Conjunctive Markers In An Extract From *The Rainbow*

Azhar Hassan Salumee
University of Kerbala College of Education

INTRODUCTION

Cohesion, in its normal form, is the presupposition of something that has gone before in discourse, whether in the immediate preceding sentence or not. This form of presupposition is referred to as anaphoric. The presupposition item may point forward to something following it. This type of presupposition is called cataphoric. On the other hand, exospheric and endophoric presupposition refer to [item information outside and inside text, respectively. [Fraser, 1988:21

Johnz [1987:16] mentions that cohesion occurs where the interpretation of an element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one presupposes the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it when this happens, a relation of cohesion is set up , and the two elements, presupposing and the presupposed, are there by at least potentially integrated into a text. In the following text:

1.   John bought a new pencil. <u>He</u> put <u>it</u> in his drawer.

The interpretation of the elements (He) & (it) is dependent on the lexical items (John) & (Pencil). So, cohesion is in the semantic relation that is setup between these elements. [ibid: 13] adds that, like other semantic relations, cohesion is expressed through the strata organization of language.

Language can be explained as a multiple coding system compressing three levels of coding, the semantic (meaning), the lexicon (grammatical) forms & the phonological (orthographic) expressions. Meaning is realized as form, and form is realized in turn as expression. The guiding principle in language is that the more general meaning is expressed through grammar, and the more specific meaning through the vocabulary. Cohesion relations fit in to the same pattern. That is to say, Cohesion is expressed partly through the grammar and partly through the vocabulary. We can refer therefore to ***grammatical cohesion*** and ***lexical cohesion***.

According to Halliday & Hassan [1976:12], the function of cohesion is to relate one part of text to another part of the same text. Consequently it lends continuity to the text by providing this kind of text continuity; cohesion enables readers or listeners to supply all the components of the picture to its interpretation. Cohesion can be systemized by classifying it into a small number of distinct categories – reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, & lexical cohesion.

Each of these categories is represented in the text by particular features such as repetitions, omissions, occurrences of certain words and conjunctions. [Brown & Yule, 1938:1].

Conjunctive elements, being one of cohesive devices, play an important role in connecting the text as a whole. They are, therefore, considered to have the function of cohesive ties leading to the creation of texture. As semantic relation, they are used to show "the way in which what is to follow is systematically connected to what has gone before"[Halliday & Hassan, 1976:227]. They are inherently presupposing something that has gone before and something to follow.

1.0 Types of Cohesive Devices

Halliday &Hassan (1976:6) mention a list of types of cohesive devices. The first three types are grammatical whereas the last is lexical. The fourth type, the core of this study, is on the border line of the two, mainly grammatical, but with a lexical component in it. These types are:

1.1 *Reference*

Mc Carthy (1991:35) points out that there are certain items in every language which have the property of reference. That is, instead of being interpreted semantically, in their own right, they make reference to something else for their interpretation. In English these items are personals, demonstratives and comparatives. For instance,

2. Look at <u>that</u>. [that = a pen].

The interpretation here lies outside the context of situation.

1.2   *Substitution*

It is a grammatical relation; a relation in the wording rather than in meaning. In English the substitute may function as a noun, as a verb, or as a clause. To these

correspond the three types of substitution, nominal, verbal & clausal [Halliday & Hassan 1976:]. Let's consider the following example:

A: do you want to stay?

B: I do.

Ellipsis 1.3

Halliday [1985:302] states that ellipses is the omission of elements normally required by the grammar which the speaker/writer assumes are obvious from the context and therefore need not be raised. For instance:

4. A: Have you been to London?
B: (I have) Never (been to London).

Conjunction 1.4

Conjunction is rather different in nature from the other cohesive relations, from both reference, on the one hand, and substitution & ellipsis on the other; it is not simply an anaphoric relation. Conjunctive elements are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their specific meaning. [Mc Carthy, 1991:4]. These elements or they are sometimes referred to as "conjunctives" are explicit markers of connective relations [Wikipedia, 2006:34]. Crystal [1985:65-66] indicates that conjunctives are terms used in grammatical classifications of words or morphemes to refer to expressions that link linguistic units. According to Halliday [Halliday in Van Dijk & Petofi, 1977:187] & [Halliday, 1985:325] these elements stand in a particular way to encode semantic relations which are referred to as "conjunctions".

