

AN ESSAY IN THE ANALYSIS
OF WRITTEN ENGLISH DISCOURSE

by 45

ROGER GORDON HILYER

B. A., University of Oxford, 1964

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Speech

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1969

Approved by:


Major Professor

L1
2668
74
1969
H56

CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Review of the literature.....	1
1.2. Statement of the problem and justification of the study.....	8
1.3. Method.....	12
2. Results.....	19
2.1. Clause and sentence sequence.....	19
2.2. Connection between sentences and paragraphs.....	28
3. Conclusion.....	62
3.1. Final statement of tentative discourse rules for written English.....	62
3.2. Final comments on the method.....	64
Appendix.....	65
References.....	71

1. Introduction

1.1. Review of the Literature

Until quite recently linguists have confined their attention in describing the structure of languages to those patterns that can be discerned at and below the sentence level. This has been because the patterns that are observable above the sentence level are obviously less well defined than those within the sentence. Experience has always suggested that if the investigator worked hard and long enough he would be able to produce a grammar that would completely describe available patterns for the sentences of a language. This did not appear to be true for the patterns above the sentence and it probably is not true. On the other hand, in order to describe a unit functioning at any level in a sentence it is necessary ultimately to rise to the sentence level of description to do it. It is never necessary to rise above that level as long as the linguist is content to list the types of elements that can fill the various slots in a sentence without trying to describe how their choice is governed by the position of the sentence in the discourse and the elements appearing in surrounding sentences.

Some linguists in recent years, however, have assumed that the discovery procedures applied to sentences can be applied to discourses and that although the rules produced may not be so absolute they will increase our knowledge of how language is used. The easiest way to show what has been done along these lines is

by a review of the literature in which the work of these linguists is presented.

'(The linguist) should have control of the discourse structure, being able to understand both conversation and text material, identifying who did what to whom, following the train of thought, and keeping track of all scenes and directions of locomotion.' (Loriot, 1962). Similarly Pike (1963) says 'In following a story one needs to be able to know what has happened to a particular person in the plot from one sentence to the next.'

The point is that experience has shown that different languages do organize discourse in different ways. Deviation from the structure appropriate to a given language will make discourse in that language less easy for native speakers to understand. This section gives a brief review of attempts that have been made to describe discourse structure. Much of the material has not been published yet. Only a little of the unpublished material was available to me so only that part is considered here. To have restricted the survey to published works would have been to give an erroneous picture of the present state of the art.

An early worker in the field was Zellig Harris whose research began in the early fifties. His work is easily available in Harris (1963), a reprint of articles written in 1957. Harris aims at establishing a pattern for a single discourse by establishing recurrent constituents on a distribution basis.

Meaning is rejected as a tool although the pattern of recurrent segments will reflect an overall semantic interpretation for the text. He begins with often repeated words and notes what other words frequently collocate with each. By freely transforming the sentences and applying a number of rules of equivalence he devises a transformed discourse which consists, as nearly as possible, of grammatical periods in which the recurrent segments are in parallel position. He thus establishes the relationships between statements in a discourse and determines how it can be divided into lexical sub-discourses but he explicitly destroys the signals whereby such relationships are marked in the actual text.

Hill (1955), though often cited as an example of discourse analysis, is really an example of the application of linguistics to the resolution of ambiguities at the sentence level; little is done above that level. Dorfman (1956), despite its title, is linguistic only in that it uses the emic principle. The author establishes recurrent patterns in French and Spanish epics in terms of obligatory elements in the plot, 'narremes', the minimal functional units of narrative incident. Propp (1958) is a more influential work of the same type which establishes recurrent character types and narrative incidents in the terms of which categories Russian folk tales can be tightly described. Dundes (1963) applied Propp's approach to American Indian stories, arguing that the lack of a morphology for them had led to a belief that they were formless. The author modifies Propp

slightly, principally by using the ideas of motifeme, motifemic slot, and allototif presented in Pike (1954 to 1960).

Riffaterre (1959, 1960) argues that style cannot be described in terms of deviation from the general norm of the speech community but only in terms of deviation from a norm set up in the text itself. Therefore the reactions of an average reader to a particular text are noted and the investigator studies the text at each point where the reader reacted to see if any patterns of deviation from the text's norm can be identified.

Loriot (1962) suggests a procedure for identifying morphemic signals pertinent to discourse structure, a format for setting up a text so that gross discourse structure is apparent, and checklists for discourse-interpreting and discourse-producing grammars. The work is valuable for its suggestions as to the types of structure that might be expected to have a part in signalling discourse pattern.

Pike (1963) provides a procedure for applying tagmemic analysis to discourse to discover the rules for a particular language which govern the sequence of sentence types in a story and which determine the relationship between the situational roles of the *dramatis personae* and the grammatical constructions in which they appear. The variety of lexical items that can realise a particular situational role, the migration of roles across grammatical levels, and such things as observer emphasis and narrator focus in some languages all complicate the matrices needed.

Examples of discourse analysis of particular languages on a tagmemic model are Loos (1963), Abbott and Longacre (1968), and Barnard and Longacre (1968).

Nida (1964) suggests five parameters relevant to discourse structure. They are: (1) Sequence of sentence and clause types, (2) markers of sequence such as therefore, (3) and (4) temporal and spatial features of sentence and clause sequence, and (5) formal and semantic carry-overs from one sentence or clause to the next.

Cowan (1965) attempts to devise a procedure for a statement of lexical distribution by noting frequent lexical items and charting collocations of other items with them. The debt to Harris is obvious. Cowan uses a vertical frame and substitution technique to establish various types of lexical classes, some collocation sets, some equivalence classes, and some closed classes. A horizontal, syntagmatic approach gives contrastive lexical structures. He establishes a lexical hierarchy for his text and points out the difference between lexical and grammatical patterns. This last point comes out in Barnard and Longacre (1968).

Two language descriptions which include discourse structure have been produced on the stratificational model (Gleason 1964, Lamb 1966). They are Austin (1966) and Taber (1966).

Labov and Waletzky (1967), arguing that the attempt to analyse highly formalised narratives on the Propp model should follow analysis of untutored narratives on the grounds that

the fundamental patterns will be clearer there and more explicable, take as their corpus narratives of personal experience. The analytic procedure involves moving clauses about in the narrative to establish the maximum degree to which each can be moved without altering the meaning of the narrative. The degree of possible movement of each clause is its displacement set. A clause whose displacement set includes no two temporally ordered clauses is itself temporally ordered and a narrative clause. Free, restricted, and narrative clauses are used as the variables in an analysis which produces some very interesting results relating to the patterns of narratives in English.

Grimes (1968) outlines a grammar which takes discourse as its unit and not the sentence. The grammar, called 'predicate grammar', is not fully described but enough is said to make the aim of the method clear. The grammar makes a statement of the probability with which any optional transformation will be chosen. Since this will vary from one type of discourse to another it is of obvious significance to discourse analysis. Plot, on the Propp model, is seen as a template against which what is to be said is matched; there are other templates for other types of discourse naturally. Discourse analysis also requires information on the speaker's point of view, referential field, and so on, in as far as these are signalled by the language. All these things would be in the base of the grammar, which would present a string of arguments and predicates. Transformations would bring this to the surface, with high level

transformations dictating the position in the discourse of the elements discovered by Labov and Waletzky and realized in free and restricted clauses. This, of course, only outlines a procedure of layout and does not say anything about discovery procedures. It has this feature in common with the transformational approach of describing discourse as one long sentence with a string of coordinate clauses separated by and, transformations deleting that word where appropriate (Katz and Fodor 1963).

A work closer than any of these to the study described in this thesis is Morgan (1967). On the basis of analysis of a number of English corpuses the author argues that attention should be given to lexical hierarchy, particularly the relationship of lexical reference to a recurrent referent to the grammatical roles it fills. He argues that there are lexical and grammatical patterns above the sentence and that a definition of sentence more valuable for discourse analysis is needed than one that equates the sentence with a main clause plus its subordinate clauses. As a procedural point he suggests that many clauses strictly describable as main clause plus subordinate noun clause might be better regarded for discourse purposes as simple main clauses derived from the noun clauses. In other words, items like It seems that can perhaps be ignored in a study of clause type sequence.

Longacre (1967) provides perhaps the definition of sentence Morgan asks for. He suggests four sentence types for English: Juxtaposition, Concatenation, Implication, and Quotation. Each has its sub-types. Under this scheme sentences having subordinate

clauses filling adverbial, adjectival, and nominal slots are classified as if they did not have clauses in those slots. The old categories of complex, compound, and compound-complex are regarded as having no significance.

1.2. Statement of the problem and justification of the study

'Practically, we have found that the production of separate, well-formed, correct sentences in sequence by no means guarantees either intelligibility of a discourse or correctness of its structure'. (Pike, 1963)

It is considerations of this type that provided the first spur to discourse analysis. The type of analysis described above as being carried out by Harris has no such aim but a purely scholastic interest. Much of the work that has been done since, however, has been done with the specific aim of translating the scriptures. For this reason, a great deal of the emphasis has been on the narrative patterns of the languages investigated. Even work such as that of Propp and of Labov and Weletzky, although it was not undertaken with the specific aim of facilitating more efficient translation of the scriptures and other narrative material, can undoubtedly be applied to that end.

The descriptions of specific foreign languages referred to in the review of the literature all attempt to set up emic discourse types in terms of the paragraphs of which a discourse is formed and emic paragraph types in terms of the sentence types

of which the paragraphs are formed. Linking devices are identified and described in emic terms. No doubt something of the sort could be done for English and Labov and Weletzky have started towards that goal. That is not the aim of this paper, however.

What is attempted here is a study in depth of one English written discourse with the aim of formulating tentative rules about the way English maintains or changes reference from one sentence to the next and from one paragraph to the next. This will involve a study of the way in which clause types and sentence types sequence in paragraphs.

The hypothesis, quite simply, is that there must be some formal linguistic way in which the language signals what is being talked about. There must be rules which govern the lexical form of a reference to any particular referent. Since these rules can be expected to cover questions of the grammatical role of each reference they will very probably involve rules about the ordering of syntactic types.

A study of this sort can not be justified very strongly from the translation viewpoint since efficient translation is best done by a native speaker of the target language, who will be in full command of the discourse patterns of his language. Perhaps some argument could be put forward suggesting the value of a discourse analysis of English for a non-native speaker translating English into another language but all the evidence suggests that the discourse structures of the target language are of much greater importance.

