

## The Semantic Clause Relations In Literary Discourse

**Professor Abass Deygan Darweesh (Ph.D)**

**Akram Nadhum Raheem**

### Abstract

The linguist Winter (1977) believes that discourse organization is in some way the product of the semantic relations that hold between clauses, sentences and groups of sentences. He also believes that there are many ways to signal such semantic relations in English. One of these ways is to use the lexical signals, which is called lexical signalling.

Winter (ibid) terms these signals vocabulary 3. Vocabulary 3 consists of a large number of items, such as confirm, different, instance, problem, solution, reason, same, truth, etc., these items have the grammatical properties of the open-set items, in the sense that they can be modified and may fill any of the functional slots of the sentence. But their meanings overlap heavily with the meanings of the items that are found in the closed-set like the subordinators and conjuncts.

This study aims at identifying the lexical signals in a selected literary text from the English literature as a means of signalling the clause relations that hold between the clauses, the sentences or groups of sentences in that text.

The study is based on the hypothesis that vocabulary 3 items play a crucial and important role in signalling the semantic relations that hold between different parts of the literary text.

In order to test the validity of the hypothesis, Mark Twain's novel of "Huckleberry Finn" is selected for this purpose. A bottom-up approach is adopted in the analysis of the text under study. That is the text have to be analyzed to find out the lexically signalled clause relations and the way by which these relations are combined.

The analysis of Mark Twain's novel of "Huckleberry Finn" has revealed that there are ten different types of lexically signalled clause relations, throughout the text holding between clauses, sentences, or groups of sentences. Some of these relations are found to be repeated. These relations differ in their way of combination. Such results prove the validity of the hypothesis.

The study falls into three chapters. Chapter one presents the problem, the aims, the hypothesis, the procedures, the limits and the significance of the study. Chapter two moves around the theoretical aspect of the study, thus chapter two sheds light on Winter's semantic theory of clause relations and the contributions made by the linguists Hoey, Jordan and Crombie to this theory. Chapter three is concerned with the practical aspect, therefore it includes the approach of the analysis, the analysis of the text, the results of the analysis and the conclusions.

## Chapter One

### 1.1 The Problem

Every language has a limited number of expressions and words part of whose function is to make explicit the semantic relationships between units in a discourse. These words and expressions act as signals of those relationships between units which are the basis of the realization of active contextual meanings. Recently, much attention is given to the role of these words and expressions in signaling not only the relations between clauses and sentences in discourses or texts, but also in unfolding the underlying rhetorical organization of these texts and discourses.

The identification of these lexical signals explicit in discourse is the first step towards unfolding the underlying rhetorical and relational organization of texts (Hoey, 1983:85). That is to say, words are no longer viewed as having stable meaning; rather, they have dynamic and creative meaning contextually negotiable between the encoder and the decoder throughout the communication process.

Winter's semantic theory of clause relations is based on the notion that adjacent clauses and sentences complement the meaning of each other. That is to say, the semantics of one sentence is completed by the semantics of another which constitute the contextual significance of both sentences. The process of interpreting one sentence depends to a greater extent on the meaning of the preceding sentence or group of sentences.

According to Winter (1977), clause relations refer to "a system of predictability of context; That is, given a sentence with its preceding context, the

lexical selection of the next sentence is frequently predictable". Therefore, the existence of a preceding context of a given sentence is a crucial factor in the process of interpreting that sentence. According to Winter (1977) these lexical items can be divided according to their clause-relating function into three groups; voc.1, voc.2, and voc.3. The first two groups are grammatical, the third is lexical. The first includes subordinators, the second sentence connectors or conjuncts, the third includes lexical items which Winter calls 'lexical signals'.

Winter (1982: 178) has rephrased his definition to read " A clause relation is the shared cognitive process whereby we interpret the meaning of a clause or a group of clauses in the light of their adjoining clause or group of clauses." Where the clauses are independent we can speak of 'sentence relation' ." According to Winter, this definition has resolved the conflation between the sentence and the clause, because independence is the first grammatical requirement of the sentence, in the traditional definition, though not enough for its meaning in a complete utterance unit. And since the sentence in Winter's definition (ibid:183) consists of more than one clause grammatically grouped together by subordination, it follows that the clause in its independent form contains inadequate information and requires lexical realization by adjoining clauses to be fully understood.

As an illustration, Winter (ibid:185) asserts that though the clause 'There is a problem' is perfectly grammatical, it remains incomprehensible and needs a lexical realization by the adjoining clauses. He also terms this clause as 'unspecific clause' which requires semantic completeness by answering the question ' What is the problem?', i.e., it must have a lexical realization from the adjoining clauses which he terms as 'specific clauses'.

Winter's clause relational approach has culminated in a broader definition presented by Hoey & Winter (1986:123) in which they expand Winter's definition (1982) by accounting for the reader/writer communicative interaction. The reader is the decoder or interpreter of the combination of sentences or clauses in the light of the preceding ones, whereas, the writer, as encoder of the message, makes all the possible choices from lexis, grammar and intonation in the creation of the combination of clauses or sentences in the same discourse. The definition of clause relations final shape is

provided by Hoey & Winter (1986: 123) where emphasis is laid on writer-reader To facilitate communicative interaction:

" A clause relation is the cognitive process, and the product of that process, whereby the reader interprets the meaning of a clause, sentence, or group of sentences in the same discourse. It is also the cognitive process and the product of that process whereby the choices the writer makes from grammar, lexis, and intonation in the creation of a clause, sentence, or group of sentences are made in the context of the other clauses, sentences, or groups of sentences in the discourse."

## 1.2 The Aims

This study aims at identifying vocabulary 3 items in a corpus of a literary text as a means of signalling the clause relations that hold between different parts of the text. This study also aims at classifying these lexically signalled clause relations.

## 1.3 The Hypothesis

It is hypothesized that the different types of clause relations which are used in literary texts help the reader to interpret the message being communicated by the writer about the way in which the literary discourse should be interpreted. The writer is telling his/her reader to interpret the juxtaposition of the parts of his/her discourse in a particular way.

## 1.4 The Procedure

1. After a survey of the literature on clause relations, a corpus of a novel text is selected for the analysis.
2. The corpus is analyzed to find out the lexically signalled clause relations.
3. The types of the lexical items in the text are identified, classified and discussed.

