Analysis of Cohesive Harmony
−Take the First Meeting of Wang Xifeng and Daiyu as the Example

Junning Yuan
(School of Foreign Languages and Cultures, Panzhihua University, China)

Abstract:
Cohesive harmony was first proposed by Halliday &Hasan (1985) and was meant to be a measuring device of textual coherence. The relationship of cohesion and texture is very close. And A Dream in Red Mansions is the very classical work. There're many kinds of analysis of it. However, the analysis of it from the perspective of cohesive harmony is very little. These ways are effective and can reflect the discourse cohesion. This thesis will make a tentative analysis and discussion of Wang Xifeng and Daiyu's first meeting from the perspective of cohesive harmony and try to make a better understanding of Cohesive harmony and the discourse.
Key Word*: Cohesive Harmony; Cohesion; A Dream in the Red Mansions.*

I.   LITERATURE REVIEW

The first part is literature review aboard. The term of cohesion is generally associated with research inspired by Halliday (1964) and Hasan (1967) in systemic functional linguistics and by Gleason (1968) in Hartford-based stratificational linguistics. Halliday and Hasan (1976) is the canonical study in the former tradition, Gutwinski (1976) in the latter. Gutwinski draws on work by Halliday and by Hasan, and later SFL work by Martin (1992) was influenced by Gleason, so there has been a fruitful exchange of ideas across theories in this field.

According to Halliday (1994: 311), cohesion is one aspect of the study of texture; texture can be defined as the process whereby meaning is channeled into a digestible current of discourse 'instead of spilling out formlessly in every possible direction'. Alongside cohesion, this process involves the text-forming resources of grammar and phonology, for example, Theme and New in English.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) present a detailed framework of cohesion, which, however, has prompted a number of researchers to ask questions about the relationship between cohesive ties and evaluations of text as coherent or not. Widdowson (1979) believes coherence may exist without cohesion. Enkvist (1978) showed with his example that cohesion does not necessarily result in coherence. Charolles (1983) argues that coherence is ultimately a function of the reader's mind and not a matter of what is in the text. Markers of cohesion, such as pronouns, do not make the text coherent. Rather it is the willingness of the reader to make the pronoun sensibly refers to something that has gone before or will come after that produces coherence in a text.

The second part is the literature review at home. In China, a huge amount of research work has been done on cohesion and its relation to coherence of the text. Guowen Huang (1988) gives a detailed introduction of the Hallidayan model of cohesion. Yumin Cheng(1986) and Jicheng Lin (1988, 1989) challenge the model with the phenomenon of textual coherence without cohesion. Zhuanglin Hu (1994) attempts an overall improvement on this theory of cohesion as well as a detailed introduction of related linguistic theories. Delu Zhang (2000, 2001) tries to redefine cohesion and coherence and provides a more refined theoretical model for each of the notions. Yongsheng Zhu (1995), after presenting a true picture of the model, points out some of the weaknesses inherent in the model and puts forward several suggestions to improve it. In a series of articles, Yongsheng Zhu (1996, 1997a, 1997b) proposes several criteria for the coherence of a text.

II.   Theoretical Framework

Halliday and Hasan (1976) define cohesion as a semantic concept referring to the relations of meaning within a text, and have focused on the linguistic means whereby the cohesive relations are expressed or realized, holding that all the cohesive relations can be realized as lexical and grammatical items. They make it explicit in Cohesion in English that they are concerned only with the linguistic factors that are characteristic of texts in

---

English in their discussion in that book, excluding the situational properties. This is another key point that has failed to receive its due attention from all the ling0uists arguing against the framework. These counter arguments, although groundless, indicate that the Hallidayan model does need to be improved. We have tried to do this in two aspects. First, we have proposed that the situational factors of the text be considered in the model and therefore the scope of meaning relationship within the text be extended to include relationship of pragmatic meaning. Second, unlike Halliday, who sees cohesive device as a set of non-structural resources in the textual metafunction, we, drawing on Martin (1992, 2001), have attempted to reformulate the notion of cohesive ties as discourse semantic structure, Halliday's non-structural textual resource have been reworked as semantic systems concerned with discourse structure, comprising: identification, negotiation, conjunction and ideation.