The principal justification for the study, apart from its intrinsic interest, is pedagogical. Teachers of English as a second language who are faced with the problem of teaching their advanced students to write natural sounding English prose could be helped by a knowledge of the rules that make prose sound natural in the language. There will be, of course, rules for spoken discourse which will also have to be discovered, presumably they will demand greater redundancy, but few non-native speakers of a language are ever expected to produce more than a few sentences at a time. Secondly, such an analysis as the present one could be of assistance to teachers of English to native speakers. A teacher can tell a student that his themes are unclear, that the paragraphs do not hang together, and so on, but improvement of the student's performance will be only a chancy thing until the teacher is enabled to put his finger on the signals that have been wrongly used to produce the effect of unclarity. Labov and Waletzky have demonstrated that even the effect a narrative gives of having no point to it is very often the result of the omission of an obligatory linguistic element in the discourse. Thirdly, analyses of this type will no doubt in due course provide contributions to the theory of language acquisition, although this will be a matter of spoken discourse. We have all met children, for instance, who use too many pronouns, rendering it difficult for the listener to tell who is being spoken of. This is the opposite of the non-native's practice of using too full a lexical reference to the people he is

speaking about. Explanation of these things, and of the failure of the adult native speaker whose failure to command the discourse structures of his own language make his words difficult to follow, will all follow complete analysis of English discourse. It may even be that dialect differences are in part matters of discourse patterns.

This study can not itself claim to achieve even a few of these aims, of course. Before that can be done many discourses must be examined to establish emic discourse and paragraph types, if such exist. Also the rules will have to be separated into those that are obligatory in certain circumstances and those that are statable only in probability terms. For instance, it is possible that there is an average number of times that a pronoun can be used for a given referent before the recurrence of a fuller lexical reference. Deviation above this average will increase the difficulty of the discourse to the point where it becomes impossible to follow. Deviation below the limit will increase redundancy to the point where the listener will be convinced that two lexical references refer to different referents and communication will break down there. On the other hand, there may be an absolute rule which specifies which of a number of references, all of the same number and gender, in a sentence can be picked up by a pronoun in the next sentence.

This study can, at best, suggest the sort of signals that the language uses and try out a procedure for discovering them.

1.3. Method

The first question was a choice of corpus. What was required was a discourse that was short enough to be dealt with in great detail in a work of this scope but was nonetheless a complete discourse and not, for instance, a chapter in a larger work. This was because there would be lexical and, perhaps, grammatical connection between chapters in a larger work. An example of a possible grammatical connection between chapters, or chapter sections for that matter, would be parallelism of structure or the use of overt connectors such as therefore. Lexical connection, of course, would be, for instance, incomplete reference in one chapter or section to a topic of a preceding one. Moreover, it was thought that a self contained discourse would contain introductory and conclusive elements quite different from those found in a part of a longer work.

One type of discourse that fits the description above is to be found in journalistic writing. A piece from a serious weekly was chosen on the grounds that the writer and editor who produced it in its final form would be likely to attempt to give the reader a coherent article to read, an attempt that must ensure the observance of discourse rules. Although the piece is largely narrative, which places it in the same field as much of the material in various languages that has been subjected to discourse analysis before this, it also contains some discussion of the facts narrated. It is possible that in English,

as in some other languages, there are emic discourse types which would distinguish between narrative writing and polemic writing. If this is so then the piece discussed here must represent a combination of two sets of rules. This is no objection to the corpus, however, for two reasons. In the first place the main emphasis is on sentence, clause, and paragraph connection, no attempt being made to distinguish between types at the paragraph or discourse level. Secondly, until it is known what the emic discourse types of English are the problem is not relevant. Only by applying the rules discovered in such studies as this one to a large number of discourses can those discourse types be discovered. It is suggested, without strong evidence of any sort, that the obligatory rules referred to earlier will, in any case, apply to all types of discourse.

Grimes (1968) makes the point that a discourse is governed in part by the speaker's or writer's knowledge of what background information and attitudes he can assume on the part of his audience. This material he would include in his predicate grammar. The discourse on which this thesis is based (Appendix) was published in Time, November 15, 1968. The writer would be able to assume whatever, in his opinion, the readers of that magazine could be expected to know about the American Presidential elections. This type of information is largely incommensurable and certainly its measurement is outside the scope of this work. Grimes suggests that it may be that a description of such background information would be the same thing as an ethnography of the

community in which the speaker/writer and his audience live.

Although the two aspects of the study, the tracing of lexical and grammatical connections between syntactic units and the study of the sequence rules for clauses and sentences, are considered to be related, they are at first treated separately in the study.

The corpus was first taken and a tagmemic statement of its construction in terms of the sentences that realized the paragraphs and the clauses that realized the sentences was made. It was decided that this format was not the most useful, for two reasons. In the first place the layout made the sequence of clauses more difficult to observe since the statement described consisted of a listing of the sentences of each paragraph with an indication of the embedded sentences and clauses realizing each sentence. Longacre sentences were used as the basis for this. This layout obscured clause sequence since it made it less easy to see at a glance what collocation of clause types there was. In the second place an analysis of this type might have prevented some important decisions on the clause types from being made. In the discussion of Morgan (1967) above it was pointed out that some clause elements that are nuclear in terms of sentence structure may be marginal in terms of discourse structure as far as clause sequence is concerned. It is possible, for instance, that the quoter in a quotation sentence may be irrelevant to the discourse structure. This type of case, and others, are discussed in this thesis by use of the concept of

topic, the thing talked about. In places it is useful to consider a sentence from the angle of topic and comment, the thing talked about and what it is that is said about it. Analysis into sentence types before full investigation of the clause types has been completed is obviously inappropriate.

For these reasons the corpus was first analysed in terms of its clause types. This analysis is presented with full discussion of the type of problem indicated above. Discussion of sentence types continues along with this analysis to see whether the sentence types are relevant.

The lexical part of the study was carried out in the following way. Each referent was identified as it appeared and given a code number. Each paragraph was considered separately but the same code number was used for each referent throughout the discourse. For each paragraph each referent was identified at its first appearance and then each reference to that referent was located and listed according to the lexical form it took and the grammatical function of the forms which realized it. This layout is not included in the thesis because it was found to be more illuminating to discuss the rules as they emerged from the data. Such discussion was found to be easier if the patterns were described rather than being presented in tabular form. Furthermore, it was found to be useful to consider alternative forms that might have occurred but did not, which would have also been difficult with a tabular layout, and in any case many reference sequences were interesting only for the light they

shed on thematic connections and not for any rules of reference that they embody.

In the thesis each paragraph is taken as a unit but each is discussed in the following way. Lexical connections of the paragraph to what precedes it and lexical connection of the sentences within the paragraph are discussed, each referent being taken separately as far as possible. Grammatical connections between sentences and paragraphs are then discussed. As the study proceeds any general principles and tentative rules of structuring that can be observed are discussed as they begin to appear so that they can be considered in the light of later evidence. Tentative suggestions as to the relevance of the establishment of such rules to the discussion of style are also made with reference to the style of this particular discourse. Information from the preceding section is brought in as it becomes appropriate and any necessary modifications in the theory of that earlier section are made.

In all discussions the punctuation and paragraph division of the writer of the discourse, who is referred to throughout by the term writer while the author of this thesis is referred to by the term author, are retained to facilitate reference and to enable judgements on the appropriateness of the punctuation to be made. Reference to paragraphs, sentences, and clauses is by numbers. The paragraphs as numbered are those of the author regardless of any suggestions that may have been made about the inappropriateness of the paragraph organization. The same is

true for sentence numbering. A sentence as numbered is bounded by a capital letter and a full stop and may or may not be a sentence in Longacre's terms. Clauses are numbered within each numbered sentence as sentences are numbered within each numbered paragraph. A clause is a construction having a finite verb as its nucleus regardless of any suggestions that may be made as to the desirability of broadening the definition of clause for the purpose of establishing clause sequence.

The clause types used are those of Engler and Hannah (1965). This thesis is principally concerned with the broad classification although some of the types have subtypes. The types are listed below with an example for each type or subtype. Type I, linking, is exemplified by: The man is a professor. He gets angry. He becomes tall. He looks happy. Sugar tastes sweet. He weighs 200 pounds. Type II, intransitive, is exemplified by: He works well. Type III, transitive, is exemplified by: I see him. I enjoy reading. He gave his wife a present. They elected him president. He had them cleaned. Type IV, concatenated, is exemplified by I saw him getting angry. He wants me to go. The final type, V, passive, is exemplified by: The window was broken by him with a stone.

The sentence types proposed by Longacre do not claim to be an exhaustive list. The article in which they are presented (Longacre 1967) is a pilot study. This explains the uncertainty with which some constructions are assigned to sentence types in this thesis. The types proposed are juxtaposition, concatenation,

implication, and quotation. Juxtaposition covers the simple sentence, having the framework of one clause, as well as recapitulation, paraphrase, sequence, and echo question. The last of these is what is normally called the tag question. Concatenation covers coordinate, constructions linked by and, antithetical, constructions linked by but and the like, and alternative, constructions linked by or. These subtypes of concatenation are established on formal grounds in the article. Implication covers general and contrary to fact implications, what are usually called neutral and unreal conditional sentences. It also includes correlative implication; as...so, just as...so, and so on. Quotation, of course, includes direct and indirect,

2. Results

2.1. Clause and sentence sequence

A previous study had suggested that, while there are not necessarily rigid rules for sequences of clause types in English, there is a tendency in the language for sequences of clauses of the same type to be found in discourse. The demonstration of this, however, required some normalization of the data. The deletions referred to in the discussions of Morgan (1967) were made and in addition alternative analyses of certain clauses were offered.

The last point needs amplification. It is possible that, for instance, a clause that is type III in terms of surface grammar may be regarded as a I or a II for the purposes of discourse analysis. For example, the sentence The newspaper took on a more respectable character. would have an alternative analysis as I because of its close relationship to The newspaper became more respectable. A second type of re-analysis is, in fact, included in the clause analysis of Engler and Hannah (1965). Under this a number of constructions like be about to, be able to, and seem to are classified as semi-auxiliaries, covered in the part of the system that deals with verb expansions, so that the clause type is decided by the following base form verb and what follows that. This principle could, perhaps, be extended to cover a case like started to walk as it now covers started walking. A third type of re-analysis covers situations in

which a clause might appear to be a type II because of the ellipsis of a contextually clear direct object. An example would be He settled out of court, in the context of the affair.

