

*Mykhaylenko V. V.,  
Doctor of Philology, Professor, Department of  
Foreign Languages and Translation: Theory and Practice,  
Institute of International Relations and Social Studies, MAUP*

## ECONOMIC DISCOURSE: CORRELATION OF COHESION AND COHERENCE

**Summary.** The focus of this paper is a study of the means of expressing coherence and cohesion and their correlation in the intra- and extra-linguistic planes both for an effective generation and an objective interpretation of economic discourse. Despite the diversity of approaches, the author shares the understanding of the language as a dynamic and heterogeneous system that mediates interaction in the social and cultural context, and explains how coherence and cohesion are reflected in various context-related aspects of human communication.

**Key words:** cohesion, coherence, discourse, semantics, structure, pragmatics.

**Preliminaries.** This study addresses the need of economic discourse in the analysis of cohesion and coherence on various levels of expression for its efficient generation, objective interpretation, and translation. The term discourse refers to verbal communication in its situational and social context. It shows the relative functions of the semantics, and makes the constituents of discourse complement each other, constructing the unique aesthetic feeling of the language [19, p. 144–5].

Primarily, the issues in focus are coherence and cohesion of the economics discourse. Terry Royce writes that in recent years there has been an increase in interest in the analysis of economics discourse by both applied linguists and economists [21, p. 137]. To characterize the constituents of the unit [see 29] in terms of cohesion and coherence is challenging for general linguistics, but the researchers whose English is a foreign language are in need of the discourse coherence and cohesion regularities for academic writing and TV or Radio editors need the rules how to make the news event semantically imbued but structurally or formally concise. Cohesion is the use of language forms to indicate semantic relations between elements in a discourse. There are two main types of cohesion: grammatical, referring to the structural content, and lexical, referring to the language content of the piece. M. Halliday, R. Hasan describe the typology of correlating the discourse register with certain cohesive links [13, p. 75]. Despite the distribution of the cohesive types strongly differs in different genres, lexical cohesion is present in the semantic structure of all the types of the discourse [see, for instance: 1, p. 323 fl.; 11]. Along with reference, ellipsis/substitution and conjunctive relations, lexical cohesion is said to formally realize the semantic coherence of texts – around fifty percent of a discourse/text's cohesive ties are lexical). Lexical cohesion is commonly viewed as the central device for making texts keep together experientially, defining the content of a text (field of discourse). It also refers to the semantic relations between the lexical items in the text, thus providing information about the way lexemes are organized in the discourse (lexical patterning) [13, p. 235; 15, p. 35–43; 17, p. 1393–1398; 25, p. 1]. The organization of discourse is one of the central issues of discourse analysis.

The term organization refers “to the sum of relations which hold between the units of text... and between each unit and the whole” [12, p. 138; 17, p. 1393–1398].

Coherence, according to the Encyclopedic Dictionary of Applied Linguistics (online), is the quality of meaning unity and purpose perceived in discourse. It is not a property of the linguistic forms in the text and their denotations (though these will contribute to it), but of these forms and meanings interpreted by a receiver through knowledge and reasoning cf. 20, p. 233]. Our assumption is that coherence is not an absolute quality of a text, but always relative to a particular receiver and context. A description of coherence is usually concerned with the links inferred between sentences or utterances. It is often contrasted with COHESION, which is the linguistic realization of such links.

**State of the arts.** Language in communication is meaningful when it is well arranged and relevant with the context surrounding the communication. The term discourse itself is very ambiguous. Linguistics states that discourse is a study of the organization of language above sentence or above clause, and therefore it is aimed to research larger linguistic units, such as conversational exchanges or written texts [see 22]. However, discourse in general can be distinguished into three focuses: (a) *Language use*, (b) the *communication of beliefs* (cognition), and (c) *interaction* in social situation. These three dimensions prove [7, p. 231; 27] that discourse must be studied in a broader interdisciplinary framework. Mode plays an important role in the discourse construction, and discourse analysis can solve many problems that they are not solved with grammar [28, p. 464]. Lexical cohesion appearing in discourse just means some semantic relationship between partial terms, including reproducibility and co-occurrence. Reproducibility relationship of the vocabulary refer to a particular word in the original word, synonyms, approximate meaning word, antonyms, hyponyms, general word and other forms reappear in the discourse. Sentences in a discourse link each other by this relationship of reproducibility. Selecting material for translation should pay attention to discourse as unity, before translation one should read the whole text, and then use the cohesion theory to analyze, form the overall consciousness of discourse, and grasp the original essence, guarantee the translation faithful to the original one [p. 17, 1394]. Co-occurrence relationship of words means the tendency of the common occurrence, such as: “money” (fee, royalty, salary, tips, etc.), and “bank” (deposit, credit card, credit, etc.) “debt” (loan, lend, borrow, etc.), and “securities” (bonds, stocks, shares, etc.).

