



VNU Journal of Foreign Studies

Journal homepage: <https://jfs.ulis.vnu.edu.vn/>

THE TEXTURE OF A LITERARY TEXT: AN EXPLORATION OF TEXTUAL COHESION RESOURCES IN *A TALE OF TWO CITIES*

Hoang Van Van*

*Faculty of English Language and Culture, VNU University of Languages and International Studies,
No.2 Pham Van Dong, Cau Gay, Hanoi, Vietnam*

Received 02 December 2024

Revised 12 May 2025; Accepted 22 May 2025

Abstract: This descriptive qualitative-quantitative paper is an in-depth enquiry into how the textual cohesion resources are utilised in the construction of texture or textual cohesion meanings of a literary text – a topic that has received scarce attention in English literature teaching, learning and research, particularly at tertiary EFL (English as a Foreign Language) departments or faculties. The text under investigation is Chapter 1 entitled “The Period” of “Book the First” of the three-book novel *A Tale of Two Cities* by the famous British novelist Charles Dickens. The main theoretical framework adopted in this study is Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) textual cohesion model as propounded in their seminal monograph *Cohesion in English*. The aspects of analysis are grammatical and lexical cohesion resources. The study shows that Charles Dickens has deployed a diverse range of textual cohesion resources to construct texture of his text, among which four stand out. First, in terms of reference resources, there is a very high frequency of endophoric references. Second, as regards conjunction resources, additive relation predominates. Third, concerning lexical cohesion resources, repetition takes up the largest proportion. And fourth, virtually no substitution and ellipsis are utilised in the text. The study closes with a résumé of the points explored, the salient textual cohesion resources deployed in the text, a recommendation affirming the relevance of Halliday and Hasan’s textual cohesion model to the study of texture or textual cohesion meanings of texts in general and of literary texts in particular for EFL literature teaching, learning and research, and a suggestion for further study.

Keywords: texture, grammatical cohesion, lexical cohesion, textual cohesion model, *A Tale of Two Cities*

* Corresponding author.

Email address: vanhv.sdh@gmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.63023/2525-2445/jfs.ulis.5432>

KẾT CẤU CỦA MỘT VĂN BẢN VĂN HỌC: KHÁM PHÁ CÁC NGUỒN TÀI NGUYÊN LIÊN KẾT VĂN BẢN TRONG MỘT CÂU CHUYỆN VỀ HAI THÀNH PHỐ

Hoàng Văn Vân

*Khoa Ngôn ngữ và Văn hóa Anh, Trường Đại học Ngoại ngữ, Đại học Quốc gia Hà Nội,
Số 2 Phạm Văn Đồng, Cầu Giấy, Hà Nội, Việt Nam*

Nhận bài ngày 02 tháng 12 năm 2024

Chỉnh sửa ngày 12 tháng 5 năm 2025; Chấp nhận đăng ngày 22 tháng 5 năm 2025

Tóm tắt: Bài báo theo hướng mô tả định tính - định lượng này là một nghiên cứu chuyên sâu về các nguồn tài nguyên liên kết văn bản được sử dụng như thế nào trong việc kiến tạo kết cấu hay ý nghĩa liên kết văn bản của một diễn ngôn văn học – một chủ đề ít được quan tâm trong giảng dạy, học tập và nghiên cứu văn học tiếng Anh, đặc biệt là tại các bộ môn hay các khoa dạy tiếng Anh như một ngoại ngữ trong các trường đại học. Văn bản được nghiên cứu là Chương 1 có tựa đề “Thời ấy” của “Tập thứ nhất” trong bộ tiểu thuyết ba tập *Một câu chuyện về hai thành phố* của tiểu thuyết gia người Anh nổi tiếng Charles Dickens. Khung lý thuyết chính được sử dụng trong nghiên cứu này là mô hình liên kết văn bản của Halliday và Hasan (1976) như được đề xuất trong chuyên khảo có tính khai sáng của họ *Liên kết trong tiếng Anh*. Các khía cạnh phân tích là các nguồn tài nguyên liên kết ngữ pháp và các nguồn tài nguyên liên kết từ vựng. Nghiên cứu cho thấy Charles Dickens đã sử dụng một phạm vi các nguồn tài nguyên liên kết văn bản đa dạng để kiến tạo nên kết cấu của diễn ngôn, trong đó có bốn nguồn tài nguyên nổi bật. Thứ nhất, xét về các nguồn tài nguyên tham chiếu, có một tần suất rất cao các tham chiếu nội chỉ. Thứ hai, xét về các nguồn tài nguyên liên từ, quan hệ bổ sung chiếm ưu thế. Thứ ba, liên quan đến các nguồn tài nguyên liên kết từ vựng, liên kết lặp lại chiếm tỉ lệ lớn nhất. Thứ tư, hầu như không có liên kết thay thế và liên kết tinh lược nào được sử dụng trong diễn ngôn. Nghiên cứu kết thúc bằng việc tóm tắt lại các nội dung đã khám phá, các nguồn tài nguyên liên kết văn bản nổi bật được sử dụng trong diễn ngôn, khuyến nghị khẳng định sự quan yếu của mô hình liên kết văn bản của Halliday và Hasan đối với nghiên cứu về kết cấu hoặc ý nghĩa liên kết văn bản của diễn ngôn nói chung và của diễn ngôn văn học nói riêng phục vụ cho giảng dạy, học tập và nghiên cứu văn học trong dạy tiếng Anh như một ngoại ngữ, và gợi ý cho việc nghiên cứu tiếp trong tương lai.

Từ khóa: kết cấu, liên kết ngữ pháp, liên kết từ vựng, mô hình liên kết văn bản, *Một câu chuyện về hai thành phố*

1. Introduction

Texture – a property that makes a text “hang together as a text” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 23) – has been a key focus of investigation in text/discourse analysis (cf. Forey & Thompson, 2009). It is generally defined as the features that make a text a unified whole and give it meanings. These include grammatical patterns in a text (concerned with transitivity patterns realising experiential meanings, mood patterns realising interpersonal meanings, theme patterns realising textual meanings, and clause complexing patterns realising logical meanings) and the relationships between words in a text (concerned with textual cohesion resources realising texture or textual cohesion meanings) (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, 1989). In this study, an attempt is made to look specifically at how textual cohesion resources are deployed to construct texture or textual cohesion meanings of a literary text – a topic which seems to have received very little attention in English literature teaching, learning and research, particularly

at tertiary EFL (English as a foreign language) departments or faculties. The data for analysis is Chapter 1 entitled “The Period” of “Book the First” of the three-book novel *A Tale of Two Cities* by the eminent British novelist Charles Dickens. The reason for the choice of the data is that *A Tale of Two Cities* is one of Charles Dickens’ best and most exciting and successful literary works, and the novel has been adapted for film, television, radio, and the stage in Britain (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/A_Tale_of_Two_Cities), and it has been translated into several languages, including Vietnamese (see Dickens, 2018). The main theoretical framework adopted for analysis is what I would like to refer to as “textual cohesion model” (TCM) as developed in Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) seminal monograph *Cohesion in English*. The study is organized around five sections. Section 1 is concerned with rationale of the study. Section 2 provides an overview of the key concepts relating to textual cohesion resources realising textual cohesion meanings of text. Section 3 deals with research methodology. Section 4 presents in detail some of the prominent textual cohesion resources deployed in the construction of textual cohesion meanings of the text. Section 5 summarizes the main points explored and the salient textual cohesion resources deployed in the text, recommends the relevance of the TCM to the analysis of literary texts, and makes a suggestion for further research.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Introductory Remarks

Among the various studies on textual cohesion to date, Halliday and Hasan’s *Cohesion in English* is perhaps the most prominent monograph. Since its publication in 1976, this seminal monograph has become a groundwork for a great number of text cohesion studies and text cohesion analysis (e.g. Hasan, 1984, 2011; Halliday & Hasan, 1989; Martin, 1983, 1992, 2001; Hoang 2006; Forey & Thompson, 2009; and many others).

Drawing on insights from traditional as well as modern semantics and stylistics, Halliday and Hasan (1976) developed a set of abstract theoretical concepts and built them into a coherent text linguistics theory. Then Halliday (1985, 1994) and Halliday and Matthiessen (2004/2014) made a step further, incorporating this textual cohesion aspect called “Around the Clause: Cohesion and Discourse” into the design of SFG (systemic functional grammar), making it an indispensable component of the framework for exploring and understanding texture or textual cohesion meanings of a text. In terms of meaning, “Cohesion is a semantic relation between an element in the text and some other element that is crucial to the interpretation of it” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 8). In terms of realization, cohesion is a non-structural linguistic resource; it is a way of relating linguistic entities across all kinds of syntactic and other structural boundaries. In *Cohesion in English*, Halliday and Hasan deal with quite a number of textual cohesion concepts. However, for purposes of this paper, we will focus on two main headings: grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion.

2.2. Grammatical Cohesion

Halliday and Hasan (1976) recognise four main types of grammatical cohesion: reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. These cohesive resources will be examined in the sections that follow.

2.2.1. Reference

Halliday and Hasan (1976, p. 33) make a useful distinction between what can be referred to as “endophoric reference” and “exophoric reference”. Endophoric reference is reference

within the text or reference to context of text; it consists of five subtypes: anaphoric reference, cataphoric reference, personal reference, demonstrative reference, and comparative reference. Exophoric reference, in contrast, is reference to context of situation. To begin, let us consider Extracts [1] and [2] below. (The reference items in point are in italics; the extracts are divided into clause simplexes and are given numbers enclosed in round brackets.)

- [1] (1) *The rocket* has just taken off. (2) *It* is going to Mars. (3) Scientists have been sending spacecraft there for several years now. (4) About 100 years ago an *astronomer* looked at *Mars* through *his* telescope and said *he* could see canals *there*. (5) Ever since *he* did that, people have been asking the same question: (6) “Is there life on Mars?”
- [2] (7) Within five or ten minutes, or more than that, three of the others had called *her*. (8) “*Kathy*, *this* is *David*. (9) I’ve given our son Fin a *birthday present*; (10) but he wants *another one* from you.”

