



TRANS · Nº 1 · 1996

This article offers an overview of the range of factors and characteristics which must be considered in the analysis of the expression of intersentential relations in authentic texts. The study is based on two exhaustive corpus surveys of newspaper editorials, one in English and one in Spanish (although references within the text itself are to the English corpus alone). A preliminary discussion is dedicated to general considerations in the analysis and definition of intersentential relations. This is followed by an outline of the different classes of relations which are involved.

The explicit signalling of intersentential relations in authentic texts: An overview

JOHN HYDE
Universidad de Salamanca

Este artículo pasa revista a los factores y características que deben ser tomados en cuenta en el análisis de la expresión de la relaciones intraoracionales en textos auténticos. El estudio se basa en dos corpus exhaustivos de editoriales de periódicos, uno en inglés y otro en español (aunque las referencias en el texto se hacen sólo al corpus en inglés). En primer lugar se hacen consideraciones generales sobre el análisis y definición de las relaciones intraoracionales, y a continuación se exponen los distintos tipos de relaciones que se manejan.



I FOREWORD

In this paper I offer an overview of the different factors and characteristics which must be considered in the study of intersentential relations in authentic texts. The study is based on two exhaustive corpus surveys, one in English and one in Spanish:

- a) 6 months of editorials from *The Guardian* newspaper, containing approximately 250,000 words.¹
- b) 12 months of editorials from *El País*, containing approximately 450,000 words.

(It is important to point out here that all references in the ensuing text are to the English corpus alone. Nevertheless, parallel examples —NB not translations!— are provided from the Spanish corpus for the illustration of each subcategory of relations.)

The ideas which are expressed here have as a conceptual framework that variety of discourse analysis which considers linguistic communication in its full operational complexity and which aims to explain texts and textual activity as an interactive inferential process between the bottom-up perception of textual and contextual data and the top-down application of prior knowledge (the 'discourse as process' approach —see Brown & Yule, p. 24). This approach attempts to go beyond the limitations of previous approaches, which were a mere extension of isolated sentence grammar to textual analysis, purely linguistic attempts to

¹ See Hyde (1990a). This survey should serve as a constant point of reference for everything which is outlined in the present paper. The corpus consists of all editorials published in *The Guardian* from January 1st to June 30th, 1985.

explain discourse as the simple bottom-up application of grammatical rules and the automatic recovery of cohesive links considered to be explicitly contained within the text itself ('text as product' approaches —see Brown & Yule, *ibid.*).²

As soon as attention shifted within language studies to the complete text as the unit of language in use, one of the obvious factors for textual analysis was that of intersentential relations (henceforth ISR's). These logico-semantic and pragmatic relations constitute one of the most important factors contributing to the micro and macro structuring and coherence of texts. Yet there have been surprisingly few comprehensive monographic studies of this area and those which exist to date suffer from various limitations when viewed from the vantage point of today.³

II PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

What I intend to embrace in this paper is an extremely broad and complex area of natural language. Nevertheless, I hope that this brief panorama may serve as an orientation for any future researcher in this field.

² The discourse as process approach is reflected in the following works, which I mention here as merely illustrative of the multiple aspects of this field of study: de Beaugrande; de Beaugrande & Dressler; Brown & Yule; Cornish; van Dijk (all references); van Dijk & Kintsch; Hoey; Moore & Carling; Sanford & Garrod; Widdowson (both references). See also Hyde (1990a) and the numerous references there.

³ The works consulted here were as follows: Alcina & Bleuca; Altenberg; Ball; Cerce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman; Crombie; Fuentes; Greenbaum; Halliday; Halliday & Hasan; Martin; Quirk et al. 1972 and 1985; Real Academia Española (Comisión de Gramática); Warner; and Winter (all references). In a recent doctoral thesis (under my supervision), Ana Isabel Moreno gives a comparative analysis of causal signals in English and Spanish which avoids the shortcomings of previous studies.



Throughout these pages I will refer to a series of phenomena which seem reasonably clear in the analysis of this aspect of language, but it will also be necessary to bear in mind the very considerable gaps in our knowledge of this area and the notable disparity of terminology and of categorization which exists between the different studies which have approached the subject to date.