Since 1960s linguists have been on the investigation of discourse coherence, see the works by van Dijk [7], Halliday and Hasan [13], Widdowson [30], Kintsch [16], Coulthart [9], Beaugrade [2], Brown & Yule [4], Blackmore [3], Cook [6], Schiffrin [22] et al. And the last three decades or more have witnessed a multifarious development in the theory of discourse coherence and a large

number of theoretical systems have been proposed. The following survey will look roughly at several representative studies on discourse coherence and present the author's view of them [28, p. 461]. A generally accepted current paradigm for the description of textual coherence is a group of approaches describing text organization in terms of coherence relations, rhetorical relations or discourse structure relations for an overview of recent proposals of E. Maier and E. Hovy. The authors admit that the coherence relations paradigm is developed for well-organized written texts, Ann Johns says, that coherence is the semantic relationship between propositions or communicative events in discourse, which is a feature of the perception of discourse rather than discourse itself [15, p. 460–461]. Yuan Wang and Guo Minghe share Ann Johns' opinion that "coherence is a semantic property of discourse, based on the interpretation of each individual sentence relative to the interpretation of other sentences" [28, p. 460–461].

As for the relationship coherence of the discourse and its extra-linguistic context, we suggest several explanations, first, our sample discourse is embedded into the Economics column or TV programme "Economics Desk", second, all the viewers/readers are in the know of current changes in the US economic policy, third, Americans have been still suffering through Finances Fall in 2008, and, fourth, dominant units or key words signal the human memory, such as *mortgage, budget deficit, trillion dollar deficit* to recreate a full conceptual system.

Coherence and Cohesion in Spoken and Written Discourse provide new insights into the various ways coherence works in a variety of text functional styles and interactional situations, all of which point to the dynamics and subjectivity of its nature. Despite such variety of approaches the scholars adopt, they share an understanding of language as a dynamic and heterogeneous system mediating interaction in social and cultural contexts and explain how coherence and cohesion are reflected in different contextually bound aspects of human communication.

**Methods, corpus and analysis.** Terry Royce believes that the need to research multifaceted economics discourse of such genres or register as report, survey, economic strategy, economy of enterprise, etc. is of great necessity [21, p. 137–159]. Each speaker is likely to have more than one register, ready to use according to the situation. A register is constituted by linguistic features which are typically generated with the configuration of situational features, classified in values of the field, mode, and tenor of the text's context" of situation [26, p. 10–11, 17–19].

The discourse under study is represented by the script "US WAR DRUMS" by Egon von Greyerz. March 30, 2018 (BBC. Economy) whose length is 271 words: *Whenever a nation starts fighting with other countries, it is always done from a position of weakness. US debt for a long time. Federal, state, corporate, personal, mortgage, auto, student etc, etc, they are all escalating exponentially. On top of that the US budget deficit will be in the trillions for the foreseeable future and the trade deficit was \$600 billion in 2017 and could soon be one more trillion dollar deficit. Starting wars is an indication of the final stages of a troubled empire. The wars and interference in countries like Iran, Libya, Ukraine, Syria and Yemen are all part of that. The appointment of hardliner John Bolton as National Security Advisor as another perilous sign that the US is on the war path again. So is policing the world's financial system and so is protectionism and trade wars. These are all desperate measures of a country in a terminal decline. And it is certainly not a coincidence that this trade war started right before the oil trading in Yuan begun.*

*Eventually this will lead to the demise of the dollar and a major power shift from West to East as well as much higher gold prices. Nor is it a surprise that Silk Road countries have been buying major amounts of gold in this century. As the graph shows, the gold holdings of Russia, Turkey, India and China have increased 7 fold since 2004 from 5,000 tonnes to 35,600 tonnes. The question is how much is actually left in Western Central Banks of the 23,000 tonnes that they allegedly hold.*

