GRAMMATICAL COHESION IN H. G. WELLS'

"THE COUNTRY OF THE BLIND"

IN TERMS OF HALLIDAY AND HASAN'S MODEL

Youssra Qassim Ali

Instructor of English/ The General Directorate of Education

Al-Najaf Al-Ashraf-Iraq

yusriqasim@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Cohesion and text are integral terms since it is considered as an aspect that combines the relations of meaning within a text to make it an integrated unit. It is pointed out as a group of semantic and structural constructions that relates the sentences within a text.Cohesion is generally interested with two broad categories: 'grammatical cohesion' and 'lexical cohesion'. These categories mirror a view on language that treats grammar and lexis along separate lines. The present study is an attempt to investigateWells usage of grammatical cohesion in terms of Halliday and Hasan's Model (1989) and observes whether there is any relationship between the grammatical ties and the literary analysis of the story. The researcher analyses the story of H. G. Wells' *"The Country of the Blind"* and proves that the followed model represents a successful tool for literary discourse studies as well as there are skilful and powerful cohesive strategies employed in the selected text.

Introduction

Cohesion has an essential role in the creation of a text and its understanding since it can provide continuity that exists between one part of a text and another. Readers and listeners can depend on the continuity provided by cohesion to fill in the missing information,which are not present in the text but are necessary to ifs interpretation.Cohesion is related to semantic since it deals with the meaning relations which exist in a text. When two elements within a text are combined in a text and convey a comprehensive idea, cohesion will take place.This paper reviews Halliday and Hasan's model of cohesion as it appears in their further work of *Cohesion in English* (1976) and their later works particularly their views about the taxonomy of lexical cohesion.The openingsections shed lights on defining cohesion and related conceptsof it. Then paper ends the two majordivisions of cohesion: *grammatical* and *lexical cohesion* are introduced. Under the first type thecohesive categories of *substitution, ellipsis*, and *conjunction* are discussed.While *reiteration* and *collocation* as means of lexical cohesion are presented inthe following subsections.

The Concept of Cohesion

The property that distinguishes a sequence of sentences that construct a discourse can be defined as cohesion. It is considered as a serious of lexical, grammatical and other relations which provide combine the different parts of a text. It is referred to the way in which two or more sentences integrate into a text by means of internal ties, i.e. each two adjacent sentences in the text are combined to each other by at least one "tie". The simplicity and easiness of understanding and interpreting of any text is the text nature and number of these internal cohesive ties within a text influence directly on the simplicity and easiness of understanding and interpreting the text. The concept of cohesion is largely owed to Halliday and Hasan, who identify five types of cohesive ties in English; four of them are grammatical and one lexical (Norgaard et al54-55).

According to Halliday and Hasan (4), cohesion points out to the "non-structural text-forming relations". The concept of cohesion in text is related to semantic ties or "relations of meanings that exist within the text ,and that defined it as a text". They discuss that cohesion is concerned with the meaning relations which exist in the text. Moreover, cohesion takes place where two elements in the text depend onone another in their interpretation. That is to say, one element presumes the other one, as one is the key to understand and interpret the other. Cohesion takes place when these two elements are combined into a text.

Cohesion is a set of linguistic means available for producing a meaningful text. Cohesion occurs "when the interpretation of the some elements in the text is dependent on that of another. Furthermore, one element presupposes the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it" (Halliday & Hassan 2). In order to call a sequence of sentences a complete meaningful text, the sentences should not occur at random and they have to display some kind of mutual dependence. Sometimes the internal structure of a text is immediately apparent and sometimes it has to be carefully demonstrated .Accordingly ,the task of textual

analyses is to identify the linguistic features that cause a coherent sentence sequence (Crystal 162).

Halliday and Hasan's Model of Cohesion

Various models have been suggested for the analysis of lexical cohesion. The most comprehensive and pioneering account of cohesion is produced by Halliday and Hasan in 1976. Historically speaking, the study of cohesion goes back to the early 1960sof the last century when discourse analysis emerged as an important part amongvarious fields of the human sciences such as anthropology, sociology,psychology and linguistics. Though some linguists have referred to cohesion intheir works, but none has introduced an exhaustive study of the subject.Jakobson (1960) talked about the role of patterning and repetition in the creationof *textual parallelism*. Yet, the first major investigation of cohesion has beencarried out by Halliday and Hasan (1976) seminal work *Cohesion in English*(Malmkjar 623).