In reading a newspaper editorial from *The Guardian* or *El País* (as in the processing of any text), part of the interpretative task consists in capturing the nature of the different ISR's which are expressed in the discourse. What should an operational theory of language explain about this aspect of textual activity in general? What do previous studies tell us (or omit to tell us)?

As a brief preview to everything which I will say in this paper, consider the following: If we take the link word *además* in Spanish and consult a bilingual dictionary as to its equivalent in English, we may well be presented with the following information:

además — besides; moreover, furthermore; also.⁴

Allow me to make the following observations with respect to the information which is provided here:

1. It includes no indication of the possible differences between the function of each of these expressions on the intersentential plane (relations between independent sentences) or on the intrasentential plane (relations between clauses within a single sentence).

⁴ See Smith.

2. It includes no indication of the use of these expressions in different kinds of discourse: written language as opposed to spoken language, formal as against informal, newspaper editorial versus cooking recipe, and so on.
3. It establishes three different categories between the expressions in English, but it gives no indication of the functional differences between these categories.

If *besides* appears in first position in the dictionary entry, this is presumably because this expression is considered to be in some sense the most normal, or the most important, or the most frequent equivalent of the word *además* in English. But what does textual evidence tell us in this respect? In the corpus of 450,000 words of editorials from *El País*, *además* appears with intersentential function on approximately 90 occasions.⁵ It is an important expression, of relatively high frequency. Would we be correct in considering that *besides* is the most normal or the most frequent equivalent in texts of the same type in English? In the corpus of 250,000 words of editorials from *The Guardian*, the expression *besides* never once occurs with intersentential function as defined in this paper. What, then, is the textual reality which is described by this dictionary? What empirical object is referred to? And let us bear in mind here that other available descriptions of English and of Spanish are equally uninformative with respect to this important dimension of textual structure.

⁵ This particular corpus has now been expanded to incorporate approximately 2,000,000 words of text.



III GENERAL FACTORS IN THE SIGNALLING OF INTERSENTENTIAL RELATIONS

All ISR's can be represented by means of the following basic schema:

A r B

A conjoin consisting of one or more sentences, *A*, stands in a particular relationship, *r*, to another contiguous conjoin of one or more sentences, *B*. (It is important to note here that in this paper the term 'intersentential' is applied equally to relations of this kind which exist between single sentences or blocks of sentences, and also between single paragraphs or blocks of paragraphs.)

The term 'sentence' is given an operational definition and refers to what is normally known as the orthographic sentence i.e. that unit of written texts which begins with a capital letter and ends with the immediately following full-stop. The term 'paragraph' is given an equally operational definition, and also refers to the corresponding orthographic unit.⁶

In this study ISR's are taken to express logico-semantic and pragmatic content which, at the most general level, may be additive, adversative, or causal (following the terminology and categorization of Halliday & Hasan, Ch. 5).⁷ Those familiar with Halliday & Hasan and other studies will observe that I omit any reference to temporal relations here. Although I

⁶ Discourse analysis insists on treating language as it is manifested in authentic texts. Full-stops (and paragraph divisions) are meaningful; they indicate important pragmatic aspects of the distribution of information in texts. See Brown & Yule, pp. 94-100.

⁷ In Hyde (1990a) I follow the terminology and the categorization of Halliday & Hasan in all cases except those in which my own analysis enters into conflict with that given by these authors.

cannot enter into details, there are clear indications that temporal relations do not constitute a category on the same level as additive, adversative and causal ISR's. Rather, we seem to have two parallel systems which exist side by side.⁸

In this brief definition and characterisation of ISR's it is also necessary briefly to mention the following two conditions:

- a) the condition of contiguity of the two conjoins which are related;
- b) the condition that the relation scope over the totality of the propositional content of both conjoins, *A* and *B*.⁹

Logico-semantic and pragmatic ISR's, as they are understood here, must be distinguished from other neighbouring discourse phenomena which may also be expressed at the sentential or suprasentential level. These other discourse phenomena include the following:

- a) the expression of various attitudinal factors;
- b) the expression of a series of factors which are rather loosely termed 'discourse control';
- c) that kind of thematic progression which Crombie calls 'term specification'.¹⁰

In principle, these other discourse phenomena do not express presuppositional logico-semantic and pragmatic meaning of an additive, adversative or causal nature. However, the analysis of textual reality demonstrates that it is

⁸ I refer here only to external temporal signals. For further details and for an analysis of internal temporal signals in the corpus, see Hyde (1990a).

