TWO WAYS OF STICKING TOGETHER AND GETTING ALONG: PROPOSITIONAL COHESION AND EVALUATIVE COHESION IN DISCOURSE

Glen Michael Alessi[1], Alan Partington[2]

[1]University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Italy; [2]Bologna University (Forlì), Italy

Two ways of sticking together and getting along: propositional cohesion and evaluative cohesion in discourse

Glen Michael Alessi[1], *Alan Partington*[2]

[1]University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Italy; [2]Bologna University (Forlì), Italy

Introduction

In this paper, we intend to describe two systems of so-called 'cohesion', namely entity/propositional cohesion and evaluative cohesion. The first of which is what is usually thought of as 'standard' cohesion has been far more extensively analysed in the discipline of linguistics, especially, under text grammar, than the latter. Cohesion means, of course, 'sticking together'.

According to Thompson (1996:147-161) cohesion teaches a 'set of resources', which 'the speaker [writer] attempts to employ to enable the listener [reader] to make sense of a piece of communication by 'organizing the ways in which the meanings are expressed', by having them connect together in some way. Here we have to underline that the kind of 'meanings' held together in standard cohesion practice range from simple entities, objects, people, places to more complex propositions encapsulated in lengthy stretches of text. 'Standard' cohesion, then affords a set of tools and techniques by which the speaker [writer] hopes to make the flow of text comprehensible (often named 'coherent') to an audience and, in some forms of texts, also engaging.

However, the study of standard cohesion can tell us a great deal about *how* a text is rendered coherent, but it sheds little light on the communicative (the perlocutionary) intents of the speaker [writer] in the first place, that is, *why* it is they wish to communicate what they do. A vast amount of human communication involves the expression of evaluation; in essence the appraisal of an entity as good or bad, always remembering that things can be good or bad in an infinity of different ways. We very rarely discuss entities or propositions without evaluating them in some way. Indeed the pres-

entation and arrangement of information without the speaker's [writer's] evaluation would not only by very dry but largely uninformative on an interpersonal level.

Expressing evaluations serves to engage with, to persuade, to create and maintain social bonds with listeners.

Texts then are also held together, they cohere, in terms of the evaluations they express, and it is the study of evaluative coherence (sometimes referred to as evaluative *harmony*) which sheds light on what speakers [writers] intend to do when they communicate to others. As Aristotle noted, human communication largely consists in attempts to connect with and to influence the beliefs and even behaviour of other people (Partington, Duguid and Taylor 2013: 5), in other words, to persuade them (of everything from the fact that you are a person worth listening to and being around, to how they should spend their money, to how they should vote.)

In order to study how evaluative cohesion functions in detail, we will utilise concordancing of relevant lexical items, lexical templates often called units of meaning, as they appear in the Siena-Bologna (SiBol) Modern Diachronic Corpora suite of corpora. This consists of four sister corpora, the first three of UK newspaper texts from different but contemporary periods in time, designed and compiled to be as alike as possible to eliminate potentially complicating variables. They contain all the articles published by three main UK broadsheet or so-called 'quality' newspapers, namely the right-leaning *The Telegraph*, the more centrist *The Times*, and the left-leaning *The Guardian* in the years 1993 (the SiBol 93 corpus), 2005 (the SiBol 05 corpus) and 2010 (the SiBol 2010 corpus). They contain, respectively, circa 100 million words,

150 million and 140 million words. The 2013 corpus wave, instead, contains the output of that year of 12 English language newspapers, including the original *The Telegraph*, *The Times*, and *The Guardian* plus two UK tabloids, *The Mirror* and *The Mail*, two US newspapers, *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*, *The Times of India*, *The South China Morning Post* (Hong Kong), *Daily News* (Egypt), *Gulf News* (UAE), and *This Day Lagos* (Nigeria). It contains a total of 327 million words.

1. Standard propositional cohesion

1.1 Entity-marking textual cohesion

Most traditional accounts of cohesion in grammars outline the arrays of mechanical links among segments of a text, generally concentrating on items which connect elements within one clause, sentence or text segment with those of another rather than elements inside a single clause.

Cohesion means 'holding together' and these links function to hold a text together so that the listener or reader can keep track of the entities, propositions etc. being communicated. What is less frequently emphasized however is that cohesive links, especially anaphoric ones, are also space and labour-saving devices. Texts would quickly grow cumbersome, not to say tiresome, if every item mentioned was referred to over again in its entire wording. Thompson (1996: 158) gives a short demonstration of this, citing an extract from a textbook which is unusually explicit in its use of repetition rather than reference:

Today scientists know that chromosomes play an essential role in hereditary. Chromosomes control all the traits of an organism, How do they perform this complex task? The main function of chromosomes is to control the production of substances called proteins. All organisms are made up primarily of proteins. Proteins determine the size, shape, and other physical characteristics of an organism. In other words, proteins determine the traits of an organism. (*Evolution* Prentice Hall 1994 cited in Thompson 1996: 158)

The first distinction usually made in descriptions of entity-marking cohesion is between acts of 'real-world' or exophoric (outside the text) reference, for instance:

Who is she? (pointing to someone in the street)

Images like this, from the Auschwitz concentration camp, have been seared into our consciousness during the twentieth century (pointing to images on a screen) (Steven Pinker, TED talk, 2007)

and acts of endophoric reference, where the indication is to some other segment inside the text. This is the type generally focused on in discourse analysis.

The second distinction generally made is between is between anaphoric reference, that is, referring backward to something already mentioned and cataphoric reference forward to something about to be mentioned. It is sometimes said that most entity-marking reference is anaphoric (Thompson 2006: 149), and it is indeed pervasive. However, it will be argued here that cataphoric reference is much more common than is often recognised, and is in many ways the more interesting of the two; indeed it is the force which drives many discourses forward.

The most common reference devices include:

- *pronouns:*
  Cholera first struck England in 1832. *It* came from the East.

where *it* refers to and substitutes 'Cholera'.