A cursory look at Extracts [1] and [2] will reveal that they contain a number of instances of what can be referred to as cohesive relations. In Extract [1], *It* in clause (2) is semantically related to *The rocket* in clause (1): *It* refers back to *The rocket*; *he* in clause (4) and *he* in clause (5) are semantically related to *astronomer* in clause (4): they both refer back to *astronomer*. These instances of cohesive relation can be generally referred to as **anaphoric reference**, defined as an item or items which point(s) the reader or listener “backwards” to a previous mentioned entity, process, or state of affairs (Halliday & Hassan, 1976; see also Halliday 1985, 1994; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004/2014; Hoang, 2006).

In contrast, in Extract [2], the personal possessive adjective or pronoun *her* in clause (7) does not refer backwards but simply refers forwards to *Kathy* in clause (8). This kind of cohesive relation is called **cataphoric reference**, defined as an item or items which point(s) the reader or listener “forwards” – it draws them further into the text in order to identify the element(s) to which the reference item(s) refer(s) (Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Hoang, 2006).

A closer inspection of Extract [1] shows that the cohesive relation between *It* in clause (2) and *The rocket* in clause (1), and that between *he* in clause (4) and *he* in clause (5) and *astronomy* in clause (4) are different in nature. In the former type, the relation is between two things: *It* to *The rocket*, which can be called non-personal reference, whereas in the latter type, the relation is between two humans: *he* and *he* to *astronomer*, which can be referred to as **personal reference**, defined as reference by means of function in speech situation and through the category of person (Hoang, 2006, p. 75).

In Extract [1], we can notice that the adverb *there* in clause (4): About 100 years ago an astronomer looked at Mars through his telescope and said he could see canals *there*, and in Extract [2], we can see the demonstrative pronoun *this* in clause (8): *Kathy*, *this* is David. These are forms of verbal pointing by the speaker who identifies the referent by locating it on the scale of proximity in terms of space and time: *this* points forwards to *David*, and *there* backwards to *Mars*. Halliday and Hasan (1976, p. 57) call these types of reference collectively **demonstrative reference**.

In Extract [2], we can notice the nominal group *a birthday present* in clause (8) and the nominal group *another one* in clause (9). Like the cohesive relation between *he* and *astronomer* (personal reference) and that between *there* and *Mars* (demonstrative reference) in Extract [1], their presence contributes to textual cohesion. But whereas personal reference and demonstrative reference, when used anaphorically, set up a relation of co-reference, whereby the same entity is referred to over again, *a birthday present* and *another one* set up a relation of contrast which is referred to as **comparative reference**.

A closer examination of clause (1) in Extract [1] shows that the definite nominal group *The rocket* at the beginning of the clause does not refer backwards. Nor does it point the reader or listener forwards. In order to know what or where *The rocket* refers to, we need an extralinguistic context, what over one hundred years ago the eminent British anthropologist Manilowski (1923) called “context of situation” accompanying the utterance *The rocket has just taken off* ... In *Cohesion in English*, Halliday and Hasan (1976) call this type of cohesive relation **exophoric reference**, defined as a kind of reference which refers to the context of situation (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 33; see also Halliday & Hasan, 1985, p. 76; Hasan, 1996, p. 197).

2.2.2. Substitution

Substitution is a cohesive type of relation. It can refer to relation between linguistic items, such as words and phrases. It can also refer to the process or result of replacing one item by another at a particular place in discourse. There are three types of substitution: nominal substitution, verbal substitution, and clausal substitution.

Nominal substitution is concerned with the use of a substitute word to replace the Head of a corresponding nominal group. In English, the noun functioning as the Head is always countable. Nominal substitution is realised by items such as *one*, *ones*, and *same*. Below are some examples:

[3] There are three books on the table. Which *one* do you like to borrow?

[4] Cherry ripe, cherry ripe, ripe I cry,

Full and fair *ones* – come and buy.

[5] A: I'll have two poached eggs on toast, please.

B: I'll have the *same*.

Verbal substitution is a type of substitution which is concerned with a substitute word in the place that is occupied by the lexical verb. The verbal substitute in English is *do*. It operates as Head of a verbal group, and its position is always final in the group. Below are two examples:

[6] The words did not come the same as they *do*.

[7] I don't know the meaning of half of those long words, and, what's more, I don't believe you *do* either.

Clausal substitution is a type of substitution in which what is presupposed is not an element within the clause but an entire clause. The common linguistic items used as substitutes in English are *so* and *not*. Here are two examples:

[8] A: Has David submitted his assignment?

B: I hope *so*.

[9] A: Will she come to the meeting?

B: I think *not*.

2.2.3. Ellipsis

Ellipsis refers to the omission of part of an utterance or grammatical structure, which can be readily understood by the hearer or reader in the co-text of text or context of situation (Wales, 2001, p. 121; see also Galperin, 1981). To put it another way, ellipsis is used in the sense that something is omitted in a structure but the missing part can always be recovered from another structure within a sentence or beyond a sentence (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 143; Hoang, 2006,

pp. 78-79). Ellipsis as a cohesive device always appears anaphoric. Like substitution, ellipsis falls into three subtypes: nominal ellipsis, verbal ellipsis, and clausal ellipsis.

Nominal ellipsis refers to omission or ellipse in the nominal group. Nominal ellipsis can be ellipsis of Subject. This type of ellipsis cohesion is commonly found in paratactic clause complex. For example (the symbol [] indicates the ellipsed item).

- [10] (1) *the guard* shot three dead, and then (2) [] got shot dead himself by the other four
 [11] (1) *Jack* fell down and (2) [] broke his crown ...

In the above examples, there are Subject ellipses in [10] (2) and in [11] (2), but they can be retrieved from the previous clauses: *the guard* in [10] (1) and *Jack* in [11] (1).

Nominal ellipsis can also be found in nominal group in English. At experiential level it is typically realised by the structure of Deictic + Numerative + Epithet + Classifier + Thing/Head as in *The* (Deictic) *three* (Numerative) *beautiful* (Epithet) *garden* (Classifier) *flowers* (Thing/Head). When the Thing/Head is omitted, one of the elements in the modifier must take the role of the Thing/Head, but the reader can recover the omitted Thing/Head from the presupposition. Below is an example in point.

- [12] A: I like the red *hat*.
 B: I prefer the *green* [].

In the above example, there is a nominal ellipsis, but it can be retrieved from the previous clause: *hat*. We also notice that *green* which functions as Epithet in the nominal group is now functioning as Head.

Verbal ellipsis refers to omission or ellipse in the verbal group. Since the verbal group in English consists of Finite plus Predicator such as *is* (Finite) *speaking* (Predicator), it follows automatically that any clausal ellipsis in which the Mood element is present but the Residue omitted will involve ellipsis within the verbal group. Below are two examples to illustrate the point.

- [13] A: Has Kathy been working hard?
 B: Yes, she *has* [].
 [14] A: What are you doing?
 B. [] *Dancing*.

The two verbal groups in the answers, *has* (in *Yes, she has*) in [13] B and *Dancing* in [14] B are both instances of verbal ellipse. Both of them can be said to stand for *has been working hard* in [13] B and *am dancing* in [14] B.

Clausal ellipsis takes the presupposing clause as a basic structure where ellipsis occurs in constituents like the Subject, Complement, Predicator and Adjunct. The missing part can be recovered from the corresponding presupposed structure in another clause. Undoubtedly the whole clause can be omitted. Example:

- [15] A: Long has gone to Ho Chi Minh City this morning.
 B: Has he? He didn't tell me [].

In the above example, there is a clausal ellipsis in [15] B, but it can be recovered from the previous clause. Therefore, the clause that is omitted would be *he's gone to Ho Chi Minh City this morning*.

2.2.4. Conjunction

Conjunction differs from reference, substitution, and ellipsis in that it is not a device for reminding the reader or listener of previously mentioned entities, actions, and states of affairs. In other words, it is not what linguists call an anaphoric relation. However, it is a cohesive device because it signals relationships that can only be fully understood through reference to other parts of the discourse.

Conjunctive cohesion in discourse analysis can be studied either in a narrow way in terms of the logical relation between consecutive clauses (clause complex), or in a broad way in terms of the logical relation between consecutive events irrespective of their being two sentences or two clauses in a clause complex. For example:

[16] He was very uncomfortable. *Nevertheless*, he fell asleep.

[17] You need to cleanse the skin well, *then* to use a good cleaner.

Both the examples above show that from what has been said in the first clause or event one can predict what is going to follow next. Such relation is achieved by the use of a conjunction or can be checked by the possibility of its insertion. Among the many types and subtypes of conjunctive relation introduced by Halliday and Hasan (1976), Halliday (1985, 1994) and Halliday and Matthiessen (2014), four are the most common: adversative, additive, temporal, and causal.

The semantic meaning of **adversative relation** is “contrary to expectation”. The expectation may be derived from the content of what is being said or from the communication process, the speaker-hearer situation. For example:

[18] I’m afraid I’ll be home late tonight. *However*, I won’t have to go in until late tomorrow.

[19] All the figures were correct; they’d been checked. *Yet* the total came out wrong.

Adversative sense in English is expressed by a number of words such as *however*, *yet*, *although*, *though*, *but*, *in spite of*, *in contrast*, *contrary to*, *adversely*, *nevertheless*, *despite*.

Halliday and Hasan (1976, pp. 233-234 and p. 244) suggest that the term **additive** should be distinguished from the term “coordinative”, because coordination in clause/sentence grammar implies the relation of a purely paratactic type, and the position of the two related items are interchangeable in most cases, such as *and* in “Winter has gone *and* spring has come”. But in text grammar, clauses have to succeed one another, it follows that the conjunctive which introduces the second clause always carries the meaning “there is something more to say”. It is no longer paratactic in its proper sense. It is for this reason that the term “additive” is preferable. Additive sense in English is expressed by the conjunctions *and* and *or* (indicating alternative meaning). Below are two examples:

[20] the mail was waylaid by seven robbers, *and* the guard shot three dead, *and* then got shot dead himself by the other four.