## 1.5 Limits of Study

1. The present study will concentrate on the identification of clause relations signalling on the basis of Winter (1977), Hoey (1983), Jordan (1984) and Crombie (1985).
2. The method of analysis will be based completely on the models by Winter (1977), Hoey (1983), Jordan (1984) and Crombie (1985).
3. The corpus of literary text is restricted to Mark Twain's novel of " The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn".

## 1.6 The Significance of Study

The study is hoped to be of significance to discourse analysts, applied linguists and prospective researchers into the fields of information structure and text grammar.

## Chapter Two

### Review Of Literature

This chapter aims at providing a general background discussion of the organization and patterning of expository discourse. This chapter introduces Winter's semantic theory of clause relations, identifying the categories of these relations and ways of their signalling with special emphasis on lexical signalling which is the main concern of this study. The rest of the chapter is devoted to the contributions made by Hoey, Jordan and Crombie to Winter's semantic theory of clause relations.

#### **2.1 Expository Discourse: A Textual View**

Generally speaking, text linguistics deals with the study and analysis of any stretch of spoken or written texts beyond the sentence or the clause level. A number of linguists have tried to identify the factors which contribute to the forming of a text. For example, van Dijk (1972); de Beaugrande (1980); de Beaugrande & Dressler (1981); and Halliday & Hasan (1976). Those linguists have the consensus that most discourses have an abstract theoretical construct underlying them which can be termed the text. This text is built around the principles of relational connectivity (cohesion and/or coherence) which bind it firmly and create co-interpretation. In discussing text types, de Beaugrande & Dressler (1981:184) mention three types: descriptive, narrative and argumentative. They claim that these three types are traditionally well-established. They also indicate that their approach allows them to study text processing in terms of problem-solving ( in the Gestalist sense), in search from the initial states to the goal states (ibid:37).

#### **2.2 The Use of Lexical Signalling in Discourse**

##### **2.2.1 The Earlier Models**

The earlier models for the study of the role of lexical signalling in discourse have exclusively concentrated on the function of items collectively called the conjunctions or

conjuncts. These items are considered signals of logical relations in a stretch of language in use. This is evident in the works of several linguists such as Sledd (1956), Quirk et al. (1972) and Longacre (1976). However, these works do not go deep enough in analyzing the potential means by which discourse can effectively signal its structure. An early reference to the paraphrasing role of lexical signalling in discourse can be traced back to the work of Garvin et al. (1967). A brief discussion of their model is given below.

### **2.2.1.1 Garvin et al.'s "Predication-Typing" (1967)**

The fundamental assumption underlying this work is that the meanings of the elements of a language are related to each other in a nonhaphazard way, and, hence they maybe described in terms of a semantic structure. The technique of predication-typing consists in requesting subjects to paraphrase the sentences of a selected text in accord with a set of specific instructions. The purpose is to allow observation and interpretation of the paraphrasing behavior of the subjects in order to arrive at a semantic classification based on their responses. Paraphrasing can be defined as an operation in which an original statement or part thereof is replaced by another statement or part while retaining the original meaning. The study follows the distributional technique of the structuralists' research in which relations between linguistic units are described in terms of class inclusion. The schema also requires a functional connection between two terms A and B. Any sentence lending itself to paraphrasing by such a schema is termed a predication; sentences not so lending themselves are termed non-predication. In the case of predication-typing the pertinent are cue forms. A cue form is whatever speech contained in the original statement prompts the choice of a particular predication type. For example, three predication types have been recorded for the cue form 'start' : statement of succession (A followed by B); indication of origin (A stems from B); and indication of basic relation (A is based on B).

Garvin et al.'s study represents an early reference to the nature of lexical signalling of clause relations. They attempt to paraphrase the connection between clauses by means of lexical items. Although the result is a classification mess, they nevertheless convincingly demonstrate that the kind of relations between clauses that are normally considered to be signalled by conjuncts only, can also be signalled by full lexical verbs.

This means that lexis in their examples can fulfill the relational role normally assigned to closed-system items. However, the procedure they adopt in their analysis is too demanding on both the subjects and the subject and the analyst. It is far more complicated and lacks systematization that reduces its applicability.

### **2.3.1 Some Current Models**

With the advent of discourse studies in the past two decades or so the boundaries of linguistics have been redrawn.

It is now an increasingly accepted view among linguists that a coherent view of language must take into account various discourse phenomena. Texts can efficiently signal their structures to the reader/listener via grammatical and lexical means. The study of the role played by lexis has taken two directions. The first is represented by Halliday & Hassan model of cohesion (1976) in which they discuss two main categories of lexical cohesion: reiteration and collocation. However, Halliday & Hasan (ibid:288) conclude that the "the effect of lexical, especially collocational, cohesion on a text is subtle and difficult to estimate". To bridge the gap for a more semantically-based approach, several developments of Halliday & Hasan's model have been proposed: Beaugrande & Dressler (1981), and Halliday & Hasan (1985). The second direction is that inaugurated by Winter (1974) and focuses on the signalling role of certain vocabulary items which act as discourse organizers or sign posts in a text. These items play a key role in Winter's (1977) clause relational approach to written English texts. The approach has been further developed by Winter's associates Hoey (1979, 1983) and Jordan (1984).

### **2.3.3. Winter's Semantic Theory of Clause Relations**

Winter's semantic theory of clause relations has undergone several stages towards a deeper understanding into the semantic and logical relations in language. He starts his investigation in a report about the sentence and the clause in scientific English written in collaboration with Huddleston, Hudson, and Henirici (1968). In a supplementary work , Winter (1971) provides a semantic analysis of clause relations. In his work he distinguishes between outer clause relations ( connection between sentences) and inner clause relations ( connection by subordination) in scientific and non-scientific material. He also presents his first definition of clause relations: " a clause relation is the way in

the other clause." which the information of one clause is understood in the light of ( ibid:42).

