Cohesion in American political rhetoric:
The Gettysburg Address, I have a dream and *Obama's Inaugural Address*

Mercedes DÍEZ PRADOS

Universidad de Alcalá
mercedes.diez@uah.es

Ana Belén CABREJAS PEÑUELAS

Universidad de Valencia
Ana.Belen.Cabrejas@uv.es

ABSTRACT

The present study attempts to add to the existing body of literature on political rhetoric by analyzing in detail the cohesive devices used in three political texts - *The Gettysburg Address, I have a dream* and *Obama's Inaugural Address* – and their potential persuasive function. We first carry out an analysis of cohesion in these three masterpieces of political writing, applying our own model based on the combination and adaptation of those found in Halliday & Hasan's (1976) and Beaugrande & Dressler's (1981), in order to cover a wider range of devices and, at the same time, ameliorate some flaws ascribed by critics to Halliday & Hasan's (1976). The results reveal that, although they share similarities, the texts also showed differences in the cohesive devices employed. We then suggest a new dimension for the analysis of cohesion: what we have termed *intertextual cohesion*, a device to extend the scope of cohesion beyond the limits of the text. This tool has proved to be very effective to show the resonance of content and form among the three speeches analyzed.

Keywords: political speech, rhetoric, persuasion, cohesion, intertextuality.

La cohesión en la retórica política americana:
Los discursos *Gettysburg Address, I have a dream* y el de la *Investidura de Obama*

RESUMEN

El presente trabajo tiene como objetivo contribuir a la literatura existente sobre retórica política analizando en profundidad los mecanismos de cohesión utilizados en tres textos políticos – los discursos *Gettysburg Address, I have a dream* y el de la *Investidura de Obama* –y su potencial función persuasiva. En primer lugar, llevamos a cabo el análisis de la cohesión en estas tres obras maestras de la retórica

política, aplicando para ello nuestro propio modelo, que combina y adapta los de Beaugrande y Dressler (1981) y Halliday y Hasan (1976) con el fin de cubrir un abanico más amplio de mecanismos de cohesión y, a la vez, mitigar los fallos encontrados por diversos críticos en este último. Los resultados revelan que, a pesar de las similitudes, los textos se diferencian en la utilización de ciertos tipos de cohesión. Sugerimos, además, una nueva dimensión para el análisis de cohesión, acuñada con el término de *cohesión intertextual*, para hacer referencia a un mecanismo que amplía la esfera de acción de la cohesión más allá de los límites del texto. Esta herramienta ha resultado muy eficaz a la hora de poner de manifiesto la resonancia de contenido y forma que se da entre los tres textos.

Palabras clave: discurso político, retórica, persuasión, cohesión, intertextualidad.

SUMMARY: 1. Introduction 2. Historical background of the speeches 3. The analysis of cohesion in texts 4. Towards an integrated model for the analysis of cohesion 5. Experimental study of cohesion 6. Analysis and results 6.1. Cohesion density 6.2. Analysis of intertextual cohesion 7. Conclusions.

1. INTRODUCTION

Since antiquity the genre of political speech has been considered as a means of influencing audiences through rhetoric, which aims at persuading, claiming leadership and moving audiences to action with arguments. In recent years, political texts have been analyzed to track legislative agendas and political topics (Quinn et al. 2006) and to estimate ideological positioning (Laver et al. 2003, Monroe and Maeda 2004, Diermeier et al. 2007, Klebanov et al. 2008) often using natural language processing. Political documents such as party manifestos or political speech are expressions of the underlying ideology. Political rhetoric has been examined to understand the internal structure of political ideologies, such as Klebanov et al. (2008), who studied the lexical cohesion of Margaret Thatcher's 1977 speech to the Conservative Party Conference. They identified some groupings, including those related to the British political system and parties and to Britain and its major locations. A number of other domains were also found that illustrate Margaret Thatcher's rhetorical tools that shape how audiences perceive her, such as the fishing and sea domain, which is used figuratively; the bills, payments and mortgage domain; the truths, promises and falsehoods domain; the journey domain; and the conflict domain.

Our first incursions on the analysis of cohesive devices in texts focused on how novel writers (both native and non-native speakers of English) used these devices in argumentative texts (Díez 2003, Cabrejas 2005). We eventually came across a text, *The Gettysburg Address*, which –despite its brevity (239 words)– displayed a great amount of cohesive devices beautifully managed to convey a truly powerful message. This revelation made us wonder how this tool could be used as a rhetorical device by expert writers or orators in political texts, one of the most prominent types of persuasive discourse, because it is used to move large audiences. As a means of comparison, we then selected two other texts that showed some *intertextual*

connections with Lincoln's, as will be justified below: *I have a dream* by Martin Luther King Jr. and Barak Obama's *Inaugural Address*.