[21] Which do you prefer, learning English *or* [] French?

The **causal relation** is undoubtedly cohesive in a discursive environment, as it must consist of two elements, cause and effect. Logically a cause precedes an effect, but in real speech situations, people sometimes start with the effect and then find its root in the cause. In any case, however, the logical relation remains the same; that is to say “because a, then b” has the same value as “b, because a”. Parallel to the causal relationship, there is a conditional relation. While the causal relation is concerned with the real fact(s), the conditional relation

mainly deals with the formula “if a, then b”, or “b, if a”, where the condition “a” functions as the cause implicitly, without which there will be no result. In English the simple form of causal relation is expressed by conjunctive items such as *so*, *thus*, *hence*, *therefore*, *nevertheless*, *however*, *consequently*, *accordingly*, and a number of conjunctive expressions like *as a result (of that)*, *in consequence (of that)*, *because of that*. Below are three examples of causal relation. The first is marked by *so*, the second by *Thus*, and the third by *Consequently*.

[22] ... she felt that there was no time to be lost, as she was shrinking rapidly; *so* she got to work at once to eat some of the other bit.

[23] ..., those two of the large jaws, and those other two of the plain and the fair faces, trod with stir enough, and carried their divine rights with a high hand. *Thus* did the year one thousand seven hundred and seventy-five conduct their greatnesses, and myriads of small creatures - the creatures of this chronicle among the rest – along the roads that lay before them.

[24] She wouldn't have heard it at all, if it hadn't come quite close to her ears. *Consequently*, it tickled her ears very much, and quite took off her thoughts from the unhappiness of the poor little creature.

Clauses in a discourse are also tied together by their **temporal relation**, because a discourse is not a collection of unrelated processes, such as a dictionary of quotations. A discourse must be a unified whole, reflecting the whole process of an episode. Being an episode, the event or the story has to develop in accordance with the sequence of time which falls into three main types of temporal relation: simple temporal relation, complex temporal relation, and conclusive temporal relation.

Simple temporal relation refers to the relation between two events, one of which may be an earlier event and the other the later event (sequential relation). Of course, the two events can occur simultaneously (simultaneous relation), or the second event can refer to the previous event (preceding relation). Temporal markers in a discourse which express this sort of relation are regarded as simple temporal markers. In English, simple temporal markers are *then*, *next*, *afterwards*, *after that*, *subsequently*; *(just) then*, *at the same time*, *simultaneously*; *earlier*, *before*, *then/that*, *previously*. Below is an example of simple temporal relation which is realised by *Then*.

[25] The alarm goes off at 4.30. I get up and go and wake Warren. *Then* I go downstairs, make some tea, and take a cup up to Warren.

With **complex temporal relation**, the meaning is more specific, often in conjunction with some addition elements. Temporal relations may be immediate, interrupted, repetitive, specific, durative, terminal, and punctiliar. These relations are realised by conjunctives such as *at once*, *on which*, *just before*, *after a time*, *next time*, *this time*, *on this occasion*, *next day*, *all this time*, *by this time*, *until then*, *next moment*, etc. Below is an example of complex temporal relation:

[26] The weather cleared just as the party approached the summit. *Until then* they had seen nothing of the panorama around them.

Conclusive relation differs from those above in the sense that it is one-directional; i.e., the event is subsequent to all events in a particular passage. In English this type of temporal relation is realised by conjunctives such as *finally*, *at last*, *in the end*, *eventually*, *in short*, *until*, *at length*, *briefly*, *to resume*, etc. Below is an example of conclusive temporal relation.

[27] It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, [...] – *in short*, the period was so far like the present period, that some of its

noisiest authorities insisted on its being received, for good or evil, in the superlative degree of comparison only.

2.3. Lexical Cohesion

The concept of lexical cohesion was first advanced in terms of collocation by Firth (1957) and was developed in some detail by Halliday (1961, 1966, and elsewhere). Lexical cohesion occurs when two words in a discourse are semantically related in some way. Halliday and Hasan (1976) recognise two major categories of lexical cohesion: reiteration and collocation.

2.3.1. Reiteration

Reiteration refers to “a form of lexical cohesion which involves the repetition of a lexical item at one end of the scale, the use of a general word to refer back to a lexical item, at the other end of the scale” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 278). Under reiteration, six categories are identified, namely, repetition, synonymy, superordinate-hyponymy, meronymy, antonymy, and general words.

Repetition refers to the same lexical item with the same meaning occurring more than one in the same discourse. It is a stylistic device that writers employ to “reinforce the message” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014, p. 463) or “to fix the attention of the reader on the key-word of the utterance” (Galperin, 1981, p. 211). Below are two examples to show the repetition of the verb *tilted* and the adverb *again* in [28], and the noun *period* in [29].

[28] “You get me a file.” He *tilted* me *again*. “And you get me wittles.” He *tilted* me *again*. “You bring ’em both to me”. He *tilted* me *again*.

[29] the *period* was so far like the present *period*

Synonymy refers to the relation between different words bearing the same meaning or nearly the same (identical) meaning for a particular person, object, process or quality. In example [30] below, *sound* is synonymous with *noise*, and *cavalry* with *horses*.

[30] He was just wondering which road to take when he was startled by a *sound* from behind him. It was the *noise* of trotting *horses* ... He dismounted and led his horse as quickly as he could along the right-hand road. The sound of the *cavalry* grew rapidly nearer...

It is commonly accepted that superordinate is concerned with class and subclass relation, and meronymy is with part and whole relation. Both constitute a set of choices under the taxonomic. The first relation can be termed **superordinate-hyponymy** and the second one, **meronymy**.

The main idea of superordinate-hyponymy is ‘inclusion’; that is, a lower term – the hyponym – is included in an upper term – the superordinate. The relation between the two lower terms is that of co-hyponym. [31] and [32] are instances of superordinate-hyponym and co-hyponym relations.

[31] *animal* *dog, cat, bear, monkey*

[32] *vehicle* *car, bus, coach, motorbike*

In meronymy, the relation between two parts is one of co-meronym. Instances of meronym and co-meronym relations are exemplified in [33] and [34].

[33] *door, driving wheel, headlight, brake* *car*

[34] *top, branch, limb, root, trunk* *tree*

Antonymy “involves opposition between two terms” (Hasan, 1996, p. 193). In other words, it refers to a contrast between two word items which can be expected. Antonymy can be further divided into contrary, complementary, relational opposite and ordered series.

Contrary relation refers to those pairs of opposites that are gradable as *best* and *worst* in

[35] It was the *best* of times, it was the *worst* of times.

Complementary relation consists of a set of only two opposites. Thus, the denial of one implies the assertion of the other, and the assertion of one implies the denial of the other. The two expressions *everything* – *nothing* in [36] and *win* – *lose* in [37] are the examples in point.

[36] We had *everything* before us, we had *nothing* before us

[37] Everybody knows that an army can be bribed to *win*, but nobody seems to have thought of bribing it to *lose* a battle.

Relational opposite relation is concerned with two opposite words which are mutually dependent and co-existent. Examples are *mob* – *musketees* in [38] and *doctor* – *patient* in [39].

[38] The *mob* fired on the *musketees*, and the *musketees* fired on the *mob*.

[39] He is a *doctor* and she is a *patient*.

Finally, antonymy can be expressed in terms of **ordered series**. Each item in the series is against the others, but there are more than two opposites and each item is arranged in rank or in order. As a result, they are non-gradable. Examples are *spring* – *winter* in [40], and *eight* – *nine* in [41].

[40] It was the *spring* of hope, it was the *winter* of despair.

[41] It was *eight* o'clock, er, no, *nine* – that's it, *nine* o'clock, Sir.

General words. In the lexis system of every language, there is a class of general nouns, which have generalised reference within the major noun classes, such as “human noun”: people, person, man, woman, child, boy, girl, “object noun”: thing, object, “place noun”: Hanoi, London, Paris. These items are often neglected in the descriptions of not only English but also of other languages, but they play a significant part in verbal interaction, and are also an important source of cohesion particularly in the spoken language (Halliday, 1966, Halliday & Hasan, 1976). The following examples illustrate the cohesive function of general words.

[42] A: Didn't everyone in our class make it clear they expected the *class monitor* to resign?

B: They did. But it seems to have made no impression on the *guy*.

[43] A: Did you try *pho* (phở) when you visited Vietnam?

B: Yes, I did. I liked the *thing* very much.

In [42], *guy* in the second move is the general noun for human. It includes the specific noun *class monitor* in the first move and is semantically related to it anaphorically. In the same way, in [43], *thing* in the second move is the general noun for object. It includes the specific noun *pho* in the second move and is semantically related to it anaphorically.

2.3.2. Lexical Collocation

Collocation refers to lexical cohesion that is achieved through the association of lexical items that regularly co-occur. Collocation does not depend on taxonomic organisation of word items, because many word items belong to classes other than nouns, such as verbs, adjectives

and adverbs, which are difficult to organise taxonomically. Under collocation, three subtypes are recognised: resultative, modificational, and contextual.

Resultative collocation refers to the relation of one item leading to the outcome of another item such as *kill – die*, *rain – wet*, *dark – night*, *praise – please*, *river – flow*, *wind – blow*, *chair – sit*, etc. **Modificational collocation** is concerned with the relation holding between an item and one of its inherent qualities; e.g., *run – fast*, *bright – sun*, *dark – night*, *clear – voice*, *face – pale*, *rain – heavy*, *thunder – loud*, etc. **Contextual collocation** differs from the resultative collocation in that the word items do not represent a cause–effect relation, but expectation can be made between the process and the participant. The words concerned are merely nouns and verbs. Examples are *house – build*, *assets – go bankrupt*, *doctor – examine*, *teacher – teach/explain*, *bishop – preach*, etc. Apart from this, the relation of things or objects that tend to occur together in the contextual situation can also be included under this heading. For example: *car – driver*, *river – bank*, *ship – yard*, *study – books*, *read – newspapers*, *withdraw – deposit/interest*, etc.