Winter considers the definition as a broadening to an earlier definition of concessive relation given by Quirk (1954). In his Ph.D work Winter (1974) makes initial reference to vocabulary 1, vocabulary 2 and vocabulary 3 items. These items are found to have a binary value within a larger semantic whole of two basic clause relations: 'logical sequence' and 'matching relations'. In a comprehensive treatment of lexical signalling of clause relations in English, Winter (1977:35) defines clause relations as "a system of predictability of context, that is, given one sentence within its preceding contexts the lexical selection of the next sentence is frequently predictable." Here, our interest is in prediction or how one part of the sentence (i.e. the clause) is made explicit in advance by some connective or paraphrase of this connective in signalling the clause relations. Winter ( ibid:17,49) offers the following three examples to show how the three types of lexical items: 'by-ing', 'thereby' and 'instrumental' are classified as vocabulary 1, 2 and 3 respectively in the signalling of the binary clause relation of instrument- achievement:

Example (1):

- (1a) By appealing to scientists and technologists to support his party,  
(1b) Mr. Wilson won many middle class votes in the election.

Example (2):

- (1) Mr. Wilson appealed to scientists and technologists to support his party,  
(2) he thereby won many middle class votes in the election.

Example (3):

Mr. Wilson's appeals to scientist and technologists to support his party were instrumental in winning many middle class votes in the election.

Winter (1982: 178) has rephrased his definition to read " A clause relation is the shared cognitive process whereby we interpret the meaning of a clause or a group of clauses in the light of their adjoining clause or group of clauses." Where the clauses are independent we can speak of 'sentence relation' ." According to Winter, this definition has resolved the conflation between the sentence and the clause, because independence is the first grammatical requirement of the sentence, in the traditional definition, though not enough for its meaning in a complete utterance unit. And since the sentence in



Winter's definition (ibid:183) consists of more than one clause grammatically grouped together by subordination, it follows that the clause in its independent form contains inadequate information and requires lexical realization by adjoining clauses to be fully understood. As an illustration, Winter (ibid:185) asserts that though the clause 'There is a problem' is perfectly grammatical, it remains incomprehensible and needs a lexical realization by the adjoining clauses. He also terms this clause as 'unspecific clause' which requires semantic completeness by answering the question 'What is the problem?', i.e., it must have a lexical realization from the adjoining clauses which he terms as 'specific clauses'.

Winter's clause relational approach has culminated in a broader definition presented by Hoey & Winter (1986:123) in which they expand Winter's definition (1982) by accounting for the reader/writer communicative interaction. The reader is the decoder or interpreter of the combination of sentences or clauses in the light of the preceding ones, whereas, the writer, as encoder of the message, makes all the possible choices from lexis, grammar and intonation in the creation of the combination of clauses or sentences in the same discourse. The definition of clause relations final shape is provided by Hoey & Winter (1986: 123) where emphasis is laid on writer-reader To facilitate communicative interaction:

" A clause relation is the cognitive process, and the product of that process, whereby the reader interprets the meaning of a clause, sentence, or group of sentences in the same discourse. It is also the cognitive process and the product of that process whereby the choices the writer makes from grammar, lexis, and intonation in the creation of a clause, sentence, or group of sentences are made in the context of the other clauses, sentences, or groups of sentences in the discourse."

According to Winter (1977) there exists a finite number of words, verbs, nouns and adjectives, which perform jobs in texts comparable to the grammar words and to which a text structuring function is assigned. The list of these words as proposed by Winter (1977) includes (108) items such as: addition, affirm, basis, cause, change, compare, concede, conclude, contrast, deny, differ, equal, error, example, feature, follow, instance, instrumental, kind, lead to, like(ness), mean, means of, opposite, problem, reason, resemble, similar, situation, way etc.

According to Winter these lexical items signal the relations between clauses in a text. His theory of clause relations is based on the assumption that a finite number of lexical items, which he calls 'voc 3' items, indicate the special relation between adjacent clauses or sentences, and how the interpretation of one clause depends in some way on the interpretation of the other in the paragraph. In other words, the semantics of one sentence is completed by the semantics of the other which constitutes the contextual significance of the two of them.

According to Winter (1977) these lexical items can be divided according to their clause-relating function into three groups; voc.1, voc.2, and voc.3. The first two groups are grammatical, the third is lexical. The first includes subordinators, the second sentence connectors or conjuncts, the third include lexical signalling.

### **2.3.3.1 Vocabulary 1: The Subordinators of English**

Winter (1977:14-15) lists a set of subordinators which he terms vocabulary 1 items. He considers these items as a closed-system. Then, he divides them up into two groups: the first group is the subordinators of clauses which include: 'after', '(al)though', '(as though)', 'apart from-ing', 'as far as', 'as well as-ing', 'on the basis that', 'because', 'before', 'besides-ing', 'however', 'in addition to-ing', 'in order to', 'unless', 'until', 'whatever', 'whenever', etc. The second group includes the correlative pairs: 'just as X so (too) Y', 'not too much X as Y', 'not X let alone Y', etc. Winter excludes two types of subordinators on the basis that they have no vocabulary 3 equivalents. These include the non-finite verbs as in 'TO escape, he broke down the door' and the subjunctive as in 'Had he arrived, we would have left immediately'.

### **2.3.3.2. Vocabulary 2: The Sentence Connectors of English**

Vocabulary 2 represents the second set of the closed-system items in English. Winter calls these items as sentence connectors of English. They are also called as adverbial adjuncts which are classified by Jakobson (1964), Greenbaum (1969) and Quirk et al. (1972) into conjuncts and disjuncts. Halliday & Hasan (1976) call them conjunctions. These have been divided into two groups: The first group includes: 'accordingly', 'in addition', 'also', 'as such', 'as a result', 'at least', 'at the same time', 'basically', 'besides', 'in any case', 'in such circumstances', 'in comparison', 'consequently', 'on the contrary', 'differently', 'equally', 'essentially', 'for example', 'for this reason', 'further more', 'in

general', 'however', 'indeed', 'in fact', 'in short', 'in other words', 'in this way', 'instead', 'meanwhile', 'moreover', 'nevertheless', 'otherwise', 'on the other hand', 'therefore', 'thereafter', 'yet', etc. The second group includes the correlatives: 'not only (but) also', 'for one thing..... for another', 'in the first place...in the second', 'on the one hand.... On the other', 'firstly', 'secondly', 'finally', etc.