Conjunctives are expressed by linguistic tools drawn from the lexico – grammatical system. They have the function of the realization of cohesion, and therefore, they are text- forming agencies. Quirk etal [1985:632] refers to these elements as a class of adverbials used by the speakers to express "his assessment of how he views the connection between two linguistic units". In this sense, these elements perform the role of connectives between one unit and another which has already been introduced. In such a case, they have anaphoric reference and this is a logical reason to call them "linking adverbs" which are explicit indicators of the communicative function of the sentence [Greenbaum, 1969: 180].

Syntactic Properties of Conjunctives 1.4.1

Conjunctives have different forms which include:

1- ***Prepositions***, such as "*in the first place*", "*in addition*", etc...

2- ***Infinitival Phrases***, such as "to conclude", "to summarize, etc...

3- ***Adverbs***, such as "*therefore*", "*nevertheless*", "*and*" etc...

4- ***A whole clause***, such as "*one my add*", "*that is to say*", etc...

As for position, conjunctives can appear in a variety of positions. These possible positions are identified below [Chalker, 1984:89]:

a) ***Initial position*** (**I**): Conjunctives in this position precede any clause element in the sentence, that is, before the subject, as seen in the example below:

5. He is afraid of the dark. And <u>therefore</u>, he believes in ghosts.

b) ***Medial Position*** (**M**): this is the position between the subject and the operator or between the subject and the main verb, as seen in the example below:

6. New roads, <u>however / though</u>, devour land.

The road lobby says a by-pass would benefit the town. The conversationalists, <u>on the other hand</u>, say the cost to the countryside and villages is great. [Chalker, ibid: 210]

c) ***End position*** (**E)**: In this position, conjunctives follow all obligatory adverbials. The final element of the sentence may be an object, or an obligatory adverbial as in:

7. He refused to pay for the book. But he paid, <u>at the same time</u>, for the car.

Semantic Properties of Conjunctives 1.4.2

Conjunctives have clear semantic functions. They make meta-references to discourse itself. In addition, they show its structure to listeners and readers. Words like 'firstly', 'finally', and 'furthermore' serve certain discourse functions. This means that conjunctives cannot be tackled syntactically, for they are not part

of the structure of the units they connect. The functions of conjunctives as connectors ascribe to them particular semantic roles. While a text is a semantic unit, classification of conjunctives depending on text and discourse studies are reliable, because conjunctive meanings can be seen clearly in the wider context. That is, connective meanings are very obvious in the text structure or in the beyond sentential level.

Types of Conjunctives .1.4.3

Farrokhpey [1999:282] has identified four types of conjunctive meanings:

A) **Additive**: it is a text forming component of the semantic system. In general, the relation is, therefore, a semantic one.

Halliday & Hassan [1976:8] in turn divide the additive type into:

1) ***Simple Additive Relations***: such as '*and*', '*nor*', '*or*' …etc.

2) ***Complex Additive Relations*** (emphatic): such as '*in addition*', '*alternatively*' …etc.

3) ***Complex Additive Relations*** (de-emphatic): such as '*by the way*', '*incidentally*' …etc.

4) ***Comparative Relations***: such as '*by contrast*', '*similar*', '*like*' …etc.

5) ***Examplificatory***: such as '*for instance*' and '*for example*'.

B) **Appositive** or **Adversative**: This relation has the meaning (contrary to the expectation). This expectation is either derived from the context of what is being said or from what can be expressed by communicative process. The relation etc… '*on the other hand*' , '*however*' , '*but*' , '*nevertheless*'.

C) **Casual Notions**: such as '*reason*', '*result*', and '*purpose*' are expressed by this relation. The elements used to express this relation are: '*so*', '*if*', '*for this reason*', '*therefore*', '*hence*'…etc.

D) **Temporal**: This is a relation of sequence in successive sentences. One sentence is in sequence to the other in time. This is simply expressed by the word '*then*'. In addition, the presupposing sentence may be temporally cohesive not because it stands in particular time relation to the presupposed sentence, but it

indicates the terminal of some process or series of processes. Thus, this meaning does not involve only sequence relation, but also conclusive and summary relation. The elements used to indicate this relation are: '*then*', '*finally*', '*previously*', '*when*', '*at last*'…etc.

