appears only once in line 9 to refer back to "Eve" in line 4. The repetition of these pronouns helps create a unified and amalgamated network of meanings which are directly and indirectly connected with one another and provide the text a cohesive unity.

Possessive pronouns are also used in this text. The possessive pronoun "her" is used thrice in lines 5,15, and 20 and makes an anaphoric connection with "Eve" in line 4.However, in line 17 it refers to the "other women/lovely women" in lines 11 and 19. The possessive pronoun "his" in line 22 refers to "anyone" in the same line. "Your" in line 10 refers back to "Eve's(man)" in line 4 and "him" in line 15 is an anaphoric reference to "the serpent" in lines 4 and 5. These possessive pronouns are cohesive sources used to provide a connection between the pronouns and the information related to themthereby adding a semantic unity to the text.

There are sixteen instances of demonstrative pronouns in this text.The determiner "the" is used 11 times in lines 4,5,6,9,13,16,18,19,20, and 23 out of which 6 times it specifiesthe "serpent" and twice in lines 18 and 23 it denotes "water". Apart from these "the" also

demonstrates "top, well and apple" in lines 16, 18, 19, and 20 respectively.Another demonstrative "this" has been used thrice in lines 6,9, and 21, In lines 6 and 9 it highlights the importance of the "apple" eaten by Eve and in line 22 it refers to the "same desert tribe" to indicated authenticity. The demonstratives "that" and "there" appear only once in line 17 to point to the direction of the "cave on the top of the hill".

The use of these demonstrative pronouns as a cohesive device show the specification of items in various places and communicates their meanings in a unified way to create the whole semantic web of the text.

Comparative references have been used thrice in this story. In line 10 the phrase "more beautiful" comparatively links the beauty of Eve with that of the other women hidden in the cave by Adam. In line 11 the phrase "no other women" shows a comparative assertion of Eve that Adam can never have any other women but her. Finally, in line 21 the phrase "same Moroccan tribe" refers to one of the "certain Morocco tribes"mentioned in line 2.

Comparative references link the information comparatively both in anaphoric and cataphoric ways to strengthen the semantic connectivity and the texture of the text and provide a unification of meaning.

Conclusion

The analyses reveal that these three texts contain all types of references: personal, demonstrative, and comparative. However, the numbers of instances of these references vary in each of these texts. References are basic cohesive devices for texturing the semantic unity of a text. These references help avoid repetition and provide the texts with semantic unity which increases the interest of readers. Anaphoric and cataphoric references connect the information in these texts and provide a better semantic understanding. Exophoric references connect the text with the practical world outside of it and increase its semantic boundaries. Personal pronouns have been used to identify different characters and objects in these texts while possessive pronouns add to their semantic relativity. Demonstrative pronouns highlight the due semantic positioning of different items in these texts and link them to one another for texturing cohesiveness. Finally, comparative references bring together relative information to transcend the semantic wholeness in these texts.

5.2 Substitution & Ellipsis

According to Halliday&Hasan substitution and ellipsis both function as linguistic links for cohesion with the only difference that ellipsis results in substitution by zero. "There are substitution ties where words such as one substitute for and thereby presuppose previous reference to a noun or noun phrase. There are ties of ellipsis where the absence of a presupposing item assumes a presupposed item or phrase" (Tierney, 1984).

5.2.1 Text: 1

There are two instances of substitution in the first text. The first instance is that of a verbal substitution.The verb "reply" in line 9 is substituted with "answer" in line 10. The second instance is that of a clausal substitution. The clause "Do you like what I write?" in line 20 is substituted with "No I don't" in line 21 to avoid repetition and to enrich the meaningfulness of the text as the semantic connection of these words and clauses bind them together in a united web of meaning thereby imparting a unified thematic structure to the text.

Substitutions in this story provide alternative semantic perfection with multiple varieties of expressions. The cohesive ties link together these multiple chains of expressions in one semantic bound which then becomes a part of the whole connected semantic unity of the textual structure.

