

# COHESIVE DEVICES AND THEIR CONTEXTUAL CONDITIONS IN MODERN HEBREW PROSE

Bruria **MARGOLIN**.

Head, Hebrew Language Department

Levinsky College of Education,

Tel-Aviv, Israel.

[bruria.margolin@gmail.com](mailto:bruria.margolin@gmail.com)

## **Abstract**

This paper identifies the linguistic, grammatical and syntactic cohesive devices used in a corpus of thirty Modern Hebrew prose stories. Based on the corpus examined in this paper, it appears that authors writing in Modern Hebrew usually use linguistic and grammatical cohesive devices to create the text's primary linear cohesive axis, while they employ syntactic cohesive devices to generate the secondary axes. The paper demonstrates the use of linguistic, grammatical and syntactic cohesive devices in these Modern Hebrew stories and examines the various contextual conditions affecting author preference for the different types of cohesive devices.

**Keywords:** Cohesion, Coherence, Cohesive devices, Linguistic cohesive devices, Grammatical cohesive devices, Syntactic cohesive devices

## **1. Introduction**

In the field of discourse studies, two major terms have been coined to delineate a text as a closed and meaningful linguistic unit (Celce Murcia & Olstain, 2000; Van Dijk, 2008, Margolin, 2012): cohesion and coherence. Cohesion usually refers to the overt textual attributes of the discourse, while coherence to its covert attributes (e.g., Bublitz, 1999; Tanskanen, 2006; Margolin, 2012), though this distinction is neither precise nor unequivocal. Indeed, the overt linguistic devices in a discourse, i.e., the cohesive devices, point out the meaningful relations among the parts of the text and are thus part of its coherence components (Olshtain & Haskel-Shaham, 2012). Cohesion has been widely accepted for textual analysis, because it refers to the

grammatical and lexical elements on the surface of a text which can form connections between parts of the text (Connor, 1996). Coherence, on the other hand, has been regarded as a vague notion (Sinclair, 1991) with little practical value for the analyst (Bublitz, 1999). The simplest definition of discourse coherence is that "discourse as a sequence of propositions is coherent if facts (events, actions, situations) it refers to are related" (Van Dijk, 2008 p.185). That is, a discourse is coherent for language users if they are able to create a mental model for it (Van Dijk and Kintsch, 1983). Scholars generally agree that cohesion is a textual attribute that helps the author reveal coherence (Martin, 1992; Thompson, 1994; Olshtain & Haskel-Shaham, 2012), while coherence is dependent upon the author and the reader and their evaluation of the text (Tanskanen, 2006).

In addition to the problematic distinction between cohesion and coherence, scholarly opinions are also divided regarding the nature of cohesion. Some (e.g., Crystal, 2004) argue that cohesion can be achieved only when the linguistic structures and the semantic meanings in the text are mutually dependent. Others (e.g., Leech et al., 2001p.83) define cohesion as a means of connecting ideas to linguistic arrangements in order to generate the text. Despite these differing scholarly opinions regarding the nature of cohesion, all are in agreement that cohesion is an important tool for producing a text and its meaning. Using cohesion, the author joins the linguistic units into a textual continuum that enables the reader to follow the text's logical or chronological sequence. In this paper, cohesion refers to the use of overt linguistic devices to indicate the relations among the sentences and the parts of the text (Connor, 1996) and to generate textual unity (Tanskanen, 2006). These cohesive devices help the reader associate previous words or phrases with the subsequent ones (Shen, 2010).

Halliday and Hasan (1976) set down the methodological foundations for the term cohesion. They defined the term as the linguistic devices an author uses to generate a textual continuum and classified these devices into five groups: reference, substitution, ellipsis, lexical cohesion and conjunctions. According to Halliday and Hasan, reference, substitution and ellipsis are grammatical cohesive devices, lexical cohesions are linguistic cohesive devices and conjunctions are grammatical devices with a lexical component.