⁹ This second condition is especially problematic. See further details in Hyde (1990a) and in Moreno 1995.

¹⁰ See Crombie, p. 26.



not always easy to distinguish between these phenomena and the expression of ISR's. There are various points of contact between them which still remain to be clarified.

ISR's can be either explicit or implicit, in the following sense: If the relation is made explicit, there will be present in the text a tangible realization, an explicit expression of the relation. Conversely, if the relation is implicit, there will be no tangible realization of the relation within the text at all and the nature of the ISR must be recovered from the situational, epistemic and discourse contexts.

In this paper I will refer only to the study of explicit ISR's. However, once again the analysis of textual reality shows us that it is by no means easy to distinguish between the two phenomena.

As we saw above, ISR's can be divided, at the most general level, into additive, adversative and causal relations. Each of these can in turn be divided into more delicate subcategories. For example, additive relations include among others the following subcategories: Positive Addition (typically expressed by *And*), Negative Addition (typically expressed by *Nor*), Alternative Addition (typically expressed by *Or*), and so on.

Particular categories and subcategories of ISR meaning may be identified by the use of various paraphrase techniques, including interactive questions. This technique consists in the interrogation of monological written text by questions, as is shown by Widdowson (1983a). Examples of such interactive questions include: 'What else happened?', 'What more would you like to add?', 'Why did that happen?', 'Why do you say that?', and so on.

One general problem which will be encountered by anyone who embarks on a study of

ISR's is that the majority of previous accounts do not distinguish sufficiently in their analyses between the expression of logico-semantic relations at the intersentential and the intrasentential levels. Martin, for example, distinguishes between what he calls finite subordinating conjunction (interclausal intrasentential) and non-subordinating conjunction (intersentential). He then goes on to posit that at some level of analysis the following are equivalent:

- a) The boy fell in the stream *because* the deer stopped suddenly. (finite subordinating)
- b) The deer stopped suddenly. *So* the boy fell in the stream. (non-subordinating)

(Martin, p. 17)

However, it is vitally important to realise that these supposed alternatives are not interchangeable in discourse. The differences between them are discourse-motivated. Even if the fundamental logico-semantic relations in these two examples can be more or less equated, there are important differences generally between the intrasentential and the intersentential levels, as van Dijk explains (1977). The realisations at the two levels do not coincide, nor are the relations themselves exactly the same. There are also semantic constraints on what can be conjoined interclausally. Above all, the pragmatic factors vary considerably, especially as concerns questions of emphasis and the distribution of given and new information.

From some studies one sometimes gets the impression that some special status is accorded to the expression of logico-semantic relations at the interclausal intrasentential level. In fact, Martin explicitly considers this level as basic, claiming that the intersentential level can be



derived from it. Halliday & Hasan, while focussing on the intersentential level, make repeated comparison with the interclausal intrasentential level. In this paper, however, the sole focus will be on the intersentential level, as the level at which the expression of logico-semantic relations is likely to prove most fruitful for a better understanding of texts and discourse. I will make no comparison between the intersentential and the intrasentential levels. This would be a study in its own right. Furthermore, I consider that no special status should be accorded to the interclausal intrasentential level over the intersentential level.

In general, previous studies limit their attention to only one type of exponent of ISR's, to so-called conjuncts, a fuzzy class which includes expressions such as those in the following schematic examples:

2. a) A. <> Similarly B.
- b) A. <> However B.
- c) A. <> So B.

The majority of previous studies thus consider the phenomenon of ISR's from the point of view of one particular sentential grammatical category—that of conjuncts—and then restrict their attention to this grammatical element alone. The expression of ISR meaning is therefore given subsidiary importance in the analysis of these relations. In order to understand vital discourse aspects of the on-line expression of ISR's we need to give priority to the meaning which is being conveyed and to approach the phenomenon from a broad discourse as process point of view.