Examples below illustrate these four types respectively:

8. I handed John a novel. He read it for a while <u>and</u> handed it back to me.

9. It was a hard experience, <u>but</u> it was all worthwhile.

10. Helen was late for class. <u>Therefore</u>, she cancelled her lecture.

11. John was discussing the case <u>when</u> his boss appeared on the scene.

2.0 Result and Discussion

Type of conjunct	Frequency of occurrence	Relative Frequency
Additive	170	73%
Appositive	34	14%
Temporal	20	8%
Casual	12	5%
	Total: 236	100%

Table (1): Frequency and Relative Frequency of Conjunctive Types.

Type of Conjunct	Conjunctive Element	Frequency of occurrence	Relative Frequency
Additive	and	147	4.09%
	nor	6	0.16%
	like	16	0.44%
	or	1	0.02%
Appositive	but	32	0.89%
	however	2	0.55%
Temporal	then	8	0.22%
	at last	4	0.11%
	when	8	0.22%
Casual	therefore	2	0.55%
	because	3	0.08%
	if	4	0.11%
	so	3	0.08%
		Total number of words in the text = 3590	

Table (2): Frequency and Relative Frequency of Conjunctive Elements.

According to table (1) conjunctive types have (236) frequency of occurrence and (65%) relative frequency out of (3590) words in the corpus. This frequency is represented by:

1) **Additive** conjunctives with (170) frequency and (73%) relative frequency.

2) **Appositive** elements with (34) frequency and (14%) relative frequency.

Thus table (1) confirms the assumption that the additive and appositive types are more common in use than other types of conjunctives.

Table (2) shows the frequency of occurrence of each conjunctive element and the relative frequency out of (3590) words in the corpus. This frequency is represented by four types of conjunctives:

1) **<u>Additive</u>**

❖ (*and*) with (147) frequency & (%4.09) relative frequency,

❖ (*nor*) with (6) frequency & (%0.16) relative frequency,

❖ (*like*) with (16) frequency & (%0.44) relative frequency,

❖ (*or*) with (1) frequency & (%0.02) relative frequency.

Through the analysis of the corpus, the absence of some kinds of additive conjunctives is noticed. That is to say, the complex additive elements such as *'in addition'*, *'by the way'*…etc, and the examplificatory ones like 'for example' have not been used by the writer. In addition, the simple additive element 'and' is more frequent in use than other simple elements. This can be traced back to the fact that 'and' is the most common conjunctive that conveys the additive meaning and links two adjoined clauses.

Also, Lawrence, in most of his narratives, reflects the most intimate feelings and complex physical intimacy that men and women experience. Thus, he tends to use rather direct, descriptive and simple language, represented by simple conjunctives such as '*and*', '*nor*'…etc, to express such complex relationship between men and women.

2) <u>**Appositive**</u>

❖ (*but*) with (32) frequency & (%0.89) relative frequency,

❖ (*however*) with (2) frequency & (%0.55) relative frequency.

It is obvious that appositive conjunctives are less frequent than the simple additive ones. However, they are more frequent than (temporal) & (casual) conjunctives. This due to the fact that every novelist tends to convey his ideas to the readers by displaying two distinct concepts or two different points of view. In being so, the readers will be able to adopt the most appropriate one.

Accordingly, the presence of the appositive elements is necessary to fulfill such purpose in narratives. Moreover, Lawrence's use of (but) and (however) shoes

clearly how women and men are different in expressing their thoughts, emotions and feelings.

3)   **Temporal**

❖ (*then*) with (8) frequency & (%0.22) relative frequency,

❖ (*at last*) with (4) frequency & (0.11) relative frequency,

❖ (*when*) with (8) & (%.22) relative frequency.

Novelists usually use temporal elements like 'when', 'then'…etc.
For either starting new events by presenting new settings and characters or putting an end to these events.
Accordingly, the absence of temporal conjunctives allows no continuity in the events of any novel and puts no end to them. However, they are less common in use than the purposes mentioned above.

4)   **Casual**

❖ (*therefore*) with (2) frequency & (%0.55) relative frequency,

❖ (*because*) with (43) frequency & (%0.08) relative frequency,

❖ (*if*) with (4) frequency & (%0.11) relative frequency,

❖ (*so*) with (3) frequency & (%0.08) relative frequency.