Ellipsis removes certain words to provide semantic preciseness to a text without making affecting its understanding. An explicit example of ellipsis is found in line 24 of this text.

67

The word "drawn" presupposes the elliptical meaning of 'result' which" appears in line 27. However, an implicit example of nominal ellipsis is found in the first line of the text with the use of a possessive pronoun "my" which stands elliptically for the protagonist whose actual name is not mentioned throughout the text.

The use of ellipses in the text results in making the text lucid and adds to its semantic unification. Elliptical items facilitate in maintaining an authentic thoughtful relation of syntactic patterns in the text. These cohesive devices enrich the text with a variety of expressions and avoid monotony. These devices are helpful in texturing the unified semantic texture of the text syntactically as well as lexically.

5.2.2 Text: 2

In this text there are two instances of nominal substitution, in lines 1 and 2. The noun "thousand intellects" in the phrase "You can give a fool a _thousand intellects_" is replaced with "one" in "but the only _one_ he will want is yours."

An explicit example of ellipsis is found in line 4 of this text. The noun phrase "one side" is used to elliptically presuppose one side (∅-of the garden) for the noun "garden" in line 3. An implicit example of ellipsis is found in the first line of the text. The possessive pronoun "you" is used as a presupposed elliptical reference to "human being/people" in general.

The use of such elliptical expressions and substitution provides cohesive unity in the text. These devices determine that only adding up lexical resources are not the only way to enrich a text but to provide preciseness of semantic structure is more helpful to infer

delicacy in semantic patterns of the text. Ellipsis substitutes an item with 'zero' to bring maximum uniformity of expression and provides the cohesiveness of the text.

5.2. Text:3

An instance of clausal substitution can be found in lines 9 and 11 of this text. The clause "you need to look more beautiful for your man" in lines 9 and 10 is substituted with *"No, I don't"* in line 11.An example of verbal ellipsis is found in line 6 and 8. The verb "refused" in line 8 elliptically stands for the verb "eat" in line 6 and results in the elision of the whole sentence.

The use of substitution and ellipsis as cohesive sources brings conciseness in the semantic texture of the text and lock its cohesive structure in a united whole. Both these devices bring semantic authenticity, variety, and connectivity and bound different grammatical and lexical items in the text.

Conclusion

An attempt has been made to identify substitution and ellipsis as cohesive devices in the three texts. The analysis reveals that these devices play an important part in creating a precise and semantically unified text. The elliptical expressions and substituted items function both anaphorically and cataphorically and provide semantic lucidity to the text. The clausal and lexical variations provided by these cohesive devices have enriched the texts and strengthened the meaningful syntactic correlation of textual properties and have resulted in imparting cohesion to the textual structures of these narratives.

5.3 Conjunctions

Halliday&Hasan (1976)argue that"conjunction is a different type of semantic relation, one which is no longer any kind of search instruction, but a specification of the way in which what is to follow is systematically connected to what has gone before." According to them there are four types of conjunctions: additive, adversative, temporal, and casual. However, Bloor & Bloor (1995) think that "Conjunctions are cohesive ties between clauses or sections of a text in such a way as to demonstrate a meaningful pattern between them."

5.3.1 Text: 1

Conjunctions of different types have been used in this text to provide the narrative with necessary cohesion. There are nine instances of additive conjunctions out of which "and" has been used eight times in lines 3,6,8,12,19,21,25, and 26. In line 3 "and there is packed audience" links the information with lines 2 and 3 "it is ten o'clock in the morning" and also relates it to the previous sentence "... Festival in Melbourne." In lines 6 and 7 "And start asking....." is semantically connected to "Felton introduces..." In lines 7 and 8 "and asked me ..." connects with "he interrupts..." and "Before I..." Likewise, in liness 12 and 13, and 19 and 20 "and take..." and "and make things...." unify the meaningfulness of the sentence structure with "I remember....." and "Let's follow..." respectively. In line 21 "and I hated both of them" is linked "...two of your books" in lines 21 and 22. Finally in lines 24 and 27 "and the atmosphere..." is linked with "the audience..." Similarly,"and everyone..." is not only liked with "the interview become a real debate" but also with "...with the result".