The early study referred to produced two types of pattern when alternative analyses were offered in this way. In the first place, some clauses were transformed to make their surface structure the same as that of other clauses in their environment. On the other hand, clauses that apparently broke such a sequence were frequently found to maintain it if the alternative clause type was selected. In this second type it was usually the case that the surface grammar of the clause defied a quite obvious, and different, analysis at a deeper lexical level.

It was because of this previous experience that an effort was made to discover patterns in the discourse used as the corpus for this study. Obviously, the type of re-analysis described above is lacking in rigour. Only if a pattern can be discerned by the use of such procedures are they justified. Moreover, an attempt must be made to apply re-analysis wherever possible so that the whole analysis is consistent and the investigator can not be accused of rigging the evidence.

The following is offered in the light of these considerations. Alternative analyses are separated by / , the first in each case being the analysis reflecting the surface structure. Subordinate clauses are in parentheses. Quotation introducers are not omitted but are marked by q, while clauses in quotations are in quotation

marks. Suggested clauses realised on the surface by structures that do not include finite verbs are within square brackets. The order of clauses is that of the finite verbs or other nuclear predicate structures.

P1

(adjectival:that II), IIIq: "I." I III [adjectival:to II]/II. And II. (When III). II/III. II. "I," IIIq. Yet I. [IIIing] II (adjectival:who III/I adjectival:III adjectival:that II).

P2

II. III/I. II. "I," IIIq "(sufficiently that III)." But II [to II and III] (noun:that III).

P3

(as IIIq), I "(adjectival:III)." III (noun:III/II/I). (adjectival; that III) I. II [with IIIing, IIIing, I. I]. I, and II.

P4

(As if I), III (adjectival:that III [adjectival:to III]). I, [adjectival:IIIing] (adjectival:who III [and II/III]). IIIq: "I (adjectival:that V)." I.

P5.

I, (adjectival:after III). II [to III adjectival:IIIing q] (noun:that if I, III [adjectival:of IIIing]). III (when III). I.

P6

II. (When IIIq noun that II), II and III. III. III/I. III. II [to II] (adjectival:which III).

P7

III/II. III and III. II.

P8

(adjectival:that III) I. "I," IIIq. Yet II (as II). I (noun:why I). III, (adjectival: V, adverbial:I).

Notes

P1 The alternative offered in S2 is offered on the grounds that in lexical terms the second clause could be regarded as he could only go up. It is to be noted that the second clause is not marked as subordinate even though in surface structure it is. Clearly in lexical terms the second clause is the main one. The whole sentence could be replaced by He could only go up. The next alternative offered is based on the fact that race against could be regarded as a transitive construction. The possibility of Richard Nixon was being raced against, and Who did Humphrey race against supports this analysis. The last alternative is offered because entertain hope is, in lexical terms, parallel to the simpler construction remain hopeful.

P2 The alternative is offered in the light of the possibility of was no longer cocky.

P3 Although the final clause in S2 is, on the surface, a III, it is clearly in lexical terms a I, similar to become. The clause nobody would have believed is not marked as a quotation introducer but it could be so regarded and this possibility is taken into account in discussion below. In S4 the final two

adjectives, disaffected and lost, are listed, with their nouns, as forming clause type I's. This is because the verb be is omitted here just as in the first two non-finite verb clauses listed in the same sentence, which are based on progressive forms. This suggestion receives support from one made later in the discussion.

P4. The case of S2 is the same as that of S4 in P1. run away from can be regarded as a lexical unit although the argument is weaker here in that the passive he was run away from might be rejected as impossible by some speakers of English.

P6. S4 is a complex alternative to The party at last began to become united, and so could be regarded as a lexical I.

P7. In S1 the surface III he drove eleven miles, (consider eleven miles were driven by him) is clearly a lexical II, which it would have been had the surface eleven miles been omitted.

The argument that there is a tendency towards the sequencing of clauses received less support from this investigation than could have been wished but enough pattern is discernible to justify a thorough discussion of it in the hope that such a discussion may advance our knowledge of this area a little.

Since quotation introducing items are bound to be III we can ignore them in considering clause sequence. This will raise the quotation itself to a higher rank which is reasonable since the quotation is usually the main item in such a construction, from a lexical point of view. It could, perhaps, be argued that direct quotations must be irrelevant to a discussion of clause sequence but this is not necessarily true. The writer has a choice

of whether to use direct or indirect quotations, has control over when to quote, and has control over the form of the surrounding clauses. We are, after all, discussing a rule which, if it exists, is applied unconsciously by the writer as he tries to make his language neater, easier to understand, and so on.

In P1 S2 begins with a I that links the sentence to S1, in which the main clause, after the normal procedure of ignoring the quotation introducer and elevating the quotation in rank, is also a I. In S2 there follows a construction superficially a III that is lexically a II as argued. S2, S3, and S4 then all have II's in their main clauses, one of them being lexically a III cast in a II surface. The two I's that follow, ignoring the IIIq, are too few to base an argument on, but the final adjectival of S8 is interesting in that a lexical I is recast as a surface III, providing a parallelism of structure with the clause that constitutes the other half of the same adjectival construction.

P2 contains no support for the thesis. In P3 the noun clause in S2 can be regarded as the main lexical item, perhaps. The alternatives offered in the noun clause give little significant information but the non-finite predicate constructions in S4 are obviously ordered according to our tentative rule.

In P4, following the usual adjustment relating to quotations, all main clauses after the first are I's. This is particularly significant in that the construction in S2 has been altered, the important information being relegated to the subordinate

clause, to fit the pattern. In the adjective clause in S2 we have a case similar to the one in P1. The two non-finite constructions are on the surface III and II but the second one is clearly a lexical III and it could be regarded, indeed, as a grammatical III. It might, perhaps, be stretching the argument a little far to say that the quotation in S3 is used because, like S2, its main clause, a I, introduces a subordinate III that carries the main information.

P5 gives little support except that, counting all subordinate clauses and non-finite verb forms suggested as clauses, there is an impressive sequence of III's. This is particularly apparent if we consider the principal lexical verb in S2 to be to deliver. This last is not really acceptable, however. To be consistent we would have to regard everything before that as a quotation introducer. This adjustment would also increase the predominance of III's in the paragraph.

In P6 there is a clearer sequence of III's with a very clear example in S4 of a lexical I that has been cast as a surface III, maintaining the pattern. Since we can disregard showed as a quotation introducer, S1 and the first clause of S2 present a sequence of II's with the interesting device of the use of the coordinate sentence to effect the transition from II to III.

P7 presents a sequence of III's in S1, of which the first is a lexical II, but since the surface form is a common way of expressing the idea little can be argued on the basis of it at this point.

P8 gives us little support. There are a large number of I's but certainly not enough to base an argument on. It may be that in topic terms the main clause of S4 is the clause that is now the subordinate, but in this case that does not affect the argument as both clauses are I's.

There is an argument that at points considerably strengthens our conclusions. It was felt that the thesis should first be argued on the basis of the raw data, as above, as there may be those who will not accept this further refinement. Both clause type I and clause type II represent topic-comment utterances made up of two elements; the subject and complement in I and the subject and verb in II. On the other hand III and V (IV did not appear in the corpus and so can be ignored for the moment) both have three or more elements, although the agent in V can be omitted. If, therefore, we regard I and II as being the same for the purposes of discourse analysis we may find that the patterns become clearer. This, in fact, turns out to be the case.

In P1 the argument offered earlier is strengthened by the fact that all the main clauses, after quotation adjustment, can now be regarded as two element clauses with all three element ones consigned to subordinate role. The two I's that had to be regarded as too few for significance earlier now, of course, take on much greater significance.

P2 now also offers a similar pattern, the only main clause III being easily regarded as a lexical I. P3 is left with no

three element clauses in main position if we regard believed as a quotation introducer. Similarly the pattern in P8 is made much clearer, with only one III left in main position.

This establishes P1, P2, P3, P4, and P8 as paragraphs heavily dominated by two element clauses with P6 and P7 dominated by three element clauses. The only paragraph that does not allow itself to be typed in this way is P5.

A final point on this aspect of the analytic procedure will help to justify the distinction between two and three element clauses. That is, that at no point when re-analysis is appropriate is there a primary choice between a I and a II. The choice is always between a three element and a two element clause. This supports both the argument that the re-analyses reflect some psychological reality for the writer and the argument that the primary significant distinction is between two and three element clauses. In the light of this the re-analysis offered for the first clause of P7, rejected in the first discussion as not being capable of significance, takes on added importance and enables us to provide greater evidence for the thesis.

We are, then, probably justified in arguing that there is a tendency towards sequencing of clauses of the same type, and that such sequencing is an element in paragraph structure. Before positive statements can be made, however, more work must be done. More texts must be analysed, the criteria for re-analysis of clauses must be refined, and statistical method must be applied to discover what degree of patterning could be expected by chance.

The text was also processed to see if there was any pattern to the sequence of sentences according to Longacre's classification. There was none. Longacre's sentences will be considered further in the discussion on the connection between sentences and paragraphs as will any pattern of order in the verb expansions and tenses. It can be said at this point, however, that the classification of certain structures into quotation sentences is not useful as far as analysis of clause sequence is concerned. As has been shown, quotation introducers are not relevant to such an analysis. Their inclusion as main clauses and the exclusion of the quotations themselves as main clauses destroys patterns that are otherwise quite clear. Moreover, several types of verb like believe and show have been demonstrated to be quotation introducers in that they share the effect just described and they do, of course, in lexical terms introduce constructions that can be regarded as quotations. Whether Longacre would regard such verbs as quotation introducers or not is not known as the article from which the analysis is taken is not sufficiently detailed.

2.2. Connection between sentences and paragraphs

In this section, as explained above, lexical and grammatical connections between sentences and paragraphs are explored. Since the investigation is intended to discover the rules for maintenance and change of reference each referent is considered separately as far as possible. Since paragraph structure is of

interest, each paragraph is taken separately and fully discussed before the next is approached.