Halliday and Hasan (1976, p. 288 and elsewhere) and Nunan (1993, 1999) note that due to the complexity of the concept, collocation can cause major problems for the discourse researcher because it includes all those items in a discourse that are semantically related. In some cases, this makes it difficult to decide for certain whether a cohesive relationship exists or not. They point out that the main problem is that collocation is expressed through open rather than closed class items. Furthermore, there is no limit to the items that can be used to express collocation. This means that it is difficult to establish sets of regularly co–occurring words and phrases. An additional problem is the fact that many lexical relationships are text– as well as context–bound. This means that words and phrases that are related in one text may not be related in another. For example, the words *cat* and *friend* can hardly be said to contract a significant cohesive relation. However, in the following example they are synonymous or cohesive by means of co-synonymy.

[44] My wife bought a nice little *cat* last month. The *cat* is now her best *friend*.

Given this text-bound nature of many lexical relationships, it is impossible to develop a finite list of relatable lexical items in English. However, despite its problematic nature, lexical cohesion is, in many ways, the most interesting of all the cohesive categories (Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Nunan, 1993, 1999; Hoang, 2006). The background knowledge of the reader plays a more obvious role in the perception of lexical relationships than in the perception of other types of cohesion. This is because collocation patterns will only be perceived by someone who knows something about the subject at hand. The text-bound nature of many lexical relations, and the role of the language user in perceiving these, creates a problem for the linguist concerned with providing a semantic account of lexical cohesion.

3. Research Design and Methodology

This study employs a descriptive qualitative-quantitative research method which can be reflected in the subsections that follow.

3.1. Aim of Study and Research Questions

The overarching aim of this study is to uncover salient textual cohesion resources Charles Dickens deploys to achieve cohesive effect or texture of his text, using Halliday and Hasan's (1976) TCM developed in their *Cohesion in English* as the analytical framework. To achieve the above aim, the study sets for itself two questions for exploration:

- What textual cohesion resources does Charles Dickens utilise in the creation of texture of his text?
- How does Charles Dickens utilise those textual cohesion resources to construct texture of his text?

3.2. Data Collection, Data Analysis and Notational Conventions

The data collected for analysis is Chapter 1 entitled “The Period” of “Book the First” of the three-book novel *A Tale of Two Cities* by the eminent British novelist Charles Dickens. The version of the novel taken for analysis was published in 2003 by CRW Publishing Limited. For analytical purposes, the chapter under study is referred to as text.

Data analysis began by careful reading the text several times to ensure a comprehensive grasp of the content. During the reading process, special attention was paid to identifying tokens of textual cohesion resources utilised in the construction of texture or textual cohesion meanings of the text.

Cohesion is a vast and complex concept, covering so many areas of text meanings. Within the scope of this paper, the analysis of the text is limited to the following aspects: (1) analysis for base-line information of the text which includes the total running words of the text, the number of paragraphs of the text, and the number of clause simplexes of the text; (2) analysis of grammatical cohesion which includes reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction occurrences deployed in the text; and (3) analysis of lexical cohesion which includes repetition, synonym, antonym, superordinate-hyponym and meronym occurrences deployed in the text.

Instances of the analysed aspects are counted, frequency of each feature is obtained by number and, where possible, in proportion in relation to its relevant total, and percentage is rounded to the nearest figure. Findings are displayed in tables, and discussion of the prominent textual cohesion features realising texture or textual cohesion meanings of the text is provided.

The notational conventions used for analysis of the text are provided as follows: Clause simplex boundary is indicated by two vertical strokes: ||; and numbers of clause simplexes are indicated by Arabic numerals placed immediately before the clause wording: || (1), || (2), || (3), and so on (see Appendix). For example,

|| (17) There were a king with a large jaw and a queen with a plain face, on the throne of England;
 || (18) there were a king with a large jaw and a queen with a fair face, on the throne of France. ||
 (19) In both countries it was clearer than crystal to the lords of the State preserves of loaves and fishes, || (20) that things in general were settled for ever. ||

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1. Base-line Information

Findings of base-line information of the text can be summarised in Table 1.

Table 1

Base-line information

- Number of total running words:	1019
- Number of paragraphs:	6
- Number of clause simplexes:	80
- Number of finite clause simplexes:	63
- Number of non-finite clause simplexes:	17

Table 1 shows that the number of total running words of the text is 1019; and the text consists of 6 paragraphs, 80 clause simplexes which consists of 63 finite clause simplexes and 17 non-finite clause simplexes. Further findings existing in the text which are not shown in the table will be brought out in the analysis of the relevant sections that follow.

4.2. The Texture of the Text

Analysis for the texture of the text includes analysis of grammatical cohesion and analysis of lexical cohesion.

4.2.1. Grammatical Cohesion of the Text

Our analysis of the text shows that there are virtually no ellipses and substitutions. The analysis, therefore, will focus on two remaining cohesive resources: reference and conjunction.

4.2.1.1. Reference

Our analysis starts with Table 2 where we will present a detailed account of all types of reference found in the text except the definite article *the* which will be treated in a separate section (in 4.3.1.2). To facilitate further analysis and discussion, Table 2 is divided into six columns. The first column indicates cohesive devices (cohesive resources), the second column provides interpretative sources, the third column presents phoric or tie status of the device, the fourth column gives chain information which is stated in terms of the address of the preceding or following clause simplex(es) in the same chain, the fifth column presents the number of tokens deployed in each chain, and the final column provides the number of cohesive ties of each chain. Note that when the tie is exophoric, a blank is entered in the second column and is not counted in the fifth and sixth columns.

Table 2

Reference Resources Deployed in the Text

Cohesive device	Interpretative source	Phoric status	Chain	No. of tokens	No. of ties
it	period	endo: anaphoric	(10)-(9)-(8)-(7)-(6)-(5)-(4)-(3)-(2)-(1)	10	9
we		exophoric	(11)		
we		exophoric	(12)		
we		exophoric	(13)		
we		exophoric	(14)		
its (noisiest authorities)	period	endo: anaphoric	(16)-(15)	2	1
it		exophoric	(19)		
it		exophoric	(21)		
that (favoured period)	1775	endo: anaphoric	(22)-(21)	2	1
this (period)	the present period	endo: cataphoric	(22)-(15)	2	1
her (birthday)	Mrs. Southscott	endo: anaphoric	(23)-(23)	2	1
its (message)	Cock Lane ghost	endo: anaphoric	(26)-(25)	2	1
theirs (their messages)	spirits	endo: anaphoric	(27)-(27)	2	1
her (sister)	England	endo: anaphoric	(30)-(30)	2	1
her (... pastors)	France	endo: anaphoric	(33)-(30)	2	1

she	France	endo: anaphoric	(33)-(30)	2	1
his (hands)	youth	endo: anaphoric	(33)-(33)	2	1
his (tongue)	youth	endo: anaphoric	(33)-(33)	2	1
his (body)	youth	endo: anaphoric	(33)-(33)	2	1
he	youth	endo: anaphoric	(34)-(33)	2	1
his (view)	youth	endo: anaphoric	(35)-(33)	2	1
It		exophoric	(36)		
it	movable framework	endo: anaphoric	(37)-(37)	2	1
It		exophoric	(38)		
his (tumbrils...)	farmer	endo: anaphoric	(39)-(39)	2	1
that (woodman)	woodman	endo: anaphoric	(40)-(37)	2	1
that (farmer)	farmer	endo: anaphoric	(40)-(39)	2	1
they	woodman & farmer	endo: anaphoric	(41)-(40)-(39)-(37)	4	3
them	woodman & farmer	endo: anaphoric	(42)-(40)-(39)-(37)	4	3
they	woodman & farmer	endo: anaphoric	(43)-(40)-(39)-(37)	4	3
their (furniture)	families	endo: anaphoric	(48)-(47)	2	1
his (fellow- tradesmen)	highwayman	endo: anaphoric	(51)-(49)	2	1
he	highwayman	endo: anaphoric	(51)-(49)	2	1
his (character)	highwayman	endo: anaphoric	(51)-(49)	2	1
him	Fellow-tradesman	endo: anaphoric	(52)-(51)	2	1
his (ammunition)	guard	endo: anaphoric	(56)-(55)	2	1
that (potentate)	Lord Mayor of London	endo: cataphoric	(58)-(58)	2	1
his (retinue)	Lord Mayor of London	endo: anaphoric	(59)-(58)	2	1
their (turn-keys)	prisoners in London	endo: anaphoric	(60)-(60)	2	1
these	things	endo: cataphoric	(75)-(75)	2	1
them	all these things	endo: anaphoric	(75)-(75)	2	1
them	all these things	endo: anaphoric	(76)-(75)	2	1
those	king of England & king of France	endo: anaphoric	(78)-(18)-(17)	3	2
those	queen of England & queen of France	endo: anaphoric	(78)-(18)-(17)	3	2
their (divine rights)	king & queen of England & France	endo: anaphoric	(79)-(78)-(18)-(17)	4	3
Their (greatnesses)	—	endo: anaphoric	(80)-(78)-(18)-(17)	4	3
this	chronicle	endo: cataphoric	(80)-(80)	2	
them	creatures	endo: anaphoric	(80)-(80)	2	1
48		48	40	100	59

A cursory look at Table 2 will quickly reveal three noticeable points. First, both pronominals and demonstratives are deployed in the text, making the total number of 48 items. Second, these pronominals and demonstratives are used in two phoric functions: endophoric (which includes anaphoric and cataphoric), and exophoric. And third, the number of cohesive chains deployed in the text is 40 involving 100 tokens, making the total number of 59 cohesive ties.