This tendency to the almost exclusive consideration of conjuncts means that the immense majority of previous studies com-

pletely ignore the existence of a wide range of alternative realizations which also serve to express ISR's.¹¹ These alternative realizations typically include verbal and nominal elements, as can be seen in the following schematic examples:

3. a) A. <> This means B.
- b) A. <> This enabled B.
- c) A. <> All this means B.
- d) A. <> All of which explains why B.
- e) A. <> That could mean that B.
- f) A. <> We may conclude that B.
- g) A. <> The result is B.
- h) A. <> That is the reason why B.
- i) A. <> The obvious conclusion is that B.
- j) A. <> That can be the only reason why B.
- k) A. <> The most convincing explanation for this ... is that B.
- l) A. <> That is why B.
- m) A. <> This is because B.
- n) A. <> ... also B.
- o) A. <> B is different.

- [A. <> Ello explica B.
 A. <> No se explica de otra forma B.
 A. <> El resultado ha sido B.
 A. <> Todo indica que B.
 A. <> Consecuencia de todo ello ha sido B.
 A. <> La consecuencia inmediata debería ser B.
 A. <> Todo ello provocó B.
 A. <> Este cambio se debe principalmente a B.

¹¹ The only exceptions here are Winter and Crombie. However, these authors do not distinguish between the intrasentential and the intersentential levels, they are not surveys of authentic texts, neither do they account for various discourse factors which do receive some consideration in Hyde (1990a). Once again, these shortcomings are avoided in Moreno 1995.

- A. <> Quiere ello decir que B.
 A. <> A ello hay que añadir B.
 A. <> El ejemplo más significativo ha sido B.
 A. <> Lo irónico es que B.
 A. <> Cuestión distinta es B.]

The existence of these alternative expressions allows us to distinguish between integrated expressions of ISR's on the one hand and peripheral expressions on the other.¹² Integrated expressions are those which are realised by one of the central categories of sentence structure. Peripheral signals are those which are realised by categories which are not central to sentence structure; they include conjuncts and some prepositional expressions. In common with many other semantic and pragmatic factors, the expression of ISR's is thus seen to cut right across the total range of the categories of sentence structure.

Verbal ISR signals are accompanied by some kind of deictic element, as in the following: *This means*, *This explains why*, and so on (see 3a-f above). The great majority of integrated verbal ISR signals express causal ISR meaning, the most frequent form by far being *This means*.

Nominal ISR signals combine typically with the copulative, *be*. Causal signals are again seen to be more frequent. Typical signals include: *The result is*, *That is the reason why*, and so on (see 3 g-k above).

A further mixed category includes signals such as: *That is why*, expressing Reason; the

additive adjunct *also*, expressing Positive Addition; and the adjective *different*, expressing the Adversative Contrastive relation (see 3 l-o above).

While it is true that the great majority of explicit ISR's in newspaper editorials are expressed by conjuncts, it is equally true that no study of textual reality can ignore integrated expressions of these relations, as these play an essential role in the signalling of the phenomenon we are concerned with.

The most important characteristic of integrated signals is the fact that they allow the expression of ISR meaning to be modified in various ways; the use of one of these signals allows the ISR meaning itself to be converted into a discourse entity or an argument in a proposition and to become subject to all the normal sentence processes of modification: modalisation, attitudinal and descriptive attribution, quantification, different kinds of anaphoric encapsulation of the semantic content of the first conjoin and references to the global macro-topic, and so on (as can be seen in some of the examples above). This metalinguistic modification of the basic ISR meaning is exploited for various discourse motives, especially for the conferring of macrostructural prominence.

A further important characteristic of these signals is the following: whereas conjuncts are largely unequivocal with respect to ISR signalling capacity, most integrated signals are seen to be highly equivocal, and the presence or absence of ISR meaning must be computed from the discourse context.