- *demonstratives such as this, these, that, those, as well as here and there and now and then:*

  Cholera first struck England in 1832. It made an immediately impact on the population *here.*

where *here* refers to and substitutes 'England'.

As Thompson points out, *this* can play an interesting role in that it can be used to refer to and substitute a 'whole stretch of text' (1996: 150), perhaps the outline of a whole set of events as in the following:

Economic historians call *this* "The Great Divergence" (Ferguson, TED talk, 2011)

where **this** refers to a process, previously described at some length by the speaker, that took place between 1400 to 1950, by which western nations' economic development grew far more quickly than that of other parts of the world.

- **ellipsis, where segments of a text are not repeated because they are so easily recovered from the context:** 'How old is he?' 'Three months' where he repetition of 'old' is redundant.

- **substitution:**
Now you can't just blame this on imperialism -- though many people have tried to **do so**
(Ferguson TED talk, 2011)

where **do so** refers back to and substitutes 'blame this on imperialism' (and note the item **this** is here replacing an entire previous set of notions, namely, the relative economic advances of western European countries and the resulting wealth gap).

- **Conjunction between clause complexes/sentences of which Thompson lists several variations:**

Table 1: Examples of contrastive linkers between clause complexes/sentences.

Despite the companionship of the her father, Katie missed children of her own age […]
Although she had her father as companion, Katie missed children of her own age […]
Katie had her father as companion. _Yet_ she missed children of her own age […]
(Thompson 1996 :107)

There is no agreement among grammarians on a definitive list of conjunction or 'linking' markers, but most would include items such as because (of), therefore (cause/ effect); despite, but, although, nevertheless (contrast, concession); and, moreover, in addition (additives or continuants) (Biber et al. 1999: 875-880)

Less frequently included in lists of entity-marking cohesive devices is **stylistic variation**. However, this is unlike the other devices in that it is not always simple substitution. For example, a text containing a reference chain such as 'Queen Elizabeth', 'the Queen of Great Britain', 'the UK head of State' and 'the head of the

Commonwealth' may all be referring to the same entity with stylistic variation, but on each occasion, further information is added. Thompson includes this intriguing example (our emphasis):

Bungling ram raiders tried to smash their way into a furniture shop – using **a stolen Mini**. But **the tiny motor** just bounced off the store's plate-glass window. (Thompson 1996: 151)

Here, 'the tiny motor' acts as both stylistic variation on 'a Mini', but also explains why the would-be thieves were so 'bungling'.

One celebrated but nonetheless fascinating instance of co-reference is the history of the two brilliant celestial objects, Phosphorus and Hesperus (Vesperus), the Morning Star and the Evening Star. They are co-referential names for the planet Venus (for much of history it was not realized that it was the same planet appearing in the sky at different times of the day in different seasons). Much logicians' ink has been spilled however over whether we should considered Phosphorus and Hesperus to be entirely the same; their co-referent is the same, but the contexts of the two are very different, and they cannot normally be interchanged in a text (Tye 1978).

Task 1: The Bottom Billion 1

Identify the anaphoric (backward-reaching) links in the following text, the publisher's description of a celebrated book in the field of international economic development.

Global poverty is falling rapidly; but in fifty or so failing states the world's poorest people – the "bottom billion" – face a tragedy that is growing inexorably worse. Why do these states defy all attempts to help them? Why does current aid seem unable to make a difference?

In his award-winning bestseller, Paul Collier pinpoints the issues of corruption, political instability, and resource management that lie at the root of the problem, and offers hard-nosed solutions and real hope for a way of solving one of the great crises facing the world today.

1.2 Cataphora or forward-leading phenomena

As mentioned earlier, cataphora has sometimes been treated as the poor relation in cohesion and receives less attention than it merits. 'Cataphora is quite rare compared to anaphora' states the voluminous and highly prestigious **Introduction to Functional Grammar** (Halliday and Matthiesson 2004: 552), and it is dismissed in a few lines.

However, if cataphora is defined not just as forward *looking* but a forward *leading* – the stem - *phoric* means literally 'carrying' - as *propelling* the text forward, it is one of the most important phenomenon or collection of phenomena in discourse building.

Textbooks sometimes limit themselves to listing the same devices as were noted for anaphora, for example, pronouns:
It was a life-threatening experience. Catching cholera in the 16th century England, that is.

substitution:
Not to do so would be irresponsible. Insure the car, I mean.

and demonstratives:
The song goes something like this. (sings)

But there is much more to cataphoric reference than meets the casual eye. Indeed, the sentence preceding this one ('But there … casual eye') is itself an illustration of this. It sets up a – by definition – forward-leading expectation in the readers' minds that they will be told a good deal more about the topic broached here in the following text. It would not be an exaggeration to state that this is how much of discourse functions: the setting up by speakers/writers of cataphoric expectations which are then, to some degree or other, normally addressed. This is how discourse generally progresses. To illustrate yet again, the segment in the previous sentence 'this is how a great deal of discourse functions' is cataphoric in function, raising the forward-looking expectation to the answer to the question raised of 'how a great deal of discourse functions', that answer being 'the setting up by speakers/writers of cataphoric expectations […]'.

This kind of cataphora is then a hugely important mechanism in text structuring. Two of the most explicit forms of cataphora structuring are questions, both overt and covert, and listing, that is, where a list is announced somehow and then the items discussed in order.

Listing can be performed openly, for example:

Now in India's case I believe there are six ideas which are responsible for where it has come today. The first is really the notion of people […] (Nilakani, TED talk 2009)

The Basel regime had three pillars: disclosure, supervision, and capital requirements. Disclosure reflected a belief that if sufficient relevant information was provided, the public and the markets would impose appropriate sanctions on a poorly managed bank […] Supervision was a process of private discussion between the bank and the regulators.

Capital requirements had a basic rule: banks had to keep equity capital^{33} equal to 8 percent of their assets. (Vargiù 2018: 18)

But lists can also be cataphorically pre-introduced with less obvious announcement; see Task 2.