According to Winter (1977:45) " Vocabulary 2 nearly always signals independence for both of its members. In contextual terms, this means that for vocabulary 2 we have the information of both members being presented as if they were new to the context." Vocabulary 2 items are typically placed in the second member of their clause relation. Thus they make more explicit the clause relation between their matrix clause and the preceding clause or sentence.

### **2.3.3.3 Vocabulary 3: The Lexical Items of Clause Relations**

In his article Winter (1977) shows that there exists a finite number of words, verbs, nouns and adjectives, which perform jobs in texts comparable to the grammar words and to which a text-structuring function is assigned. The list of these words as proposed by Winter (ibid:20) includes (108) items such as: achieve, addition, affirm, basis, cause, change, compare, concede, conclude, contrast, deny, differ, equal, error, example, feature, follow, instance, instrumental, kind, lead to, like(ness), mean, means of, opposite, problem, reason, resemble, similar, situation, way, etc. which perform a pivotal function in texts. They encapsulate information which the writer has encoded in the text and guide the reader into how information is interrelated. According to Hoey (1983:21) the so far mentioned vocabularies 1 and 2 constitute the grammatical system of signalling, whereas, vocabulary 3 items constitute the lexical system of signalling. In the examples (4a, b and c) below the relation is expressed by the vocabulary 3 item 'follows' can be paraphrased by the vocabulary 1 item 'after' as in (4b) or the vocabulary 2 item 'thereafter' as in (4c):

Example (4a):

*The rifle clubs have banned the use automatic and semi-automatic weapons. The move **follows** the police raids.*

Example (4b):

*After the police raids, the rifle clubs have banned the use of automatic and semi-automatic weapons*

Example (4c):

*The police raided the rifle clubs. **Thereafter**, the rifle clubs banned the use of automatic and semi-automatic weapons.*

Winter (ibid:23) suggests that what makes vocabulary 3 lexical is that they " are chosen in the same way as other lexical items, namely as nouns, verbs and adjectives in the syntax of subject, verb, object, or complement of the clause." Their lexicality is clearly apparent in their ability to be qualified or premodified like any other open-ended lexical items. For instance, the vocabulary 3 item 'example' can be modified by an open-ended item like 'striking' in order to spell out the relation of 'generalization' . However, vocabulary 3 items are differentiated from other ordinary lexical items by their need to be 'filled out' or lexically realized. The term 'lexical realization' has been employed by Winter (ibid:26) to refer to the open-ended creative lexical choices which extend outside the sentence or clause boundary within the semantic structure of the clause relations. The vocabulary 3 item follows in example (4a) above refers back to the open-ended lexical choices of the previous sentence and signals the chronological sequence relation. Winter considers lexical realization as a crucial condition for labeling vocabulary 3 items as a closed-system.

Vocabulary 3 items not only signal relations that hold between clauses, but they also have other special connective roles. Winter (ibid:28) identifies three types of these roles: First, Winter draws the attention to what he terms 'items of metastructure' like; **situation, problem, solution, evaluation.** These are found to be the lexical signals which serve a larger clause relational function signalling the organization of the whole text. According to Hoey (1979:32) "It is this extension to the notion of vocabulary 3 to cover whole discourses which enables us to demonstrate the ways in which discourses signal their structure." The second type is represented by certain vocabulary 3 items like

'attitude' which can perform an attitudinal function similar to that performed by vocabulary 2 attitudinal disjuncts such as 'fortunately', 'essentially', etc. These represent the speaker's comment on the truth-value of what he is saying. The third type includes a number of vocabulary 3 items such as 'move' (n.), 'event', 'action' etc. that may function anaphorically or retrospectively providing information about the content of previously mentioned clause or sentence. In example (4a) above the vocabulary 3 'move' in the second sentence connects the two sentences anaphorically to the action taken in the second sentence.

It is quite obvious that these lexical items cannot be defined in dictionary terms as any other words, therefore, Winter (1977) tried to figure out a solution for this difficulty. He proposes four criteria in order to facilitate the identification of the closed-system semantics on the semantic continuum between open-system and closed-system. These four criteria are designed to make the process of distinguishing the vocabulary 3 items from the ordinary

## 2.4. The Criteria of Closed-System Semantics

### 2.4.1. Criterion 1: The Closed-system Vocabulary

Winter's claim that vocabulary 3 items belong to a closed-system is based on two principles: First, most of the vocabulary 3 items can either directly or indirectly paraphrase the connective semantics of the closed-system vocabularies 1 or 2 or both. The vocabulary 3 item 'reason' is paraphrased by the vocabulary 1 item 'because'. Direct paraphrase happens in two ways, one where a vocabulary 3 item has a correspondences with items in vocabulary 2 by anaphoric function, for example the item 'contrast' is paraphrased by vocabulary 2 item 'in contrast' or 'in comparison' and so on. The other way where vocabulary 3 is paraphrased by vocabulary 2 and 1 in turn, like the vocabulary 3 item 'concede' which is paraphrased by vocabulary 2 item 'in addition' and vocabulary 1 item 'even though'. On the other hand, indirect paraphrase can be viewed where the lexical items of vocabulary 3 provide an internal part of the semantics made by vocabularies 1 and 2

The second principle is that some vocabulary 3 items like 'error' which do not directly and indirectly paraphrase vocabularies 1 or 2 may behave in the same way as those which do. In other words, they may perform the same function done by

vocabulary 3 items in that they relate clauses and sentences to each other in meaning not covered by vocabularies 1 and 2. This function is typically performed by the vocabulary

3 item '**error**' which signals the relation of Error-correction as in the example below:

Example (5):

(1) *Sir, may I indicate an **error** in the photograph caption on page 72 ...?* (2) *The Graph Zeppelin was not designed for helium, nor did it have ...* (3) *The Hindenberg was designed for helium ....*

The signalling role of vocabulary 3 item '**error**' in the above example is that of cataphoric reference.

#### **2.4.2 Criterion 2: The Characteristic Vocabulary of Questions**

In his second criterion, Winter states that vocabulary 3 items can have the same lexical selective powers as the closed-system WH-items such as 'what', 'where', 'when', etc. This is based on Winter's observation that the relation between WH- items and vocabulary 3 item can be made more explicit by showing what typical questions are elicited by the second member of the relation. Thus, the relation between the first and the second sentence in the following example can be elicited by the WH- question 'What did George.W.Bush achieve by invading Iraq?' The vocabulary 3 item 'achieve' shows the relational signalling of both members as that of Instrument-Achievement. In other words, the vocabulary 3 items may perform a complementary role when there is a need for more precise specification of information, which means that vocabulary 3 items complement the selectional function of WH- items.