There is another additive conjunction "(something) like" which is used in lines 9 and 10. In line 9 "... something like" forms a relation with the succeeding "that wasn't a very clear answer." The adversative conjunction "but" has also been used in the text to illustrate opposite meanings and not expectations. In line 17 "But it is relevant" refers back to line 15 where it is said by the interviewer "that's irrelevant." The protagonist uses "but" to remove the misconception of expectations on the part of J.Felton.

Temporal conjunctions are also used in the text and their function is to show the time sequence in the text. In line 23 "Now" signals the time sequence in the debate going on between the interviewee and John Felton. This temporal conjunction unifies the onward debate/information sequentially with the previous one and provides the necessary semantic unity.

Conjunctive devices have been widely used in this text to semantically connect various syntactic units and to enrich the texture of the narrative. These devices are indispensible linguistic carriers for blocks of information in sentences and clauses and are used to provide direction to the thematic track of information perfectly.

5.3.2 Text: 2

There are five instances of the additive conjunction "and" in this text which enrich the texture of the narrative and provide the necessary semantic unity. In line 4 "and notice our neighbor..." refers back to "we(people/human being) glance..." and also, generally, to "you(people/human being)" in line1. In line 7 "and when to water..." structurally connects this activity to the previous set of same activities in lines 6 and 7 "to give advice ... to sow... to fertilize..."In line 9 "and the garden of our life..." points forward to

"neighbour's ideas" and also points back to "… end up working". In line 11 "and fertilized with so many blessings" unites the information with "…we cultivated with so much sweat". Lastly, in line 16 "and the seasons" refers back to the same connected items as "…the sun, the rain".

Adversative conjunctions have been used twice in this text. In line 1 "but the only one…." refers back to "thousand intellects" in line 1 which shows the opposition of expectation on part of the fool that even if you offer him thousand intellects he will ask you for the one you have. In line 6· "But he likes to give advice…" refers to the opposition of information in line 5 "… himself capable of growing…" which shows that the fool/neighbor never tends to do his work and rather prefers to give advices only.

These conjunctive cohesive devices enrich the texture of, and provide the necessary semantic unity to, the narrative.

5.3.3 Text: 3
There are three instances of the additive conjunction "and" in this story. In line 1 "and tells me a curious story…" links the information back to "A visitor" because he the narrator of the text. In line 18 "Eve leaned over and," semantically unites the information with "… she saw a lovely women" and in line 23 "and feels no fear" connects the information with "…A return is guaranteed …" to the one who recognizes the limits.The adversative conjunction "but" has been used once in the text.In line 12 where "but me" denotes the assertion of Eve that Adam should have no women in his life but she.

All the above-mentioned information is unified into a semantic whole with these conjunctive cohesive devices which help structure the narrative. These devices facilitate

in maintaining the communication sequence of the characters,integrate the textual

information, and enrich the semantic texture of the narrative.

Conclusion

The use of conjunctive devices has been analyzed in the selected texts. It has been observed that these devices provide the necessary semantic unity to the narrative and help organize the textual data in line with both the previous referents and the succeeding referents. Additive conjunctions specifically collect random information in a uniformed way but this uniformity is not without the cohesive unity as the thoughts are semantically related. Adversative conjunctions segregate comparative form of information in the text in a refined way through injecting structural connecters and also maintain their meaningful unity. The temporal conjunctions demonstrate that the subsequent relation of time while patterning syntactic information is one of the important conjunctive functions in securing the cohesive unity of the texts.

5.4 Lexical Cohesion

Lexical cohesion focuses those elements which are non-grammatical in nature and directs to the "cohesive effect achieved by the selection of vocabulary"(R.Hasan, 1976) ."This cohesion is signaled by vocabulary selection, rather than by structural devices. While lexical cohesion is the most difficult to specify due to the innumerable ways word meanings can be related to one another and can co-occur, it is clearly an important source of cohesion in text" (Anderson, 1983).