The almost exclusive consideration of conjuncts on the part of previous studies also obscures the presence of a complex series of expressions which occur within the environ-

¹² The term 'integrated' is taken from Quirk et al. 1985, where it appears in a different context from that referred to here (see Hyde 1990a II:8.1). In their description of ISR's these authors do not account for integrated signals as understood in this paper and therefore ignore the distinction which is established here.





ment of adversative conjuncts and which have important consequences for an understanding of the signalling and interpretation of adversative relations. These expressions fall into two categories. Firstly, there are expressions which occur in the main clause of the same sentence as an adversative conjunct (i.e. in the second conjoin) and which will here be termed adversative co-collocates. Such expressions help to establish more delicate subdivisions of the general adversative relation. Secondly, there are expressions which occur in thematic position in a sentence which is contained in the first conjoin (i.e. before the adversative conjunct or other adversative ISR signal), and which will here be termed predictive adversative pre-collocates. Predictive adversative pre-collocates also help to establish more delicate subcategories of the general adversative relation.

The existence of a wide range of regular co-collocates and predictive pre-collocates seems to be almost exclusively associated with the adversative relation, especially with the Adversative Proper subcategory.¹³

Adversative co-collocates can be seen in the following schematic examples:

4. a) A. <> But also B.
- b) A. <> Beyond that, however, is B.
- c) A. <> A more substantial lesson, however, is that B.
- d) A. <> But mostly B.
- e) A. <> But the crucial thing is that B.
- f) A. <> But at least B.
- g) A. <> But the problem is that B.
- h) A. <> But it should not be forgotten that B.
- i) A. <> But there remains B.
- j) A. <> But the fact is that B.

¹³ One predictive pre-collocate for causal relations is *Suppose*.

- [A. <> Pero el progreso más espectacular es que B.
 A. <> Pero la mayor novedad es B.
 A. <> Pero, con mucho, el peligro más serio es B.
 A. <> Pero quizá el quid de la cuestión esté en que B.
 A. <> Pero, además, B.
 A. <> Pero, sobre todo, B.
 A. <> Pero no es posible olvidar B.
 A. <> No se puede olvidar, sin embargo, que B.
 A. <> Pero ... en realidad B.
 A. <> Pero la cuestión es que B.
 A. <> Pero el problema de fondo sigue estando en B.
 A. <> Pero ... seguiría siendo B.]

The analysis of such expressions allows identification of the important Adversative Additive relation (see 4a-b above). This relation combines an adversative conjunct in an especially pragmatic or internal function with an additive expression and is typically expressed by *But also*. This constitutes an especially emphatic means of expressing addition. The relationship revolves around the basic conceptual meaning «not only ... but also» and involves counterexpectations as to adequacy and sufficiency with respect to what has already been detailed in the discourse. The ISR meaning of this relation can be paraphrased as: 'Though that might seem sufficient in itself, there is even more to add'. Similar to the Adversative Additive relation is the Adversative of Degree relation, in which an adversative conjunct cooccurs with some kind of comparative or superlative expression (see 4c-e above). The Compensatory Adversative relation is expressed by the combination *But at least* (see



4f above). Further adversative co-collocates include expressions from the following semantic areas: «the problem is»; «forget»; «still»; «the fact is» (see 4g-j above).

The analysis of adversative co-collocates is thus shown to establish important areas of ISR meaning and expression which have not been adequately taken into account in previous descriptions which focus exclusively on conjuncts.

Predictive adversative pre-collocates can be seen in the following schematic examples:

5. a) In one sense A. <> But B.
- b) On the face of things A. <> But B.
- c) It is easy to A. <> But B.
- d) In theory A. <> But B.
- e) It is true that A. <> But B.
- f) Not just A. <> B.¹⁴

[Es cierto que A. <> Pero B.
 Es posible que A. <> Pero B.
 Es lógico que A. <> Pero B.
 Inicialmente A. <> Pero B.
 En teoría A. <> Pero en la práctica B.
 A primera vista A. <> Sin embargo, B.
 Puede parecer extraño a primera vista que A. <> Pero B.
 Parecía claro que A. <> Pero B.
 Nadie puede negar que A. <> Sin embargo, B.
 No sólo A. <> También B.]

The analysis of such expressions reveals a very wide range of realisations in the corpus. These expressions convey meaning which can be divided into the following sub-categories:

¹⁴ The last example here illustrates an implicit adversative relation in the second conjoin. See Hyde 1990a II:7.2.