Researchers agree on the methodological importance of the cohesion model proposed by Halliday and Hasan (Tanskanen, 2006), and many use this model to examine textual cohesion (e.g., Connor, 1984; Shen, 2010). Moreover, in many studies examining the topic of cohesion (e.g., Hadely, 1987; Enkvist, 1990; Tanskanen, 2006), researchers agree in principle that cohesion comprises two components, referred to by Halliday and Hasan (1976) as reiteration and collocation. Reiteration refers to the repetition of identical or different lexical items:

synonym, generalization, differentiation, and contradiction (Olshtain & Haskel-Shaham, 2012), while collocation is concerned with the associative meanings among linguistic items. In this paper, I describe cohesion as comprising reiteration and collocation. I use the term "explicit cohesive devices" to refer to reiterative cohesive devices, including reference and repetition. The term "implicit cohesive devices" refers to collocative cohesive devices, including substitution and ellipsis.

Linguists have adopted cohesion as a reliable analytical tool because it refers both to the grammatical and to the lexical components of a text (Connor, 1996). Yet despite the importance of this topic, not many researchers have examined cohesion in various patterns of discourse (Tanskanen, 2006). Hence, the pragmatic conditions necessitating the use of these or other cohesive devices should be examined, as should the contextual conditions determining the preferences for using various devices in a particular language (Widdowson, 1992, p. 109).

In this paper, I put forward two hypotheses. First, the linguistic and grammatical cohesive devices used in the corpus of Modern Hebrew prose examined in this paper generate a linear discourse with clear-cut connections. Second, the linear pattern of discourse in this corpus is generated not only by these linguistic and grammatical cohesive devices, but also by syntactic cohesive devices. The authors represented in this corpus use syntactic devices in addition to linguistic and grammatical cohesive devices to lend support to the text's cohesive linear axis, especially in cases of long paragraphs, thus creating secondary cohesive axes.

## 2. What are syntactic cohesive devices?

The syntactic cohesive devices identified in the examined corpus are sentences that have been focused syntactically through the use of topicalization. Topicalization or thematization (Verma, 1976, p. 143; Ben Horin, 1976; Margolin, 2011) manifests itself through the placement of an unusual component at the beginning of a sentence such that the sentence's psychological structure, informative structure and pragmatic structure are not related. Topicalization also emerges in the sentence intonation. Hence, topicalization is created by placing an unusual thematic component at the beginning of a sentence as the topic in the topic-comment binary structure and by changing the sentence intonation to create a syntactically focused sentence (Margolin, 2000).

In the examined corpus, topicalization can be classified into six main models: simple topicalization, focalized topicalization, double topicalization, triple topicalization, quadruple topicalization and multiple topicalization. These topicalization types are differentiated by the number of irregular components at the beginning of the sentence and by their intonation patterns. Simple topicalization involves placing one irregular component, the simple topic, at

the beginning of a sentence and stressing the pause between topic and comment. Focalized topicalization is marked by one irregular component, the stressed topic, which is placed at the beginning of a sentence and stressed. In double, triple and quadruple topicalization models, the topic is constructed from two, three or four components respectively, each of which can serve as a separate topic for the comment. In the case of multiple topicalization, the degree of stress placed on the multiple components is not equal (Margolin, 2011).

In the examined corpus of Modern Hebrew prose, the frequency of sentences focused by means of topicalization indicates that these authors view topicalization as essential in organizing the discourse text. Furthermore, the authors in the examined corpus use topicalization to preserve the thematic component in the form of information to be stored actively by the reader. Through topicalization, an author seeks to distinguish between the thematic participants and the "non-thematic" participants so that the thematic participants are stored in the reader's consciousness, while the unexpected or "new" components are highlighted in the text.

Two dichotomies used to categorize the message should be taken into consideration when examining new components in a discourse: discourse-new vs. discourse-old, and hearer-new vs. hearer-old (Prince, 1992). In terms of the discourse, old information is information that already existed, while information that is old to the hearer is information the author is sure belongs to the hearer's general knowledge. This distinction emphasizes the fact that what is new in a discourse is not necessarily new to the hearer (Lambrecht, 1994). Information that is familiar to the hearer may be new in the discourse. Presenting what is "new" in a discourse is one of the cognitive constraints of languages, and authors always choose to mark a new referent in the discourse (Chafe, 1987). Such a referent is one that has not yet been mentioned in the discourse (Prince, 1997). One of the ways authors choose to mark such new referents is through topicalization. The topic marks the old information in the discourse, and the comment is used to introduce new referents into the discourse.