The chain of lexemes links the discourse constituents into one semantic unity:

Nation → countries → US → US → empire → country → Iran / Libya / Ukraine / Syria / Yemen → country → decline → (troubled) empire → demise (of the dollar) → trading (in Yuan) → (world's) financial system → gold (holdings). According to M. Halliday and Hasan (1976), a text/discourse is coherent when it satisfies two conditions: its consistency with a context in which it is created, the other is a text must be cohesive, i.e. that is, all parts in a text must be connected by cohesive devices, for instance, word building: *trade* → *trading*, *hold* → *holdings*; pronominalization: *nation* → *it*; synonymy: *nation, country, empire*; repetition: *war (5), country (4), war (4), trade (4) deficit (3), tonnes (3)*; collocations: *foreseeable future, gold holdings, major amounts, budget deficit, trade deficit, dollar deficit, starts fighting, world's financial system, buying major amounts of gold, major power shift, much higher gold prices, gold holdings, desperate measures, terminal decline; another perilous sign*, temporal markers: *whenever, always, for a long time*, tense forms (present continuous): *are escalating, have been buying, is policing*; idioms: *has been running out of hand, Silk Road countries, on top of, lead to the demise of, foreseeable future, war path*.

The discourse analysis reveals the conceptual system actualized in the can be labeled as 'professional' in the broadest sense of the word, and in the most narrow sense – 'publicist' [15, p. 35–43]. We must admit that this piece of information aimed at a great number of viewership in the UK and worldwide was packed into a kind of feedforward without any direct feedback. The author twines two conceptual systems into one structural unit, primarily, it should produce a strong impact upon viewers and, second, meet the TV time limits. We have chosen a multi-mode discourse – BBC news script – registered in internet which differentiates between two concepts represented by two semantic net: (1) NATION → country → US → country → fighting → starting wars → war started → interference → Iran, Libya, Ukraine, Syria, Yemen → countries → troubled empire; (2) War drums → trade war → the oil trading in Yuan → debt → budget → mortgage → deficit → trillion → financial system → the gold holdings → countries (Russia, Turkey, India and China) → Western Central Banks. The core units of the first part may organize the conceptual system of "US Empire".

We would call constituents of the first and second domains "functional-semantic" because they consist of the units of different parts of speech and refer to different language structures, but sharing a common semantic component. The lexemes of the first net can constitute a dyade – US (nation, empire): other country (Iran, Libya, Ukraine, Syria, Yemen and the other net presents a dyade "America First" (president's slogan): America weakening" losing her position of a superpower. The term a discourse analysis is employed to reveal the ways of its structuring, unlike the term 'textual analysis' referring to links sentences within the text structure, but beyond. M. Halliday and R. Hasan define various cohesive markers by which semantic relations are realized, but they do not show how