5.4.1 Text: 1

Lexical cohesion, usually, employs repetition, synonyms, near synonyms, super ordinate and collocations. An instance of a similar and near-similar use of this term has been observed in this text. A super ordinate term "Interview" is used as an activity and there are many related terms which come under this head: Interviewed, introduces, asking, questions, saying, interrupts, asks, question, reply, says, answer, the audience, ask, irrelevant, replies, says, real debate. Another lexical category is "human feelings" under which there are many similar items like "feelings of apprehension, feeling of unease, like, hated, (audience) relaxes, (every one) pleased". All these vocabulary items are related to the main lexical category of "human feelings" in a general sense and create a semantic link with one another. There are many vocabulary items related to time in this text that can be classified as "time expressions" such as "10 o'clock, morning, before, five minutes, now, continue".

Synonyms and superordinates provide for semantic unity in a text. These devices encircle the collective communicative messages throughout the text in an organized manner by

76

linking together the precedent items with the succeeding ones and make the narrative a cohesive whole at the thematic level.

Another type of a lexical cohesive device found in this text is repetition. The word "write" is repeated in lines 1,4,14, and 20. The word "clear" is repeated in lines 9,18,19, and 20. There is no instance of collocation in this text. An instance of lexical cohesion is observed in line 16 "the other way round" and also in the use of the phrasal verb "pleased with" in line 27 which collocate grammatically and bind the text into an integrated texture to provide semantic unity.

These repetitive items in the text signify the importance of information conveyed by these terms. These devices also providethe systematic regulatory information in the text and the semantic uniformity. However, grammatically collective lexical terms convey regulation of lexical information in connected pairs and serve as a fundamental mechanism for texturing the cohesiveness of the text.

5.4.2 Text: 2

There are a number of instances of lexical cohesion in this text. For example, there is a series of related lexical items to the superordinate term "garden/gardening" which are: planting, garden, growing, sow, fertilize, water, garden, earth, cultivate, sweat, fertilize, fertilized, earth, gardener, sun, rain, season, garden and plants. Similarly, under the category of "human traits" contains intellect(s), glance, spying, likes, actions, thoughts, achievements, patient, hand, peering ,attention, concentrate, loves, tends, listen and saying. Terms related to "numbers/quantity" like thousand, one, one (side), each (centimeter),so much and so many have also been used in the text. Apart from this, there

is a repetition of certain lexical items such as "fool" in lines 1 and18, "advice" in lines 6 and 18, "neighbor" in lines 4,8, and 10, "forget" in lines 10 and 12, "end up" in lines 9 and 10 and "give" in lines 1,6, and 18.

These related lexical repetitive terms provide a unanimous blend of meaningful unity to the text. The superordinates serve as semantic groups to convey random information in an organized way. Without these devices the semantic connectivity becomes difficult to achieve because these devices provide sequential links in the text.

Collocation has not been used in the text. However, the use of the phrasal verb "end up" in lines 9 and 10 bind the text through grammatical collocation.

These grammatical collocations give the text its contemplative richness and the thoughtful communicative style. The use of collocation as a cohesive device demonstrates that these grammatical relations are not only responsible in providing the structural unity but are also helpful in maturing the semantic base of the text to engender the cohesive harmony.

5.4.3 Text: 3

There are a number of instances of lexical cohesion in this text. The phrase "beautiful and lovely" is related with "women qualities". Repetition has also been used in this text. The word "serpent" has been used five times as it is the main source of the original sin and the whole text revolves around it. Similarly, the word "apple" is used thrice because of its significance in making Eve commit the sin. "Eve" is the major character in the text and her name is repeated five times.

The repetition of the names of different characters in the text highlights their importance and also helps in providing the semantic outlook of the text.

There are many other lexical items which are repeated: "eat" thrice, "well","women", "Morocco", "tribe", and "reflect" twice.