## **2. Methodology**

The aim of the current study is to identify and describe the cohesive devices in a corpus of Modern Hebrew prose comprising the work of thirty authors. The resulting model of cohesion emerges from the need to describe cohesion in various discourse patterns and to discover the

contextual conditions necessitating the use of one type of device or another in a particular language.

### *2.1 Data collection*

The data for this study were derived from a closed corpus. The corpus, chosen to reflect Modern Hebrew prose, was compiled from thirty short stories published in the anthology *Thirty Years, Thirty Stories - An Anthology of Hebrew Stories from the 60s to the 90s*, edited by Z. Stavi (1993). While the anthology's editor believes the stories in the collection constitute “an expression of personal taste that is totally subjective” (p. 13), they were selected for reflecting the state of written language in Modern Hebrew prose. The authors of the stories in the anthology are among the top authors of Modern Hebrew prose, including Yoram Kaniuk, Amos Oz, Yehoshua Kenaz, David Grossman, A.B. Yehoshua, Savyon Liebrecht and others.

### *2.2 Research tool*

Two tools were used in this study to determine the cohesive devices used in the examined corpus. The first tool is the taxonomy of cohesive relationships proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976), which has become the standard in this field. Halliday and Hasan claim that to understand a text we need to be continually aware of its linguistic and grammatical cohesive devices. The second tool is a syntactical tool developed specifically for this study to analyze topicalization. Topicalization reinforces the discourse's linear cohesive axis by using the topic to mark an old textual referent that refers back to preceding referents. Topicalization also generates the discourse's secondary cohesive axes by using the comment to mark a new textual referent that refers to subsequent referents. In this paper, these two tools are used to demonstrate cohesiveness in the examined corpus and to consider the contextual conditions affecting the author's choice of cohesive devices.

## **3. Discussion**

### *3.1 Constructing the cohesive axis by means of linguistic and grammatical devices*

As noted, in this paper I base my description of linguistic and grammatical cohesive devices on the cohesion model proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976), and define each of the principles of cohesion accordingly. Reference is defined as a semantic relationship in which one item in a text refers to another by means of identity of meanings. Reference can be endophoric or

exophoric. An endophoric reference is found in the text and may be anaphoric or cataphoric. When the endophoric reference item is a personal pronoun or a demonstrative pronoun, the reference is made explicit by means of identification with the reference item. When the endophoric reference item is a possessive pronoun, an objective pronoun or the definite article, the reference is made explicit through a comparison to the reference item (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 304, p. 309). When references appear in a text more than once, they produce a network of meaning among the various parts of the discourse (Hadley, 1987).

Substitution is a formal connection between linguistic forms but not between meanings. A specific linguistic structure is substituted by another identical linguistic form that is substituted for it, though their meanings are not the same (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 308). Substitution is used when an author wants to avoid repeating a particular lexical item and can replace it with another lexical item that will not impair the structural function of the previous item (Bloor & Bloor, 1995). Ellipsis is a form of substitution: "substitution with zero." Ellipsis occurs when a specific structural component is left out and another component fills in the missing information (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 142). Substitution and ellipsis are used as linguistic mechanisms that help express specific linguistic structures more economically in order to avoid repetitions of familiar words, phrases or clauses within the text.

Lexical cohesion is achieved by means of verbal and synonymic repetition using synonyms, subordinates or hyponyms, and superordinates or hypernyms (ibid, p. 278). According to Halliday and Hasan, conjunctions differ from cohesive devices in that they are cohesive by virtue of their specific meaning. Conjunctions mark various types of semantic connections and are therefore indirect rather than direct cohesive devices (ibid, p. 226).

The following examples from *Thirty Years, Thirty Stories* are analyzed for cohesion. The paragraphs were chosen based upon the assumption that in short paragraphs the authors relied mainly on explicit cohesive devices, including reference and repetition, to produce the cohesive axis. In longer paragraphs, the authors used also implicit cohesive devices, including substitution and ellipsis, and tended to add syntactical devices to support the linear cohesive axis and to produce secondary cohesive axes.

**Taganka, Here / Reuven Miran: 221**

1

Gregory himself lived in peace mainly with himself. Most things went in one of

2

3

his ears and out the other without tarrying too long in his head. But a small portion

4

penetrated deeply and almost reached his heart. This portion, which was actually

composed of crumbs, sank and was buried somewhere beyond memory.