Task 2: Credit ratings agencies

The agencies defended themselves from criticism in different ways. Standard & Poor's defended its ratings as no more than opinions, based on available information at the time […] Fitch openly admitted mistakes had been made. Moody's defended its actions throughout the region, and pointed out the excessive expectations that had been placed on the predictive power of ratings. (Vargiù 2018: 16)

Q1 What is the cataphoric expectation set up in the first sentence?

Q2 There are three elements in the list; what are they?

Questions are among the most obviously forward-reaching of mechanisms. Firstly, when they are

interactive, that is, when one person asks for goods or services, including, very frequently, information:

> Journalist: A couple questions on Puerto Rico if I can. The President said that the debt in Puerto Rico is going to be wiped out. Director Mulvaney sort of cleared that up a little bit, saying he shouldn't take the President word for word on that. Can you just button it down from the podium whether or not the President will take action or push for legislation to forgive any of the debt that Puerto Rico currently has?
> MS. SANDERS: Right now, the primary focus is to provide relief to Puerto Rico and support in the rebuilding efforts. While we're still dealing with the immediate disaster, it isn't inappropriate to focus on the difficulties that Puerto Rico was dealing with before the storm. There's a process for how to deal with Puerto Rico's debt, and it will have to go through that process to have a lasting recovery and growth.
> (White House Press Briefing, Oct 5th 2017)

where 'information' also includes, opinion, or, as in the following, 'assessment' (which the interviewee here cunningly transforms into a positive self-assessment):

> Q: What's your assessment of the demand for a European growth pact, which you
> promoted throughout your campaign?
> Francoise Hollande: The French presidential campaign deserves credit for reviving the demand for growth. The word appears in the budgetary treaty. But without any concrete content or application. However, without additional economic activity, it will be difficult or indeed impossible to reduce the deficits or control the debt. (*Slate*, May 7th 2012).

But even in situations where a live interlocutor is not available, in, say, speeches or in a written text, questions are used to move the discourse forward; the same person asks the question, setting up the expectation in the listener or reader that a response will be forthcoming.

The aim of this work is to test these two theories against each other. **Are credit rating agencies the independent organization of property, capital, and individualism cutting through international** **differences that liberals like Angell envisaged, the heralds of wealth and commerce that Constant foresaw subjugating state authority? Or are they really arms of an empire, a state granted organization, something not too distant, in a realist perspective, from the old Dutch East India Company?** If the realist theory is correct, ideological bias in the agencies' actions in sovereigns around the world should lead investors, who care more about yield than they care about ideology, to overlook their judgment. If, instead, the liberal theory is closer to the truth, agencies should have no evident ideological bias in their actions, and investors should generally follow their judgments.

(Vargiu 2018: 3)

Task 3: Paul Collier. Credible hope

Listen to the opening segment of the TED talk entitled 'New rules for building a broken nation', on the topic of post-conflict rebuilding:

www.ted.com/talks/paul_collier_s_new_rules_for_rebuilding_a_broken_nation

The economist Paul Collier introduces his topic and advances his arguments with a serious of questions, which he then gives answers to later in the discourse. Here are the questions, can you supply his answers?

1. How can we give credible hope to that billion people?
....
....
....
....
....
....

2. What does it mean to get serious about providing hope for the bottom billion? What can we actually do?
....
....
....
....
....
....

3. Why did America get serious?

………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………

4. So, what did you do, last time you got serious?

………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………

5. What else did you do?

………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………

6. Did you do anything else?

………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………

7. Is that easier or harder?

………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………

In Section 2.1.1 below we will also discuss the close relationship between Question-Response sequencing and the Problem – Solution model of text organisation. (Hoey 1983).

Another set of important cataphoric text-organising devices are certain types of linkers. We will look at the role of contrastive linkers as evaluation switches in Section 2.1.1.

And the so-called contrastive or concessive linkers like *despite*, *although*, *while* already discussed in Section 1 above, signal the cataphoric projection of information into the future; they forewarn the reader/listener that, after a stretch of text expressing one kind of proposition (and evaluation see Section 2.1), another proposition contrasting with it in some way, is on its way soon. In the following:

> *Although* the Senate Committee later exonerated Moody's from improper influence or pressure in its late downgrade of Enron, the SEC had become determined to re-examine the competitive impact of the NRSRO designation. (*New York Times* 2002)

the concessive linker *although* warns the reader to expect, two pieces of information, first one then the other, given the linear nature language, which will somehow be in contrast with each other. The reader or listener knows they have to wait for the second piece which is cataphorically projected into the future.

Task 4: Complacency

The following contains two concessive linkers *while* and *although*. In each case, what is the information being projected forward in the text, in other words, that the reader has to wait for?
While the collapse in the value of internet stocks was initially mirrored in the wider stock market, the effect of cheap money encouraged stock prices to rise again in 2001. Although there were many signs of future instability for those who cared to look, it is hard to overstate the complacency that characterized the period from the bursting of the internet bubble to the global financial crisis of 2007-08. (Vargiù 2018: 17)

In the above text, once the notion of *complacency* has been introduced, the reader expects and receives cataphorically more information on the reasons for this complacency:

[…] the critical trend during this period was the growth in trade in asset-backed securities, and subsequently in collateralized debt obligations, between financial institutions. A false belief in the security provided by such packaging stimulated demand for these assets.

Further reassurance appeared to be provided by the parallel development of a market in credit default swaps, derivative securities that insured investors against possible defaults of other securities. The insatiable demand of financial markets for asset-backed securities led to the pursuit of assets of lower and lower quality.