«in one sense»; «at first sight»; «it is tempting to»; «in theory»; unreal conditional constructions; «it is true that»; «X is right to»; «not only» (as can be seen variously in the examples above). These expressions contain presuppositional elements of meaning (either semantic or pragmatic) and have a very important prospective role, alerting the reader as to the ISR nature of the upcoming discourse.¹⁵ In this prospective role, predictive adversative pre-collocates function in a way similar to cataphoric ISR signals (see immediately below).

A further factor which should be taken into account is the phoric direction of ISR signals. All the signals which we have examined so far, both integrated and peripheral expressions, have been anaphoric signals. This can be schematically represented as follows:

A <> rB

With anaphoric signals the expression appears within the sentence domain of the second conjoin, *B*, establishing the relationship retrospectively with regard to the first conjoin, *A*.

The immense majority of ISR signals, whether integrated or peripheral, are anaphoric. But the study of authentic texts from an operational point of view shows that there are also cataphoric realisations of these relations, as can be seen in the following examples:

- 6.a) There are a mixture of reasons for A. <> B.
- b) There is good reason to A. <> B.
- c) Why A? <> B.
- d) What can explain A? <> B.

[¿Cómo se explica A? <> B.
 ¿Por qué A? <> B.]

¹⁵ See Hyde 1990b.



¿Qué ha ocurrido para que A? <> B.
 ¿A qué se debe A? <> B.
 ¿Qué efectos políticos cabe esperar de A? <> B.
 Cabría preguntarse por A. <> B.
 A no es fruto de la casualidad. <> B.]

This can be schematically represented as follows:

Ar <> B

With cataphoric realisations the signal appears in the sentence domain of the first conjoin, *A*, establishing the relationship prospectively with regard to the second conjoin, *B*.

Cataphoric ISR signals are shown to be a rather special category of ISR signalling, expressing almost exclusively the Reversed Causal relation of Reason. The two principal exponents of this relation are the nominal signal *reason* and the interrogative signal *Why?* (as can be seen in the examples above). Cataphoric signals show a marked tendency to scope forward over extensive stretches of discourse. They thus play an important role in the macrostructural announcement of ISR meaning, sometimes appearing in the discourse-initial sentence or even in the headline itself.

The analysis of textual reality shows us, furthermore, that there are ISR signals which are both anaphoric and cataphoric at the same time. This allows us to distinguish between intrinsic signals on the one hand, and extrinsic signals on the other.¹⁶

All the expressions which we have examined

¹⁶ The terms are from Crombie (pp. 73-74). However, this author merely mentions the distinction in passing; she gives no consideration to the frequency of occurrence of these signals, nor to the various semantic, pragmatic and discourse characteristics which they display.

so far, anaphoric and cataphoric, integrated and peripheral, have been intrinsic signals. With intrinsic signals, the expression of the relationship appears within the sentence domain of one of the two conjoins *A* or *B* (within the domain of *A* in the case of cataphoric realisations, and within the domain of *B* in the case of anaphoric realisations).

With extrinsic realisations, the expression of the relationship is given independent sentence status to itself. The expression of the ISR meaning (and various possible modifications to that meaning) stands alone in a sentence which contains no part of the semantic content of either the first or the second conjoin. The informational and intonational force of the sentence is given over entirely to the expression of the ISR itself. This can be represented schematically as follows:

A <> r <> B

See the following examples:

7. a) A. <> And yet, and yet. <> B.
- b) A. <> You can see why. <> B.
- c) A. <> The examples vary between the hair-raising and the hilarious. <> B.
- d) A. <> There is a purpose to all this and it is a good one. <> B.
- e) A. <> There seem to be two particular lessons. <> B.
- f) A. <> But ... this time there is a big But. <> B.
- g) A. <> But wait a minute. <> B.
- h) A. <> And, again, one sees why he does so. <> B.
- i) A. <> But the Government's decision is open to a further criticism. <> B.
- j) A. <> But that is not the end of the matter. <> B.



- k) A. <> But that is only the start of it. <> B.
 l) A. <> But there was more. <> B.

[A. <> Y con razón. <> B.