A closer examination of Columns 1, 3, 4, and 6 shows four important findings. First, of the 48 cohesive devices found in Column 1, 39 are pronominals accounting for 81.2 per cent (of which the number of pronouns is 20/39 making up 51.2 per cent, the number of possessive adjectives is 18/39 accounting for 46.1 per cent, and the number of possessive pronouns is 1/39 accounting for only 2.5 per cent), and 9 are pronominal demonstratives accounting for 18.8 per cent. Second, in terms of phoric status, of the two types of reference found in Column 3, the number of endophoric references predominates: 40/48 accounting for 83.3 per cent v. 8/48 exophoric references accounting for 16.6 per cent. Third, of 40 cohesive chains in Column 4, 32 consist of 2 tokens accounting for 80 per cent, 2 consist of three tokens accounting for 5 per cent, 5 consist of 4 tokens making up 12.5 per cent, and 1, which is the longest chain, consists of 10 tokens making up 2.5 per cent. Of particular interest regarding this chain is that all the 10 tokens are the third impersonal pronoun *it* referring backwards or anaphorically to the definite nominal group title “The Period”. And finally, the total number of the grammatical cohesive ties deployed in the text is 59, and if we want to calculate the total number of the grammatical cohesive ties over the total number of 80 clause simplexes of the text, we will obtain an approximate ratio of 0.73 tie/clause. These findings are summarised in Table 3.

Table 3*References Deployed in the Text*

	Number	Percentage
Cohesive device:	48	100
Pronominal:	39	81.2
Demonstrative:	9	18.8
Phoric status:	48	100
Endophoric reference:	40	83.3
Exophoric reference:	8	16.6
Chain:	40	100
Two-token chain:	32	80.0
Three-token chain:	2	5.0
Four-token chain:	5	12.5
Ten-token chain:	1	2.5
Clause simplexes:	80	
Cohesive ties:	59	
Ratio of tie/clause simplex:	59/80	0.73

A note on the use of *it* and *we*. In Table 2 we notice 15 occurrences of the third impersonal pronoun *it*: in (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), (19), (21), (36), (37), (38), and 4 occurrences of the first plural personal pronoun *we*: in (11), (12), (13), (14). All of them function as Subject in these clause simplexes. What is of interest here is that of the 15 occurrences of *it*, only 11: in (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), (37) have an anaphoric function and contribute to the texture of the text. The remaining 4 occurrences of *it*: in (19), (21), (36), (38) and the 4 occurrences of *we* have a “generalised exophoric use in which the referent is treated as being as it were immanent in all contexts of situation” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 53), and thus do not contribute to the texture of the text.

4.2.1.2. The Use of ‘the’ in the Text

79 occurrences of the definite article *the* are found in the text, making up 7.7 per cent of the total running words. This noticeable ratio suggests that *the* deserves a separate treatment.

Among the specific determiners in English, the definite article *the* is one of the most

commonly used words (Katies, 2001, p. 98; see also Collins Cobuild, 2000). According to (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, pp. 70-71), in many grammars of English the definite article *the* has always been set apart as a unique member of a class; its only relative is the indefinite article *a*; and no other items in English behaves exactly like *the*. On the one hand it has important similarities with a whole group of other items (specific as well as non-specific determiners). An examination of *the* reveals that in many ways, it resembles the demonstratives *this*, *that*, *these*, *those*, from one of which it is derived. Halliday and Hasan (1976) suggest that *the* is originally a reduced form of *that*, functioning only as a modifier, in the same way that *a* is the reduced form of *one* likewise restricted to the modifier function. Essentially *the*, like the demonstratives, is a specifying agent, serving to identify a particular individual or subclass within the class designated by the noun, but it does it only through dependence on something else because it contains no specifying of its own. In a similar manner, Babarash (1975, p. 21) also maintains that both *a* and *the* have originated from pronouns: *a* has developed from the Old English numeral *an* (one) which later acquired the meaning of an indefinite article, and *the* has developed from the Old English demonstrative pronoun *that* and in some cases it has preserved this demonstrative meaning in modern English.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) show that the main difference between *the* and other specific determiners (*this*, *that*, *these*, *those*, *here*, *there*) is that while all other specific determiners are semantically selective such as *my room*, *his book*, and *their pens* indicating person's possession – the item is identified as present in someone's possession, and *book here* and *pens there* indicating proximity – the item is identified as present in the environment, and more or less, remote, *the* is not – it is a semantically non-selective item. Further, the definite article *the* has no content; it merely indicates that the item in question is specific and identifiable, that somewhere the information necessary for identifying is recoverable. The environment in which *the* occurs may be situational or textual. When it is situational, it is said to be exophoric and this form of specification makes no contribution to the texture of text; by contrast when it is textual, it is said to be endophoric and this form of specification becomes cohesive.

When *the* is exophoric, the item (the noun or nominal group immediately following it) can be interpreted in one of two ways. (1) A particular individual or subclass is being referred to, and that individual or subclass is identifiable in the specific situation or environment. Examples are *the wine* in *Please pass the wine* (= the wine on the table) and *the garden* in *Mai is in the garden* (= the garden of this house/hotel). All immediate situational instances of *the* are exophoric in this way: *mind the step*, *where is the book*, *the children are singing in the room*, etc. And (2) The referent is identifiable on extralinguistic grounds no matter what the situation. This occurs under two specific conditions. First, it may occur because there exists only one member of the class of objects referred to; e.g. *the sun*, *the moon*, *the sky*; or, at least, one member which will be assumed in the absence of specific indication to the contrary, for example, *the country* (= our country or the country both you [the hearer] and I (the speaker] know), *the boy* (= our boy or the boy both you [the hearer] and I (the speaker] know). Secondly, it may be because the reference is the whole class, e.g. *the stars*; or the individuals considered as a representative of the whole class like *The verb* in *The verb is a part of speech denoting an action* and *the mail* in *the mail was waylaid by seven robbers*. Halliday and Hasan (1976, p. 71) call this type of exophoric reference which does not depend on the specific situation 'HOMOPHORIC' to distinguish it from the situationally specific type.

When *the* is endophoric, its identification lies in the text with two possibilities: reference forward or cataphoric reference and reference backward or anaphoric reference. Cataphoric reference *the* is limited to the structural type. Unlike the selective demonstratives *this*, *these*,

and *here, the* can never be forward cohesively beyond the clause boundary (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 72). It can only refer to a modifying element within the same nominal group (the interpretative source form part of the same nominal group in which the cataphoric *the* occurs; and its structural function is normally that of Qualifier) as *her Christian pastors in the guidance of her Christian pastors* and *France and Norway in the woods of France and Norway*.

Anaphoric reference *the* is the only one condition in which *the* is cohesive beyond the clause boundary. The clearest instances of this are those in which the item is actually repeated as *The tree* and *a tree* in

[45] There is *a tree* in the garden. *The tree* is an oak.

Often the reference is a synonym or near-synonym, or to some other item which by its connotations provides a target for the anaphora. An example of this is *the highwayman* and *the Captain* in

[46] *the highwayman* in the dark was a City tradesman in the light, and, being recognised and challenged by his fellow-tradesman whom he stopped in his character of *the Captain*.

Halliday and Hasan (1976, p. 73) claim that in most other varieties of spoken and written English, the predominant function of *the* is cataphoric.

We now turn to look at the definite article *the* and its functions in creating texture of the text. A detailed account of *the* is given in Table 4. The table is divided into five columns. The first column lists the occurrences of *the* and the nouns or the nominal groups it modifies, the second column provides the address or the clause number in which *the* occurs, the third column enunciates interpretative sources and reference chains, the fourth column states the phoric status of *the* in terms of endophoric (which includes anaphoric and cataphoric) and exophoric references, and the fifth column provides information about the number of cohesive ties.

Table 4

Analysis of 'the' and its Functions in the Text

Occurrence of <i>the</i>	Address	Interpretative source	Phoric status	No. of ties
the best	(1)	of times	endo: cataphoric	1
the worst	(2)	of times	endo: cataphoric	1
the age	(3)	of wisdom	endo: cataphoric	1
the age	(4)	of foolishness	endo: cataphoric	1
the epoch	(5)	of belief	endo: cataphoric	1
the epoch	(6)	of incredulity	endo: cataphoric	1
the season	(7)	of Light	endo: cataphoric	1
the season	(8)	of Darkness	endo: cataphoric	1
the spring	(9)	of hope	endo: cataphoric	1
the winter	(10)	of despair	endo: cataphoric	1
the superlative degree	(16)	of comparison	endo: cataphoric	1
the thrown	(17)	of England	endo: cataphoric	1
the thrown	(18)	of France	endo: cataphoric	1
the lords	(19)	of the state	endo: cataphoric	1
the State preserves	(19)	of loaves of fishes	endo: cataphoric	1
the year	(21)	of Our Lords	endo: cataphoric	1
the swallowing up	(24)	of London	endo: cataphoric	1