The use of phrasal verbs has also been observed in this text: "slithered out" in line 5, "led her up" in line 15, "leaned over" in line 18 and holding out in line 20 that grammatically collocateand enhance the semantic texture of the text by conveying information in united pairs. This lexical mechanism grammatically helps in weaving the cohesive texture of the text.

Lexical items like these are repeatedly used in the story which highlights their semantic significance and integrates them into the whole semantic structure of the text.

Conclusion

Lexical cohesion in the three selected texts provides the semantic harmony to these texts. The repetition of certain vocabulary items make their complete semantic circle and help in texturing the unified semantic structure. The repetition of the same lexical items also highlights their significance place in the overall lexical stock of the texts and renovates their meaningful part in portraying the thematic outlook of the texts. The accumulated information structured in the texts in the form of superordinates gives an extensive explanation to one semantic unit with a variety of terms, systematically classifies the semantically connected terms, and organizes them into separate semantic entities at the same time which then as a whole get cohesively linked into a whole semantically united structure. The use of grammatical collocations in these texts is another form of lexical binding that integrates the related pairs of meanings and enrich the connotative and denotative semantic bases. Collocated information, in the selected texts, set itself in line with the structural infrastructure of information patterns and forms a grammatical and semantic linking with the cohesive harmony of the whole texts.

Conclusion

The present cohesive analysis of selected texts sheds light on those linguistic principles which guarantee semantic agreement in a text. It reveals that cohesion plays the most important role in unifying different non-structural elements of a text. A harmonious blend of these ties develops semantic linking between lexical and syntactic patterns to knit the texture of these texts and to convert them into a semantically unified form of discourse. By generating this semantic unity, cohesion bridges the gaps between the relationships of ideas and thoughts and allows semantic networking between grammatical and lexical elements. Each device works in correlation with this semantic processing and coins an elemental semantic linkage with the previous one as the one presupposes and the other is presupposed. This dispensation is achieved by describing backward and forward semantic connections. This analysis authenticates the basic property of cohesion that meanings of a text cannot be understood in isolation and rather their complete understanding comes from generating patterns of relations among various covert and overt signals within the text for attaining semantic unification. Thus, it is these collaborated operations of meanings that actually weave semantic wholeness in a text and cohesion systematizes this process. The application of the cohesion model on selected texts has highlighted the sequential semantic track in these texts that not only systematically infers the unity of meaning in these texts but also gives practical understanding in generating such integrated texts.

Suggestions:

The present research will be beneficial for deficient learners of English to get practical proficiency because most learners, especially in Pakistan, have an accurate understanding of grammatical structures but are weak in their functional applications. The study will also add up to the fundamental linguistic knowledge of both learners and teachers with the perspective of richness in interpreting the textual data along with keeping in line the whole semantic connectivity of a text. The understanding of the patterns of these cohesive devices for maintaining semantic unity at lexical and syntactic levels will facilitate in adding up to the knowledge of future learners and researchers to pursue further research in the related field. The applied model of cohesion can also be used as a teaching model with a specific focus on lexico-grammatical basis of English to enhance the identification of multiple meanings and structuring of semantically unified and cohesive texts. Furthermore, the knowledge of cohesion is indispensible for a complete textual understanding and perfect knitting of ideas.

Bibliography

A. D. Pellegrini, L. G. (1984). Context in Text: The Development of Oral and Written Language in Two Genres. *Child Development, Vol. 55* , 1549-1555.

Alonso, P. (2003). Conceptual Integration as a Source of Discourse Coherence: A Theoretical Approach with Some Examples from William Boyd's "my Girl in Skin-Tight Jeans" . *Atlantis, Vol. 25* , 13-23.

Anderson, P. F. (1983). Effects of Vocabulary Difficulty, Text Cohesion, and Schema Availability on Reading Comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly, Vol. 18* , 277-294.

Arnold, R. D. (1988). Teaching Cohesive Ties to Children. *The Reading Teacher, Vol. 42* , 106-110.