The connection between the three texts was the main reason to select them for comparison with the final aim of finding out the cohesive relations existing in the three pieces of political writing in order to discover what the three speeches have in common and what distinguishes them. All three politicians were reputed speakers at their own time with ample oratory abilities and the speeches selected have been often regarded as memorable. All three texts have an enormous significance in American history and have received the attention of numerous scholars. Nevertheless, and despite the numerous and different types of analyses that can be found in the literature, no one, as far as we know, has undergone a thorough and comparative analysis of the cohesive devices used in them; Morgan (2009), for instance, points out the power of repetition in Lincoln's speech, but he does not mention the varied types of repetition that can be found in this text.

Our aim in the present study is twofold: on the one hand, we carry out an analysis of the cohesive relations existing in these three masterpieces of political writing in order to discover what similarities and differences exist in the use of these devices by each politician, and, on the other, we pursue to examine the potential persuasive function these devices may fulfill (Foz Gil & Vazquez Orta 1995). We believe that the use of cohesive devices can contribute to persuade the audience of the producer's communicative intention, since cohesive devices produce an intrinsic effect of repeating and, thus, insisting, on the main issues stated in the text. Beaugrande & Dressler (1981) categorize cohesive devices, depending on their discursive function, into those that contribute to the internal stability of the text and those that contribute to its economy; the former imply repetition of either form or content, whereas the latter consist in substituting a lexical element by a function word. Notwithstanding, this second type of devices, to our mind, is also a kind of repetition because it restates the same textual entities by means of grammatical replacement of lexical meanings. Thus, we might say, that all cohesive devices can potentially fulfill an echoic function, creating a resonance of form and content through the text.

On what follows, we will provide a brief historical account of the circumstances that contextualize each of the texts selected and then proceed to explain the theoretical framework that supports the present study.

2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE SPEECHES

The Gettysburg Address was a speech delivered by US President Abraham Lincoln during the American Civil War on November 19th, 1863 at the dedication of the Soldiers' National Cemetery in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. The Battle of Gettysburg, which happened four months earlier, was the bloodiest battle of the Civil War and was also the turning point of the war. Some acres of pasture were bought and turned

into a cemetery for the Gettysburg dead. Both Edward Everett, a famous orator of the time, and Abraham Lincoln delivered a speech at the cemetery's dedication. In his speech, Lincoln invoked the principles of human equality present in the Declaration of Independence and exhorted listeners to ensure the survival of democracy in America. Lincoln's speech, which lasted just over two minutes, has been regarded as one of the most well-known speeches in the history of the United States. Despite the importance of the speech for American History, the exact location of the speech and wording, punctuation and structure of the text remain unclear. There are five known manuscripts of *The Gettysburg Address*: the Nicolay copy, Hay copy, Everett copy, Bancroft copy, and Bliss copy. The copy used in this study is the earliest of all, the Nicolay copy.

In the same way that many historians have considered the Gettysburg Battle as the turning point in the civil war (i.e. the South surrendered not long after that), *The Gettysburg Address* might be regarded as a turning point in American political rhetoric, since Lincoln departed from the expected norm of long, complex and even cumbersome speeches, such as the two-hour speech orator Everett[11] delivered right before Lincoln's words as part of the funeral oration at Gettysburg cemetery (Wills 1992). According to McPherson (1991: 93), "[w]e [Americans] have not had another president –except perhaps Franklin D. Roosvelt –who expressed himself in such a clear, forceful, logical manner as Lincoln". And he adds that *The Gettysburg Address* is "the most famous of his *poems* [emphasis added]" (McPherson 1991: 110).

I have a dream was delivered by Martin Luther King, Jr. on August 28th, 1963 on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial during the March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom in a moment when segregationist practices were common in the southern states of America and African-Americans were denied the right to vote, while the federal government and the leading politicians of the time did little to enforce the Constitution. In the speech, King called for racial equality and the end of discrimination by invoking the Declaration of Independence, the Emancipation Proclamation and the United States Constitution. The speech, which was considered a masterpiece of rhetoric, also includes multiple allusions to Lincoln's *Gettysburg Address*, the Bible and Shakespeare's *Richard III*. King's speech does not have a single version but, instead, is a combination of several drafts and had an earlier title: "Normalcy, Never Again".