the spirit	(27)	of this year last past	endo: cataphoric	1
the earthly order	(28)	of events	endo: cataphoric	1
the chickens	(29)	of the Cock Lane brood	endo: cataphoric	1
the guidance	(33)	of her Christian pastors	endo: cataphoric	1
the woods	(37)	of France and Norway	endo: cataphoric	1
the rough outhouses	(39)	of some tillers	endo: cataphoric	1
the heavy lands	(39)	adjacent to Paris	endo: cataphoric	1
the weather	(39)	that everyday	endo: cataphoric	1
the farmer	(39)	death,...	endo: cataphoric	1
the highwayman	(49)	in the dark	endo: cataphoric	1
the failure	(56)	of his ammunition	endo: cataphoric	1
the Lord Mayer	(58)	of London	endo: cataphoric	1
the illustrious creature	(59)	in sight of all this retinue	endo: cataphoric	1
the majesty	(61)	of law	endo: cataphoric	1
the necks	(62)	of noble lords	endo: cataphoric	1
the mist	(68)	of them	endo: cataphoric	1
the hangman	(68)	ever busy and... than useless	endo: cataphoric	1
the door	(72)	of Westminster Hall	endo: cataphoric	1
the life	(73)	of an atrocious murderer	endo: cataphoric	1
the creature	(80)	of this chronicle	endo: cataphoric	1
the roads	(80)	that lay before them	endo: cataphoric	1
the period	(15)	'The Period' in the title	endo: cataphoric	1
the Cock Lane	(29)	'Cock Lane' in (25)	endo: cataphoric	1
the woodman	(37)	'woods' in (37)	endo: cataphoric	1
the Captain	(51)	'highwayman' in (49)	endo: cataphoric	1
the other four	(56)	'seven robbers' in (54)	endo: cataphoric	1
the mail	(57)	'the mail' in (54)	endo: cataphoric	1
the mob	(66)	'the mob' in (65)	endo: cataphoric	1
the musketeers	(66)	'musketeers' in (63)-(65)	endo: cataphoric	2
the dear old year 1775	(75)	'1775' in (21)	endo: cataphoric	1
the woodman	(77)	'the woodman' in (37)	endo: cataphoric	1
the farmer	(77)	'the famer' in (39)	endo: cataphoric	1
the large jaws	(78)	'a large jaw' in (17)-(18)	endo: cataphoric	2
the plain face	(78)	'a plain face' in (17)	endo: cataphoric	1
the fair face	(78)	'a fair face' in (18)	endo: cataphoric	2
the year 1775	(80)	'1775' in (75)-(21)	endo: cataphoric	2
The period	(title)	in situation	exophoric	
the other way	(14)	in situation	exophoric	
the present period	(15)	in situation	exophoric	
the Life Guards	(24)	in situation	exophoric	
the sublime appearance	(24)	in situation	exophoric	
the Cock Lane ghost	(25)	in situation	exophoric	
the English Crown	(28)	in situation	exophoric	
the human race	(29)	in situation	exophoric	

the whole	(30)	in situation	exophoric	
the shield and trident	(30)	in situation	exophoric	
the rain	(34)	in situation	exophoric	
the Revolution	(39)	in situation	exophoric	
The rather	(42)	in situation	exophoric	
the capital itself	(46)	in situation	exophoric	
the dark	(49)	in situation	exophoric	
the light	(49)	in situation	exophoric	
the head	(52)	in situation	exophoric	
the mail	(54)	in situation	exophoric	
the guard	(55)	in situation	exophoric	
the law	(61)	in situation	exophoric	
the mob	(65)	in situation	exophoric	
the common way	(67)	in situation	exophoric	
the hangman	(68)	in situation	exophoric	
the hand	(71)	in situation	exophoric	
the dozen	(71)	in situation	exophoric	
the rest	(80)	in situation	exophoric	
79			79 (53 en +26 ex)	57

Analysis in Table 4 reveals three noticeable features. First, of 79 occurrences or tokens of *the* found in the text, 53 are endophoric accounting for 67 per cent, and 26 are exophoric accounting for 33 per cent. Second, a detailed analysis of the endophoric references in the text shows that between cataphoric and anaphoric references, cataphoric references predominate: 38/53 accounting for 71.6 per cent v. 15/53 anaphoric references accounting for 28.3 per cent. And third, analysis in Columns 1 and 5 shows that 53 tokens of endophoric *the* form 57 cohesive ties.

Putting Table 2 and Table 4 together, we can summarise the main findings of cohesive devices utilised in the text in Table 5.

Table 5

Cohesive Devices Deployed in the Text

	Table 2	Table 4	Total	Percentage
Cohesive device:	48	79	127	100
Pronominal:	39	0	39	30.7
Demonstrative:	9	79	88	69.3
Phorus status:	48	79	127	100
Endophoric reference:	40	53	93	73.2
Exophoric reference:	8	26	34	26.7
Number of cohesive ties:	69	57	116	
Ratio of tie/clause:			116/80	1.45

Three points stand out from Table 5. First, between pronominal and demonstrative devices, demonstrative devices take the lead: 88/127 accounting for 69.3 per cent v. 39/127 pronominal devices accounting for 30.7 per cent. Second, between endophoric and exophoric references, endophoric reference predominates: 93/127 accounting for 73.2 per cent v. 34/127 exophoric tokens accounting for 26.7 per cent. And third, the ratio of the number of cohesive ties/the number of clause simplexes of the text is 1.45.

4.2.1.3. Conjunctive Cohesion

For purposes of this study, the analysis of conjunctive relations will focus on four main devices: additive, temporal, adversative and projecting (referring to a conjunctive relation established between a projecting and a projected clause in a reporting clause complex). Findings are given in Table 6.

Table 6

Conjunctive Devices Deployed in the Text

Types of conjunctive devices	Conjunctive devices	Address	No. of tokens	No. of ties
Additive	and	(32)	1	1
	and	(50)	1	1
	and	(51)	1	1
	and	(53)	1	1
	and	(55)	1	1
	and	(61)	1	1
	and	(65)	1	1
	and	(66)	1	1
	and	(78)	1	1
	and	(79)	1	1
Temporal	in short	(15)	1	1
	and then	(56)	1	1
	now	(69)	1	1
	now	(70)	1	1
	now	(71)	1	1
	and now	(72)	1	1
	today	(73)	1	1
	and tomorrow	(74)	1	1
Causal	so...that (15)–(16)	(15)–(16)	1	1
	because (43)	(43)	1	1
	Thus (79)	(79)	1	1
Adversative	But	(40)	1	1
	though	(41)	1	1
	and	(42)	1	1
	and	(67)	1	1
Projecting	that	(20)	1	1
	that	(37)	1	1
	that	(39)	1	1
Total	28		28	28

Table 6 shows that the total number of conjunctive devices/tokens utilised in the text is 28, making up 28 cohesive ties. A closer inspection reveals that of 28 conjunctive devices, the number of additive relations takes the largest number: 10/28 accounting for 35.7 per cent. Ranked second is the number of temporal relations: 8/28 accounting for 28.5 per cent, followed by the number of adversative relations: 4/28 accounting for 14.3 per cent and the number of causal relations: 3/27 accounting for 10.7 per cent; and bottomed the list is the number of projecting relations: 3/27 accounting for 10.7 per cent.

Three points are of notice here. First, all 10 additive relations are realised by the conjunction *and*. They are found to occur in clause complexes of expansion: extension type.

[47], [48], and [49] are the examples in point.

[47] ... || (31) making paper money || (32) *and* spending it. ||

[48] ... || (54) the mail was waylaid by seven robbers, || (55) *and* the guard shot three dead, || (56) *and* then got shot dead himself by the other four, 'in consequence of the failure of his ammunition': ||

[49] ... || (63) musketeers went into St Giles's, || (64) to search for contraband goods, || (65) *and* the mob fired on the musketeers, || (66) *and* the musketeers fired on the mob, || (67) *and* nobody thought any of these occurrences much out of the common way. |||

Second, most temporal relations are found in clause complexes of expansion: enhancement type. They are of three main subtypes: simple temporal relation, simple temporal relation: conclusive, and simple additional temporal relation: consequential. [50], [51], and [52] are the examples in point:

[50] || (69) now, stringing up long rows of miscellaneous criminals; || (70) *now*, hanging a housebreaker on Saturday who had been taken on Tuesday; [simple temporal relation]

[51] || (15) – *in short*, the period was so far like the present period, || (16) that some of its noisiest authorities insisted on its being received, for good or evil, in the superlative degree of comparison only. || [simple temporal relation: conclusive]

[52] || (69) now, stringing up long rows of miscellaneous criminals; || (70) now, hanging a housebreaker on Saturday who had been taken on Tuesday; || (71) now, burning people in the hand at Newgate by the dozen, || (72) *and now* burning pamphlets at the door of Westminster Hall; || [simple additional temporal relation: consequential]

And third, in all three clause complexes of projection, the projecting conjunction *that* is used after the adjectives *clearer* in (19), *likely* in (36), and *likely* in (38). Its function is to connect the projecting clauses with the projected ones.

[53] ||| (19) In both countries it was clearer than crystal to the lords of the State preserves of loaves and fishes, || (20) *that* things in general were settled for ever. |||

[54] ||| (36) It is likely enough || (37) *that*, rooted in the woods of France and Norway, there were growing trees, when that sufferer was put to death, already marked by the Woodman, fate, to come down and be sawn into boards, to make a certain movable framework with a sack and a knife in it, terrible in history. |||

[55] ||| (38) It is likely enough || (39) *that* in the rough outhouses of some tillers of the heavy lands adjacent to Paris, there were sheltered from the weather that very day, rude carts, bespattered with rustic mire, snuffed about by pigs, and roosted in by poultry, which the farmer, death, had already set apart to be his tumbrils of the Revolution. |||

4.2.2. Lexical Cohesion

As regards the importance of lexical cohesion in forming texture of text, Halliday and Hasan have this to say:

However luxuriant the grammatical cohesion displayed in any piece of discourse, it will not form a text unless it is matched by cohesive patterning of a lexical kind' (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 292).

Lexical cohesion analysis of the text focuses on five main devices: repetition, synonymy, antonymy, superordinate-hyponymy, and meronymy. It should be noted that a given occurrence of one lexical token might have any two or three functions at the same time; i.e., it can have repetition, synonymy, and meronymy functions at the same time. For purposes of this

paper, however, we will deal with each function separately. Table 7 presents a detailed analysis of the lexical cohesive devices found in the text. The first column enunciates the types of lexical cohesive devices; the second lists lexical cohesive devices and the address or the clause number in which the device occurs; the third gives the number of tokens deployed in each lexical cohesive device, and the fourth column provides the number of cohesive ties.