In his later analyses of clause relations, Winter (1982) considers the questioning technique as one of the major tools in unfolding the grammar and semantics of the clauses in adjoining sentences. Winter (ibid:207) asserts that "for every clause there must be a question which it is answering."

#### **2.4.3. Criterion 3: The Paraphrasing of Clause Relations**

One of the defining features of vocabulary 3 items is their ability to paraphrase directly or indirectly the connective semantics of vocabularies 1 and 2 . In his discussion of lexical signalling, Hoey (1986:26) asserts that "paraphrase is crucial evidence for the

existence of a third vocabulary serving the same signalling functions as subordinators and conjuncts." In terms of our discussion of Winter's semantic theory, we observe that when a sentence like that in example 3 above can be paraphrased by either example 2 or 1 in the same discourse or context, this means that the vocabulary 3 item. i.e., 'instrumental' in the example must serve the signalling function of the vocabulary 2 item, i.e., 'thereby' or vocabulary 1 item 'by-ing'.

Winter (1977:42) distinguishes between two kinds of semantics involved in the clause relations between vocabularies 1, 2 and 3. The first is the underlying semantics contributed by both members of the relation. The second is the interpretative semantics of the connectives themselves. That is to say, the second kind of semantics is the one involved with the third criterion. Therefore, we may say that all of the vocabulary 3 items share the same feature which is the ability to paraphrase the interpretative semantics of vocabularies 1 and 2.

#### **2.4.4.: Criterion 4: The Anticipation of the Clause Relation as a Necessary Part of Lexical Realization**

Winter (1977:57) states that "The anticipation of the clause relation depends on the "organization of the immediate context to come, either within the matrix clause which has the anticipatory feature or within the immediate context of the sentences to come in its paragraph." This anticipatory element is often signaled by a vocabulary 3 item which provides a strong semantic link beyond sentence or clause boundaries.

Winter (ibid:59) states the following example:

Example (6):

(1) *There is a significant contrast between the national mood now and in 1964. (2) Then, despite the minuteness of Labour's majority, there was some sense of exhilaration: a feeling that new opportunities were opening up for the country as a whole. (3) Now, this is missing.*

The vocabulary 3 item **contrast** in the above example anticipates the compatible lexical realization which follows in the very next sentence. In other words, any vocabulary 3 item has the ability to perform two predictive roles; first, it predicts the

order of information in the adjoining sentences or clauses. Second, it organizes our open-ended creative lexical choices on the basis of predictability and compatibility.

## **2.5. Applications of Winter's Semantic Theory of Clause Relations**

### **2.5. 1 Hoey (1979 & (1983)**

Hoey (1979) has been able to develop a new model for discourse analysis derived from Winter's model of clause relations. Hoey (1983) states that " The clause relation is not so called because it relates only clauses. Rather, it is so described because all systems for signalling relations are rooted in the grammar of the clause." This means that clause relations in discourse may be between clauses, groups of clauses, paragraphs, or even whole texts. Hoey (ibid:16) states that "the relation does not respect the syntactic boundaries, though its realization is necessarily rooted in the grammar of the clause." According to Hoey (1983:18) the notions 'clause' and 'sentence' should be treated as conflated, and 'sentence' should be interpreted as also including part of a sentence. Hoey's work concentrates on what he terms the minimal discourse pattern of problem-solution.

### **2.5. 2 Jordan's (1984) Contribution to the Theory of Clause Relations**

Jordan's application of clause relations represents a further development of Winter (1982). Like Hoey (1979), Jordan presents a comprehensive analysis of the four basic metastructures of information situation-problem-solution-evaluation. Various possible combinations of the items of metastructure which depends on the writer's purpose and the reader's knowledge have been demonstrated. Jordan's work is also complementary in that it covers a greater range of every-day English texts whose signalling items are treated in special indices to facilitate their learning and teaching. For instance, under the index j: key words, Jordan (ibid: 154) introduces a general survey of vocabulary 3 items signalling the four metastructural items arranged in alphabetical order. Jordan provides a survey of vocabulary 3 items which, though specific to certain corpus, can apply in most contexts. Jordan's work offers an insight



into the structure of everyday English texts and the role of various signalling systems in structuring and organizing these texts.

### **2.5.3 Crombie's Relational Approach (1985)**

Crombie's relational approach to syllabus design is inspired by Winter's (1977) clause relational approach in which she finds the notion of vocabularies 1, 2 and 3 is usefully relevant. Crombie has criticized the structural and notional syllabuses because they concentrate on discrete linguistic or semantic items. They do not take adequate account of language as coherent discourse. Instead, she proposes that language syllabuses should not only concentrate on linguistic items but also on coherent spoken and written discourse

Although she draws attention to the importance of Winter's and Hoey's work on signalling in texts, she disagrees with them on a number of issues. The most important one concerns Hoey's claim that all systems for signalling relations are rooted in the grammar of the clause (Hoey 1983:18). Crombie's disagreement is based on two observations. First, she believes that Hoey's claim contradicts Winter's statement (1982: 7) that intonation is as important as the grammatical devices of signalling. Second, she believes that Winter's notion of vocabulary 3 runs counter to the point Hoey is making, concluding that the problem results here from the attempt to reconcile the term clause relation with the term cognitive process.

### **2.6. Classification of Clause Relations**

The linguists Winter, Hoey and Crombie share a general agreement concerning the classification of clause relations. However, they show differences in the terminology and the scope of such relations.

Winter (1977) divides them into two broad classes; *the logical-sequence relations* and *the matching relations*. Logical-sequence relations are the relations between successive events or ideas, whether actual or potential, the most basic form of these relations being time sequence, they answer the question of "How does x event connect with y event (in time) ?". They include three types of relations; condition-consequence, instrument-achievement, and cause-consequence. On the other hand, matching relations are the relations where we match things, actions, people, events, etc. for similar and

different. They answer the question of "How does x compare with y in respect of z feature?". They are of two types; contrast and compatibility (comparison).