Cohesion has undergone fruitful exchanges among scholars. Halliday(1964) and Hasan (1968) initiated this field in *Systemic FunctionalLinguistics* and Gleason (1968) dealt with it in Hartfordbasedstratifictional linguistics. Halliday and Hasan's (1976) work is considered as the canonical study that categorizes cohesion under five devices as*reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion*. Getwinski(1976) draws on work by Halliday and Hasan developing the sameframework of cohesive categories in addition to grammatical parallelism. Later on, *Systemic Functional Linguistics* work by Martin (1992) was influenced by Gleason. Then, thismodel took its path with developments or modifications by other scholarssuch as Winter (1982), Hoey (1983), and Jordan (1984) (Martin 35).

Following Halliday and Hasan 1976, two opposed schoolsregarding the role of cohesion in discourse were appeared. The first school represented those whoadopted the view as introduced by Halliday and Hasan and regard it as asemantic concept that gives text its definition and texture. Works which adoptedthis paradigm were introduced by Givon (1981) and Hoey (1980). The second one which has distinct views claim that cohesion is only a formal factor that supplies grammatical connections within the text and has nothing to do forunderstanding, which is gained by coherence. The major works in the later viewrepresented by de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), Carrel (1982), andWiddowson (2007). (Tanskanen 18-19). There are two kinds of cohesive categories through which cohesion can be achieved:*grammatical and lexical cohesion*. (Al-Maliki 19).

Grammatical Cohesion

Grammatical cohesion is classified according to the categories ofreference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976) the first three types are purely grammatical while the fourthcategory of conjunction occurs in between the grammatical and lexicalclassification, but it is closer to the

former. Each one of these categories hasthree sub-divisions according to the grammatical items used in realizing them**.**

a.References

References refer to various items that can be interpreted by relating them to
something else instead of being interpreted semantically in their own right. These items, In English, are divided into three types: *personals* (i.e. John, he, the book, it), *demonstratives* (i.e. here, there) and *comparatives* (i.e. fewer). Accordingly, the interpretationcan be performed due to two ways of references either internal reference in which therethe items takes place inside the text or by the aid of the outer context. Moreover, within the text an endophoric reference is made whereas out of the text bordersan exophoric reference is utilized.Reference is regarded as a relationship between things, events or facts. It may be establishedat varying distances although it usually links functional elements inside clause borders. Two types of phoric relations are recognized: *exophoric*which underliessituational reference and *endophoric* that describes internal textual links(Halliday & Hasan31-36).

b.Substitution

Substitution refers to the process bywhich linguistic item is replaced by another while ellipsis is another form ofsubstitution indicates zero replacement to the omitted item. The two categoriesmainly share a common set of mechanisms, but ellipsis is a more complex one.It differs from reference in being interested with wording rather thanmeaning. But the two devices interfere in many cases where a semanticcomponent has a different interpretation from that of the grammatical one. Insuch case, we have to adopt the two depending on certain general conventions.In general, substitution points out to a relation that takes place within the text. It is a kind ofstrategy employed to prevent repetition. As a general condition, the substitute itemshould have the same structural function (Halliday & Hasan 88).

c.Ellipsis

The third grammatical device of cohesion is referred to as ellipsis. The
common view of ellipsis is that it is something- *unsaid but understood*.Something understood in the special sense of understood as *'going without saying'*. Understood in the sense that language does not function in isolation: itfunctions *as text in real context*. The *unsaid* is brought down by language usersfrom the context of situation (Halliday & Hasan 142).A plethora of definitions are available to the concept of *ellipsis*. Barker and Galasinski (80) consider ellipsis as the deletion of an element in the textstructure that is presupposed by the previous text. For instance, one hearing '*Ilove you'*we can easily say *'so do I'*, without explicitly mentioning theprocesses of love.

d. Conjunction

As a cohesive category, conjunction possesses both of the grammatical andlexical aspects of the lexicogrammar, but it is closer to the grammatical inidentity. Conjunction is not an anaphoric relation and this what distinguishes itfrom other categories. Conjunctive items are not self-cohesive, but cohesivenessis attributed to their own senses. Moreover, they are not phoric relations that presuppose other items in the discourse (Halliday & Hasan 226).