Table 7*Lexical Cohesive Resources Deployed in the Text*

Types of lexical cohesive devices	Lexical cohesive devices	Number of tokens	Number of ties
Repetition	times (2) – times (1)	2	1
	age (4) – age (3)	2	1
	epoch (6) – epoch (5)	2	1
	season (8) – season (7)	2	1
	going (14) – going (13)	2	1
	direct (14) – direct (13)	2	1
	king (18) – king (17)	2	1
	queen (18) – queen (17)	2	1
	large (18) – large (17)	2	1
	throne (18) – throne (17)	2	1
	jaw (18) – jaw (17)	2	1
	face (18) – face (17)	2	1
	period (21) – period (15) – Period (title)	3	2
	rapping out (27) – wrapping out (26)	2	1
	messages (28) – messages (27)	2	1
	Cock Lane (29) – Cock Lane (25)	2	1
	spiritual (30) – spiritual (22)	2	1
	likely (37) – likely (36)	2	1
	enough (37) – enough (36)	2	1
	France (37) – France (30) – France (18)	3	2
	farmer (40) – farmer (39)	2	1
	worked (41) – worked (41)	2	1
	England (44) – England (22) – England (17)	3	2
	mail (56) – mail (54)	2	1
	London (60) – London (58) – London (24)	3	2
	highwayman (58) – highwayman (49)	2	1
	fired (66) – fired (65)	2	1
	mob (66) – mob (65)	2	1
	musketeers (66) – musketeers (65)	2	1
	robbed (74) – robbed (57)	2	1
	shot (56) – shot (55) – shot (54) – shot (53)	4	3
	woodman (77) – woodman (40) – Woodman (37)	3	2
	farmer (77) – farmer (40) – famer (39)	3	2
	worked (77) – worked (41) – worked (41)	3	2
	jaws (78) – jaw (18) – jaw (17)	3	2
	large (78) – large (18) – large (17)	3	2
	plain (78) – plain (17)	2	1
	fair (78) – fair (18)	2	1
	face (78) – face (18) – face (17)	3	2
	1775 (80) – 1775 (75) – 1775 (21)	3	2

	things (75) – things (20) 41	2 95	1 54
Synonymy	epoch (6/5) – age (4)	2	1
	English Crown (28) – king (18)	2	1
	sufferer (37) – youth (31)	2	1
	capital (46) – London (24) – London (58) – London (60)	4	3
	highwayman (49) – Captain (51) 5	2 12	1 7
Antonymy	worst (2) – best (1)	2	1
	foolishness (4) – wisdom (3)	2	1
	incredulity (6) – belief (5)	2	1
	Darkness (8) – Light (7)	2	1
	winter (10) – spring (9)	2	1
	despair (10) – hope (9)	2	1
	nothing (12) – everything (11)	2	1
	good (15) – evil (15)	2	1
	dark (49) – light (49) 9	2 18	1 9
Superordinate-hyponymy	times (2/3) – age (3/4) – epoch (5/6) – period (title/15/15) – season (7/8)	5	3
	countries (19) – England (18) – France (18)	3	2
	England (22/44) – London (24) – capital (46) – Westminster (24) – Cock Lane (25/29) – Turnham Green (59) – London gaols (60) – Newgate (71) – Westminster Hall (71) – highwayman (49) – Lord Mayor of London (58) – mob (65/66) – musketeers (65/66) – hangman (68)	14	13
	France (30) – Paris (39)	2	1
	youth (33) – hands (33) – tongue (33) – body (33)	4	3
	woods (37) – trees (37) 6	2 29	1 23
Meronymy	jaw (17) – king (17)	2	1
	face (17) – queen (17)	2	1
	jaw (18) – king (18)	2	1
	face (18) – queen (18) 4	2 8	1 4
Total	65	162	97

Table 7 shows that the total number of lexical cohesion instances found in the text is 65 which involves 162 tokens, making up the total number of 97 lexical cohesive ties. A closer analysis reveals three noticeable features. The first is that of 65 instances of lexical cohesion devices deployed in the text, repetition tops the list: 41/65 accounting for 63 per cent. Ranking second is antonymy: 9/65 accounting for 13.8 per cent. Taking the third position is superordinate-hyponymy: 6/65 accounting for 9.2 per cent, followed by synonymy: 5/65 accounting for 7.6 per cent, and bottoming the list is meronymy: 4/65 accounting for 6.1 per cent. The second feature is that of 162 tokens deployed in 65 instances of lexical cohesion device, repetition still tops the list: 95/162 accounting for 58.6 per cent. But occupying the second position is now not antonymy but superordinate-hyponymy: 29/162 accounting for 17.9 per cent. Ranking third is antonymy: 18/162 accounting for 11.1 per cent, followed by synonymy: 12/162 accounting for 7.4 percent, and bottoming the list is again meronymy: 8/162 accounting for 4.9 per cent. And the third, and most noticeable, feature has to do with the

utilisation of the superordinate noun *England* in clause (22) where we find 14 tokens of superordinate-hyponyms, making up a chain of 13 ties: *England* (22) – *London* (24) – *capital* (46) – *Westminster* (24) – *Cock Lane* (25/29) – *Turnham Green* (59) – *London gaols* (60) – *Newgate* (71) – *Westminster Hall* (71) – *highwayman* (49) – *Lord Mayor of London* (58) – *mob* (65/66) – *musketeers* (65/66) – *hangman* (68). These findings are summarised in Table 8.

Table 8

Findings of Lexical Cohesion Resources

Lexical cohesion devices	No. of instances (%)	No. of tokens (%)	No of ties (%)
Repetition	41 (63.0)	95 (58.4)	54 (55.6)
Synonymy	5 (7.6)	12 (7.4)	7 (7.2)
Antonymy	9 (13.8)	18 (11.1)	9 (9.2)
Superordinate-hyponymy	6 (9.2)	29 (17.9)	23 (23.7)
Meronymy	4 (6.1)	8 (4.9)	4 (4.1)
Total	65 (100)	162 (100)	97 (100)

5. Conclusion

5.1. Summary of Research Findings

In this paper we have attempted to make an enquiry into some major cohesive resources Charles Dickens employs in the construction of textual meanings of his text. The text under study is Chapter 1 entitled “The Period” in the famous novel *A Tale of Two Cities*. The theoretical framework adopted in our study is the TCM as propounded by Halliday and Hasan in their *Cohesion in English*. Our analysis has shown that although the text investigated is a chapter of a long novel, it displays a full range of possibilities open to texts in general. But due to the extremely complex nature of textual cohesion resources, we have restricted ourselves to exploring only two main types: grammatical cohesion (which includes reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction) and lexical cohesion (which includes repetition, synonym, antonym, superordinate-hyponymy and meronymy). The findings of our study have shown that Charles Dickens has utilised a variety of grammatical and lexical cohesive resources to create texture of the text, among which the following findings are salient:

- Virtually no substitution and ellipsis.
- A high number of instances of cohesive devices: 194 which involve 343 tokens, making up the total of 241 cohesive ties.
- Both pronominal and demonstrative references, between which the latter resource predominates: 88/127 accounting for 69.3 per cent v. 39/127 of the former resource accounting for 30.7 per cent.
- Both endophoric and exophoric references, between which endophoric references take up a predominant frequency: 93/127 accounting for 73.2 per cent v. 34/127 exophoric references accounting for 26.7 per cent.
- Five main types of conjunctive resources: additive, temporal, causal, adversative, and projective, of which additive is the main strategy: 10/28 accounting for 35.7 per cent.
- Five main types of lexical cohesion resources: repetition, synonymy, antonymy, superordinate-hyponymy, and meronymy, of which repetition takes up the largest number: 41/65, accounting for 63 per cent, involving 95/167 tokens accounting for 56.8 percent and making the total number of 54/97 lexical cohesive ties accounting for

55.6 per cent.

- A high ratio of cohesive ties per clause: 213/80 accounting for 2.7 percent.

The findings summarised above allow three conclusive suggestions. First, the text is of purely written and monologic mode. Second, the text is highly cohesive and self-sufficient. And third, the text is, by and large, not quite easy to read, particularly for contemporary EFL learners of English as it contains a number of content words whose meanings cannot be guessed from the context of the text. To understand them, they need extralinguistic knowledge (context of situation); i.e. knowledge about place names, proper names and British and French cultural information in the nineteenth century, which may not be familiar to them.

In analysing and discussing the textual cohesion resources of the text, we have placed them all within the compass of the TCM as developed by Halliday and Hasan in their *Cohesion in English*. It is clear from our study that the TCM is a highly relevant theoretical framework for textual cohesion studies: it stands to benefit discourse researchers, teachers and students not only because it focuses almost exclusively on textual cohesion studies but also because it accommodates an extremely rich pool of instruments to help them analyse the text and explain its textual cohesion meanings in a sensible way.

Our research has pedagogical implications. It is obvious that to understand meanings of a text, we need a relevant linguistic framework, and as the findings from our research have shown, the relevant theoretical framework here is Halliday and Hasan's TCM. But how far it is possible to use the framework depends largely on how much the user can exploit its power. It is, therefore, recommended that discourse analysts, tertiary EFL teachers and students explore the framework carefully before starting their work. And, to help teachers and students better familiarise themselves with the model, it is recommended that SFL of which the TCM is a part be an eligible component of any tertiary EFL teaching curriculum.

5.2. Limitations of the Study and Further Research

In her *Selected Works of Ruqaiya Hasan on Applied Linguistics*, the eminent systemic functional linguist Ruqaiya Hasan (2011, p. 56) suggests that the realisation of the linguistic features that make a text a text is not localized but is likely to be dispersed over the whole text as a whole, and within the meanings of a text there are constellations of meanings which are crucial to the identity of its register. Her suggestion implies that to be able to uncover all the meanings characterizing a text of whatever text type, the discourse researcher should explore as many constellations of meanings of it as possible. In this study we have focused on examining only one constellation of meanings of the text – texture or textual cohesion meanings realised in textual cohesive or text-forming resources. Other constellations of meanings of the text such as the experiential meanings realised in transitivity resources, the interpersonal meanings realised in mood (including modality) resources, the textual meanings realised in theme and information focus resources, and the logical meaning realised in clause-complexing resources, should be explored. These are topics of further research.