In discussion of reference it is important to know whether the occurrence of a particular form is optional or obligatory. In particular, as will be seen, there is a choice for each reference to a particular referent between pronominal and lexical reference. In some circumstances the choice is governed by obligatory rules, in others it is optional. In order to establish the pattern of this aspect of the language alternative forms of reference were frequently tested to discover whether the choice at a particular point is available to the user of the language or not. Any judgements of this type included in this thesis are the result of such tests and of observation of the corpus as a whole. For these tests the intuition of the author, a native speaker of English, was consulted.

Where the choice is optional there is a more difficult problem. As was suggested earlier, there are likely to be probability rules governing the number of times a pronominal reference can be used before a lexical reference re-appears, even in circumstances where a lexical reference never becomes strictly obligatory. Obviously, so short a corpus as was used for this study will give no grounds for stating such a probability rule in any but the vaguest terms. A second question is that of cases in which a pronominal reference would be normal but is not obligatory and in which a lexical reference is found.

Explanations for these cases are offered in the thesis but, since they are often based on stylistic considerations, such explanations can not be advanced with the same confidence as arguments on the primary question of reference. Thirdly, where lexical reference is chosen for any reason, the question of how full that reference is to be arises. It would be expected that the first lexical reference would be fuller than later ones and that the main body of the text would employ a fixed lexical reference for each referent, to be used whenever lexical reference was necessary. This aspect of the matter will also be discussed but it, too, is not so measurable as the simple binary opposition between pronominal and lexical. Deviation from an established lexical reference might be prompted by the mere desire for variety or it might be the result of the writer's intention to bring some particular aspect of the referent to the front of the reader's mind. An example would be, in the case of the referent Hubert Humphrey, reference to him by the Vice President or by the Democratic candidate. The reader is asked to approach the following analysis in the light of these comments, bearing in mind that not all arguments are offered with the same confidence.

The principal referent in the article is Hubert Humphrey, Vice-President from 1965 to 1968 and unsuccessful Democratic Party candidate for the Presidency in 1968. The readers of the paper would know perfectly well who he was, (Grimes 1968), and could anticipate the topic of an article entitled 'THE LOSER: A Near Run Thing' published in that paper on November 15, 1968, the week after the Presidential elections.

The first reference to Humphrey is Hubert Horatio Humphrey, the subject of the main clause of S1. This is a fairly full reference which would not be strictly necessary in terms of identifying the topic of the article as argued above. It would not be unreasonable to assume that the first reference is likely to be fairly full. The next reference is 'I', subject of the quotation. A similar argument applies to quotations in this section as applied to them in the section on clause sequence. Although the form of reference in a direct quotation is obviously outside the control of the writer, he does have control over whether to quote or not, whether to use indirect or direct quotation, and what form of reference to the referent in question to use in surrounding clauses, quotation introducers and so on. An additional device open to the writer is that of changing a quotation to change pronominal reference to lexical, or the reverse, and indicating the change by the use of the conventional parentheses. For all these reasons form of reference in quotations is of interest to us.

The two clauses in S2, the one in S3, and the first clause in S4 all have he as subject but the main clause of S4 has the Vice President as subject. No ambiguity would have arisen from a repetition of he so presumably the fuller lexical form is used to break a sequence of pronouns. The form the Vice President, rather than Humphrey, can be explained only on the basis of the writer's wish to include all relevant information early in the article. As will be seen, Humphrey is soon established as the

base form of lexical reference for the whole text. It seems that the first time the sequence of pronouns could have been broken is for the subject of C1, S4. In this case the next reference, what is now the Vice President, would almost certainly have been he.

It appears that pronominal reference runs through the subjects of successive clauses. There is at this point no real evidence for this statement as there is nothing to contrast the pattern with but it receives further support, with certain modifications, as the study progresses. A second point is that where pronominal reference is permitted the use of lexical reference leads to ambiguity, and that the earlier in a string of pronominal references a lexical reference is inserted the greater the ambiguity is.

The definition of ambiguity used here requires discussion. Obviously in the case in point no ambiguity is possible since only one referent has appeared so far. Nor would there be any ambiguity leading to failure to understand what was meant since the informed reader of the article can work out who is being referred to at any point on the basis of his previous knowledge. The point is that the language tries to achieve reference that is unambiguous regardless of the reader's comprehension of what he is reading. Lexical reference where the discourse rules of the language dictate pronominal reference produces an immediate impression in the reader that another referent is being introduced, a surface ambiguity resulting that may or may not be resolvable from the reader's prior knowledge.

If we consider S4 in further detail this point becomes clearer. The first example is seen here of a rule that receives further support throughout the thesis. This is a rule stating that if two clauses in a sentence, one of them being subordinate, both have the same subject referent only one of them will ordinarily take lexical reference in its subject. This is not to say that there could not be a sentence like S4 with, for instance, Humphrey as subject of C1 and the Vice President as subject of C2, but that such a sentence would communicate in defiance of the above rule and would demand quite a degree of knowledge on the part of the reader. Under no circumstances could Humphrey be the subject of both clauses in S4. The same arguments apply, of course, to the subject references in S2 and S3.

S6 has Humphrey as its subject. This may be because of the existence of S5 with a different subject referent and may be because the last male human mentioned was Richard Nixon. As will be seen, the first of these is a stronger influence, Richard Nixon not being the subject of its clause in S4. The grin in S7 is obviously Humphrey's, established only by context. As will also be seen as the text is further studied His grin would have been entirely unambiguous. Humphrey's grin would have been possible in this case. It will become apparent that within the same sentence a lexical reference of this latter type would not be possible. his in S8 is rendered unambiguous by the lack of a previous alternative reference and the occurrence of Humphrey as subject of the main clause in that sentence. Once

again a lexical reference is used where an intervening sentence has had a different subject referent even though he would have been unambiguous. Had S7 been omitted the subject of S8 would have had to be he.

In the case of people, referents are easy to identify. A reference to Hubert Humphrey either is or is not being made and where Hubert Humphrey is included in a larger reference, the three candidates for example, this can also be established. Other referents are not necessarily so easily identifiable. In P1, for instance, the lexical analysis was based on nine identified referents which were, in the order in which they appear, and under the first reference to each, campaign, disarray, Hubert Horatio Humphrey, confessed, close aides, Democratic, Leamington Hotel in Minneapolis, Richard Nixon, and characteristic ebullience.

The difficulty is apparent. Some of these referents are easily established but the criteria for separating, for instance, the referent disarray (disaster, down, deficit, chaos, failed) from confessed (grim, endless thanks, heroic) are quite subjective and therefore of little practical use. Where a particular referent is clearly established, references to it forming the subjects of successive clauses as the ideal case, it can be established as having specific grammatical functions, a chain of pronominalization and generalization can be identified, and so on. This type of situation holds for the referents relevant to P1 only sporadically and so it was decided to work

through the paragraph discussing every feature of sequence and pattern as it appeared, including the grammatical signals.

Investigation of sequence of verb expansions in the article as a whole revealed nothing except at specific points which will be discussed as they are reached. Of more significance was the question of whether the verbs manifesting the nuclei of clauses and clause like structures were state or process verbs. We here come into another area of less than rigorous analysis since the primary appeal is to the author's intuition as a native speaker of English, although appeal can be made to the possibility of insertion of specific time adverbials. The distinction between state and process appears to be important, however, and so it is used despite the lack of a well defined set of criteria.

The distinction is between verbs that refer to a steady state regarded as existing over a period of time and those that refer to an event regarded as complete. The question is not, of course, one of whether a verb refers to an event that is, in fact, virtually instantaneous or not but whether the signal system of the language expresses the notion of state or not. From this point of view progressives will be state verbs (Palmer, 1965) while non-progressives may be state and may be event.

The sequence signals in P1 begin with the opening adverbial which establishes the starting point of the period covered by the article. It also establishes the co-topic, with Humphrey, of the article. Practically every sentence in the article can be regarded as relating to the referent the campaign and references

to disarray and disaster also occur quite frequently. Such occurrences are important for thematic continuity and will be mentioned in that context but references to referents of this sort will be discussed in detail only where questions of pronominalization and stages of generalization arise.

The adjective clause in S1 is an event clause, as is C2, but C3 is a state clause. This provides a connection to the two state clauses in S2 but note that C2, S2 includes an adjectival to go which is an event verb and forms a direct link to the event verb in S3, the same verb in fact. Lexical connection is through dead and down, up and up. An interesting point is that the sequence of events referred to in C1, S1 is not the sequence reported in S2 and S3. Comprehension of S1 requires knowledge by the reader given, and then only briefly, in P5. This could reduce communication at this point. S2 and S3 form a Longacre coordinate concatenated sentence by the linking element And, which here has a sequence meaning. However, the writer's sentence division reflects a real intonation effect, an effect that has an emphatic meaning. C1, S3 is inverted to help bring this emphasis on up and to make the connection more apparent by bringing the two tokens of up closer together. This inversion also allows a rough parallelism of the clause with the two following adverbial phrases, each of which begins with up also. These two phrases also tie together these first three sentences by recalling the references down, S2, and disarray, S1.

S4 begins with a time adverbial with nuclear event verb introducing C2, a state clause. S5 is also a state clause as is the quotation, C1, of S6. S4, S5, and S6 all exemplify the state resulting from the events referred to in S3. At the outset, C1, S1, And, C1, S3, and the When clause of S4, with its precise time reference, provide a progressive time reference for the paragraph. still, S5, marks the time period of S5 and the main clause of S4 as the same. This serves to reinforce the fact that S5 is an amplification or exemplification of the main clause of S4.

Longacre, under the sentence type juxtaposition, includes recapitulation, paraphrase, sequence, echo question, (what is usually called tag question), and the simple sentence. These terms are not sufficiently clearly defined but it seems reasonable to suppose that sequence would be likely to cover a situation like that of S4 and S5. The case is one of close lexical connection between a clause and what follows it, especially where the connection is one of exemplification. Perhaps Longacre would see this as a case of paraphrase. In any case, the criteria would have to be refined. One suggestion would be that a series of apparent sentences can be yoked as juxtaposed when there is a punctuation available and commonly used that would put them within the same overt sentence. In this case a semicolon is perfectly possible instead of the full stop after Richard Nixon. Here again the writer's choice of separate sentences reflects an intonation effect. Despite the lack of

clarity of the categories the clearer examples of such juxtaposition will be mentioned as they appear to see if any patterns are observable.