Bamberg, B. (1983). What Makes a Text Coherent? *College Composition and Communication, Vol. 34* , 417-429.

Belasco, S. (1981). Explorations in Applied Linguistics by H. G. Widdowson. *BelascoThe Modern Language Journal, Vol. 65* , 231.

Beverly E. Cox, T. S. (May, 1991). Children's Knowledge of Organization, Cohesion, and Voice in Written Exposition. *Research in the Teaching of English, Vol. 25* , 179-218.

Beverly E. Cox, T. S. (1990). Good and Poor Elementary Readers' Use of Cohesion in Writing. *Reading Research Quarterly, Vol. 25* , 47-65.

Bloor, T. B. (1995). *The Functional Analysis of English.* London,New york: Arnold.

Carrell, P. L. (1982). Cohesion Is Not Coherence. *TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 16* , 479-488.

Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). Grammar Pedagogy in Second and Foreign Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 25, , 459-480.*

Chapman, J. (1979). Confirming Children's Use of Cohesive Ties in Text: Pronouns. *The Reading Teacher, Vol. 33 , 317-322.*

Coelho, P. (2006). *Like the Flowing River.* India: Thomson Press (I) Ltd.

Crowhurst, M. (May, 1987). Cohesion in Argument and Narration at Three Grade Levels. *Research in the Teaching of English, Vol. 21 , 185-201.*

Dijk, T. A. (1977). *Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse.* London: Longmans.

Eggins, S. (1994). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics.* London : Printer.

Fahnestock, J. (1983). Semantic and Lexical Coherence. *College Composition and Communication, Vol. 34 , 400-416.*

Froma P. Roth, N. J. (1995). Reference Cohesion in the Oral Narratives of Students with Learning Disabilities and Normally Achieving Students. *Learning Disability Quarterly, Vol. 18 , 25-40.*

H.G.Widdoson. (1979). *Explorations in applied linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hagerup-Neils, A. (1977). Role of microstructures lingustic connectives in comprehending familiar and unfamiliar written discourse,University of Minneosta.

Halliday, M. (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar.* London: Arnold.

Halliday, M. (1977). Text as semantic choice in social context. In T. V. Petofi, *Grammars and descriptions.* New York: Walter de Gruyter.

84

Hayward, S. (1986). Cohesive Relations and Texture in Bresson's Film "L'Argent". *SubStance, Vol. 15,* , 52-68.

Holloway, D. W. (1981). Semantic Grammars: How They Can Help Us Teach Writing. *College Composition and Communication,Vol. 32,* , 205-218.

J.L.Morgan, B. &. (1980). Discourse and linguistic Theory. In B. B. R.J. Spiro, *Theoretical issues in reading comprehension.* Erlbaum.

John.L.Chapman. (1977). Some Influences of Semantics on and Reading Development. In J. Gilliland, *eading, Research and Classroom Practice.* London: Longman.

John.L.Chapman. (1979). The Perception of Language Cohesion During Fluent Reading. In M. E. Paul A Kolers, *Processing of visible language.* New York: Plenum Press.

Kittay, E. F. (1984). The Identification of Metaphor. *Synthese, Vol. 58* , 153-202.

Kopple, W. J. (1983). Functional Sentence Perspective, Composition, and Reading. *College Composition and Communication, Vol. 33* , 50-63.

L.Faigley, S. &. (1981). *Coherence, cohesion, and writing ability.* College Compositiona nd Communication.

Lavid, J. (1992). A computational approach to the Theory of Discourse structure:Advances in Text planning. *Atlantis, Vol. 14* , 81-105.

M.A.Eiler. (1980). Meaning and choice in writing about literature: a study of cohesion in the expository texts of ninth graders. *Dissertation AbstractsI nternational* , 40.

M.A.K.Halliday. (1966). *'Descriptive Linguistics in Literary Studies', Patterns of Language,* . Edinburgh University Press.

McCulley, G. A. (1985). Writing quality, coherence, and cohesion. *Research in the Teaching of English ,19 ,* 269-270.