This paragraph contains four verbal clauses with unmarked stress and unmarked syntax. The components of these clauses are ordered according to SVO (Subject-Verb-Object). The paragraph is short and uses short sentences. Hence, no syntactical means were used to generate linear cohesion. Instead, linear cohesion is achieved only by means of the linguistic cohesion devices of reference and substitution, as depicted in the following chart:

1.		Gregory	
2.	things	-----his ears	<i>reference (possessive pronoun)</i>
3.	small portion		<i>substitution</i>
4.	this portion		<i>reference (definite pronoun)</i>

**Beit Ha'am (The Community Center) / David Schütz: 386**

1            2

The clumsy figure of Mr. Birne was cut off by the shadow of the house. Two

broad tree stumps whose branches had been sawed off were lying in the truck.

3

4

Their roots were wrapped in damp straw. A fresh odor of soil and wood chips

5

emanated from them. Mr. Birne gave them a fond smack like he used to do to

the bottom of Toby, his old horse.

This paragraph contains five verbal clauses with unmarked stress and unmarked syntax. The components are ordered according to SVO. Because the paragraph and its sentences are short, the author did not use syntactic devices to generate linear cohesion. The cohesion is achieved

through explicit cohesive devices, including reference and repetition, as depicted in the following chart:

1.		Mr. Birne	
2.	tree stumps		
3.	their roots		<i>reference (possessive pronoun)</i>
4.	from them		<i>reference (objective pronoun)</i>
5.	gave them	Mr. Birne	<i>reference (objective pronoun)</i>

*Mr. Birne: lexical cohesion (repetition)*

An examination of all the paragraphs in the *Thirty Years, Thirty Stories* anthology that do not contain syntactic cohesive devices but rather only linguistic and grammatical cohesive devices indicated that all are relatively short paragraphs. In the examined corpus, the authors only tend to use linguistic and grammatical cohesive devices in very short paragraphs. In longer paragraphs they tend to add syntactic cohesive devices, specifically in the form of constructions focused by topicalization. The examination also revealed a tendency to use explicit cohesive devices such as reference and lexical cohesiveness in short paragraphs. Implicit cohesive devices such as substitution and ellipsis, which deal with associative meanings among linguistic items, were not often used.

### *3.2 Constructing the cohesive axis by means of syntactic devices*

The authors in the examined corpus tend to use syntactic devices in longer paragraphs. In particular, these authors use simple topicalization and double topicalization as syntactic means of cohesion. In Hebrew, simple topicalization involves changing the order of the sentence components by transferring one of them to the beginning of the sentence and introducing a pause in intonation between the thematic component and the rhematic component. The sentences below have been focused by means of simple topicalization. For purposes of simplification, their components are referred to as “simple topic” (ST) and “comment” (CT). The pause in intonation between the topic and the comment is indicated by means of the sign >.

- |    |                        |   |  |                                      |
|----|------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|
|    | ST                     |   | CT   |                                      |
| 1. | <u>At the cemetery</u> | > | <u>they tore my garment and my mother's garment.</u> | (After Tu BeShvat / Ruth Almog: 27). |



ST

CT

2. When Ursula was born > snowflakes covered the window of Mrs. Zonz's room at the hospital. (Between Mountains and Rocks Flies the Train / Yoel Hoffman: 101).

ST

CT

3. About five weeks after our meeting, > Anat informed me that there was no longer any doubt. (Little Woman / Izhak Orpaz: 18).

Double topicalization refers to the creation of sentences with a fronted topic constructed from two components. A fronted topic that has two components is referred to as a "double topic" (DT). Each of the two components in the double topic can serve as a separate topic for the comment. This coordination between the components of a double fronted topic is expressed in a pause in intonation between the two components, followed by a pause in intonation between the double fronted topic and the comment. The author marks the pause in intonation with commas, as can be seen in the following examples:

DT

CT

4. In my childhood, > at Neshet, > I once saw a gigantic lump of rock torn from the mountain. (My Friend B's Last Meal / Judith Hendel: 126).

DT

CT

5. At night, > by the light of the oil lamp, > Clara saw that the color of the fellow's

eyes was not the color of the dead bird. (The Beautiful Life of Clara Shiato / Yehoshua Kanyuk: 324).