Thus, casual type is less frequent in use than the first three types. Notions like '*reason*' and '*result*' are reflected by the elements mentioned above.
Besides the use of different elements of this type is noticed in the corpus. Avoiding the repetition of the same conjunctive element in a text helps to make it more interesting and reduces this feeling of being bored. The use of the same additive element 'and', for example, more than five times in a page makes the reader's task more difficult since it moves him/her from an event to another. Hence, the diversity in the casual elements helps to create a comprehensive and an interesting text in a way or another.
It is the time to conclude that removing these conjunctives from the text reduces the comprehensibility of it and lends no continuity as in the following example:
12. She knew,(*and*) she cared no more through her illness, distorted into vague forms, persisted the question of herself (*and*) Skrebensky,(*like*) a gnawing ache

that was still superficial, (*and*) did not touch her isolated, impregnable core of reality.(*But*) the corrosion of him burned in her till it burned itself out.

[Lawrence,1984:435]

Thus, it is true that conjunctive markers represented by additive, appositive, temporal and casual elements work side by side with other cohesive devices (substitution, ellipsis, reference, lexical) to enrich the reader's comprehensibility by guiding him/her properly from an interpretation to another.

Conclusion

The study has pin pointed some conclusions.

1)   Conjunctive markers are one of cohesive devices that play an effective role in the interpretation of a text.

2)   The additive and appositive conjunctives are more frequent in use than the temporal and casual ones.

3)   The simple additive conjunctive 'and' is more common than the other simple conjunctives.

4)   The absence of the complex and examplificatory additive markers in the data under study.

5)   Removing the conjunctives markers from the text reduces its comprehensibility and helps to make it incoherent.

References

Brown , G., & G , Yale. (1983). Discourse Analysis. Cambridge : Cambridge University press.

Chalker , S. (1984). Current English Grammar

London : Macmillan Publisher , Ltd.

Crystal , D. (1985). <u>Cambridge Encyclopedia of language</u>.
London : Longman Group.

Farrokhpey , M. (1999) , <u>Fundamental Concepts in Linguistics</u>.
Tehran : Sokhan.

Fraser , B. (1983). "Types of English Discourse Markers".
<u>Actalinguistica Hungarica</u> , 38 (14):19-33.

Greenbaum ,S. (1969). <u>Studies In English Adverbial Usage</u>.
London :Longman Group.

Halliday , M. (1985). <u>An Introduction to Functional Grammar</u>.
London : Edward Arnold.

Halliday , M., & R.Hassan.(1976). <u>Cohesion In English</u>.
London :Longman UK Group Limited.

Jonz , J. (1987). "<u>Textual Cohesion and Second Language Comprehension</u> "In
Language Learning.Vol.37,30.

Lawrence , D.H.(1984). <u>The Rainbow</u>.
London : Macmillan Education Limited.

Mc Carthy , M. (1993). <u>Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers</u>: Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.

Quirk, R.S.Greenbaum,G.Leecg,and J.Svartvik. (1985).
<u>A comprehensive Grammar of the English Language</u>. New York: Longman
Group.

Van Dijk, T.,ed. (1985). <u>Hand book of Discourse Analysis</u>.
Vol.2., London: Longman Group.

Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia (2006). "<u>Conjunct</u>" http:tlen.
Wikipedia.org/wiki/conjunct

Appendix

The Rainbow

(Chapter (16

Abstract

Cohesion refers to relations of meaning that exist within the text, and that defines it as a text. The detection of these meaning relations is important to its interpretation. These relations are achieved by the use of cohesive devices. This means that the presence or absence of these devices in a text helps to make a text coherent or incoherent respectively.

This paper deals with the use of conjunctive elements, being one of cohesive devices, in an extract from the Rainbow, a novel written by D.H. Lawrence. The last chapter (chapter 16) is devoted for the purpose of analysis as it is expected that it includes, more than others, all types of conjunctive elements: additive, appositive, temporal and casual.

The study aims at presenting data verifying the assumption the additive and appositive types are more frequent in use than others. Also, the simple elements of these two types are more common than others. This can be traced back to the writer′s attendance to use rather simple, descriptive and comparative language in expressing his rather complex themes as the use of indirect and complex language makes the reader′s task more difficult. Moreover, removing these conjunctive elements from the text reduces the comprehensibility of the text and lends no continuity.