Following the inevitable event clause, C2, S6, state clauses and clause-like structures follow with nuclei was, Giving, spoke, entertained, and was recounting. spoke is regarded as a state verb because of its identity relationship with the previous Giving. Yet, S7, joins S6 and S7 in a Longacre antithetical concatenated sentence but once again the sentence division reflects an emphatic intonation feature. The topic of S7 is, of course, related in an antithetical way to the final adverbial of S6. still, C2, S6, with still, S5, helps to tie everything from S4 onwards together as referring to a single plateau in the time sequence. C1, S4 functions primarily as a time reference but the speech itself appears as topic in S6 and S8. The final clause in S8, an event clause, is the first with regressive time reference, breaking the forward advance. The contrast in the two subordinate clauses of S8 picks up many previous references, the first picking up the ideas of S4, S5, and S6 while the second relates back to the first three sentences. The opening adverbial phrase of S8, Giving endless thanks, picks up the bade goodnight reference in S4 as the list of people addressed picks up loyal Democratic Party workers in that same sentence. A rather more uncertain connection is that of endless thanks with the grin was grim. This last is more clearly picked up in the last clause of S8.

There is little that can be said about chains of pronominalization or generalization. Although a strongly defined network of thematic references can be traced, as is done briefly above, these are principally a matter of references to the same idea rather than to the same identifiable referent. Only if the references were to the same identifiable referent would it become profitable to trace the chain of references. One repetition of reference to the same referent comes in Democratic, S3 and S4. Conceivably the word could have been omitted the second time but its repetition gives no sense of redundancy, perhaps because the adjective applies to different nouns each time. Perhaps there is little generalization possible in an adjective. A second interesting case is that of the quotation in S6. 'It' clearly refers to the situation described in S4 and S5 as far as the writer is concerned and to the developing situation as far as Humphrey was concerned when he said it. However, such constructions, in which it or this or the like are used to refer to a vaguely defined situation apparent to the listener or reader, are so common in English that little can be based on this particular case. the grin, S7, refers in a sense to the same thing as characteristic ebullience, S6. This is a good example of the uncertainty of reference discussed above. Although the two references are thematically the same, the writer's wish to make the second reference metaphorical dictates the form of the reference regardless of possible pronominalization. Were this not so, however, the grin could not be replaced by

it. Such a replacement would certainly have introduced an element of ambiguity since it would, most naturally, have referred to the same thing as 'It' in S6. The only other relevant case is the uninteresting and inevitable replacement of a man by one in S8.

Before any consideration of P2 is made it would be appropriate to consider what a paragraph is. The traditional explanation that it is in some sense a unit of thought is probably quite correct but inadequate. It is inadequate because the native speaker of the language knows that when he is writing he has to deliberately break his material up into units of paragraph length. When a writer feels that a paragraph is growing to unwieldy length he decides upon a suitable place to divide his paragraph into two. Presumably something of the same sort happens in speech, with the difference that the editing must take place as the utterance is being delivered, except in quite formal circumstances, and the signals of paragraph division will be matters of stress, pitch, and pause.

The question of just what is a manageable length for a paragraph will not be considered here. The thesis concerns itself only with the ways that new paragraphs are signalled and not with how the writer decides that a new paragraph is necessary. What can be said is that a paragraph of too great length inhibits understanding and that one of the marks of a bad speaker or writer can be excessive paragraph length. It is also apparent that different styles of writing tend to different

paragraph lengths and that therefore a paragraph can be too short as well as too long, producing an unacceptable mixture of styles. There are two considerations of paragraph length that, unlike those above, are relevant to the study of one text in isolation. One of these is the possibility that a particular text will have a favourite paragraph length, the writer manipulating what he has to say to fit that length. The other is the availability to the writer of paragraphs significantly longer or shorter than the norm for that style or that text. For instance, a writer could use an especially long paragraph to comment on the matter of the preceding few paragraphs or an especially short paragraph to introduce a new topic or to contain material of particular importance or difficulty. These considerations will be touched on when appropriate.

The argument relating to P1 has demonstrated a paragraph structure based on the patterned recurrence of themes, a pattern of development in which the first two sentences are developed in the remaining ones and in which an opening state is linked to a final state through a sequence of events. Only in the light of what has been said in the two paragraphs above can any conclusions be reached about why P2 is a separate paragraph.

The first previously occurring referent to be picked up in P2 is Campaign, S1. The general context of the campaign is, however, so all pervasive that little of significance can be said about this. It is more instructive to consider the two referents Campaign Manager Larry O'Brien and Speechwriter

Ted Van Dyk. Despite the fact that one of these occurs in a possessive determiner to the subject of its sentence while the other is itself the grammatical subject these two references can be regarded as parallel just as the sentences in which they occur were both regarded in the section on clause sequence as I's. The referents are adequately identified by context but the references do pick up previous specific references, aides, S1, P1, loyal Democratic workers, S4, P1, and staff, S8, P1. The last reference is the most important. The two referents under discussion reappear as Their, possessive article to the subject of S3, P2. This reference is entirely unambiguous, connection being through the subjects of successive sentences. Their is almost obligatory here, given that the writer wanted to link the two men with Humphrey, any more lexical reference would have appeared highly redundant.

The next referent is Humphrey, appearing first as Their man which links him to the first two referents. This is quite unambiguous as the situation is the same as that of the end of the previous paragraph. S4 appears to need Humphrey, however, even though he would not have been ambiguous since the subject of the previous sentence had the same referent. This is presumably simply a result of the fact that it is some time since full lexical reference has been made to Humphrey, a situation made worse by the fact that full lexical reference to other people has been made since Humphrey was last named. Note that the lexical base form, Humphrey, has now established itself,

having been used three times now. The two references in the quotation are fixed, of course, but consideration of them is important as argued above. Their reference is rendered unambiguous by the fact that the speaker of the lines is identified as Humphrey but note that the first 'I' presents one more non-lexical reference to Humphrey, increasing the pressure for Humphrey as subject of the main clause. S5 has he as subject, rendered entirely unambiguous by the fact that a Humphrey reference provided the subjects of the previous four clauses. his, C2, S5 is unambiguous because the clause in which it appears has a plural reference as subject and a Humphrey reference is the subject of the earlier clause, the main clause of the sentence. Being unambiguous in this case it is also obligatory. It becomes increasingly clear that a possessive determiner in unambiguous position is bound to be a pronominal form if the base referent appears in the same sentence.

P2 continues from the point at which P1 left off. S1 is a state sentence and S2, though an event sentence, has in this case a state meaning for reasons similar to those used in arguing that it is a lexical I. This argument can not be pursued too far, of course, since the writer deliberately chose an event verb to express his idea, perhaps for variety but more probably because of the cumbrousness of the equivalent state expression. S3 is a state clause, as are the two clauses in the quotation in S4, the quotation introducer being almost inevitably an event clause. C3, S4, however, includes an event verb to get. This

event verb is matched in S5 by to awaken and discover and the event clause C2, S5. This provides a neat pattern the reverse of that in P1, a series of state verbs giving way to a series of event verbs. The only break in this is the state clause C1, S5. It will be recalled that in the clause classification system used for this study (Engler and Hannah, 1965) want to is classified as a quasi auxiliary, rendering want to get a single verb construct. If we accept this view there is no need to consider to get an event verb, we may regard want to get as a single state verb. This removes the break in the pattern.

P2 continues from the point at which P1 left off in terms of thematic continuity as well. S1 and S2 pick up the characteristic ebullience of S6, P1 and the grim grin of S7. was not conceding, S3, P2, parallels was recounting, S8, P1, and Giving, S8, P1. The pattern is continued with the quotation in S4, P2, similar in feeling to the one in S6, P1 and directly picking up the idea of a man who still entertained hope, S8, P1. S5, P2, coupled with S4, form a Longacre antithetical concatenated sentence. Oddly enough, the first half of the antithesis is a Longacre direct quotation sentence. The antithesis, however, is solely between the quotation itself and what follows. S5 is the culmination of the first two paragraphs in several senses. The comparison with 1916 ties in with all the time references noticed above to bring all this account, of 1968, together. The main clause of S5 has a state verb with future meaning picking up the last verb of S4 and preparing for the future reference

adverbials, to awaken and discover. The final noun clause picks up references from the central part of P1, California (and Illinois in 1968) relates directly to S5, P1, and electing his opponent to the presidency to was racing neck and neck against Richard Nixon. Incidentally, the parenthetic (and Illinois in 1968) serves not only to point up the comparison mentioned above but also allows simultaneous double reference to his opponent.

Since all the evidence, grammatical and lexical, argues that P2 is a continuation of P1, why is there a separate paragraph? As has been noted, sentence division frequently reflects an intonation effect which conveys meaning not carried by any other feature of the writing. The same is probably true of paragraph division although paragraph division intonation effects can very well signify nothing more than that a paragraph is getting unwieldy and has to be cut down, as argued above. If this is so in this case no amount of search will reveal any significance in the break, even the point of the break must be determined to a large extent by the order in which things are said in the paragraph. However, the author has control over the order in which he says things and the detail in which he says them, so something may be determinable from the organization of the paragraphs even here.

One feature of difference between the two paragraphs has already been noted. P1 starts with event verbs and holds a temporal plateau with state verbs while P2 starts with state verbs and ends with event verbs that forecast what is to happen

next. The flow of P1 is broken by a final event verb that has regressive time reference, a break that would certainly be followed by a pause in reading, silent or aloud, providing an opportunity for the start of a new paragraph. Although P2 does not change the topic, the first two sentences have subjects, closely connected with one another, which are references to the first human, non-Humphrey, referents taking subject role in the text. It is worthy of note that all main clauses in P1 with the exception of S5 have a Humphrey reference in subject slot. Even S5 is an exemplification of the main clause of S4, which did have a Humphrey reference as subject. The subject references in S1 and S2 are quite full but they would presumably have had to be quite full had they appeared in the middle of a paragraph. One further feature of paragraph organization can be observed, however. It has been noted that S1 and S2 of P2 are linked by theme and parallelism of structure. S3 is linked to them by Their. Perhaps the first two form a Longacre sequence juxtaposed sentence which, with S3, form a Longacre antithetical concatenated sentence even though there is no use of but or a similar word. The next sentence is an exemplification of S3 and S5 recounts the sequel to S4. In this way the first paragraph can stress the plateau and the second the final failure first mentioned at the end of P1.