DT

6. In the evening, > nearby the youth hostel in which the two [girls] were starving, >

CT

Jenny gave him her address in the United States. (Haste / Itzhak Le'or: 193).

The authors in the examined corpus use simple topicalization and double topicalization as syntactic cohesion devices. Placing a simple topic or a double topic at the beginning of a sentence supports the linear cohesive axis by marking the old information in the discourse that is linked to words or expressions that precede it. The comment is used to introduce new referents into the discourse, thus creating secondary cohesive axes. These syntactically focused structures produce secondary cohesive axes, in particular in long or complex paragraphs in

which the discourse requires textual organization. In longer paragraphs, the authors are more likely to use a greater number of sentences focused by simple topicalization.

The following examples from the examined corpus demonstrate structures that are focused using simple and double topicalization. These examples indicate that the textual function of simple and double topicalization in the examined corpus is to create linear cohesion. These paragraphs were chosen sporadically based upon their length and the length of the sentences in them. The choices were based on the assumption that the longer a paragraph is or the longer the sentences within it are, the greater the number of focused sentences the paragraph will include. Each example is followed by an outline of the linear cohesive axis between the explicit cohesive devices and an examination of the role played by the focused sentences in producing linear cohesion.

**Schneider's Sabbath Suit / Yeshayahu Koren: 301**

1		2
Schneider's bed was not made. The sheets were tangled in the blankets.		
3		4 DT
The ends of one of the sheets touched the floor. <u>Next to the bed, between</u>		
	CT	
<u>it and the wall closest to the door, was a narrow and tall cupboard.</u>		
5		6
It was locked. The cupboard facing it, that belonged to me, was open and		
	7	8
empty. In it were three shelves and a few hangers. The mattress on my bed		
	9	10
was bare, and sharp straw twigs poked out from it. I turned it over.		
11 ST	CT	12
<u>On top of the bedsprings an old towel was spread out.</u> Apparently		
	13 ST	CT
belonged to the one that slept here before me. <u>Under the bed was a broom.</u>		

Of the 13 sentences in this paragraph, three (4, 11 and 13) are syntactically focused by means of topicalization. In each, an adverbial phrase of place appears at the beginning of the sentence as the fronted topic.

DT

CT

Sentence 4: Next to the bed, > between it and the wall closet to the door, > was a narrow  
and tall cupboard.

Two adverbial phrases have been placed at the beginning of this sentence as the double fronted topic. This double topic comprises two components, each of which can serve as the topic. A pause separates the simple double fronted topic and the comment, marked by the author with a comma. There is also a pause between the two components of the double topic, also marked by a comma.

ST CT

Sentence 11: On top of the bedsprings > was spread out an old towel.

ST CT

Sentence 13: Under the bed > was a broom.

In these two sentences, the adverbial phrases of place at the beginning serve as the simple fronted topics. The simple topic and the comment are separated by a stressed pause, not marked with a comma. The textual function of such focused sentences is to create linear cohesion, as illustrated in the following chart illustrating the linear cohesion of the above paragraph. The focused structures are underlined to indicate their role in producing linear cohesion.

1.	(Schneider's) bed	
2.	the sheets	<i>substitution</i>
3.	one of the sheets	<i>lexical cohesion (hyponym)</i>
4.	<u>the bed</u> ----- <u>cupboard</u>	<i>the bed: substitution</i>
5.	It	<i>reference (personal pronoun)</i>
6.	the cupboard	<i>reference (definite article)</i>
7.	----- In it	<i>reference (objective pronoun)</i>
8.	The mattress	<i>substitution</i>
9.	from it	<i>reference (objective pronoun)</i>
10.	it	<i>reference (objective pronoun)</i>
11.	<u>the bedsprings</u> ----- <u>the towel</u>	<i>the bedsprings: substitution</i>
12.	----- belonged to	<i>belonged to: ellipsis</i>
13.	<u>bed</u> ----- <u>a broom</u>	<i>the bed: substitution</i>

The chart shows the linguistic, grammatical and syntactic cohesive devices used to generate the paragraph's linear cohesive axis. The linguistic and grammatical cohesive devices include reference, lexical cohesion, substitution and ellipsis. The paragraph contains explicit cohesive

devices—reference and lexical cohesion—and implicit cohesive devices—substitution and ellipsis. The syntactically focused sentences (4, 11 and 13) serve as the syntactic cohesive devices that generate secondary cohesive axes by introducing new referents. In Sentence 4 the author introduces a new referent, the cupboard, which produces a secondary cohesive axis. In Sentence 11 he introduces another new referent, the towel, generating another cohesive axis. In Sentence 13 he introduces yet another new referent, the broom. By means of simple topicalization, the author marks additional referents that emerge in the discourse as secondary cohesive axes and that enable the reader to recall the preceding referents on the primary cohesive axis. In this way the author retains the linear cohesive flow of the discourse.