Lexical Cohesion

A text is not only a collection of different sentences on some random topics. To some extent, the sentences and phrases of any text should be relevant the same thing, i.e. the text should have a quality of unity. Any text should contain several lexical chains so as to provide a semantic context for interpreting words, concepts, and sentences. Thus, lexical cohesion is the result of chains of related words that contribute to the continuity of lexical meaning. Accordingly, cohesion exists when explicit linguistic linking devices are provided in order to relate one part of the text to another giving the text its structure and texture. Consequently, lexical cohesion is the cohesion that results from semantic relation between words (Woods 137).Furthermore, lexical cohesion "comes through the selection of items that are related in some way to those that have gone before". He classified the lexical cohesion, synonymy , and collocation (Halliday 310).Baker and Ellece (69) define lexical cohesion as a way of achievingcohesion by repeating the same word or phrase or using chains of related wordsthat contribute towards the continuity of lexical meaning.

Lexical cohesion differs from the grammatical cohesion which shows four cohesive relations; *reference, substitution, ellipsis ,and* conjunction. Halliday and Hassan (274) define lexical cohesion as "the cohesive effective achieved by the selection of vocabulary". Thus, lexical cohesion is considered by Halliday and Hasan model as the fifth type of cohesion which stands apart from other types. They differentiate between two fundamental categories of lexical cohesion which are: collocation and reiteration(Halliday & Hasan 318).

a. Collocation

The notions of collocation is used as an umbrella term for the kind of cohesion produced by the co-occurrence of lexical elements that are in certain point or another typically linked with each other due to their identical context (Halliday & Hasan 287). Furthermore, Halliday and Matthiessen (577) define collocation as a specific relation among words basing on their tendency to accompany each other. Collocation is an important device to provide connectedness to text segments. It is not limited to a couple of items, but it builds up lexical links of long cohesive chains within the whole text. A collocation of longer cohesive chain is a stronger one in having more cohesive force because these long chains contribute to the expansion of the discourse topic. So, it is a vital factor in improving one's perspective and acting as a thread of the text.

b. Reiteration/Repetition

When the same words in a particular text will be repeated and has the same reference to both occasions, lexical cohesion takes place. There is no necessity forthe second example to be exactly an identical item; it works within the*Reiteration* categories as being either synonym, superordinate, or general word(Halliday & Hasan 282; Crystal 410). Lexical cohesion is provided due to the choice of a lexical item that is in somesense synonymous with a preceding one; for example, sound with noise, cavalrywith horses (Halliday & Matthiessen 572). Additionally, reiteration is a form of lexical cohesion which requires the repetition of a word and a number of things in between the use of a *synonymy*, *near-synonymy* or *superordinate*(Halliday & Hassan 278). Due to McCarthy (65), it is emphasized that the function of reiteration as "either restating as item in a form of lexical cohesion which involves the repetition of a lexical item from lexical cohesion which in later part of the discourse by direct repetition or else resorting its meaning by exploiting lexical relations".To sum up, reiteration represents the repetition of a lexical element such as repeating the same word or a synonym, specification, co-specification, or contrast.Furthermore, it is easier to realize reiteration in a text rather thancollocation since it is further systematic. There are five kinds of reiteration:*Synonymy*, *Antonymy*, *Hyponymy*, *Meronymy*, and *Repetition*(Hellalet 161).

Data Analysis

The researcher depends on Halliday Model (1976) in data analysis. Wells's "The Country of the Blind"is selected to be the center of the study. The story is about a person who, by mistake and accident, gets into a country or a world of blind people who never know what seeing is. Throughout the exchange between him and those people, a number of themes, ideas, perspectives and events are revealed. However, we are after analyzing the mechanisms of the grammatical cohesion found in this story. We are going to read the story fully and reveal the mechanisms of grammatical cohesions which are found in the story such as references, substitution, conjunction and ellipsis. The main concern of the present part of the paper is to conduct an analysis of the four cohesive devices stated above in terms of their quantity, quality, cohesive ties types, relevance to Country of the This includes sorting out the text cohesive items according to their types, number of ties, distances, and the presupposed items procedures of data management and data analysis with illustrated tables and figures.

The analysis of cohesion in the first part of Well's "the Country of the Blind" divulges his present treatment of reference cohesive categories. As the statistics indicate, cohesive reference items signify a total of 455 ties. The analysis of cohesion in the country of the Blind divulges his present treatment of reference cohesive categories. As the statistics indicate, cohesive reference items signify a total of 310 ties with an average of from and rank as the highest among the other four devices. More specifically, anaphoric reference is the most dominant type in comparison with the cataphoric. The analysis shows that there are more than anaphoric ties. Furthermore, the writer makes use of all the three kinds of cohesive reference, but he uses them with great divergence in terms of their density and distribution in this part of the text discourse. Most of the employed reference items are of the personal type. The second

high average of the reference items is that of the demonstrative class in being of While the lowest portion is given to the comparative cohesion which represents 25 . However, these averages are explained in the following Table 1:

Table1: frequnecy and percetage of reference

Reference type	Frequency	Percentage
personal	310	60%
Demonstrative	125	35%
Comparative	25	5%
Total	450	100

Furthermore, the analysis has examined the story's use of demonstrative reference by accounting its two subtypes: Neutral "the Article" and other Selective Demonstratives like this, that, here, now etc. It is found that he employs both of them with some divergence in their percentages according to his discourse needs. Indeed, the most frequent use of demonstrative is the article "the", because the writer describes and talks about things that are known by the reader. Moreover, the most frequent use is the personal reference "he" as the story focus on him throughout the story especially at the beginning of the story , then, the focus is on him and the people of the city and that is why the pronoun "he" and "they, later, used equally and the middle and end of the story. And there is a reference to the world of the blind and unblinded and references to the places in tow worlds, there is a focus on place and time in frequent cases of "this, these, then and now as well as that and this, the demonstrative is seconded the list.

Regarding substitution, it rarely happens throughout the story. This may be due to the fact that the dialogue is highly more than the exchange in the story. As stated hereunder in Table 2, substitution occupies one of the lowest rates in this part. It shares only an amount of 21 ties. Most of these are normal substitutes since they rank as the highest in number of 9 ties.

Table2: frequnecy and percetage of substitution

Substitution	Frequency	Percentage
Nominal	9	42.85
Clausal	4	19
Verbal	8	38
Total	21	100

The most frequent occurred substituition is the nominal. As stated above, normal substitutes are more preferable by the writer than the other two types. For instance,

he even uses this cohesive device more than once in the same occasion which in turn serves the requirements of the discourse success. Here, as in the following example, this contributes as an emphasis to the characters' speech. Examples of the nominal substitution found in the text as follows:

1- He thought how far or *so one* might come down through passes.
2- If *one* went *so*, up that gully and to that chimney there.
3- He did not turn aside as he had meant to *do*.
4- The first time they did *this*

In terms of the cohesive conjunction, as Table 4 presents, this device has been accounted as 566 ties.The following table shows the occurrences and percantages of the conjunction and which type is more dominant and which one is less. Looking at the various uses of these subcategories, we see that the writer uses them to provide transitions within the subtexts to serve narration and dialogues. Through this means, he controls his discourse directions that serve the demands of discourse meaning continuity and plot progress.

Table 3: frequnecy and percetage of conjunction

Conjunction type	Frequency	Percentage
Additive	412	72.79
Adversative	60	10.60
Temporal	75	13.2
Causal	10	1.76
Continuative	9	1.59
Total	566	100

The data analysis shows that additives represent the majority among the conjunctions found in the short story. Additives occurs about 412 times (72.79 %). The second major conjunction types is the temporals, as they recur about   75 times (13.2 %). With regard to adversatives, they recur about 60 times (10.60 %). The rest of conjunctions are causal and continuative, which represent the least occurred conjunctions. The causal conjunctions occur about 10 times, whereas the continuatives occur about 9 times.

Having a frequent usage of additive conjunctions is justifiable by the fact that the analyzed text is a short story " the country of the blinds", which has a series of connected events and too many descriptions involves. That is to say, the text's informativity requires the use of additive conjunctions where the writer provides a detailing description of the events, as well as of the places and characters involved in the story. The most occurring additive conjunction is " and" :

Through temporal conjunction, the writer expresses the event 's sequence. Through temporal, the reader can be indulged within the events of the story as timing helps in tracing the events. Regarding adversatives, too many contractive views are expressed through using adversatives. With respect to the rest of conjunctions that are causal and continuatives, in spite of their infrequent occurrence, they have an important role in making the text cohesive.

As far as ellipsis is concerned, the result of analysis shows a few number of ellipsis found in the text. The frequent used ellipsis is the nominal as it occurs 13 times, and the clausal occurs 10 times. Finally, the verbal ellipsis which occurs only 4 times (see table 4). Also, ellipsis remains of the same low percentage obtained as having only 35 ties. In turn, this small portion of ellipsis ties is made by a dominance of 13 clausal ellipsis ties; 37 % followed by 5 verbal ties; and 17 nominal ellipsis ties; about 48%. Below, Table 4 exhibits these numbers. Referring to the novelist interest in this category, we may easily remark here that he mostly uses it in dialogues more than narration. In this regard, it shows the dominance of some characters upon others as they just signals. In addition to, as the series of conflict continues, they avoid repeating and tend to uses ellipsis. Moreover, the surprising and serious events happed heat the debate between him (protagonist) and the people from the city or country of the blind. The below examples may certify this point:

Table4: frequnecy and percetage of ellipsis

Ellipsis	Freque ncy	Percentage
Nominal	17	48. 57
Clausal	13	37. 14
Verbal	5	14. 28
Total	35	100

The most frequent occurred ellipsis is the nominal. Examples of the nominal ellipsis found in the text as follows (the elliptic word is between brackets):

1- I will repay you. My dearest one, my
      dearest with the tender voice, I will repay (you)."