Apart from cohesion, we have also given due attention to the other two textual components of text: thematic and information structures.

Realizing the neglect on Halliday's part of the role Rhemes can play in developing a text, I have, drawing on Danes and Thompson, proposed a modified model of thematic progression as a practical tool for textual analysis.

Lexical cohesion refers to th relationship established within a text by the choice of lexical items in organizing the text. Halliday and Hasan divide lexical cohesion into two main categories: reiteration and collocation. Reiteration, as the name suggests, involves repetition of lexical items. A reiterated item may be a repetition of an earlier item, a synonym or near-synonym, a super ordinate or a general word.

Hasan (1984, 1985) develops a method of measuring the relative cohesion of series of texts, called by herself chain interaction. It is based on the recognition of cohesive chains within a text. The term cohesive chain refers to a semantic relationship between the members of the chain. There are three types of relationship: co-referentiality, co-classification and co-extension. Co-reference refers to identity of reference. The terms refer to the same item. Co-classification relates different members of the same class of thing, processes or circumstances (Halliday&Hasan 1985: 74). The last term ties members that in the same general field of meaning. This covers the semantic relations of synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy and the part-whole relationship of meronymy. These three types of meaning relation lead to two types of cohesive chain, known as identity and similarity chains. The relation between members of identity chains is that of co-reference, and members of similarity chains are connected by co-classification and co-extension.

Hasan(1984: 218) puts forward four hypotheses. The first is a general hypothesis and subsumes the others. It considers that ranking by cohesive harmony will match the ranking of texts on a cline of coherence judged by informants. The second emphasizes the importance of the percentage of central tokens that is seen as a measure of cohesive harmony and claims that any text will be seen as coherent if it contains at least 50% central tokens (expressed with respect to total lexical tokens). The third claims that if two texts show no difference in cohesive harmony, variation in coherence will correlate with the number of breaks in the chain of interaction. Finally she holds that all else being equal, the more coherent the text the higher will be the ratio of central tokens to peripheral tokens.

A Dream in the Red Mansions is the really classical literary work in the world. The data in this thesis is the part of Daiyu and Wang Xifeng's first meeting in the Jia's Mansion. Wang Xifeng's performance is valuable to analysis. From Wang Xifeng's words and action, we can know the class relation and personal relation.

III. Cohesive Harmony in *A Dream in the Red Mansions*

Firstly, the reference chains are as follows:

Reference chains (in order of appearance)

有人-这个人-他-他-他-琏嫂子-这熙凤-这熙凤-熙凤-熙凤

笑-说-上下细细打谅-送-笑道-用帕拭泪-听-转悲为喜道-忙携-又问-亲为捧茶捧果

后院-后房门-贾母身边

黛玉-黛玉-黛玉-黛玉-黛玉

纳罕-连忙起身接见-忙赔笑见礼

贾母-贾母-老祖宗-老祖宗-贾母-老祖宗

笑道-笑道

The Reference chains show that Wang Xifeng's actions are a lot. Then we can see in Jia's Mansion the power is frequently controlled by Wang Xifeng. From Jia Mu's performance, we can see she is satisfied with Wang Xifeng. And Daiyu's very little action shows that she is very cautious at the beginning in Jia's Mansion.

As far as ideation is concerned, the Orientation in addition includes the following lexical strings (based on repetition, synonymy, co/hyponymy, co/metonymy in this field of discourse):

有人-黛玉-这个人-黛玉-贾母-黛玉-黛玉-黛玉-这熙凤-黛玉-贾母-老祖宗-老祖宗-贾母-这熙凤-熙凤-熙凤

笑-笑道-陪笑见礼-笑道-用帕拭泪-笑道-转悲为喜-问

In cohesive harmony analysis we are asking how strings and chains interact as far as experiential grammar is concerned (Hasan 1984, 1985). For example, the group "笑-笑道-陪笑见礼-笑道-用帕拭泪-笑道-转悲为喜-问". Hasan defines interaction as taking place when two or more members of a string or chain relate in the same way to two or more members of another string or chain.

Then, let us look briefly at cohesive harmony in relation to class.