(Vargiu 2018: 17-18)

In fact, cataphoric, forward-projecting discourse markers are very common and extremely varied in form. Here is a selection:

This would not be the last time the Commission hesitated in tinkering with the ratings system. Before that, however, *a broader context is needed*. (continues with an account of such a context, namely, how the dot.com crisis of the 2000s provoked the Commission into intervening again)

(Vargiu 2018: 17)

Telling your listener 'what it is not', raises the expectation of being told what it *really* is, and mention of 'different', 'differences' raise an expectation of learning more about what is different:

And it's not the economy. Richer country has a little higher. If I split Tanzania in its income, the richer 20 percent in Tanzania has more HIV than the poorest one. *And it's really different within each country*. Look at the provinces of Kenya. They are very different. And this is the situation you see. *It's not deep poverty*. It's the special situation, probably of concurrent sexual partnership among part of the heterosexual population in some countries, or some parts of countries, in south and eastern Africa. Don't make it Africa. Don't make it a race issue. Make it a local issue. And do prevention at each place, in the way it can be done there.

(Hans Rosling, TED talk, 2009)

Both the phrases here *it's not* and *it/they are different* often, then, act as what we might call cataphoric expectation *triggers*, that is, they alert us to the probability of certain types of future information supply.

Moreover any language offers speakers/writers a large varieties of ways of signaling that what has been said is true, but that there is more to come, e.g. but a wider context is needed, this is only half the story, my real message to you is, but there is a problem here, and so on.

Segments of texts are often organised into parallel phrases, in which the first part prefigures the second. In the following example there is a parallel and a contrast made between the past and the present:

Until the 1980s, regulation of banks had been a national affair, reflecting different historical developments in different jurisdictions. The banking structure of the U.S. was fragmented as a result of its restrictions on inter-state banking, Britain had a concentrated retail banking system and clear separation between commercial and investment banking, while universal banks prevailed in France and Germany.
Since the 1980s, however, the dominant influence on banking supervision was the attempt to reach internationally harmonized structures through the Basel agreements, the first of which was signed in 1988.

(Vargiù 2018: 18)

Note too how the phrase 'reflecting different historical developments', again including the expectation trigger *different*, cataphorically creates the expectation that different scenarios will be presented, and in the next section we are given information on such developments in the U.S., in Britain and in France and Germany respectively.

Frequently the reader is projected forward wanting to learn how the parallel will end. See Task 5: Parallel phrases.

Task 5: Parallel phrases

Information and telecommunications technologies transformed how companies do business. […]
Those who were most plugged into this global conversation stood to gain the most from it. Those outside the conversation, by virtue of political ideology, personal choice, poverty, or misfortune, risked total economic failure, a fact that was as true for countries as it was for companies (Harvard Business Review 1993).

Q1 Which are the two sentences acting as parallel?
Q2 The relationship between the two is one of contrast. What is the contrast?
Q3 What information are the readers left wanting to learn? How are they also made to wait before learning it?

Task 6: Matching projecting and projected information

In each of the following cases the sentences or phrases in the first list (i-iv) project cataphorically to the information contained in one of the sentences or phrases in the second list (a-d). Find the four matching pairs of phrases or sentences. The first has been done as an example.

Forward looking sentences:
i   This work was conceived while reading two authors that looked quite prophetic given the financial events of the recent years.
ii A complete meltdown of the global financial system was averted only by public intervention on an unprecedented scale.
iii Eight years after the beginning of the crisis, the three agencies were thriving […]
iv The event was the most severe financial crisis since 1929 (Kay 2015, 41). For rating agencies, such a failure was unheard of.

Following sentences
a) Revenues were at all-time highs, and S&P had settled its case with the Department of Justice,

paying $1.4 billion but not admitting any wrong-doing.
b) Credit ratings had been embraced by financial markets because they mostly did what agencies claimed they did: accurately predict the likelihood of defaults.
c) One of them was a British journalist, Sir Norman Angell, the only person to have been awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for publishing a book, 'The Great Illusion' (Nobel Media 2018).
d) Government funds were used to provide liquidity support for the banking system and directly recapitalize failed or failing institutions

Answers: i and (c); ii_____; iii_____;
iv _____
Q Are there any particular segments in the first of each of these pairs which act as triggers of the forward-looking reference?

To summarise and conclude this section on entity and propositional cohesion, both anaphoric and cataphoric projection play roles in making texts more comprehensible (often called 'coherent' in discourse analysis terminology) and easier to process. Cataphoric projection also plays an important role in preparing the ground for future information. It signals that some new information is about to arrive, of a different type when we come across a contrastive linker, or that the current type of information - or at least a similar and non-contrasting type - will continue for a while (as in listing or following an additive linker like *in addition*, *moreover*, even *and*). And it is even used to create an atmosphere of suspense, even of teasing, to deliberately make your audience of listeners or readers wait a while until they are given the full picture.

Task 7: Building suspense

Watch and listen to, and/or read the introductory section (the first three paragraph's of Lord Ashdown's TED talk:
www.ted.com/talks/paddy_ashdown_the_global_power_shift.html

1) There's a poem written by a very famous English poet at the end of the 19th century. It was said to echo in Churchill's brain in the 1930s. And the poem goes: "On the idle hill of summer, lazy with the flow of streams, hark I hear a distant drummer, drumming like a sound in dreams, far and near and low and louder on the roads of earth go by, dear to friend and food to powder, soldiers marching, soon to die." Those who are interested in poetry, the poem is "A Shropshire Lad" written by A.E. Housman.

2) But what Housman understood, and you hear it in the symphonies of Nielsen too, was that the long, hot, silvan summers of stability of the 19th century were coming to a close, and that we were about to move into one of those terrifying periods of history when power changes. And these are always periods, ladies and gentlemen, accompanied by turbulence, and all too often by blood.

3) And my message for you is that I believe we are condemned, if you like, to live at just one of those moments in history when the gimbals upon which the established order of power is beginning to change and the new look of the world, the new powers that exist in the world, are beginning to take form. And these are -- and we see it very clearly today -- nearly always highly turbulent times, highly difficult times, and all too often very bloody times.

Q. What are the suspense building language techniques he employs until he finally begins to
address his topic of 'The Global Power Shift' in the rest of his talk?