context consistency influences the choice of these cohesive markers [13, p. 23; cf.: 17, p. 1393–1398]. Terry Royce suggests that an interaction of cohesion and coherence in discourse provides a new insight into the dynamics and subjectivity of the discourse [21, p. 137–159]. The other net: War drums → trade war → the oil trading in Yuan → debt → budget → mortgage → deficit → trillion → financial system → the gold holdings → countries (Russia, Turkey, India and China) → Western Central Banks. can be analyzed in the same style. The concept expressed by the given lexemes is ‘trade war’. Van Dijk says in his book *Text and Context*: “Coherence is a semantic property of discourse, based on the interpretation of each individual sentence relative to the interpretation of other sentences” [7, p. 96]. He argues that coherence of discourse is represented at two levels: linear or sequential coherence and global coherence. Linear coherence refers to “coherence relations holding between propositions expressed by composite sentence and sequences of those sentences” [7, p. 95]. Global coherence is of a more general nature characterizing a discourse as a whole [7, p. 52]. We shall start with a definitional analysis of the lexeme *war*, first, in the title and thrice in the text: (1) armed fighting between two or more countries or groups; (2) any situation in which there is strong competition between opposing sides or a great fight against something harmful (Cambridge); (3) a state of usually open and declared armed hostile conflict between states or nations; (4) a struggle or competition between opposing forces or for a particular end (Merriam Webster). In the title the lexeme realizes its component of *hostility* without referring either to the *armed conflict*, or *competition*, though in combination with the lexeme *drums* it signals the beginning of fighting. In the second case as a constituent of collocation *wars and interference in countries* it refers to *armed conflict* – the fact is well-known to the public which can be supported by the third case: *on the war path*, this idiom like that in the title idioms belongs to the military discourse [see 24]. But in the fourth and fifth cases the lexeme *war* in combination with the adjective *trade* is defined as “a negative side effect of protectionism that occurs when Country A raises tariffs on Country B’s imports in retaliation for Country B raising tariffs on Country A’s imports. (see Investopedia). The phrase also actualizes the component competition which correlates with the component *trade deficit*. The use of the concepts *war* and *deficit* in the discourse helps the reader connect this fragment with a political-economic conceptual system in his/her worldview. Lihong Shen underlines that coherence is a consequence of interaction between linguistic factors and non-linguistic factors [23, p. 852]. In his book “Text and Context”, van Dijk admits: “Coherence should be defined “not only in terms of semantic or conceptual relations between propositions, but (also) in terms of the underlying, subjective intersubjective mental models of participants” [7, p. 249].

The corpus-assisted discourse analysis (CADA) employs the techniques such as word frequency counts, concordances and collocation analysis to aid the discourse semantic interpretation. CADA gives the frequency of the concepts represented by the following lexemes in the BNC: *nation* (4261), *country* (20839), *empire* (3542), *war* (26881), *trade* (19395), *deficit* (2244), *budget* (7997). These figures substantiate our assumption that readers/hearers have corresponding permanent conceptual systems in their subconscious, which enable them to recreate the concepts during their text/discourse perception. In case a series of sentences seems incoherent, the reader as a translator can use inference to understand the discourse again due to his/her conceptual systems in their mind.

**Findings and perspectives.** The theory of coherence and its analysis are an important issue of discourse studies. The term sometimes overlaps with cohesion and frequently cohesion as a true linguistic phenomenon also covering the notion of coherence, which traditionally used to refer to speech. Usually coherence is considered as the connected relationship in meaning between every part of the text. David Crystal (1987) claims that coherence means that various kinds of concepts and relations expressed by a text must be relevant to each other, thereby we can infer the deep meaning of the text appropriately [5; 10]. From the point of view of discourse-as-product, coherence is a linguistic phenomenon, which is realized on the surface of discourse by various linguistic devices to connect different parts in a discourse. From the point of view of discourse-as-process, coherence is the consequence of interaction between the addresser and addressee, which can be achieved by mutual efforts of the both speaker and addressee. Cohesion and coherence are two complex linguistic terms in discourse analysis. Though they share the same morpheme “cohere”, they are different.

There is another perspective of a further investigation of the referred issues teaching academic writing evolving the discourse analysis to make structural parts of the final discourse coherent and logic.

#### References:

1. Abelen E.G., Redeker G., Thompson S. The Rhetorical structure of US-American and Dutch fund raising letters. Text. 1993. Vol. 13. P. 323–350.
2. Beaugrande Robert De. New foundations for a science of text and discourse: Cognition, communication, and the freedom of access to knowledge and society. Norwood, NJ, Greenwood Publishing Group, 1997. 670 p.
3. Blackmore Diane. Relevance and linguistic meaning: The Semantics and pragmatics of discourse markers. Cambridge: CUP, 2004. 212 p.
4. Brown Gillian, Yule George. Discourse analysis. Cambridge: CUP, 1983. 288 p.
5. Bussmann Hadumod. Routledge dictionary of language and linguistics. London, New York: Routledge, 2006. P. 560.
6. Cook Guy. Discourse. Oxford: OUP, 1989. 165 p.
7. Dijk Teun A. van. Discourse and knowledge: A Sociocognitive approach. Cambridge: CUP, 2014. 400 p.
8. Dontcheva-Navratilova Olga. Building up discourse coherence: creating identities in political speeches / Ed. Olga Dontcheva-Navratilova, Renata Povolná. Coherence and cohesion in spoken and written discourse. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009. P. 97–123.
9. Coulthart Malcolm. An Introduction to discourse analysis. London. New York: Routledge, 2014. 228 p.
10. Crystal D. An Encyclopedic dictionary of language and linguistics. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992. 428 p.
11. Fowler R. Language in the news: discourse and ideology in the press. London. New York: Routledge, 1991. 254 p.
12. Goutsos Dionysis. Modeling discourse topic: Sequential relations and strategies in expository text. Norwood, NJ: Greenwood Publ. Group, 1997. 203 p.
13. Halliday M., Hasan R. Cohesion in English. London: Longman, 1976. 374 p.
14. Halliday M.A.K., Christian M.I.M. An Introduction to functional grammar. 3-d ed. New York: Routledge, 2014. 480 p.
15. Johns Ann M. Cohesion in written business discourse: Some contrasts. 1980. Vol. 1(1). P. 35–43.
16. Kintsch Walter. The Representation of meaning in memory (PLE: Memory). New York: Psychology Press, 2014. 290 p.