2- Three hundred miles and more from Chimborazo,
      one hundred (miles) from the snows of Cotopaxi

3- They turned their faces this way and that (way),

Regarding the clausal ellipsis, some of the examples found in the text are:

1- men did not think of germs and infections, but (they thought) of sins

2- "Where does he come from, brother Pedro?"
    asked one. "(he comes from) Down out of the rocks."

3- they could distinguish individual differences as readily as a dog can (distinguish differences),

Several verbal ellipsis are found in the novel, for instance:

1- The old became groping, the young saw but
    (saw) dimly,

2- They would seek him, but not find him.

Conclusions

The novel is analysed in terms of its linguistic cohesion based on the model of Hallidy and Hasan's (1976) which is proved to be a successful tool for literary discourse studies. Accordingly, the study has indicated that there are skilful and powerful cohesive strategies employed in Well's "the Country of the Blind". In turn, this chiefly operates in the achievement of the story as a whole and plays a vital role to its overall coherence. So, In terms of the five analysed ties categories, the following conclusions are drawn:

1- Reference and conjunctions are the most predominate cohesive category employed throughout the whole text and shares the highest percentage within all instances of analysis. The analysis shows that additives represent the majority among the conjunctions found in the short story. Additives occurs about 412 times (72.79 %). Besides, the writer uses both types of reference: anaphoric and cataphoric and he utilizes the few occurrence of the second to serve suspense creation particularly by the multipart of (Article "the"+ general noun).
2- On the contrary, substitution and Ellipsis ranks as the lowest in most of occurrences within the novel tripartite discourse divisions. Ellipsis is relatively more prominent than substitution and they are mainly used in the story dialogues.
3- In terms of characters, it is concluded that though the story protagonist is the most referred to character throughout the novel, there is no single character who reserves consistent dominance in all the parts and there is no fixed order in this regard too. This is due to the fact that all focus is on him and how he gets in and out the country of the blind.
4- In terms of themes, it is concluded that the novelist keeps the same pattern used in presenting his characters by making each part has its own dominating themes which either continue or disappear in the next parts. The most common theme happens when he gets into the country of the Blind; the theme of disability and islolation.

References

Al-Maliki, A. M. S.(2014). Cohesion in Charles Dickens's Hard Times. Unpublished M.A. Dissertation,University of Basrah, College of Education for Human Sciences.

Baker, P. & Ellece, S. (2011). Key Terms in Discourse Analysis. London & New York, NY: Continuum International.

Barker, C. & Galasinski, D. (2001). Cultural Studies and Discourse Analysis.1ST Edition. SAGE Publication Ltd.

Crystal, D. (2008). A Dictionary of Phonetics and Linguistics. London:Blackwell.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). An introduction to functional grammar. London: Edward Arnold.

Hallidy, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1976). Cohesion in English. London: Longman.

Hallidy, M.A.K. & Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. (2004). An Introduction toFunctional Grammar (3rd. ed.). London: Hodder Arnold.

Hellalet, N.(2013). Reiteration Relations in EFL Student Writing: the Case of Moroccan University Students. The Journal of English Language Teaching, Vol. 6, No.11, 160-166.Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education.

McCarthy, M. (1991). Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Malmkjar, K. (Ed.). (2010). The Linguistic Encyclopaedia (3rd. ed.). London & New York, NY: Routledge.

Martin, J. R. (2001). Cohesion and Texture. In Schiffirin. D., Taneen. D. Hamilton,

H. (Eds.), The Handbook of Discourse Analysis (pp.35-53).Malden &

Oxford: Blackwell.

Norgaard, N., Montoro, R. and B., Busse .(2010). Key Terms in Stylistics. India: Replika Press Pvt Ltd.

Tanskanen, S.-K. (2006). Collaborating Towards Coherence: Lexical Cohesion in English Discourse. Amsterdam & Philadelphia : John Benjamins.

Woods, N. (2006). Describing Discourse: A Practical Guide to Discourse Analysis. London: Hodder Arnold.