2.   Evaluative cohesion (or harmony): evaluative intentions; *why* we say what we say

The traditional study of propositional textual cohesion as outlined in the previous sections reveals some of the nut and bolts of how texts are structured by speakers/writers and then interpreted by hearers/readers. It tells us something about what and a little about how the text has been organized but less about *why* the speaker/writer decided to communicate. In other words, it tells us little about the interactive rhetorical persuasive aims of the text producer. To inves-

tigate these we need to look at another form of cohesion, namely, *evaluative* cohesion, sometimes also called evaluative *harmony* (Partington 2015, 2017).

As a first step we need to focus on what evaluative meaning actually *does* in discourse. There are some clues when we take stretches of text wider than the simple sentence. The first is that meaning can often spread across grammatical boundaries, for instance:

(1) George Bush is talking again and [I don't have a clue what he's saying]. It's not that [he's mangling his syntax]. That's [par for the course] […] (SiBol 05)

in which we find a string of negatively evaluated items (highlighted) which work together − cohere − to paint a negative picture of the person in question. Using corpus evidence, Channell (1994) shows how the expression *par for the course*, literally 'average', is almost always used to describe some entity or behavior in a negative way (roughly equivalent to 'mediocre', 'no better than could be expected'). The fact that evaluative items appear in chains across grammatical boundaries suggests that texts cohere evaluatively as well as propositionally.

2.1 Reading texts evaluatively: how evaluative cohesion is constructed, and the role of evaluative prosody

2.1.1 Evaluative blocks: the processes of embedding and contagion

To investigate evaluative cohesion further, then, we need to look at wider contexts, complete texts or significant segments of them. The following is the publisher's description of the celebrated work 'The Bottom Billion' (Collier 2007), already seen in section 1.1 above:

Global poverty is falling rapidly; but in fifty or so failing states the world's poorest people − the "bottom billion" − face a tragedy that is growing inexorably worse. Why do these states defy all attempts to help them? Why does current aid seem unable to make a difference?

> In his award-winning bestseller, Paul Collier pin-points the issues of corruption, political instability, and resource management that lie at the root of the problem, and offers hard- nosed solutions and real hope for a way of solving one of the great crises facing the world today.

As with most book blurbs, the text has two communicative functions, informative, to tell the reader what the book is about, and evaluative-persuasive-marketing, encouraging the reader to buy it. Unsurprisingly, the language is highly evaluative and it is the evaluative interplay which structures the piece and provides its dynamic cohesion. In these and the following analyses I will employ a simple bracketing annotation: round brackets for positive items, entities and notions, square brackets to indicate negative ones (first employed in Morley and Partington 2009).

The piece contains a good number of items which are either inherently evaluative or acquire evaluation in context. However, competent readers do not flip back and forward at every evaluative indication – from poverty [bad] to falling rapidly (good) to failing states (bad) and tragedy [bad] to attempts to help (good) to unable to [bad] to make a difference (good). Instead, writers and speakers employ – and readers and listeners in turn recognize and employ – the two processes of, firstly, evaluative embedding and secondly of contagion, in order to maintain what we have called consistency or 'harmony' of evaluation over long segments of text.

Contagion is the simpler of the two. It is the process whereby the surrounding items of no particular evaluation are subsumed into the prevailing evaluative 'mood', the evaluative polarity of the segment of text they find themselves in. We might use the analogy of *momentum* or *inertia* from physics;[1] we carry on using or interpreting any particular stretch of text according to one evaluative polarity, positive or negative, until we are given an indication to switch to the other polarity.

Evaluative embedding is more complex. The very first phrase contains an example. The notion of global poverty is clearly a bad thing but the fact that it is falling rapidly *is* positive. We can annotate this as ([Global poverty] is falling rapidly), where square

brackets indicate negative evaluation and round brackets positive evaluation. In an embedded evaluation, it is the outer level which dictates the final overall polarity. What must be stressed is that we tend not to read embedded evaluations as two separate evaluations, but as a single evaluative whole, negative or positive (as in this instance), as the case may be.

The next item, the adversative linker *but*, signals an abrupt switch in evaluation. Their role as indications of a reversal of evaluative polarity is one of the principal though much understudied functions of contrastive linkers (section 1.1.) such as *but*, *however*, *although*, *despite*, and so on. In Table 1 above, we see how this evaluative switch occurs in every instance. In the present text, *but* pre-warns the reader to expect, after the positive opening, something negative to follow. We are not disappointed. The rest of the sentence contains a linked series of negative elements, namely: the world's poorest people, face a tragedy, … growing inexorably worse. On the way, we learn that the expression the bottom billion is an alternative term for the world's poorest people and it therefore acquires a negative connotation in the text, that is [bad: a problem]. The item bottom is interesting in itself. Lakoff and Johnson famously include the 'up versus down' dichotomy among their 'orientational' metaphors (1980: 14), a subset of experiential metaphors. They go on to claim that *up* is regularly associated with more and better, *down* with less and worse. Others have shown that there are a number of exceptions to this regularity (rising inflation is very bad whilst, as we see in the present text, global poverty going *down* is highly desirable). However, SiBol 05 and SiBol 13 corpus evidence shows that the item *bottom* is, of all the 'down' words, one of the most likely to indicate negative states and situations: *bottom of the class*, … *of the league*, … *of the food-chain*, and so on.

The next two sentences continue in negative vein. The first contains another example of evaluative embedding; this time a positive process is embedded within an overall negative environment [*defy (all attempts to help them)*]. SiBol 05 contains 13 occurrences of *attempts to*

---

[1] Oxford Dictionary of English (2010): inertia (Physics): A property of matter by which it continues in its existing state of rest or uniform motion in a straight line, unless that state is changed by an external force.

help of which ten are in some negative environment. The attempts to help fail, meet with frustration, are blocked or meet with cynicism. In the present text they are *defied*. One corpus instance relates, as in our example, to problems of international development:

(2) Is it possible that rich nations' attempts to help the developing world only encourage dependency and corruption? (SiBol 05)

The third sentence contains yet another embedded evaluation, this one a little less self-evident. SiBol 05 data shows that the expression *make a difference*, especially when used in phrase-final position as here, is very generally found in positive contexts, even though there appears to be nothing explicitly positive or negative in the semantics of the expression itself. Instead its evaluative force is not immediately explicit but is expressed by its relationship with its environment, making it a prototypical instance of evaluative (also known as 'semantic') prosody:

(3) […] people were being deterred from a career in nursing because nobody told them about the emotional rewards of joining a profession based on compassion, teamwork, versatility and the opportunity to make a difference. (SiBol 05)

(4) A number of vacancies are on offer that could provide a real chance to make a difference to youngsters' lives and further your career. (SiBol 05)

The overall embedded evaluation of the final part of the sentence in our sample text is thus [unable to (make a difference)]; again we read this not in two opposing evaluations but as a single negatively evaluated unit.