Nathaniel Norment, J. (1995). Discourse Features of African American Students' Writings. *Journal of Black Studies, Vol. 25 ,* 558-576.

Neuner, J. L. (1987). Cohesive Ties and Chains in Good and Poor Freshman Essays. *Research in the Teaching of English, Vol. 21 ,* 92-105.

Olshtain, F. D. (1980). The Interface of Writing and Reading. *TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 14 ,* 353-363.

O'Toole, L. M. (1971). Structure and Style in the Short Story: Chekhov's "Student". *The Slavonic and East European Review, Vol. 49 ,* 45-67.

P.Freebody, R. &. (1981). Vocabulary knowledge. In J. Guthrie, *Comprehension and Teaching.* International Reading Association.

Pearson, D. (1974). Effects of grammatical complexity on children's comprehension recall and conception of certain semantic relations. *Reading Research Quartrly ,* 115-192.

R.Hasan, M. &. (1976). *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman.

Reinhart, T. (1980). Conditions for Text Coherence. *Poetics Today, Vol. 1 ,* 161-180.

Stalter, W. (Decembber,1978). "A Sense of Structure," College Composition and Communication, 29 .

Sulzby, B. C. (1984). Children's Use of Reference in Told, Dictated, and Handwritten Stories. *Research in the Teaching of English, Vol. 18* , 345-365.

Tierney, J. H. (1984). Commentary: Cohesion: Problems with Talking about Text. *Reading Research Quarterly, Vol. 19* , 240-244.

Walmsley, S. (1977). Children's understanding of linguistic connectives:Reviewed of selected literature and implications of future research. *National Reading Conference.* Clemson.

Weissberg, R. C. (1984). Given and New: Paragraph Development Models from Scientific English. *TESOL Quarterly,Vol. 18* , 485-500.

Winterowd, W. R. (May,1970). "The Grammar of Coherence," College English, 31.

Appendix.I

Text.1

In Melbourne

This is to be my first appearance at the writer's festival in Melbourne, Australia. It is ten o'clock in the morning and there is a packed audience. I am to be interviewed by a local writer, John Felton.

I step onto the platform with my usual feelings of apprehension. Felton introduces me and starts asking me questions. Before I finish what I'm saying, he interrupts me and asks me another question. When I reply, he says something like 'that wasn't a very clear answer.' Five minutes later there is a feeling of unease among the audience; everyone can sense that something is wrong. I remember Confucius, and take the only possible action.

'Do you like what I write?' I ask.

'That's irrelevant,' Felon replies. 'I'm here to interview you, not the other way round.'

'But it is relevant. You won't let me finish my thought. Confucius says: "Whenever possible, be clear." Let's follow that advice and make things absolutely clear. 'Do you like what I write?'

'No, I don't. I've read two of your books, and I hated both of them.

'Fine, now we can continue'.

The lines of battle have been drawn. The audience relaxes, and the atmosphere becomes electric; the interview becomes a real debate, and everyone including Felton- is pleased with the results.

Text.2

Looking at Other People's Garden

'You can give fool thousand intellects, but the only one he will want is yours,' says an Arabic proverb. When we start planting the garden of our life, we glance to one side and notice our neighbor is there, spying. He himself is incapable of growing anything, but he likes to give advice on when to sow actions, when to fertilize thoughts, and when to water achievements.

If we listen to what this neighbor is saying, we will end up working for him, and the garden of our life will be our neighbor's ideas. We will end up forgetting about the earth we cultivated with so much sweat and fertilized with so many blessings. We will forget that each centimeter of earth has its mysteries that only the patient hand of the gardener can decipher. We will no longer pay attention to the sun, the rain, and the seasons, we will concentrate instead only on that head peering at us over the hedge.

The fool who loves giving advice on our garden never tends his own plants at all.

Text.3

A Visitor Arrives From Morocco

A Visitor Arrives from Morocco and tells me a curios story about how certain desert tribes perceive original sin.