Table 4.1 Mrs. Wang's activities (in sequence)

Agent (actor)	Process (range)	Medium (goal)	Circumstance
有人	笑声		
这熙凤	携着	黛玉的手	
[这熙凤]	上下细细打谅		
[这熙凤]	送至	贾母身边	坐下
[这熙凤]	笑道		
[这熙凤]	用帕拭泪		
这熙凤	忙转悲为喜		
[这熙凤]	忙携	黛玉之手	问
[这熙凤]	又问	婆子们	
熙凤	亲为捧	茶果	
熙凤	道		
熙凤	道		

Table 4.2 Daiyu and Jiamu' activities (regrouped)

Agent (actor)	Process (range)	Medium (goal)	Circumstance
黛玉	纳罕		
黛玉	连忙起身接见		
黛玉	忙陪笑见礼		
贾母	笑道		
贾母	笑道		

For Hasan, the purpose of cohesive harmony analysis is to provide a measure of the coherence of a text. She defines peripheral tokens as meanings in the text which do not participate in identity chains or lexical strings, relevant tokens as meanings which do so participate, and central tokens as relevant tokens which interact (as illustrated above). She then suggests that:

. the lower the proportion of peripheral to relevant tokens, the more coherent a text is likely to be;

. the higher the proportion of central tokens to noncentral ones (i.e. of interacting to noninteracting relevant tokens), the more coherent a text is likely to be.

Temporal progression

一语未了，只听后院中有人笑声，说："我来迟了，不曾迎接远客！"……

心下想时，只见一群丫鬟围拥着一个人从后房门进来。……

黛玉连忙起身接见。……

黛玉正不知以何称呼，……

黛玉忙陪笑见礼，以"嫂"呼之。

这熙凤携着黛玉的手，上下细细打谅了一回，仍送至贾母身边坐下，因笑道……

说着，便用帕拭泪。……

这熙凤听了，忙转悲为喜道……

又忙携黛玉之手，问……

一面又问老婆子们……

说话时，已摆了茶果上来。熙凤亲为捧茶捧果。

又见二舅母问他……因又说道……

From the temporal progression, we can see in this part Wang Xifeng says a lot and does a lot. And Daiyu and Jia mu are less. So we can refer the power control. Although Jia mu is the biggest and eldest one, but she quite likes Wang Xifeng. So Wang Xifeng is quite powerful now. What's more, Daiyu is at the beginning of coming to Jia's Mansion, so she is cautious and doesn't talk much.

Then let us see another point, we can see other knowledge from the theme. There are many Unmarked theme. For example,

一语未了，只听后院中有人笑声，说："我来迟了，不曾迎接远客！"黛玉纳罕道……贾母笑道……

Then let's compare it with two kinds theme in Piggybook (Brown 1989):

Mr. Piggott lived with his two sons, Simon and Patrick, in a nice house with a nice garden, and a nice in the nice garage. Inside the house was his wife.

The first one is unmarked theme, and the second one is marked one. And the marked one is the unusual situation.

Then let's see the parallel waves in this part:

一语未了，只听后院中有人笑声，说……
　这熙凤携着黛玉的手
　　[ ]上下细细打谅了一回，
　　[ ]仍送至贾母身边坐下
[ ]因笑道……
黛玉纳罕道……
　黛玉连忙起身接见。
　黛玉这个不知以何称呼，
　黛玉忙陪笑见礼，以"嫂"呼之。
贾母笑道
贾母笑道

So we can see the verbs and know the class and language difference and the cohesion.

Some analysis (Martin, 1979; Hasan, 1984) shows that the degree of discourse's cohesive harmony is agreed with the reader' institution of the cohesion. What's more, because of the related word item, peripheral item, central item, noncentral item and the interaction interruption can be counted in quantification, thus, the cohesive harmony is beneficial to the quantization to the degree of cohesion and put forward the assumption to quantitative analysis according to the quantization features of cohesive harmony. However, some scholars consider that the theory of cohesive harmony to the subjects of the study, concrete operations and the scientificity of the theoretical objects need to improve.