There is, then, an evaluative chain running through the three sentences, obviously of negative polarity which links them cohesively: a tragedy […] – growing inexorably worse – defy all attempts to help them – unable to make a difference.

It may be noted that these last two sentences express problems which are both framed as questions. There is a natural connection; problem as topic and question as grammatical structure are psychologically and textually forward-looking (cataphoric) to solution and response respectively (Hoey 1983). These sentences are therefore

both backward-looking (anaphoric) to the negative item *tragedy* and forward-looking to the positive prospect of finding a solution, an answer, to the tragedy.

This first paragraph is thus processed evaluatively by the reader as just two evaluative units: a short opening positive one, and the rest as a single negative block:

(Global poverty is falling rapidly;) *but* [in fifty or so failing states the world's poorest people
– the "bottom billion" – face a tragedy that is growing inexorably worse. Why do these states defy all attempts to help them? Why does current aid seem unable to make a difference?]

The second paragraph of the **Bottom Billion** text contains a good number of highly negatively evaluated items, including *corruption*, *political instability*, *problem*, *crises,* but they all occur embedded within positively evaluated frames (pinpoints [the issues of corruption, political instability]) and (solving [one of the great crises]), and so their negativity is subsumed into the overall positivity. As regards *corruption* and *political instability*, it is better they be *pinpointed* than not, and SiBol corpus evidence indicates that *pinpoint* has a positive prosody, strongly associated with uncovering remedies and solutions. In this way, the whole second paragraph is processed by the experienced reader as a single positively evaluated block, and constitutes the answer and the solution respectively to the negatively evaluated questions and problems posed in the first paragraph. Our text can now be annotated as it is actually processed in practice by competent readers, as just three evaluatively consistent blocks.

(Global poverty is falling rapidly);
but
[in fifty or so failing states the world's poorest people – the "bottom billion" – face a tragedy that is growing inexorably worse. Why do these states defy all attempts to help them? Why does current aid seem unable to make a difference?]
(In his award-winning bestseller, Paul Collier pinpoints the issues of corruption, political instability, and resource management that lie at the root of the problem, and offers hard- nosed solutions and real hope for a way of solving one of the great crises facing the world today.)

We see then, how this text is structured largely by its evaluation; how the negative evaluation allows the first paragraph to cohere and make sense to the reader as the *problem*, and how the positive evaluation enables the second paragraph to cohere and make sense as a *solution*.

The Question / Problem (negative) and Answer / Solution (positive) evaluative argument structure is not uncommon in the discourse type of book marketing. The following is another instance:

> *Why Nations Fail*
> by Acemoglu and Robinson, 2013.
>
> Why are some nations more prosperous than others? Why Nations Fail sets out to answer this question, with a compelling and elegantly argued new theory: that it is not down to climate, geography or culture, but because of institutions. Drawing on an extraordinary range of contemporary and historical examples, from ancient Rome through the Tudors to modern-day China, leading academics Daron Acemoglu and James A. Robinson show that to invest and prosper, people need to know that if they work hard, they can make money and actually keep it – and this means sound institutions that allow virtuous circles of innovation, expansion and peace.

The problem, of course resides in the fact that some countries are failing to achieve prosperity. This is implicitly a negative state of affairs. The negatively is stated still more boldly in the book's title, *Why Nations Fail*.

The two entities evaluated, both positively, are firstly the authors, and secondly their theory, or rather the proposed solution to the problem of why some countries fail to achieve prosperity through sound institutions. The authors are praised as 'leading academics' who draw 'on an extraordinary range of contemporary and historical examples'. The theory is 'compelling' and 'argued elegantly'. The 'sound' institutions 'allow virtuous circles of innovation, expansion and peace'. We read the entire main paragraph ('Why Nations … expansion and peace') as a single positively-evaluated textual block.

1.2 Multiple 'voices' in text

The role of evaluation in cohesion becomes especially interesting when radically differing points of view are being presented in the same text and especially where the goals of participants are in conflict. The text we analyse below is the opening to an essay on the current work of charities, including Oxfam, in the UK (from Cohen 2009: 241).

There are two separate but co-existing narrative points of view, two evaluators, present in the text: a dominant one, that of Oxfam, the writer and presumed 'all right-thinking readers', and a subordinate one, that of the British government, or 'Whitehall'. The two evaluators are posited as having antithetical aims, and are therefore bound to have different evaluations.

Taking account of embeddings and contagion, we can read the author's pro-Oxfam array of evaluations as follows:

> (Oxfam was founded in 1942 to bring aid to the oppressed of Nazi Europe), (a cause) that [did not make it popular with the Churchill government]. [After the Germans occupied Greece, the Royal Navy blocked the shipping lanes. Famine spread across the mainland and the islands.] (Lifting the blockade might have helped the starving), *but* Whitehall wondered whether food meant for the hungry would end up in the bellies of German troops instead, and [gazed with some disdain on the new lobbyists].

SiBol corpus evidence indicates that *a cause*, a nominal phrase as here, has a positive prosody, especially when followed by a verb clause:[2]

(5) […] the rights of transgender people have taken a place alongside gay rights as a cause
that matters. (SiBol 2013)
(6) Power to the media, for taking up a cause that legislators are placing low on their priority list. (SiBol 2013)

---

[2] Some authors have claimed that cause as a verb, in contrast, often occurs in negative environments (Stubbs 2001: 66).