Hoey (1983) adopts exactly the same division used by Winter (1977) i.e., logical-sequence relations and matching relations for small passages, but for long passages and whole discourses. Hoey uses the term 'discourse patterns' to indicate the rhetorical patterns such as the problem-solution pattern, general particular pattern and so on.

According to Crombie (1985 a, XV), clause relations have a wider scope.

Therefore, Crombie (ibid, 15-28) divides clause relations into nine classes:

**1. Temporal Relations:** these relations are concerned with the temporal connection between events, e.g. after he has seized Helen, he will leave Greece.

**2. Matching Relations:** these relations involve comparison of two things, events, or abstractions in terms of some particular in respect of which they are similar (simple comparison, e.g. the prince was afraid and so were his followers.), or different (simple contrast, e.g. the one was good; the other, bad.).

**3. Cause-Effect Relations:** are four different semantic relations, each of which is concerned in some sense with cause and effect. These relations are reason-result, e.g. *we're in trouble and his arrival is the reason*. Means-result, e.g. *his pressing the lever made the handle turn*. Means-purpose, e.g. *Agamemnon surrendered the girl in order to propitiate Apollo*. And condition-consequence, e.g. *if some arrives late again, I will tell him what I think of him*.

**4. Truth-Validity:** each of the four relations here concerned directly or indirectly with truth and validity. In (statement-affirmation, e.g. (1) *all wild animals are dangerous*, (2) *I agree*.) the truth of a statement is affirmed, (in statement-denial, e.g. (1) *the Greeks won*, (2) *they lost*.) the truth of a statement is denied, while in (denial-correction, e.g. *he wasn't a doctor, he was a teacher*.) a denial involving a negated word preceded or followed by a statement in which that word or expression is correlatively replaced, in (concession-contradiction, denied e.g. *although anxious, he appeared calm*.) the validity of an inference is directly or indirectly denied.

**5. Alternation Relations:** each one of these relations involves a choice between two things or events. Contrastive alternation involves exclusive (i.e. P or not P) disjunction that is, it is a choice involving a positive/negative opposition, e.g. whether he lives or

dies, he will enter history. On the other hand, supplementary alternation involves a choice between two or more things, events or abstractions which are not treated as opposites, e.g. nobody insulted him or hit him.

**6. Bonding Relations:** these relations are additive (i.e. non-elective) non-sequential relations between conjoined or juxtaposed propositions unlike the alternation relations which are elective (i.e. involve choice). There are four types of bonding relations; coupling, e.g. *he was furious and savage*, contrastive coupling, e.g. he tried to remember what he heard but he failed. Statement exemplification, e.g. *drinking leads to many consequences, for example addiction*. Statement-exception, e.g. *all the students passed except her*.

**7. Paraphrase Relations:** the paraphrase relation involves restatement without amplification, the same propositional content is stated in different ways in both members of the relation, or it might involve a negated antonym, e.g. *he is not tall, he's short*.

**8. Amplification Relations:** the amplification relation involves the substitution of a specific word or expression for a general one. There are three kinds of such relation; *term-specification*, e.g. *he was invited: John invited him*. *Predicate-specification*, e.g. *we knew that Bob was married*. *Term-exemplification*, e.g. *play useful games for example chess*.

**9. Setting-Conduct Relations:** these relations are of four kinds, each one of them involves an adverbial, they are: event/state location, e.g. *the spy was jumped over the walls of the house*. Event-direction, e.g. the boy entered his room. Event-manner, e.g. *resentfully, David viewed the destruction*

## Chapter Three The Analytic Framework And Text Analysis

### 3.1 Introduction

This chapter moves around the analysis of the novel under study which is Mark Twain's "The adventures of Huckleberry Finn" to find out the lexically signalled clause relations. Thus, this chapter sheds light on the analytical

framework, explains the obtained results, list the lexical signals that are used to signal the clause relations in the texts, and classifies the resulting clause relations. The chapter will be supported by figures and tables to backup the discussions.

### 3.2 The Analytic Framework

A bottom-up approach will be followed in the analysis of both novels under study, that is the texts will be analyzed to find out the lexically signalled clause relations and the way by which these relations are combined. This will be achieved by identifying the lexical items which highlight such relations.

Hoey (1983:65) asserts that:

" One of the first steps to analyze any discourse must be the identification of the lexical signalling present in it. Lexical signals are the author's/speaker's signalling of the intended organization and are therefore obviously of primary importance; it is probable that they are one of the main means whereby a reader/listener decodes a discourse correctly."

Within the same context, Crombie (1985:72) maintains that discourse is full of clues and signals and they allow readers or listeners to make relational predictions.

The analytic framework underlying the present work is basically derived from Winter's semantic theory of clause relations (1974 &1977) and its subsequent development by Hoey (1979,1983), Winter (1982), Jordan (1984), and Crombie (1985).

### 3.3 Text Analysis

The text analysis of both novels under study has revealed that there are ten different types of lexically signalled clause relations holding between clauses, sentences and groups of sentences. These relations are as follows:

1. Condition-Consequence Relation.
2. Term-Specification Relation.
3. Contrast Relation.
4. Preview-Detail Relation.
5. Cause-Consequence Relation.
6. Statement-Assessment Relation.
7. Comparison Relation.
8. Alternation Relation.

9. General-Particular Relation.
10. Generalization-Exception Relation.

For the easiness of reference, a brief discussion for each clause relation with an example from the analyzed texts will be given. Lexical signals explicit in the clause relations are grouped at the end of each relation.

### 3.4 Discussion of the Clause Relations

#### 3.4.1 Condition-Consequence Relation

- a. Description: In this relation, the instrument member specifies the means undertaken to achieve a particular intended result or purpose.
- b. Exemplification: In example (4.1) below, the vocabulary 3 item **so as** in the second clause (1b) signals the consequence of the condition mentioned in the first clause (1a).

Example (4.1):

(1a) *We went tip-toeing along a path amongst the trees back towards the end of the widow's garden,* (1b) *stooping down so as the branches wouldn't scrape our heads.*

*(The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, Chp.2, p.6)*

#### The Signals of Consequence

**so as**

#### 3.4.2 Term-Specification Relation

- a. Description: In this relation, the second member specifies or identifies an item or a term introduced in the other member.
- b. Exemplification: In example (4.3) below, the vocabulary 3 item '**things**' mentioned in S (5) operates as a two way signal. It functions cataphorically and anaphorically by linking what precedes with what follows. It links what's mentioned in Ss (1), (2), (3) and (4) with Ss (6), (7), (8) and (9) by signalling a definition for the term 'robbery'.