IV. Conclusion

From the analysis of the part and cohesive harmony theory, we can know more about the cohesion. Drawing on Martin (1992, 2001), we have described the ways in which cohesion can be recontextualized as discourse semantics (identification, negotiation, conjunction, ideation).The Hallidayan model of cohesion is limited in their scope of research, as is made explicit by Halliday and Hasan themselves. Therefore any attempt to use it to account for the coherence of any natural utterance is dangerous and bound to give rise to disputes about the model. However, this model of cohesion itself leaves much room for improvement.

References

[1]. Charolles, M. 1983. 'Coherence as a principle in the interpretation of discourse.' Text 3: 71-97.
[2]. Danes F. 1974. 'Functional Sentence Perspective and the Organization of the Text.' In Danes, F. (ed.), Papers on Functional Sentence Perspective. The Hague: Mouton.
[3]. Gleason, H. A. Jr. 1968. Contrastive analysis in discourse structure. Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics). [reprinted in Makkai and Lockwood 1973: 258-276.]
[4]. Gutwinski, W. 1976. 'Cohesion in Literary Texts: A Study of Some Grammatical and Lexical Features of English Discourse'. The Hague: Mouton Linguarum Series Minor 204.
[5]. Halliday, M.A.K. 1961. 'Categories of the theory of grammar', Word, 17, 241-292.
[6]. Halliday, M.A.K. 1964. 'The linguistic study of literary texts'. In H.G. Lunt (ed.), Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists. The Hague: Mouton. 302-7. [reprinted in S. Chatman and S.R. Levin. 1967. Essays on the Language of Literature. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. 217-223.]
[7]. Halliday, M.A. K. 1967. 'Notes on transitivity and theme in English. Part 2.' Journal of Linguistics, 3, 199-244.
[8]. Halliday, M.A.K. 1974. Language and Social Man. Schools Council Program in Linguistics & English Teaching, SeriesII, Paper 3. London: Longman.
[9]. Halliday, M.A.K. 1978. Language as a Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning. London: Edward Arnold.
[10]. Halliday, M.A.K. 1985b. 'Dimensions of Discourse: Grammar', in van Dijk (ed.) Handbook of Discourse Analysis. London: Academic Press Inc. (London) Ltd.
[11]. Halliday, M.A.K. 1993. Systemic Grammar and the Concept of a 'Science of Language' in 朱永生（主编）1993.《语言·语篇·语境》北京：清华大学出版社
[12]. Halliday, M.A.K. 1994. An Introduction to Functional Grammar. (Second edition). London: Edward Arnold.

[13]. Halliday, M.A.K. 1998. 'The Notion of Context in Language Education' in Ghadessy Mohsen (ed.) Text and Context in Functional Linguistics. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

[14]. Halliday, M.A.K. &Hasan, R. 1976. Cohesion in English. London: Longman.

[15]. Halliday, M.A.K &Hasan,R. 1985. Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-semiotic Perspective. Victoria: Deakin University Press.

[16]. Halliday, M.A.K. and J.R. Martin. 1993. Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power. London: Falmer (Critical Perspectives on Literacy and Education).

[17]. Hasan, R.1968. Grammatical Cohesion in Spoken and Written English, Part One. London: Longman.

[18]. Martin, J. 1992. English text: system and structure. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

[19]. Winddowson, H.G. 1979. Explorations in Applied Linguistics. OUP.

[20]. 程雨民，1986，英语使用中的表面不连贯，《外国语》第 4 期

[21]. 胡壮麟，1994，《语篇的衔接与连贯》，上海：上海外语教育出版社

[22]. 黄国文，1988《语篇分析概论》，长沙：湖南教育出版社

[23]. 林纪诚，1988，试论语篇连贯性的条件，《现代外语》第 4 期

[24]. 林纪诚，1989，语义连贯的语用模式，《外语教学》第 2 期

[25]. 张德禄，2000，论语篇连贯，《外语教学与研究》第 2 期

[26]. 张德禄，2001，论衔接，《外国语》第 2 期

[27]. 朱永生，1996，语篇连贯的内部条件（上），《现代外语》第 4 期

[28]. 朱永生，1997a，语篇连贯的内部条件（下），《现代外语》第 1 期

[29]. 朱永生，1997b，韩礼德的语篇连贯标准-外界的误解与自身的不足《外语教学与研究》第 1 期