### **The Fortune Teller / David Shahar: 365**

1 ST CT

For two years the fortune teller lived together with his wife in a small room at the

2 DT

corner of the yard, and at the end of the second year, about a week after Kalman

CT

was released from the prison and came to live with us, we woke up one morning

and we discovered that the fortune teller and his wife had disappeared and were

3 ST

gone, simply fled owing us rent for seven months. During the entire time that one

CT

was at our house, there was not even one person in the entire neighborhood that did

4 ST

not come to have his fortune told by him at least two three times. In that the

CT

fortune teller resembled old Doctor Levenstein, who was closely acquainted with

5 ST

the pains and heartaches of every person in the neighborhood, and who like him

CT

6 ST

CT

also had four or five formulas that were valid for everything. And like him also

7

had two three regular clients who needed him every two or three days. One

8

was Rachamim the old stonemason. Rachamim himself did not know how old he

9 ST

CT

was and when asked his age he would answer: "A lot of years, thank God. A

lot more than seventy years", and his tongue would poke out and shake all the time

like some kind of snail peeking out of its shell here and there to see the big

11 ST

CT

world. With the fortune teller and with Dr. Levenstein he would consult regularly

12

about matters of male potency. And the old fat Bucharian woman who could not

get up from a sitting position without help, who would sit at the entrance to her

cellar all day long, muttering lamentations in Bucharian to herself and sucking

the mouthpiece of a hookah made out of tin — even she would come to the

13

fortuneteller from time to time to ask him when the letter would arrive. The secret

14

of the letter was known only to her and to him. And I still recall his wife and her

two brothers who made it big and became taxi drivers on Ben Yehuda Street and

15 ST

they even managed after the State was established to buy their own taxi, but the

CT

fortune teller I never saw again.

The above paragraph is long and cumbersome. It contains 15 sentences, nine of which (60%) are focused sentences. The 3:2 ratio of focused to non-focused sentences in this paragraph is a consequence of its length and the number of referents it contains. The focused sentences are as follows:

ST

CT

Sentence 1: For two years < lived the fortune teller together with his wife in a small

room at the corner of the yard.

ST

Sentence 2: And at the end of the second year, about a week after Kalman was released

CT

from the prison and came to live with us, < we woke up one morning and

we discovered that the fortune teller and his wife had disappeared and were

gone, simply fled owing us rent for seven months.

ST

CT

Sentence 3:During the entire time that one was at our house, > there was not even one

person in the entire neighborhood that did not come to have his fortune told

by him.

ST CT

Sentence 4:In that > the fortuneteller resembled old Doctor Levenstein, who was closely

acquainted with the pains and heartaches of every person in the

neighborhood.

ST CT

Sentence 5:And like him > also had four or five formulas that were valid for everything.

ST CT

Sentence 6:And like him > also had two three regular clients who needed him every two or three days.

ST

CT

Sentence 9:And when asked his age > he would answer: "A lot of years, thank God, a lot

more than seventy years".

ST

CT

Sentence 11:With the fortune teller and with Dr. Levenstein > he would consult regularly about matters of male potency.

FT

>

CT

Sentence 15:But the fortune teller I never saw again.

The above sentences are syntactically focused by means of topicalization. In each sentence special syntactic devices are used to emphasize the focus of information. Seven of the nine sentences are focused using simple topicalization, while one (Sentence 2) uses double topicalization. Sentence 15 is focused by means of focalized topicalization, and its topic is a

focalized topic (FT). The order of the components in these sentences is not the usual order in Hebrew: SVO. In all these sentences, an adverbial phrase is placed at the beginning of the sentence in the topic position. These adverbial phrases are descriptions of time (Sentences 1, 2 and 3), objects (Sentences 4, 11 and 15) and modal descriptions (Sentences 5 and 6). All except Sentence 15 include a pause in intonation between the topic and the comment, not marked by a comma. In all the sentences, the verb precedes its subject when the subject is not a personal pronoun or inflected in the verb.