P3 presents little scope for discussion of chains of nominalization and generalization. The outcome is referred to in the complement of S1 as 'the nearest run thing you ever saw', where thing represents a stage in generalization well beyond the

first reference. Such a general or pronominal reference is not, however, obligatory in a complement of this type. that way, S2, refers back specifically to the whole of S1 and also to everything in the first two paragraphs. Again, a fuller lexical reference would have been possible but there is no ambiguity since overall context makes the race obviously the presidential race and The outcome obviously the outcome of that race. Humphrey, S3, is inevitable because it is so long since the last reference, which was in a different paragraph, and another human male has intervened as the subject of a sentence. Even though no reader of the article could conceivably imagine that the Democratic Party nominated the Duke of Wellington in August of 1968 the language, as explained above, is sufficiently sensitive to surface ambiguities that it would reject him instead of Humphrey in S3.

Although the referent the Democratic Party has not yet appeared in the text the party that nominated Humphrey is rendered unambiguous by a combination of the reader's prior knowledge and such references in the text as up from the chaos of the Democratic Convention, S3, P1. Note that although the subjects of S3 and S4 of P3 are related they do not have identical referents so that although context and reader's prior knowledge would have allowed the writer to use The old coalition as his subject, It would have been impossible. A more interesting point is that although The war chest refers to the Democratic Party's campaign fund it would not have been possible for the writer to have used Its war chest as the subject of S5. Such a reference would be read as referring

to the subject of the immediately previous main clause, The old Democratic coalition. It is interesting that, although that main clause is followed by four clause like structures of which the last has as subject the South, a reference that could have been picked up by Its, Its would nonetheless have been taken to refer back to the subject of the main clause. More will be said on this below.

The paragraph is linked to the one that precedes it by The outcome, whose referent is the same as the election described in the final clause of P2. It is also, perhaps, linked to P1 by the parallel of The outcome with the outset, S1, P1. The paragraph is dominated by state clauses with the exception of the inevitable quotation introducer in S1 and the adjective clause in S3. The classification of C2, S2 as a state clause may be regarded as a little dubious perhaps. This state nature of the paragraph distinguishes it from P2 and P4. It is interesting that S1 could more easily have been couched as an event clause. It is a summation of the material of the first two paragraphs and a link to S2, providing an immediate antecedent for that way. S2, in its turn, presents the reason for the inclusion of the description of the situation in August that follows and so the event material of the end of P2 is linked to the state material of P3.

As has been seen, the time reference of P1 and P2 is predominantly progressive. P3, on the other hand, is regressive. S1 The outcome, S2 One week before Election Day, and S3 In

August demonstrate this. The referent election day used in S2 has been adequately established in S5, P2. There is an ambiguity in the adjective clause in S3 where there is no evidence whether the condition of shambles follows or precedes the nomination. The reader's prior knowledge suggests the first reading, but in any case the description of the coalition in S4 is obviously parallel in time with was a shambles. Every verb from S3 on could have been in the past perfect, emphasizing the fact that it is all part of the explanation for the statement in S2, but in fact the writer takes the reader back through the time scale. The term shambles, picking up the earlier references disarray, S1, P1, and chaos, S3, P1, is exemplified in S4 and S5. S4 could be recast as a Longacre juxtaposed sentence if the clause like structures in what is on the surface the adverbial phrase were recomposed with finite verbs. S5, of course, is just another element in this juxtaposed sentence. S5 is given separate identity by the writer, it can be assumed, because it refers to the party rather than to the coalition. S5 contains a further regressive step in time with neglected by Lyndon Johnson, which refers to a time before the August convention and therefore before anything previously mentioned in the text. Lyndon Johnson is one of a number of referents that appear for the first time in P3, and without any full identification. The reader is expected to know who they are.

As has been shown, the first two paragraphs are basically one. P3 is clearly separate, beginning a chronological account of the campaign by taking the reader back to the beginning of what is relevant and introducing a large number of dramatis personae. It is significant that the writer, or editor, recognized this, for he gives the sub-heading Fists Clenched to P4 even though the event to which that refers occurs in P5.

The first reference to Humphrey in P4 is Humphrey, the subject of S1. The full form is inevitable with several sentences since he was last mentioned and more since a reference to him was subject of its clause. Also, this is a new paragraph and the last mentioned human male was Lyndon Johnson. Lyndon Johnson was not the subject of his sentence; if it had been, he as subject of S1, P4 would have been read as referring to Johnson. In the present circumstances he would have been confusingly ambiguous. his, C2, S1, and his, C3, S1, are obligatorily pronominal as discussed above. The reference a Vice President who etc. is determined by the writer's wish to incorporate certain information in the sentence. Without the relative clause him would have been possible; with the relative clause a lexical reference appears to be almost obligatory. Oddly enough, despite the lexical reference in S2, the reference Humphrey's in S3 seems to be almost obligatory; his would not have been acceptable. This may be because the reference to Humphrey in S2 is not in the subject slot but in the low hierarchical position of direct object to a non-finite verb functioning as adjective to the complement. On

the other hand his would have given the reader pause but would have been read as relating to Humphrey, for two reasons. The highest ranking noun in the previous sentence is the hecklers, the complement of there were and therefore subject equivalent. Since this is plural no ambiguity is possible. On the other hand the most recent noun with human singular male reference is his unpopular chief, a noun with even lower ranking on the hierarchy than a Vice President. Note that his in S2 is another example of the rule discussed earlier making the pronominal obligatory in such circumstances.

The only other referent relevant to the question of pronominalization is Dr. Bergman, very fully identified on his first appearance in S3 and referred to by He in S4. There is nothing unusual here. He would not be known to most of the readers so he has to have full definition but He is available for S4 because reference to him was subject of S3 as well. The doctor would have been possible but any fuller lexical reference would have seemed somewhat laboured.

S1 begins with a link to P3 in that, referring to all that has been listed there. A separate paragraph is suggested by the change of time direction to progressive again and the reintroduction of events. S1 begins with a state clause as a link to P3 could be expected to be, but the next two clauses are event clauses. The clauses in S2 are state clauses; refused to repudiate is a marginal case. However, the arguments relating to the clause analysis of this sentence can be applied to the

state versus event analysis, rendering taunting a topic event. S3 is an event sentence and while the main clause of the quotation is a state clause the principal information is in the complement with its event adjective clause.

The state/event argument is obviously weaker for this paragraph than for some others but the time argument is quite clear. Then, S2, is a sequence reference that applies to temporal sequence in this case as well as to logical sequence. The refusal to repudiate and run away is an attitude extending over some time but clearly continuing beyond the opening of the campaign. Although the at one point of S3 is vague it is clear that the event takes place quite late in the campaign from the regressive adjective clause.

Thematically P4 has clear connections to what has gone before. a wild, disorganised abandon picks up disarray of P1. P2 relates to the disaffected liberals and, in the record of the past four years, the problem of the Viet Nam war of P3. S1 and S2 are comments on the opening adverbial of the paragraph and S3 is a summation of all the troubles that developed as opposed to those that were there at the start, which P3 dealt with.

The separation of P4 and P5 is justified thematically by the fact that P4 describes conditions early in the campaign while P5 describes them when the change took place. P4 ended with a state clause, S4, the writer's comment on the quotation in S3. This breaks the forward advance which is renewed in P5 with the opening The turning point came. This refers back to P4, as does the

reference to heckling. All clauses are event clauses with the exception of S4. A precise time reference is given in S1, a further justification of the paragraph break at this point being the fact that the turning point is a turn from the situation described in S1 and S2 of P4 whereas S3 of P4 is placed in a time reference purposely vague and not in the direct line of development of the campaign.

S1, P5 is inverted to put the later event first as that is the topic of the paragraph. S2 describes events in chronological order, flew, to deliver, if he became, would risk halting. S3 is regressive in time, beginning Twice before with the time reference when in the adverbial clause tied to that time reference, the events in the when clause preceding the events in the main clause making a double regression. S4, This time, returns the reader to the time of the whole paragraph or a little later. Note that each main clause is based on a point in this slowly advancing time sequence with regression in the subordinate clause of S1, progression in that of S2 and the double regression, held to the base point by before, in S3. S2 is a description of the turning point referred to in S1 and S4 is the consequence of it with S3 providing necessary previous information and linking the event to the rest of the campaign.

Thematic linking to P4, and between S2 and S3 of P5, is through the Viet Nam war; the reference to a change in policy picking up the topic of repudiation of an unpopular chief in P4, as does S3, P5.

Reference to Humphrey is inevitably by a full lexical form in S1 because of the paragraph separation, the distance from the last subject reference to him, and the fact that the subjects of the two previous sentences were references to Dr. Bergman. He is the subject of the following three clauses. Some reference other than Humphrey is obligatory for the subject of S2 since Humphrey was the subject of the preceding clause and the main clause of S1 did not have a singular human male as subject so there is no scope for ambiguity. The pronominal reference is most likely although some general lexical reference would have been possible. Within the indirect quotation the pronominal reference is obligatory since the subject speaker reference is a Humphrey reference. S3 is interesting in that the subject of the sentence is Johnson and yet the subject of the subsequent subordinate clause is he, with unambiguous reference to Humphrey. Why this should be unambiguous is not clear. Obviously the him of C1 is a Humphrey reference since there are only two human male referents referred to in the paragraph and reference to Johnson would have involved a reflexive as a Johnson reference is subject of the clause. Obvious context is our only resort as it is easy to construct a very similar sentence in which he would refer to the subject, not the object, of the main clause. Moreover the replacement of he by Humphrey, a perfectly possible replacement since the last lexical reference is some way away, would not have decreased the surface ambiguity at all.

Another repeated reference is Salt Lake City and Utah, comprehension of which relies on the reader's knowing where Salt

Lake City is. An interesting point relative to both this and the last problem arises from the writer's stylistic practice, previously noted, of avoiding the marked past perfect and using the unmarked simple past instead. In S3 use of the perfect form in the when clause would have gone some way towards resolving any surface ambiguity by establishing clearly the order of the events. In this case had flown in place of flew in S2 would have established that Salt Lake City and Utah are, for the writer's purposes, the same place. This, incidentally, tends to destroy the argument that each main clause in P5 is based on a point on a slowly advancing time scale. However, argument in the section on clause sequence was advanced in favour of regarding everything from flew to pledging as a complex verb phrase the equivalent of pledged, a quotation introducer.