The wartime British government's chief preoccupation is, instead, that of not accidentally feeding the enemy. Given that it evaluates Oxfam as [bad: interfering], its array of evaluations may be reconstructed as follows:

> [Oxfam was founded in 1942] to bring aid to the oppressed of Nazi Europe, a cause that did not make it popular with (the Churchill government). [After the Germans occupied Greece,] (the Royal Navy blocked the shipping lanes). Famine spread across the mainland and the islands. Lifting the blockade might have helped the starving, *but* Whitehall wondered whether [food meant for the hungry would end up in the bellies of German troops instead], and gazed with some disdain on [the new lobbyists].

Note again the role of *but* as evaluative switch, here, from the positive help for the starving to the negative potential feeding of the enemy. The expression *end up* + preposition + somewhere is primed for negative evaluative meaning, largely because something has gone to a place which the adopted perspective does not intend it to go. The SiBol corpus provides the following somewhat similar instance:

> *(7) The challenge for the future is to increase yields on marginal lands where much of the crop ends up in the bellies of insects or is devastated by drought or disease. (SiBol 05)*

What is interesting is how, at this point in the text, the author of the extract chooses to employ an evaluative prosody – negative – consistent with the temporarily adopted perspective (the government's), not his own. Similarly, the choice of the item *lobbyists* to describe Oxfam is made from the government's perspective; very likely Oxfam would have chosen a more evaluatively favourable term to describe themselves, perhaps *charity*. The macro-structure of this extract is parallelism of voices and a contrast of evaluations. As experienced readers, we have no problems in keeping apart the two points of view; in fact, we handle complex interwoven webs of evaluation quite instinctively.

3. How the two forms of cohesion – propositional and evaluative - interact

Standard and evaluative cohesion combine to work together in several ways. We have already seen numerous examples of how evaluative items play a part in propositional reference, for example:

> Now you can't just blame this on imperialism -- though many people have tried to *do so* (Ferguson TED talk, 2011)

where the substituted phrase including the verb *blame* is a clearly evaluative item. In the following:
> Bungling ram raiders tried to smash their way into a furniture shop – using *a stolen Mini*. But *the tiny motor* just bounced off the store's plate-glass window. (Thompson 1996: 151)

the noun phrase *the tiny motor* not only coheres with the previous noun phrase in elegant variation but also expresses a negative evaluation of weakness and failure (from the would-be thieves' point of view). In our example text 'The Bottom Billion' we saw that the co- referential synonyms *issues, problems, crises* were in evaluative contrast with *solve, hope* and *solutions*, working together within the Problem-Solution argument model. There are also a number of phrases with inherent evaluative polarity which contain a cohesive linker, usually anaphoric, for example, *that's just par for the course* (see example (1) where 'that' coheres anaphorically with 'mangling his syntax') and *get away with it*, where it refers backwards to some misdeed, for example:

> People can't see the moral squalor of what they're doing. It is outrageous that anyone can steal an artist's work and get away with it. (SiBol 13)
> In 2012, media and politics went into full denial on melting icecaps and rising emissions. They shouldn't get away with it in 2013. (SiBol 13)

In these instances, it refers to stealing an artist's work and full climate damage denial, respectively, both negatively evaluated propositions. And substi-

tution using stylistic variation is also frequently used to construct an evaluation, e.g. Bashar-al-Assad, Syrian President, Syrian dictator and Syrian government, Syrian regime, police state, Assad's Mafia-like regime (all from The Guardian newspaper 12/12/2011).

Another way in which propositional and evaluative cohesion combine is in the use of contrastive adversative linkers. We noted earlier the cataphoric cohesive function of contrastives such as *despite*, *although* and *while*. In the following we see that the contrast, marked by *despite*, is very frequently one of evaluation, where four positive items *easier* etc, and followed by, as if cataphorically summoned, four negative ones *complex* etc.:

> The simple act of buying and selling a house in England and Wales is so *fraught with* hazards that it is a notorious minefield. Despite a succession of governments promising to make the process easier, cheaper, safer and faster, the entire process remains complex, expensive, difficult and time-consuming. (SiBol 05)

In term of argument structure, we have already seen how cohesion and evaluative combine in one type of argument organisation, the Problem- Solution structure. Cataphoric, expectation-building devices can be used, especially when applied cumulatively, to create an overall evaluative context.

An example of this can be found in the introduction by Paddy Ashdown to his TED talk entitled 'The Global Power Shift' (2011), to be found in Task 7. Listen to or read the text again, making note of how the evaluation contributes to the built-up of forward-looking, cataphoric suspense.

There are numerous cataphoric cohesive devices, including 'there is a poem …', 'and the poem goes …', 'But what Housman understood […] was that …', 'And my message for you is that …' which combine together with a variety of negative evaluative lexis, for example, 'terrifying', 'blood', 'condemned', 'turbulent', 'bloody' to construct a discourse atmosphere of intense foreboding.

Another argument structure in which propositional and evaluative cohesion work in tandem is that, which we can call the 'Garden Path' technique, from

the idiom to 'lead someone up (sometimes down) the garden path', that is, to lead astray, to mislead in an enticing way (Gulland & Hinds-Holland 2002: 47). A speaker or writer who uses this technique first presents one narrative with an accompanying evaluation, inviting the audience to share it, only to suddenly switch to another, usually opposing narrative with radically contrasting evaluation. It is not uncommon in sophisticated forms of speaking. Mark Antony claims to being plain and unlettered, in contrast to his arch enemy Brutus:

> I am no orator, as Brutus is;
> But, as you know me, a plain blunt man
> That love my friend … (Julius Caesar Act 3, Sc. 2)

just before launching into one of Shakespeare's more celebrated rhetorical addresses ('Friends, Romans, countrymen …'). In the opening of his TED talk on inter-human violence, Steven Pinker shows his audience pictures of some of the atrocities of the 20th C, before arguing, with a plethora of evidence from many fields, that inter-human violence has actually declined appreciably over time. The marriage of both cataphoric and anaphoric devices plays a vital role in employing this technique. An example is the introduction to the TED talk by Leslie Chang 'The Forgotten Voices of Chinese Workers' (2012):

1. I'd like to talk a little bit about the people who make the things we use every day: our shoes, our handbags, our computers and cell phones. Now, this is a conversation that often calls up a lot of guilt. […] We, the beneficiaries of globalization, seem to exploit these victims with every purchase we make, and the injustice feels embedded in the products themselves. […] It's taken for granted that Chinese factories are oppressive, and that it's our desire for cheap goods that makes them so.