17. Li Junxin. The Application and significance of discourse cohesion and analysis in practical teaching of foreign language. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. 2013. Vol. 3(8). P. 1393–1398.
18. Maier E., Hovy E. A metafunctionally motivated taxonomy for discourse structure relations. *Proc. 3-rd European workshop on language generation*. Judestein, Austria, 1991. P. 38–45.
19. Mykhaylenko Valery V. *Glossary of linguistics and translation studies: English-Ukrainian*. Chernivtsi: Tehnodruk, 2015. 555 p.
20. Redeker Gisela. *Coherence and Structure in Text and Discourse*. / Ed. H. Bunt and W. Black. *Abduction, Belief and Context in Dialogue: Studies in computational pragmatics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 2000. P. 233–264.
21. Royce Terry. The Analysis of economic discourse. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*. 1995. Vol. 18(2). P. 137–159.
22. Schiffrin Deborah. *Approaches to discourse: Language as social interaction*. London: Wiley, 1994. 482 p.
23. Shen Lihong. Relevance and coherence. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*. 2013. Vol. 4(4). P. 852–857.
24. Sperber Dan., Wilson Deirdre. *Relevance: communication and cognition*. Oxford, Cambridge: Blackwell, 1995. 338 p.
25. Stubbs Michael. *Discourse analysis: The Sociolinguistic analysis of natural language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983. 272 p.
26. Taboada María T. *Building coherence and cohesion: Task-oriented dialogue in English and Spanish*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 2004. 261 p.
27. Tannen Deborah. *Conversational style: Analyzing talk among friends*. Oxford: OUP, 2005. 272 p.
28. Wang Yuan, Guo Minghe. A Short analysis of discourse coherence. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*. 2014. Vol. 5(2). P. 460–465.
29. Werlich E. *A text grammar of English*. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1976. 315 p.
30. Widdowson H.G. *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: OUP, 1978. 168 p.

### **Михайленко В. В. Економічний дискурс: кореляція когезії та когеренції**

**Анотація.** У фокусі праці – дослідження необхідності аналізу засобів вираження когерентності й когезії та їх кореляції в інтра- й екстралінгвістичній площинах як для ефективного породження, так й для об'єктивної інтерпретації економічного дискурсу. Незважаючи на різноманітність підходів, автор розділяє погляд на мову як динамічну та гетерогенну систему, яка опосередковує взаємодію в соціальному й культурному контекстах, і пояснює, як саме когерентність і когезія відображаються в різних контекстно пов'язаних аспектах людського спілкування.

**Ключові слова:** когезія, когеренція, дискурс, семантика, структура, прагматика.

### **Михайленко В. В. Экономический дискурс: корреляция когезии и когеренции**

**Аннотация.** В фокусе работы – исследование необходимости анализа средств выражения когерентности и когезии и их корреляции в интра- и экстралингвистической плоскостях как для эффективного порождения, так и для объективной интерпретации экономического дискурса. Несмотря на разнообразие подходов, автор разделяет понимание языка как динамичной и гетерогенной системы, опосредующей взаимодействие в социальном и культурном контекстах, и объясняет, как когерентность и когезия отражаются в различных контекстно связанных аспектах человеческого общения.

**Ключевые слова:** когезия, когеренция, дискурс, семантика, структура, прагматика.