Eve was walking in the Garden of Eden when the serpent slithered over to her.

'Eat this apple', said the serpent.

Eve, who was properly instructed by God, refused.

'Eat this apple', insisted the serpent. 'You need to look more beautiful for your man.'

'No, I don't,' replied Eve. 'He has no other women but me.'

The serpent laughed.

'Of course he has.'

And when Eve did not believe him, he led her up to the well on the top of a hill.

'She's in that cave. Adam hid her in there.'

Eve leaned over and, reflected in the water of the well, she saw a lovely woman. She immediately ate the apple the serpent was holding out to her.

According to this same Moroccan tribe, a return to paradise is guaranteed to anyone who recognizes his or her reflection in the water and feels no fear.

Appendix.II

Text.1

In Melbourne

1. This is to be my first appearance at the writer's

2. festival in Melbourne, Australia. It is ten o'clock

3. in the morning and there is a packed audience. I am to

4. be interviewed by a local writer, John Felton.

5. I step onto the platform with my usual feelings of

6. apprehension. Felton introduces me and starts asking

7. me questions. Before I finish what I'm saying, he

8. interrupts me and asks me another question. When I

9. reply, he says something like 'that wasn't a very clear

10. answer.' Five minutes later there is a feeling of unease

11. among the audience; everyone can sense that some-

12. thing is wrong. I remember Confucius, and take the

13. only possible action.

14. 'Do you like what I write?' I ask.

15. 'That's irrelevant,' Felon replies. 'I'm here to inter-

16. view you, not the other way round.'

17. 'But it is relevant. You won't let me finish my

18. thought. Confucius says: "Whenever possible, be

19. clear." Let's follow that advice and make things

20. absolutely clear. 'Do you like what I write?'

21. 'No, I don't. I've read two of your books, and I hated

22. both of them.

23. 'Fine, now we can continue'.

24. The lines of battle have been drawn. The audience

25. relaxes, and the atmosphere becomes electric; the

26. interview becomes a real debate, and everyone

27. including Felton- is pleased with the results.

Text.2

Looking at Other People's Garden

1. 'You can give fool thousand intellects, but the

2. only one he will want is yours,' says an Arabic

3. proverb. When we start planting the garden of our life,

4. we glance to one side and notice our neighbor is there,

5. spying. He himself is incapable of growing anything,

6. but he likes to give advice on when to sow actions, when to fertilize thoughts, and

   when to water

7. achievements.

8. If we listen to what this neighbor is saying, we will

9. end up working for him, and the garden of our life will

10. be our neighbor's ideas. We will end up forgetting

11. about the earth we cultivated with so much sweat and

12. fertilized with so many blessings. We will forget that

13. each centimeter of earth has its mysteries that only the

14. patient hand of the gardener can decipher. We will no

15. longer pay attention to the sun, the rain, and the seasons,

16. we will concentrate instead only on that head

17. peering at us over the hedge.

18. The fool who loves giving advice on our garden

19. never tends his own plants at all.

Text.3

A Visitor Arrives From Morocco

1. A Visitor Arrives from Morocco and tells me a curi-

2. ous story about how certain desert tribes perceive

3. original sin.

4. Eve was walking in the Garden of Eden when the

5. serpent slithered over to her.

6. 'Eat this apple', said the serpent.

7. Eve, who was properly instructed by God,

8. refused.

9. 'Eat this apple', insisted the serpent. 'You need to

10. look more beautiful for your man.'

11. 'No, I don't,' replied Eve. 'He has no other women

12. but me.'

13. The serpent laughed.

14. 'Of course he has.'

15. And when Eve did not believe him, he led her up to

16. a well on the top of a hill.

17. 'She's in that cave. Adam hid her in there.'

18. Eve leaned over and, reflected in the water of the

19. well, she saw a lovely woman. She immediately ate the

20. apple the serpent was holding out to her.

21. According to this same Moroccan tribe, a return to

22. paradise is guaranteed to anyone who recognizes his or

23. her reflection in the water and feels no fear.