A. <> Hay para ello razones históricas obvias. <> B.

A. <> Razones no les han faltado. <> B.

A. <> Las razones son tres. <> B.

A. <> ¿En qué ha quedado todo? <> B.

A. <> ¿Cuáles serán las consecuencias? <> B.

A. <> Las causas básicas ... no son de hoy. <> B.

A. <> La realidad resulta completamente distinta. <> B.

A. <> No pudo ser. <> B.

A. <> No es así. <> B.

A. <> No sólo eso. <> B.

A. <> Pero no sólo eso. <> B.

A. <> Pero hay más. <> B.]

Extrinsic signals may take three basic forms. First, they may consist of a conjunct or composite conjunct standing alone, such as *And yet, and yet* (see 7a), though such signals are rare. Second, they may be expressed by an integrated signal standing alone, as in the following: *You can see why, There is a purpose to all this and it is a good one* (see 7b-e above). Third, the most frequent case, they may consist of both a conjunct and an accompanying integrated ISR signal, as in *But .. this time there is a big But, And you can see why, But that is only the start of it, and so on* (see 7f-h above).

The majority of extrinsic signals express additive ISR meaning, especially by means of the extrinsic Adversative Additive relation (see 7i-l above, together with comments on the intrinsic version of this relation in the account given earlier).

Extrinsic signals are seen to permit extensive modification of ISR meaning along the para-

meters which have already been mentioned in the account of integrated signals above. These signals confer an especially emphatic and prominent status to the conveying of ISR meaning; they show a marked tendency to macrostructural prominence, to scope long range, and to occupy paragraph-initial position. Extrinsic signals constitute the maximum expression of ISR meaning in newspaper editorials.

In everything that I have said so far in this paper there have been present two fundamental limitations of previous descriptions of ISR's which have important consequences for the study of language today.

Firstly, the majority of such studies are not carried out from an operational point of view. This leads them to consider only one aspect of ISR meaning, the semantic or ideational component. They thus ignore various aspects of the pragmatic or internal component of the expression of these relations together with factors related to the on-line interpretation of ISR's. These factors include the following (some of which have already been mentioned in passing in this paper):

a) the speech —or writing— acts which are realised by the expression of ISR's and the possible sequences and combinations of such acts (so-called rhetorical routines);

b) various preannouncing and cataphoric devices which alert the reader as to the ISR nature of the upcoming fragment of text;

c) various parameters of the metalinguistic modification of ISR meaning;

d) the emphasis and salience which can be given to certain expressions and the role which these play in the macrostructuring of editorials;

e) problems of the calculation of the scope



of these relations and the contribution to this of various referential elements and anaphoric encapsulations;

f) the ambiguous, equivocal nature of many ISR expressions, especially integrated signals.

Secondly, the majority of previous studies are not strict corpus studies of authentic texts. This has two important consequences. First, they frequently resort to invented examples based on the intuitions of the researcher. Studies by Sinclair and others at the University of Birmingham have demonstrated the lack of reliability of native speaker intuitions with regard to many lexical factors.¹⁷ The study of ISR signalling in authentic texts also reveals many important discrepancies between textual reality and those descriptions which exist to date. Second, some previous studies are indeed based on corpora of authentic texts, but they do not distinguish in their descriptions between different types of discourse, and hence obscure important differences on this parameter also, most notably between spoken and written language. Such studies offer undifferentiated descriptions and consequently do not describe any identifiable empirical object. The research on which the present paper is based demonstrates the urgent need for descriptions of language to be discourse type specific.¹⁸

IV CONCLUSION

If we seek a theory of language to serve as the conceptual infrastructure for a true understanding and description of actual language

¹⁷ See all bibliographical references to this author.

¹⁸ The research also demonstrates the need for corpora to be several million words in length in order to guarantee sufficient data for analysis.

use, then we need to go beyond the narrow confines of isolated sentence grammar. From the perspective of what I have merely outlined in this paper, those grammars and linguistic descriptions which exist to date are in general little more than convenient fictions. We should seriously question the excessive idealisation in prevailing conceptions of language and inquire as to the true dimensions and characteristics of our raw material as this is manifested in the reality of text.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES

- Alcina, J. & J.M. Blecua. 1975. *Gramática Española*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- Altenberg, B. 1984. 'Causal linking in spoken and written English', *Studia Linguistica*, Vol. 38, No 1, 20-69.
- Ball, W.J. 1986. *Dictionary of Link Words*. London: Macmillan.
- de Beaugrande, R. 1980. *Text, Discourse, and Process*. London: Longman.
- de Beaugrande, R. & W. Dressler. 1981. *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Brown, G. & G. Yule. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cerçe-Murcia, M., & D. Larsen-Freeman. 1983. *The Grammar Book: An ESL/EFL Teacher's Course*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.
- Cornish, F. 1986. *Anaphoric Relations in English and French: A Discourse Perspective*. London: Croom Helm.
- Crombie, W. 1985. *Process and Relation in Discourse and Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- van Dijk, T.A. 1977. *Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse*. London: Longman.
- van Dijk, T.A. 1981. *Studies in the Pragmatics of Discourse*. The Hague: Mouton.

- van Dijk, T.A. (ed.). 1985. *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. 4 vols. London: Academic Press.
- van Dijk, T.A. & W. Kintsch. 1983. *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.
- Fuentes, C. 1987. *Enlaces Extraoracionales*. Sevilla: Alfar.
- Greenbaum, S. 1969. *Studies in English Adverbial Usage*. London: Longman.
- Halliday, M.A.K. 1985. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & R. Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hoey, M. 1983. *On the Surface of Discourse*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Hyde, J.R. 1990a. *Aspects of Discourse Analysis: The Explicit Signalling of Intersentential Relations in English*. Doctoral Thesis: Universidad de Salamanca.
- Hyde, J.R. 1990b. «The expression of intersentential relations in authentic discourse: predictive adversative pre-collocates». *Anglo-American Studies*, X, 1-2, pp. 79-97.
- Martin, J.R. 1983. 'Conjunction: the logic of English text', in Petöfi, J.S. & E. Sözer (eds.). 1983. *Micro and Macro Connexity of Texts*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske, 1-72.
- Moore, T. & C. Carling. 1982. *Understanding Language: Towards a Post-Chomskyan Linguistics*. London: Macmillan.
- Moreno Fernández, A.I. 1992. *La Expresión de la Causalidad Interoracional en Inglés: Discurso Argumentativo*. Memoria de Licenciatura. León: Universidad de León.
- Moreno Fernández, A.I. 1995. *Estudio Contrastivo Inglés-Español de la Expresión de las Relaciones de Coherencia Causal Interoracional: El Artículo Académico sobre Economía y Empresa*. Doctoral Thesis. León: Universidad de León.
- Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech & J. Svartvik. 1972. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: Longman.
- Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech & J. Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of English*. London: Longman.
- Real Academia Española (Comisión de Gramática). 1982. *Esbozo de una Nueva Gramática de la Lengua Española*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- Sanford, A.J. & S.C. Garrod. 1981. *Understanding Written Language*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sinclair, J.McH. 1986. 'First throw away your evidence', in Leitner, G. (ed.). 1986. *The English Reference Grammar: Language and Linguistics, Writers and Readers*. Tübingen: M.N. Verlag, 56-64.
- Sinclair, J. McH. 1991. *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J. McH. 1992. «Trust the text: the implications are daunting» in M. Davies & L. Ravelli (eds.). 1992. *Advances in Systemic Linguistics*. London: Pinter, 5-19.
- Sinclair, J.McH. (ed.). 1987. *Looking Up*. London: Collins.
- Smith, C. 1990. *Diccionario Español-Inglés, Inglés-Español*. Glasgow: Harper Collins.
- Warner, R.G. 1985. *Discourse Connectives in English*. New York: Garland.
- Widdowson, H.G. 1983a. *Explorations in Applied Linguistics II*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Widdowson, H.G. 1983b. *Learning Purpose and Language Use*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Winter, E. 1968. 'Anaphoric sentence adjuncts', in Huddleston, R.D., R.A. Hudson, E.O. Winter & A. Henrici. 1968. *Sentence and Clause in Scientific English*. London: University College.
- Winter, E. 1977. 'A clause-relational approach to English texts: a study of some predictive lexical items in written discourse', *Instructional Science* 6, 1, 1-92 (special issue).
- Winter, E. 1982. *Towards a Contextual Grammar of English*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