The only other repeated referent is Johnson, who appears as Johnson as subject of the main clause of S3 and reappears in the adverbial for S4 as the White House, a more general lexical form. The writer would be encouraged to use a lexical form by the fact that the second reference is not the subject of its clause, or even the object, and by the use of the potentially ambiguous he in S3. However, there would be no ambiguity if the White House were replaced by him, supporting the suggestion that pronominal reference is dominated by the subject of the previous clause.

In P6 Humphrey once again is first referred to as Humphrey, C2, S6. This is a new paragraph, it is some way from a reference

to Humphrey and a greater distance from a lexical reference. He is again referred to as Humphrey as the subject of C4, S2. he would have been acceptable here as no referent with a possibility of ambiguity has appeared in this paragraph. Note, however, that although Humphrey is the subject of a main clause it is the second main clause in a coordinate concatenated sentence. Had the first clause been the one with a Humphrey reference as subject Humphrey would not have been possible and a pronominal reference would have been most likely. In this case the fact that the previous Humphrey reference is the subject of a subordinate clause only perhaps increases the pressure for lexical reference.

S3 has He as subject. Note that here a lexical reference would not have been acceptable. Indeed, a reference by other than his name, The Democratic Candidate for instance, would be ambiguous for anyone reading the article without a clear understanding of the subject. S5 has Humphrey as subject. Once again a sentence with some other subject reference and no reference to Humphrey has intervened since the last reference. Use of He here would have been unacceptable despite the lack of any other human male to provide confusion. Parallelism with Edmund Muskie perhaps makes the lexical reference more appropriate also. S6 has Humphrey as subject of the main clause. It is interesting that despite the closeness of Edmund Muskie He would have been unambiguous. Had S6 referred to Muskie, who was not the subject of S5, it would either have been an adjectival clause beginning who flew or a separate sentence with lexical reference to Muskie

as its subject. Presumably Humphrey is used because of the length of S4. The next reference is his, in the same sentence, an obligatory form. The indirect object him in the adjectival clause associated with his home precinct is not obligatory. However, Humphrey is possible only in this case where parallelism with Nixon's and Wallace would make it stylistically acceptable. Had the sentence ended with votes, him would have been most likely and Humphrey impossible.

For reasons that will become apparent P7 is discussed along with P6. S1, P7 has he as subject picking up Humphrey the subject of S6, P6. If we regard P7 as part of P6 this is natural, almost obligatory. On the other hand Humphrey would be expected as the subject of the first sentence in a new paragraph. Perhaps because of the length of S1, which has three predicates, S2 has the Humphreys for subject instead of the possible he and his wife. Also, the last lexical reference is some way away. The next reference is his in S2. This is quite unambiguous as it can only refer to the male element in the Humphreys. Note, however, that a lexical reference, Humphrey's or the Vice President's, would have been acceptable here whereas his would have been obligatory had Humphrey alone been the subject.

P6 is thematically separable from P5 on the grounds that P5 is a turn from the disarray of P4 and picks up the notion heroic, grim of P1. In P6 the turn is complete and we have the up and the racing of P1 with the characteristic ebullience of the same paragraph. Note that up to this point the paragraphs that

can be clearly distinguished begin At the outset, The outcome, As if that were not enough, The turning point, From then on. P1, P5, and P6 particularly can be regarded as being linked through their opening phrases, the openings of P3 and P4 being links that look back rather than forward. P5 describes a crucial moment, the turning point, and P6 describes the sequel to that moment.

The time reference of P6 is clearly maintained. The opening clause establishes the starting point. The When clause that begins S2 establishes a date ten days later, the first main clause marks the beginning of a continuous process and the second the overall effect of that. S3 localises that effect to the last week. S4 is the only sentence that breaks the time sequence, having the same time scale as C3, S2 but S5 localises it a little more, from the last month to the last week to the last day. S6 takes the time up to election day morning, a progressive adjectival clause taking the time to the end of that day. P7 maintains the same time scale as P6, during the early hours being picked up in During the afternoon, and That evening, there being no further reference to Election Day after S6, P6. The second and third time references are unambiguous in their parallelism of function with the time adverbial in S6, P6. The only, very flimsy, reason here for separating these paragraphs is the slight break in the momentum occasioned by the adjective clause in S6.

As we would expect from so narrative a paragraph, P6/P7 is dominated by event clauses. The only state verb is was clambering in S2, a reference to the state of affairs causing the events.

was able is regarded as an event verb because it is regarded as complete. Note the uses of began to increase the event nature of the matters referred to by that verb, S2 and S4.

The thematic internal unity of P6/P7 is quite simple. The opening has already been discussed, the reference to mood in S1 also links back to turning point as well as picking up the other mood references mentioned above. The When clause establishes a point somewhere in the time period From then on. S2 in the When clause picks up the references of S4, P3 while the main clauses pick up the references of S5, P3. Although three successive clauses concern money, one as subject reference and the next two as object reference, no pronominalization is possible because of the writer's need to indicate exact sums of money. S4 returns to reference to S4, P3 and S5 and 6, and S1 and 2 of P7 are connected by the sequence of events relationship, all closely tied to Election Day. S6 and what follow pick up the P1 reference to the Lemington Hotel, Minneapolis.

There is, then, no reason for P7 to be a separate paragraph except the length of P6/P7 and no paragraph signals are used. A more reasonable paragraph division would have been after S4 since P6/P7 is a plateau paragraph. We saw how the units of time got smaller and smaller throughout until, for S5, we are down to the day as unit with simple sequence from then on.

In P8 the first Humphrey reference is Humphrey, the subject of S1, establishing the new paragraph, with the obligatory his later in the same sentence. Hubert, S2, is governed by the fact

that it is in a quotation but it is a slight reduction in lexical fullness over Humphrey. The subject of S3, Humphrey, is determined by the fact that the subject of the previous main clause was Lyndon Johnson. He, however, would not have been ambiguous, probably because a Humphrey reference was subject of the quotation in the previous sentence. On the other hand it is possible to write a sentence to replace S3 having he as subject but with unambiguous reference to Johnson. For instance we could substitute Yet he admired his honesty. he as subject of C2, S3 is obligatory and would have been so even if the subject of the main clause had been He. It seems that a subordinate clause following the main clause of a sentence and having the same subject referent is bound to take pronominal reference for that subject. Substituting the Vice President for he in the clause in question demonstrates this. his as article to the first noun in S4 is obviously unambiguous with Humphrey as subject of the main clause of the preceding sentence but Humphrey as subject of the later noun clause, the main topic clause, makes his unambiguous in any case. If his were replaced by Humphrey's Humphrey would have to be replaced by he. Both references in S4 could have been pronominal, of course, but if they had been there would perhaps have been a tendency for full lexical reference to be used instead of his in S5, unambiguous as it stands because of the presence of Humphrey as subject of the immediately preceding clause, the principal one of its sentence.

The only other case of maintenance of reference is gut fighter in S2 and the breed in the same sentence. The second reference could have been replaced by them. There is an automatic case of pronominal reference in did, C2, S3, referring back to hit in C1.

The opening noun of P8, with its adjectival clause, relates all the way back to the situation described in P1. The distant reference to the Leamington Hotel is made possible by the recent references to Minneapolis in P7. The adjectival clause in S1 is an event clause but the main clause is a state clause, as is the quotation in S2. S2 is the introduction to a further quality of Humphrey's not listed in S1 except as practical politics. In other words, the principal item following on from S1 is S3, S2 and S3 form a Longacre antithetical concatenated sentence, with the usual intonation effect. The main clause in S3 is a state verb although the subordinate clause is an event clause. S4, composed of two state clauses, does not follow particularly closely from S3 but is a comment on the whole text. S5 is, however, a comment on S4 and in fact forms another antithetical concatenated sentence with it. Its principal clauses are state clauses although the main clause is an event clause. Thematically, as would be expected, P8 picks up references from the whole article without any interesting pattern to it.

3. Conclusion

3.1. Final statement of tentative discourse rules for written English

Paragraphs within a discourse tend to be roughly the same length; unusual length or shortness leads the reader to expect something special. (In the text used in this study that expectation is disappointed in the case of P7). A paragraph tends to be dominated either by two element or by more than two element clauses and, independently, to be dominated by state or event clauses. Paragraph change tends to be marked by one or more of: thematic change, change in time pattern, and full lexical reference to the principal referent. Sentences within a paragraph and paragraphs within a discourse are connected in sequence by thematic connection and overt lexical and grammatical signals. In particular, yoking of sentences into Longacre sentences does not cross paragraph boundaries. (The text under study gave no example of the possible paragraph-initial But, And, etc. Such things must be studied to discover whether sentences or paragraphs are being so yoked.) Emic paragraph types, not the object of this study, probably exist. The text used offered evidence for at least one, the plateau paragraph, P1, P3, P6/7.

Pronominal reference is closely tied to grammatical hierarchy. In particular, pronominal reference is easiest when the reference appears in a subject and previous reference was in a subject in the previous sentence. A main clause in

a previous sentence predominates over a subordinate clause in this respect except that pronominal reference in a sentence following a quotation sentence may be to the subject referent of the main clause or the quotation. Where reference is made to the same referent as subject of main and subordinate clause in the same sentence a subordinate clause following its main clause must have pronominal reference regardless of the form of reference in the main clause, whereas if the subordinate clause is first, either one, but not both, can have full lexical reference. These rules also apply where the references in question are not subjects nor in the subject slot but only when no ambiguity is possible.

Initial lexical reference tends to be followed by three or four instances of pronominal reference. The number tends to be reduced for the following reasons: great sentence length, intervention of potentially ambiguous references, and shift of grammatical role, though none of these is very powerful. Where another sentence intervenes between references with a different main clause referent lexical reference is required unless the main clause in question was followed by a subordinate clause with a reference to the original referent as subject. Paragraph change requires lexical reference again. The occurrence in a sentence of a possessive determiner with the same referent as a noun reference in the same sentence must be pronominal except where the possessive occurs in a subordinate clause before the main clause, in which case the rule is the same as the one given above relating to subordinate clauses.

Within a discourse a norm for lexical reference to frequently appearing referents is set up, deviation from which tends to have significance. Non-human referents are less liable to take pronominal reference than human ones. In the case of human referents excessive lexical reference is as confusing to the reader as inadequate lexical reference.