As acknowledged elsewhere (see Hoang, 2024, 2025), the data of this study has been confined to only one of the forty-five chapters of Charles Dickens' *A Tale of Two Cities*. This modest scope may limit the generalisability of the findings. In order to get a comprehensive picture of Charles Dickens' work and to be able to make more meaningful generalisations about his writing style, the entire novel should be taken as research data. This can also be a topic for future study.

References

- Babarash, T. A. (1975). *A Guide to Better Grammar*. Издательство «Международные отношения» (Foreign Relations Publishing House).
- Collins Cobuild (2000). *English Grammar – Helping Learners with Real English*. HarperCollins Publishers.
- Dickens, C. (2018). *Hai kinh thành* (2nd ed.) (Trans: Dang, T.). Writers Association Publishing House.
- Firth, J. R. (1957). *Papers in Linguistics: 1934–1951*. Oxford University Press.
- Forey, G. & Thompson, G. (2009). *Text Type and Texture: In honour of Flo Davies*. Equinox.
- Galperin, I. R. (1981). *Stylistics* (3rd ed.). Vysšaja Škola.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1961). Categories of the theories of grammar. *Word*, 17, 241–292.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1966). Lexis as a linguistic level. In C. E. Bazell, J. C. Catford, M. A. K. Halliday & R. H. Robins (Eds.), *In Memory of J. R. Firth* (pp. 148–162). Longman.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1976). *Halliday: System and Function in Language: Selected Papers Edited by Gunther Kress*. Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1981). Linguistic function and literary style: An inquiry into the language of William Golding's 'The Inheritor'. In D. C. Freeman (Ed.), *Essays in Modern Stylistics* (pp. 325–360). Methuen & Co. Ltd.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (2nd ed.). Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (2012) *Dẫn luận ngữ pháp chức năng* (An Introduction to Functional Grammar) (V. V. Hoang, Trans.). Vietnam National University Press, Hanoi. <https://doi.org/10.25073/2525/vnufs.4229>
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R. (1989). *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-semiotic Perspective*. Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. (3rd ed.). Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203783771>
- Hasan, R. (1984). Coherence and cohesive harmony. In J. Flood (Ed.), *Understanding Reading Comprehension*, (pp. 181–219). International Reading Association.
- Hasan, R. (1996). *Ways of Saying: Ways of Meaning. Selected Papers of Ruqaiya Hasan*. Cassell.
- Hasan, R. (2011) *Selected Works of Ruqaiya Hasan on Applied Linguistics*. Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Hoang, V. V. (2006). *Translation: Theory and Practice – A Textbook for Senior Students of English*. Vietnam Education Publishing House.
- Hoang, V. V. (2024). Transitivity and mood resources realising experiential and interpersonal meanings in “A Tale of Two Cities”: A systemic functional linguistics analysis. *VNU Journal of Foreign Studies*, 40(6), 1–28. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/A_Tale_of_Two_Cities
- Hoang, V. V. (2025). Clause complex resources in a literary text: A systemic functional analysis. *VNU Journal of Foreign Studies*, 41(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.63023/2525-2445/jfs.ulis.5311>
- Martin, J. R. (1983). “CONJUNCTION: The Logic of English Text”. In J. S. Petofi & I. Sozer (Eds.), *Micro and Macro Connexity of Texts* (pp. 1–72). Helmut Buske Verlag (Papers in Textlinguistics 45).
- Martin, J. R. (1992). *English Text: System and Structure*. John Benjamins.
- Martin, J. R. (2001). Cohesion and texture. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, (pp. 35–53). Blackwell.
- Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (1995). *Lexicogrammatical Cartography: English Systems*. International Language Sciences Publishers.
- Manilowski, B. (1923). Supplement I – The problem of meaning in primitive languages. In C. K. Ogden & I. A. Richards (Eds.), *The Meaning of Meaning* (International Library of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Method) (pp. 296–336). Kegan Paul.
- Matthiessen, C. M. I. M., Teruya, K., & Lam, M. (2010). *Key Terms in Systemic Functional Linguistics*. Continuum.

Nunan, D. (1993). *Introducing Discourse Analysis*. Penguin.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching & Learning*. Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Simpson, P. (1993). *Language, Ideology and Point of View*. Routledge.

Wales, K. (2001). *A Dictionary of Stylistics* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.

Wikipedia. *A Tale of Two Cities*. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/A_Tale_of_Two_Cities

Appendix

Key:

	indicate clause simplex boundary
(1), (2), (3) ...	indicate numbers of clause simplex

The Period

Paragraph 1

|| (1) It was the best of times, || (2) it was the worst of times, || (3) it was the age of wisdom, || (4) it was the age of foolishness, || (5) it was the epoch of belief, || (6) it was the epoch of incredulity, || (7) it was the season of Light, || (8) it was the season of Darkness, || (9) it was the spring of hope, || (10) it was the winter of despair, || (11) we had everything before us, || (12) we had nothing before us, || (13) we were all going direct to Heaven, || (14) we were all going direct the other way || (15) – in short, the period was so far like the present period, || (16) that some of its noisiest authorities insisted on its being received, for good or evil, in the superlative degree of comparison only. ||

Paragraph 2

|| (17) There were a king with a large jaw and a queen with a plain face, on the throne of England; || (18) there were a king with a large jaw and a queen with a fair face, on the throne of France. || (19) In both countries it was clearer than crystal to the lords of the State preserves of loaves and fishes, || (20) that things in general were settled for ever. ||

Paragraph 3

|| (21) It was the year of Our Lord one thousand seven hundred and seventy-five. || (22) Spiritual revelations were conceded to England at that favoured period, as at this. || (23) Mrs Southcott had recently attained her five- and-twentieth blessed birthday, || (24) of whom a prophetic private in the Life Guards had heralded the sublime appearance by announcing that arrangements were made for the swallowing up of London and Westminster. || (25) Even the Cock Lane ghost had been laid only a round dozen of years, || (26) after rapping out its messages, || (27) as the spirits of this very year last past (supernaturally deficient in originality) rapped out theirs. || (28) Mere messages in the earthly order of events had lately come to the English Crown and People, from a congress of British subjects in America: || (29) which, strange to relate, have proved more important to the human race than any communications yet received through any of the chickens of the Cock Lane brood. ||

Paragraph 4

|| (30) France, less favoured on the whole as to matters spiritual than her sister of the shield and trident, rolled with exceeding smoothness down hill, || (31) making paper money || (32) and spending it. || (33) Under the guidance of her Christian pastors, she entertained herself, besides, with such humane achievements as sentencing a youth to have his hands cut off, his tongue torn out with pincers, and his body burned alive, || (34) because he had not kneeled down in the rain || (35) to do honour to a dirty procession of monks which passed within his view, at a distance of some fifty or sixty yards. || (36) It is likely enough || (37) that, rooted in the woods of France and Norway, there were growing trees, when that sufferer was put to death, already marked by the Woodman, fate, to come down and be sawn into boards, to make a certain movable framework with a sack and a knife in it, terrible in history. || (38) It is likely enough || (39) that in the rough outhouses of some tillers of the heavy lands adjacent to Paris, there were sheltered from the weather that very day, rude carts, bespattered with rustic mire, snuffed about by pigs, and roosted in by poultry, which the farmer, death, had already set apart to be his tumbrils of the Revolution. || (40) But that woodman and that farmer, || (41) though they worked unceasingly, worked silently, ||

(42) and no one heard them || (43) as they went about with muffled tread: the rather, forasmuch as to entertain any suspicion that they were awake, was to be atheistical and traitorous. |||

Paragraph 5

|| (44) In England, there was scarcely an amount of order and protection || (45) to justify much national boasting. || (46) Daring burglaries by armed men, and highway robberies, took place in the capital itself every night; || (47) families were publicly cautioned || (48) not to go out of town without removing their furniture to upholsterers' warehouses for security; || (49) the highwayman in the dark was a City tradesman in the light, || (50) and, being recognised || (51) and challenged by his fellow-tradesman whom he stopped in his character of 'the Captain', (52) gallantly shot him through the head || (53) and rode away; || (54) the mail was waylaid by seven robbers, || (55) and the guard shot three dead, || (56) and then got shot dead himself by the other four, 'in consequence of the failure of his ammunition': || (57) after which the mail was robbed in peace; || (58) that magnificent potentate, the Lord Mayor of London, was made || (59) to stand and deliver on Turnham Green, by one highwayman, who despoiled the illustrious creature in sight of all his retinue; || (60) prisoners in London gaols fought battles with their turnkeys, || (61) and the majesty of the law fired blunderbusses in among them, loaded with rounds of shot and ball; || (62) thieves snipped off diamond crosses from the necks of noble lords at court drawing-rooms; || (63) musketeers went into St Giles's, || (64) to search for contraband goods, || (65) and the mob fired on the musketeers, || (66) and the musketeers fired on the mob, || (67) and nobody thought any of these occurrences much out of the common way. || (68) In the midst of them, the hangman, ever busy and ever worse than useless, was in constant requisition; || (69) now, stringing up long rows of miscellaneous criminals; || (70) now, hanging a housebreaker on Saturday who had been taken on Tuesday; || (71) now, burning people in the hand at Newgate by the dozen, || (72) and now burning pamphlets at the door of Westminster Hall; || (73) today, taking the life of an atrocious murderer, || (74) and tomorrow of a wretched pilferer who had robbed a farmer's boy of sixpence. |||

Paragraph 6

|| (75) All these things, and a thousand like them, came to pass in and close upon the dear old year one thousand seven hundred and seventy-five. || (76) Environed by them, || (77) while the woodman and the farmer worked unheeded, || (78) those two of the large jaws, and those other two of the plain and the fair faces, trod with stir enough, || (79) and carried their divine rights with a high hand. || (80) Thus did the year one thousand seven hundred and seventy-five conduct their greatneses, and myriads of small creatures – the creatures of this chronicle among the rest – along the roads that lay before them. ||