The textual function of the sentences focused by simple topicalization is to produce linear cohesion, as illustrated in the following chart depicting the paragraph's linear cohesion.

1.	<u>two years-----</u>	<u>fortune teller</u>		
2.	<u>the second-----year</u>	<u>fortune teller</u>	<i>the second year: lexical cohesion (hyponym)</i>	<i>fortune teller: lexical cohesion (reiteration)</i>
3.	<u>time-----</u>	<u>that one</u>	<i>time: lexical cohesion (hyponym)</i>	<i>that one: reference (demonstrative pronoun)</i>
4.		<u>the fortune teller-----</u>	<u>Doctor Levenstein</u>	<i>fortune teller: reference (definite article)</i>
5.		<u>who-----</u>	<u>like him</u>	<i>who: reference (personal pronoun); like him: reference (demonstrative pronoun)</i>
6.		<u>like him-----</u>	<u>clients-----</u>	<i>like him lexical cohesion (reiteration)</i>
7.				<i>Rachamim substitution</i>
8.				<i>Rachamim lexical cohesion (reiteration)</i>
9.				<i>his age reference (possessive pronoun)</i>
10.				<i>his tongue reference (possessive pronoun)</i>
11.		<u>fortune teller-----</u>	<u>Doctor Levenstein---</u>	<i>would consult ellipsis</i>
12.		fortune teller		<i>lexical cohesion (reiteration)</i>
13.		to him		<i>reference (objective pronoun)</i>
14.		his wife		<i>reference (possessive pronoun)</i>
15.		<u>the fortune teller</u>	<u>I</u>	<i>reference (definite article)</i>

According to the chart, the sentences focused by simple topicalization clearly generate secondary cohesive axes by introducing new referents along the linear cohesive axis. The first secondary cohesive axis is temporal: two years-----the second year-----the time. The second

cohesive axis refers to Dr. Levenstein, and the third refers to Rachamim the stonecutter. These secondary cohesive axes are linked to the primary cohesive axis, which refers to the fortuneteller. The considerable use of sentences focused by simple topicalization in this paragraph meets the need to create cohesion in this long and cumbersome paragraph with its numerous referents.

An examination of all the paragraphs in the *Thirty Years, Thirty Stories* anthology reveals that the authors choose among a variety of syntactic cohesive devices depending upon paragraph length and number of referents. When a paragraph is short and does not have many referents, the author tends to use only linguistic and grammatical cohesive devices to produce linear cohesion. When a paragraph is long or contains many referents, the author tends to use simple topicalization and double topicalization structures to produce linear cohesion. The linguistic and grammatical cohesive devices include explicit cohesive devices such as reference and lexical cohesion, as well as implicit cohesive devices such as substitution and ellipsis.

#### **4. Conclusion**

Even though many studies have examined cohesion, very few have put forward models of cohesion characterized by the rhetorical patterns of different languages. This paper has identified a cohesion model in a corpus comprising thirty stories written in Modern Hebrew. This model is characterized not only by linguistic and grammatical linguistic devices, but also by syntactic devices used by the authors to produce a linear discourse pattern with clear connections.

In the examined corpus, the grammatical cohesive devices in Modern Hebrew prose refer to reference, substitution and ellipsis, the linguistic cohesive devices refer to the repetition of identical lexical items, using synonyms, subordinates or hyponyms, and the syntactic devices are sentences focused by means of simple and double topicalization. The authors in this corpus use a simple or double fronted topic at the beginning of the sentence to refer to existing referents in the discourse, thus generating the primary linear cohesive axis. They use the comment to introduce new referents in the discourse, thus generating secondary cohesive axes. The contextual conditions for producing these secondary cohesive axes are paragraph length and complexity. When a paragraph is long or cumbersome, the author tends to use many syntactic cohesive devices, while for short and clear paragraphs, the author makes do with linguistic and grammatical cohesive devices.