3.2. Final comments on the method

The development of the above rules, obviously incomplete though they are, suggests that the method followed is profitable and that work on more texts following the same lines, with refinement of criteria, would produce a complete set of discourse rules for English. The clause types used were evidently the right ones for analysis, although it seems that further extension of the quasi-auxiliary classification would be useful. The Longacre sentence types were also useful, frequently throwing light on paragraph internal construction. The class of quotation introducers needs to be broadened and established more clearly but the quotation sentence type is useful since argument relating to pronominal chains and sequence of event/state clauses revolves principally around the surface main clause and not the topic main clause identified for clause sequence purposes. Nevertheless, the arguments used for re-analysis of clause types were frequently applicable to the argument for event/state analysis, suggesting that those arguments do reflect a psychological reality for the user of English.

APPENDIX

The Corpus

THE LOSER: A Near Run Thing.
Time. November 15, 1968.

P1 S1 C1
At the outset of a campaign that progressed from disarray to
C2
the brink of disaster, Hubert Horatio Humphrey confessed to close
C3 S2 C1 C2
aides: "I'm dead." He was down so far he had no place to go but
S3 C1
up. And up he went--up from a 16-point deficit in the polls, up
S4 C1
from the chaos of the Democratic Convention. When he bade good
night to loyal Democratic Party workers in the ballroom of the
Leamington Hotel in Minneapolis at 2:30 a.m. on Nov. 6, the
C2
Vice President was racing neck and neck against Richard Nixon.
S5 C1 S6 C1
Crucial states were still teetering. "It's a real Donnybrook."
C2 S1
Humphrey declared with characteristic ebullience. Yet the grin
C1 S8
was grim. Giving endless thanks to his staff, family and
C1 C2
supporters, Humphrey spoke less like a man who still entertained
C3 C4
hope than like one who was recounting a heroic foray that had
failed.

P2 S1 C1
Campaign Manager Larry O'Brien's Irish eyes were not smiling.
S2 C1
Speechwriter Ted Van Dyk, ashen and somber, had lost his usual

S3 C1 S4 C1
 cockiness. Their man was not conceding. "I feel sufficiently

C2 C3
 at ease." said Humphrey, "that I want to get a good night's rest."

S5 C1
 But, like Charles Evans Hughes in 1916, he was heading for bed

only to awaken and discover that voters in California (and

C2
 Illinois in 1968) were electing his opponent to the presidency.

S1 C1
 P3 The outcome, as the victorious Duke of Wellington said of

C2 C3 S2
 Waterloo, was "the nearest run thing you ever saw." One week

C1 C2
 before Election Day, nobody would have believed the race could

S3 C1
 turn out that way. In August, the party that nominated Humphrey

C2 S4 C1
 at Chicago was a shambles. The old Democratic coalition was

disintegrating, with untold numbers of blue-collar workers

responding to Wallace's blandishments, Negroes threatening to sit

out the election, liberals disaffected over the Viet Nam war,

S5 C1
 the South lost. The war chest was almost empty, and the party's

C2
 machinery, neglected by Lyndon Johnson, creaked in disrepair.

Fists Clenched

S1 C1 C2
 P4 As if that were not enough, Humphrey opened his campaign

C3
 with a wild, disorganized abandon that defied his advance men's

efforts to bring out the crowds. Then there were the hecklers,

taunting a Vice President who refused to repudiate his unpopular chief and run away from the record of the past four years.

Humphrey's personal physician and adviser, Dr. Edgar Bergman,

complained at one point: "There is no adversity that has not

been visited upon this campaign." He was not far wrong.

P5 The turning point came on Sept. 30 in Salt Lake City, the

day after Humphrey endured some of the worst heckling of the

entire campaign. Fists clenched, lips tight, he flew to Utah

to deliver a speech pledging that if he became President, he

would risk halting the bombing of North Viet Nam in the hope of

achieving peace. Twice before, Johnson had undercut him when

he tried to stake out even moderately independent positions on

the war. This time there was not a word from the White House.

P6 From then on, the mood palpably changed. When a poll on

Oct. 10 showed that Humphrey was clambering back from his

post-convention slump, money began to flow in and Humphrey

was able to spend some \$12 million altogether. He spent

\$3,000,000 in the last week alone, most of it on TV. ^{S4} The

^{C1} deeply divided Democratic Party began to show signs of belated

^{S5} ^{C1} unity. Humphrey wound up his campaign odyssey of more than

98,000 miles amid laughter, with a triumphant Los Angeles parade

and a four-hour telethon with Edmund Muskie. ^{S6} ^{C1} Humphrey flew home

to Waverly, Minn., during the early hours of Election Day to vote

^{C2} in Marysville Township, his home precinct, which gave him 385

votes to Nixon's 128 and 15 for Wallace.

^{S1} ^{C1}
P7 During the afternoon, he drove eleven miles to nearby

^{C2} Buffalo, dropped off a blue suit at a cleaner's shop and sipped ^{C3}

a cup of hot chocolate at a local grill. ^{S2} That evening, the

^{C1} Humphreys drove through flurrying snow to his headquarters in

Minneapolis.

^{S1} ^{C1}
P8 The stubborn Democratic battle that Humphrey watched in a

^{C2} 14th-floor hotel suite was in no small measure a tribute to his

rare amalgam of warmth, courage, do-gooding liberalism and

^{S2} ^{C1} practical politics. "Hubert is not a gut fighter," Lyndon

^{C2} Johnson, an expert judge of the breed, carped in 1960.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, Shirley M., and Robert E. Longacre. 1968. Discourse and paragraph structure of Ata Manobo. MS.
- Austin, Virginia Morey. 1966. Attention, emphasis, and focus in Ata Manobo. Hartford Seminary Foundation M.A. thesis.
- Barnard, Myra L., and Robert E. Longacre. 1968. Grammar and lexicon in Dibabawon narrative procedure discourse. MS.
- Cowan, George M. 1965. Some aspects of the lexical structure of a Mazatec historical text. (Summer Institute of Linguistics publications in linguistics and related fields, 11.) Norman, Summer Institute of Linguistics of the University of Oklahoma.
- Dorfman, Eugene. 1956. The structure of the narrative: a linguistic approach. The history of ideas news letter. 2. 63-7.
- Dundes, Alan. 1963. Structural typology in North American Indian folktales. Southwestern journal of anthropology. 19. 121-30.
- Engler, Leo, and Elaine Hannah. 1965. A structural analysis of speech samples for the clinician. MS.
- Gleason, Henry A. 1964. The organization of language: a stratificational view. Report of the fifteenth annual (first international) round table meeting on linguistics and language studies (Georgetown monograph series. 17.), ed. by Christopher I.J.M. Stuart. 75-95. Washington D.C., Georgetown University Press.
- Grimes, Joseph E. 1968. The thread of discourse. MS.
- Harris, Zellig S. 1963. Discourse analysis reprints. The Hague, Mouton.

- Hill, Archibald. 1955. Analysis of the windhover, an experiment in structural method. PMLA. 70. 968-78.
- Katz, Jerrold J., and Jerry Fodor. 1963. The structure of a semantic theory. Lg. 39. 170-210.
- Labov, William, and Joshua Waletzky. 1967. Narrative analysis: oral versions of personal experience. Essays on the verbal and visual arts, ed. by June Helm. Seattle, University of Washington Press.
- Lamb, Sydney M. 1966. Outline of stratificational grammar. Washington D.C., Georgetown University Press.
- Longacre, Robert E. 1967. The notion of sentence. Report of the eighteenth annual round table meeting on linguistics and language studies (Georgetown monograph series, 20.), ed. by Edward L. Blansitt, Jr., 15-25. Washington D.C., Georgetown University Press.
- Loos, Eugene A. 1963. Capanahua narration structure. Texas studies in literature and language. 4, Supplement, 697-742.
- Loriot, James, 1962. Introduction to the analysis of discourse structure. MS.
- Morgan, James O. 1967. English structure above the sentence level. Report of the eighteenth annual round table meeting on linguistics and language studies (Georgetown monograph series, 20.), ed. by Edward L. Blansitt, Jr., 123-132. Washington D.C., Georgetown University Press.
- Nida, Eugene A. 1964. Towards a science of translating. Leiden, Brill.

- Palmer, Frank R. 1965. A linguistic study of the English verb.
London, Longmans.
- Pike, Kenneth L. 1954 to 1960. Language in relation to a unified
theory of human behavior. 3 parts. Glendale, California,
Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- _____. 1963. Discourse analysis and tagmeme matrices. Paper
read at the summer meeting of the Linguistic Society of America.
- Propp, Vladimir. 1958. Morphology of the folk tale. Bloomington,
Indiana University Research Centre in Anthropology. Folklore,
and Linguistics.
- Riffaterre, Michael. 1959. Criteria for style analysis. Word. 15.
154-74.
- _____. 1960. Stylistic context. Word. 16. 206-18.
- Taber, Charles. 1966. The structure of Sango narrative. Hartford
Seminary Foundation Ph.D. thesis.

AN ESSAY IN THE ANALYSIS
OF WRITTEN ENGLISH DISCOURSE

by

ROGER GORDON HILYER

B. A., University of Oxford, 1964

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Speech

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1969

ABSTRACT

This thesis is the report of an investigation into the structure of English above the sentence level. Until recently linguists have confined their attention to the sentence in describing languages. A working assumption of the study was that the methods of description developed for language at the sentence level could be successfully applied to units higher in the hierarchy. In particular, it was assumed that the structure of discourse could be described in terms of the internal structure of the sentences composing the discourse. This assumption proved valid.

The study was principally concerned with the rules that were assumed to exist in the language determining the nature of reference, the way that reference to the same referent is maintained and the way that new referents are introduced.

The establishment of emic units above the sentence was not a primary aim of the study but it was assumed that rules governing pronominalization and stages of generality in reference to a given referent were quite likely to be concerned in part with the definition of such units. Accordingly the structure of paragraphs in terms of sequences of clause types, sentence types, and verb expansions was studied. For a similar reason patterns of lexical and thematic connection between sentences and paragraphs were investigated. The text taken as corpus for the study was 'THE LOSER: A Near Run Thing.' Time. November 15, 1968.

The results of the study consist of tentative rules of reference and of paragraph structure. In addition, the thesis discusses a number of procedural matters. The results of the study are laid out in the form of a running discussion of the test, providing an opportunity for comment on the method of analysis used and the clause and sentence typology used in the thesis.