Example (4.3):

(1) Now, says Ben Rogers, 'what's the line of business of this Gang?' (2) 'Nothing only robbery and murder,' Tom said. (3) 'But who are we going to rob? (4) houses—cattle—or—'Stuff! (5) stealing cattle and such **things** ain't robbery, it's burglary, says Tom Sawyer. (6) We ain't burglars. (7) That ain't no sort of style.(8) We are highwaymen.(9) We stop carriages on the road, with masks on, and kill the people and take their watches and money.'

(ibid: Chap.2, p. 9)

### The Lexical Signals

thing(s) (5)

#### 3.4.3 Contrast Relation

- a. Description: This relation involves a comparison between two events, things or abstractions in terms of something in respect in which they are different.
- b. Exemplification: In the example (4.4) below, the vocabulary 3 item **different** mentioned in S (4) operates as an anaphoric and cataphoric signal simultaneously. It anaphorically signals that the relation between S (4) and the following sentences is that of contrast. At the same time, this item cataphorically signals that the relation between S(4) and the preceding three sentences in the same discourse is that of contrast as well. Thus, it sets up a strong anticipatory role typical of vocabulary 3 items.

Example (4.4):

(1) 'We stop stages and carriages on the road, with masks on, and kill the people and take their watches and money.' (2) 'Must we always kill the people?' (3) Oh, certainly.(4) It's best.(5) Some authorities think **different**, but mostly it's considered best to kill them.(6) Except some that you bring to the cave here and keep them till they're ransomed.'(7) Ransomed? What's that?(8) I don't know.(10) But that's what they do.(11) I have seen it in the books; and so of course that's what we've got to do.'

(ibid:Chap.2,p9)

### The Lexical Signal

Different (5)

### 3.4.4 Preview-Detail Relation

- a. Description: The second member in this relation provides enumeration or listing of the concrete details that support information introduced in the first member.
- b. Exemplification: In example (4.5) below, the vocabulary 3 item **two** in S(5) predicts that the enumeration of more concrete details will follow in Ss (6) and (7) and its adjoining clauses (7a) and (7b) and S(8).

Example (4.5):

*(1) So the hair ball talked to Jim and Jim told it to me.(2) He says: 'Yo' ole father doan' know, yit, what he's a-gwyne to do.(3) Sometime she spec he'll go 'way, en den agin he spec he'll stay.(4) De bes' way is to res' easy en let de ole man take his own way.(5) Des's **two** angels hoverin' roun' 'bout him.(6a) **One** uv 'em is white en shiny,(6b) en 'tother **one** is black.(7a) De **white one** gits him to go right,(7b) den de **black one** sail in en bust it all up.(8) A body can't tell, yit, which **one** gwyne to fetch him at de las'.*

(ibid.Chap4,p:16)

### The Lexical Signals

#### Signals of Preview

two (5).one (6)

#### Signals of Detail

white one (7a), black one  
(7b)

### 3.4.5 Cause-Consequence Relation

- a. Description: In this relation one member provides the effect of a specific cause stated in the other member.
- b. Exemplification: In the example (4.6) below, the vocabulary 3 item **bad** mentioned in S(5) cataphorically signals that S(3) and its adjoining clauses is the cause of S(1) and S(2).

Example (4.6):

*(1) 'Jim was laid up for four days and nights.(2) Then the swelling was all gone and he was around again.(3a) I made up my mind I wouldn't ever take aholt of a snake-skin again with my hands,(3b) now that I see what had come of it.(4) Jim*

*said he reckoned I would believe him next time.(5) And he said that handling a snake-skin was such awful **bad** luck that maybe we hadn't got to the end of it yet.'*

(ibid. Chap 10, p:46)

### The Lexical Signals

bad (5)

### 3.4.6 Statement-Assessment

a. Description: In this relation, the second member supplies an an assessment (positive / negative) of a statement introduced in the first member.

b. Exemplification: In example (4.7) below, the vocabulary 3 item **right** mentioned in S (2) provides a positive assessment of what has been stated in S (1). This assessment is supported in S (3) by Huck's observation of the rats.

Example (4.7):

*(1a) 'Well, the woman fell to talking about how hard times was,(1b) and how poor they had to live,(1c) and how the rats was free as if they owned the place, and so forth, and so on, and then I got easy again.(2) She was **right** about the rats.(3) You'd see one stick his nose out of a hole in the corner every little while.'*

(ibid. Chp11,p:51)

### The Lexical Signals

right (2)

### 3.4.7 Comparison-Relation

a. Description: The relation involves a comparison of two things, events or abstractions in terms of some particular in respect of which they are similar.

b. Exemplification: In example (4.8) below, the vocabulary 3 item like mentioned in S(4) signals a comparison between Huck's body shaking and the shaking of a leaf.

Example (4.8):

*(1) 'Come now—what's your real name?'(2)' Wh-what, mum?'(3)'What's your real name? Is it Bill, or Tom, or Bob?—or what is it?'(4) 'I reckon I shook **like a leaf**, and I didn't know hardly what to do.'*

(ibid. Chp11, p:51)

### The Lexical Signals



Like (4)

### 3.4.8 Alternation Relation

- a. Description: This relation involves a choice between two or more that two events, things or abstractions.
- b. Exemplification: In example (4.9) below, the vocabulary 3 item **correct** mentioned in S(4) anaphorically signals that the relation between Ss (1), (2) and (3) is that of alternation

Example (4.9):

(1) *'Whenever we see anybody coming, we can tie Jim hand and foot with a rope, and lay him in the wigwam and show this handbill and say we captured him in the river, and were too poor to travel on a steamboat, so we got this little raft on credit from our friends and are going down to get the reward.*(2) *Handcuffs and chains would look still better on Jim, but it wouldn't go well with the story of us being so poor.*(3) *Too much like jewelry.*(4) *Ropes are the **correct** thing—we must preserve the unities, as we say on the boards.'*

(*ibid. Ch. 20,p: 113*)

### The lexical signals

Correct (4)

### 3.4.9 General-Particular Relation

- a. Description: In this relation, the second member provides a particular analysis or a classification of an idea, or a topic that is generally stated in the first member of the relation.
- b. Exemplification: In example (4.9) below, the vocabulary 3 item **kind** mentioned in the second clause (1b) provides an analysis or a classification for the item **sign** mentioned in the first clause (1a) and also for the item **whispered** mentioned in S(2). Therefore, it operates anaphorically to signal that the relation between S(1) and its adjoining clauses and S(2) is that of General-Particular.