The cataphoric expressions include 'I'd like to talk about …', 'this is a conversation that …' and 'it's taken for granted that …'; the negative evaluations are expressed by guilt, exploit these victims, 'oppressive'. The highly negative narrative is created of western exploitation of Chinese workers. The speaker, however, proceeds to overturn this narrative:

2. So, this simple narrative equating Western demand and Chinese suffering is appealing […] it's also inaccurate and disrespectful. We must be peculiarly self-obsessed to imagine that we have the power to drive tens of millions of people on the other side of the world to migrate and suffer in such terrible ways. In fact, China makes goods for markets all over the world, including its own, thanks to a combination of factors: its low costs, its large and educated workforce, and a flexible manufacturing system […] By focusing so much on ourselves and our gadgets, we have rendered the individuals on the other end into invisibility […]

'This simple narrative' is obviously anaphoric but is also immediately augmented by evaluative information (negative. i.e. 'innacurate and disprespectful'). 'China makes goods for markets all over the world […] thanks to a combination of factors' looks forward cataphorically to a list of these factors, all positively evaluated. Westerners are also re-evaluated, still negatively, but no longer as simply exploitative but 'self-obsessed', but as poorly-informed and indeed covertly racist. The finale of her introduction is as follows:

3. Chinese workers are not forced into factories because of our insatiable desire for iPods. They choose to leave their homes in order to earn money, to learn new skills, and to see the world.
In the ongoing debate about globalization, what has been missing is the voices of the workers themselves. Here are a few.

Chinese workers continue to be one of the objects of evaluation, but now they are evaluated positively as educated and self-motivated. There is the anaphoric repetition of 'factories', implicitly recalling our (inaccurate) narrative. The final two utterances include a Problem (namely, the missing voices of the workers) and a Solution (I'm about to give you some of these voices), the latterly being implicitly but obviously a positive thing.

4. Conclusion

From the above several conclusions can be drawn. First of all that cataphoric cohesion, often treated in grammars as infrequent and of little consequence has, instead, a vital role to play in both standard and evaluative cohesion.

Secondly, given how standard (propositional/ entity) cohesion and evaluative cohesion are so inter-related and work together to keep discourse 'sticking together' meaningfully, it would seem perverse to teach one without the other, which has generally been the case (evaluative cohesion usually being ignored completely).

Lastly, the term 'cohesion' itself hardly seems adequate to describe everything that speakers do in combining the two systems of anaphor-cataphora and evaluation. These systems are not used soley to make a discourse hang together in a more comprehensible ('cohesive') fashion. Their co-use also helps economise the processing effort required of the discourse receiver, for instance, in the way cataphor can pre-alert a listener to what is about to come and the way in which by evaluative contagion, that is, inertia we can expect the present evaluation to continue until told otherwise. Finally, as has been demonstrated many times, these systems are not to be viewed as static text structuring mechanisms but as means in which discourse producers drive their discourse forward in the directions they wish.

'Cohesion' is a term used in grammar and in text linguistics in general. Inevitably, text linguistics cannot study the live production of discourse; instead it studies the linguistic trace, what is left behind by discourse producers. Text is in this sense is 'once-was-discourse' Partington, Duguid & Taylor 2013:3). There is therefore inevitably a difference in emphasis between text linguist and text producer. There has been a tendency on the part of text linguists to view texts as completed constructs and often to focus on the structure, the architecture of a whole text. This is somewhat different though from the viewpoint of the text producer who is constructing the discourse in 'real-time' and for who therefore so-called cohesive devises and evaluative harmony (and occasional clash) are tools being used to complete the task in hand. 'Cohesion' may therefore

be a useful term for the linguist in implying a finished product with component parts. The discourse producer instead is concentrating on using anaphora and particularly cataphora and evaluation to generate communication which is meaningful and engaging both propositionally and evaluatively to an audience.

References

- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad S. & Finegan E. 1999. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. London: Longman.
- Channell, J. 1994. Vague Language. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Cohen, N. 2009. Waiting for the Etonians. London: Fourth Estate.
- Collier, P. 2007. The Bottom Billion. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gulland D. & D. Hinds-Holland 2002. Penguin Dictionary of English Idioms. London: Penguin. Halliday, M. & Matthiessen, C. 2004. An Introduction to Functional Grammar. Arnold: London.
- Hoey, M. 1983. On the Surface of Discourse. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Lakoff G. & M. Johnson. 1980. Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Morley, J. and Partington, A. 2009. A few Frequently Asked Questions about semantic – or evaluative –
- prosody. International Journal of Corpus Linguistics 14:2, 139-158.
- Partington, A. 2015. Evaluative prosody. In K. Aijmer and C. Ruhleman (eds.) Corpus Pragmatics: A Handbook. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 279-303.
- Partington, A. 2017. Evaluative clash, evaluative cohesion and how we actually read evaluation in texts.
- Journal of Pragmatics 117, 190-203.
- Partington, A.,A. Duguid & C. Taylor. 2013. Patterns and Meanings in Discourse. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Thompson, G. 1996. Introducing Functional Grammar. London: Arnold.
- Tye, M. 1978. The puzzle of Hesperus and Phosphorus. Australasian Journal of Philosophy. Volume 56: 3, 219-224.
- Vargiù, Andrea. 2018. Wall Street Divisions. M.A. Thesis at the School of Political Science, Bologna University.