## References

- Ben-Horin, G. (1976). Aspects of Syntactic Proposing in Spoken Hebrew. In: P. Cole (Ed.), *Studies in Modern Hebrew Syntax and Semantics* (pp. 193-208). Holland: North Holland Publishing Company.
- Bloor, M. & Bloor, T. (1995). *The Functional Analysis of English: A Hallidayan Approach*. London: Arnold.
- Bublitz, W. (1999). Introduction: Views of coherence. In W. Bublitz, U. Lenk & E. Ventola (Eds.), *Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse*. (pp. 1-5). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Celce - Murcia, M. & Olshtain, E. (2000). *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching: A Guide for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: University press.
- Chafe, W. L. (1987). Cognitive Constraints on Information Flow. In R. S. Tomlin (Ed.), *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse* (pp. 21–51). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Connor, U. M. (1984). A Study of Cohesion and Coherence in English as a Second Language Students' Writing. *International Journal of Human Communication*, 17, 301-316.
- Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive Rhetoric: Cross-Cultural Aspects of Second Language Writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2004). *Making Sense of Grammar*. Harlow: Longman.
- Enkvist, N. E. (1990). Seven Problems in the Study of Coherence and Interpretability. In U. Connor & A. M. Johns (Eds), *Coherence in Writing: Research and Pedagogical Perspectives* (pp.9-28). Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Hadely, I. L. (1987). Understanding Cohesion – Some Practical Teaching Implications. *Literacy*, 21(2), 106-114.
- Halliday, M.A.K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Lambrecht, K. (2000). When Subjects Behave like Objects: An Analysis of the Merging of S and O in Sentence-Focus Constructions Across Languages. *Studies in Language*, 24(3), 611-682.
- Leech, G. et al. (2001). *An A-Z of English Grammar & Usage*. Harlow: Longman.
- Margolin, B. (2000). The Issue of the Punctuation of Focalized Sentences in Hebrew, *Hebrew Linguistics*, 47: 85-92.
- Margolin, B. (2011). Topicalization and its Pragmatic and Textual Functions in Contemporary Hebrew Literature. *Hebrew Studies*, Volume LII, 341-352.

- Margolin, B. (2012). Towards a Description of Coherence Patterns in Contemporary Hebrew Prose and Palestinian-Israeli Arabic Prose. *Intercultural Pragmatics* 3(9), 293-308.
- Martin, J. R. (1992). *English Text: System and Structure*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Olshtain, E. & Haskel-Shaham, I. (2012). A Discourse Approach to Second Language Teaching. In I. Haskel et al. (Eds.), *Mizimrat Halashon – Essays in Language Education* (pp. 366-387). Jerusalem: The Ministry of Education.
- Prince, E. F. (1992). The ZPG Letter: Subjects, Definiteness and Information-Status. In S. Thompson and W. Mann (Eds.), *Discourse Description: Diverse Analyses of Fundraising Text* (pp. 295-325). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Prince, E. F. (1997). On the Functions of Left-Dislocation in English Discourse. In A. Kamio (Ed.), *Directions in Functional Linguistics* (pp. 117–144). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Shen, Y. (2010). Qualitative Characteristics of Coherence, Substitution, and Reference by Non-English Major Chinese Students. *English Language Teaching*, 3(2), 104-114.
- Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Z. Stavi (Ed.). (1993). *Thirty Years, Thirty Stories - An Anthology of Hebrew Stories from the 60s to the 90s*. Tel Aviv: Yedioth Aharonoth Sifrei Hemed.
- Tanskanen, S.K. (2006). *Collaborating towards Coherence*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Thompson, S. E. (1994). Aspects of Cohesion in Monologue. *Applied Linguistics*, 15, 58-75.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and Context: A Socio Cognitive Approach*. Cambridge: University press.
- Van Dijk, T. A. & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.
- Verma, S. K. (1976). Remarks on Thematization. *Archivum Linguisticum*, 7, 142-151.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1992). Comments on: 'Luick, the Theoretician' (by N. Ritt), and 'Cohesion in OE Prose' (by H. P. Platzler). *Views*, 1, 105-110.

#### **The author**

Bruria Margolin received her PhD in Linguistics from Bar-Ilan University in Israel, and is currently a senior lecturer and the head of Hebrew Language Department at Levinsky College of Education in Israel. Her research interests include Discourse Analysis, Syntax and Style in Modern Hebrew and Intercultural Rhetoric.