Example (4.9):

(1a) Tom he made a **sign** to me- (1b) **kind** of a little noise with his mouth-and went creeping away on our hands and knees.(2) When we was ten foot off, Tom **whispered** to me and wanted to tie Jim to the tree for fun; but I said no; he might wake and make a disturbance, and then they'd find out I warn't in.

### The lexical Signals

Kind (1b)

#### 3.4.10 Generalization-Exception Relation

a. Description: In this relation, the second member specifies an exception to the general statement introduced in the first member.

b. Exemplification: In example (4.10) below, the generalization member is introduced in Ss (1), (2), (3), (4),and (5). The exception member is typically signalled by the vocabulary 3 item **except** mentioned in S(6).

Example (4.10):

(1) 'We stop stages and carriages on the road, with masks on, and kill the people and take their watches and money.' (2) 'Must we always kill the people?' (3) 'Oh, certainly.'(4) 'It's best.'(5) 'Some authorities think different, but mostly it's considered best to kill them.'(6)' Except some that you bring to the cave here and keep them till they're ransomed.'

(*ibid.* Chp.2, p:9)

### The lexical Signals

Except (6)

## Conclusions

1. The vocabulary 3 items function as exponents of the clause relations of literary discourse, though signalling the relations holding between the clauses, the sentences and groups of sentences. From the analysis of Mark Twain' master piece of " Huckleberry Finn" , it is found that the text contains of ten different types of clause relations that are lexically signalled.

2. The vocabulary 3 item has proved to perform syntactic and semantic roles in the sentence simultaneously. The syntactic role comes from the fact that it can act as a subject, verb, object or complement in the sentence, and it is premodified and postmodified as other lexical words such as nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc. The

semantic role comes from its connective function, in that the presence of the item in a particular sentence anticipates by its predictive effect what kind of information is to be presented in the following sentence or sentences. Thus, the vocabulary 3 item can be regarded as an organizing element of its context, it connects the adjoining sentences of the context to each other by its need for the open-system lexical choices (to which it refers to or signposts) to realize its semantics and to have its proper functional significance as a connector of sentences.

3. Vocabulary 3 may function anaphorically referring backwards to the preceding context, cataphorically referring to the following context or both as a two-way signal, that is why they are significant in the interpretation of discourse.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beaugrande, R. and Dressler, W. (1981) *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Beardsley, M. C. (1950) *Practical Logic*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Becker, A. L. (1965) " *A Tagmemic Approach to Paragraph Analysis*." *College Composition and Communication*. 16, pp. 237-242.
- Brooks, C. and Warren, P. (1970) *Modern Rhetoric* (4<sup>th</sup> edition). New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World.
- Connolly, F. (1953) *A Rhetoric Case Book*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
- Crombie, W. (1985a) *Process and Relation in Discourse and language Learning*. London: OUP.
- ..... (1985b) *Discourse and Language Learning: A Relational Approach to Syllabus Design*. London: OUP.
- de Beaugrande, R. (1980) *Text Discourse and Process*. London: Longman.
- de Beaugrande, R. and W. U. Dressler (1981) *Introduction to Text linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Decker, R. E. (1978) *Patterns of Exposition 6*. Boston: Little Drown and Company.
- Garvin, P. L., J. Brewer and M. Mathiot (1967) " *Prediction-Typing: A Pilot Study in Semantic Analysis*" *Language*, 43.2 Pt. II, pp. 1-43.
- Greenbaum, S. (1969) *Studies in English Adverbial Usage*. London: Longman.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1970) " *Language Structure and Language Function*". In Lyons, J. (ed.) *New Horizons in Linguistics*. Middx: Penguin Books.
- Halliday, M. A. K. & R. Hasan (1976) *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- ..... (1985) *Language Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social Semiotic Perspective*. Victoria: Deakin University Press.

- Hoey, Michael. (1979) "*Signalling in Discourse.*" Discourse Analysis Monographs. Birmingham: Instant print Ltd.
- ..... (1983) *On the Surface Of Discourse.* London: George Allen & Unwin.
- ..... (1989) "*Discourse- Centered Stylistics:* Simpson (eds.), pp. 123-36.
- Hoey, Michael and Eugene Winter (1986) "*Clause Relations and the Writers Communicative Task,*" in Couture, Barbara (ed.), pp. 120-41.
- Jordan, M. P. (1984) *Rhetoric of Everyday English Texts.* London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Jordan, M. P. (1985) *Academic Writing Course.* Vollins: London and Glasgow.
- Kane, T. S. and L. J. Peters (1966) *Expository Prose.* New York: Oup.
- Longacre, R. E. (1972) *Hierarchy and Universality of Discourse Constituents in New Guinea Languages: Descriptions.* Washington: George Town University Press.
- Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech and J. Svartvik (1972) *A Grammar of Contemporary English.* London: Longman.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1972) *Some Aspects of Text Grammar.* The Hague: Mouton.
- ..... (1977) *Text and Context: Exploration in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse.* London: Longman.
- Winter, E. O. (1971) "*Connection in Science Material: A Proposition about the Semantics of Clause Relations.*" *Centre for Information on Language Teaching Papers and Reports.* No. 7, pp. 41-52.
- ..... (1977) "*A Clause Relational Approach to English Texts: A Study of Predictive Lexical Items in Written Discourse.* *Instructional Sciences,* Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 1-92.
- ..... (1982) *Towards a Contextual Grammar of English.* London: George Allen & Unwin.
- ..... (1996) "*Denial and Correction as the Most Fundamental Clause Relation 1.*" *Conference Developing Discourse Awareness in Cross-Cultural Contexts.* University of Warsaw, Poland.