The Inaugural Address by Barack Obama was delivered on January 20th, 2009 after his presidential election on November 4th, 2008. He was widely celebrated as the first African American President of the United States and a symbol of change and hope for the country after George W. Bush. Obama had demonstrated excellent oratory skills and, thus, he raised high expectations for his Inaugural Address. By

---

[1] Everett himself recognizes that "I should be glad, if I could flatter myself, that I came as near to the central idea of the occasion, in two hours, as you did in two minutes" (McPherson 1991: 112).

using references to Lincoln's Gettysburg Address and his ideas of national unity in times of crisis and to King's ideal for equality set forth in *I have a dream*, he managed to make his audience believe in a new era of hope.

3. THE ANALYSIS OF COHESION IN TEXTS

Although Gutwinski's (1976) volume on textual cohesion was released a few months before Halliday and Hasan's (1976), theirs has been considered the seminal work on the topic. Since then, the phenomenon of cohesion has been of interest until recent times with the identification of those elements contributing to the coherence of a text, including lexical repetition (Hoey 1991), patterns of entity realization and rhetorical organization (Marcu 2000, Siddharthan & Copestake 2004, Barzilay & Lapata 2005). Current studies of cohesion include analyses of the anaphoric relations found in Spanish and English conversations (Taboada 2000) or EFL texts (e.g. Díez 2003, Cabrejas 2007).

    Cohesion is defined as "a semantic relation between an element in the text and some other element that is crucial to the interpretation of it" (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 8). It involves the recourse of one element to another in the text for its interpretation: "the one PRESUPPOSES the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it" (1976: 4). Cohesion in the text points out to the possibility that the speaker or writer has to "[make] text hang together" if one of the elements points to something else anaphorically or cataphorically. Cohesion is created through grammar, such as pronouns and conjunctions, but also through lexis by the repetition of lexical items and semantically related items. This is called lexical cohesion, which is a component of a coherent text.

    Hoey (1991: 12) claims that "cohesion is objective, capable in principle of automatic recognition, while coherence is subjective and judgments concerning it may vary from reader to reader." From a broader perspective, Stoddard (1991) defines cohesion taking into account the different perspectives of theoretical linguistics, philosophy, psychology and pragmatics and their common elements. For Stoddard, a cohesive *element* stands in a meaning relationship with another element called cohesion *node*. The association is called a cohesive *tie*, which can be signaled either implicitly or explicitly by linguistic devices. However, cohesion cannot be said to exist only in the physical text, but rather, it is "a mental construct from reader processing" (1991: 17). The presence of linguistic signals indicates the potential for cohesion that can only be realized when the reader recognizes the cohesive ties. Therefore, for Stoddard, cohesion may rely on the reader, rather than on the text, like most authors affirm of coherence, which is "the connection that is brought about by something outside the text. This 'something' is usually knowledge which a listener or reader is assumed to have" (Renkema 2004: 49).

The view of coherence as less dependent on the language of the text but rather viewed as "more user- and context-oriented" is the position taken by an increasing number of recent analyses. Bublitz (1999: 2) claims that:

> ... it is not texts but rather people that cohere when understanding texts (be it as the producing, receiving or, indeed, analysing side), [then] it can be said that for one and the same text there exist a speaker's (or writer's), a hearer's (or reader's) and an analyst's coherence, which may or may not match.

That view of cohesion as reader-dependent has also been supported by other authors, like Klebanov & Shamir (2007: 28), who studied how lexical cohesion is represented in the text. These authors point out that, in contrast with referential cohesion and rhetorical structure signalled by specific cue phrases, lexical repetition is not inherently cohesive. Instead, lexical items are cohesive with respect to other lexical elements. Although lexical cohesion may be achieved by relations such as synonymy and antonymy, for different researchers, lexical cohesion is achieved by relations *felt* by the reader that are difficult to classify, such as the examples given by Halliday & Hasan (1976): *dig/garden*, *ill/doctor*, *laugh/joke*. If there is a good proportion of agreement between readers, then it may be possible to develop reader-based identification procedures (Morris & Hirst 2005, Klebanov & Shamir 2007). The notion of *anchoring* is used to refer to the connections made by the reader between two pieces of writing: "Once any *normal* direction is actually taken up by the following text, there is a connection back to whatever makes this a normal direction, according to the reader's commonsense knowledge" (Klebanov & Shamirl 2007: 29). For example, according to Klebanov & Shamir (2007: 29-30), a text starting with the sentence *Mother died today* can take many different directions: a description of an accident, of a long illness, what happened to the family afterwards, the speaker's feeling of loneliness, and so on. If the text takes the illness side, this can be better explained by the previous mention of the mother's death. Therefore, *illness* is anchored by *died* (*illness* → *died*), existing a cohesive relation between them. A debate that seems to be still open is the relation between cohesion and coherence[2], that is, whether they are intrinsically linked or whether they can exist autonomously. Grabe & Kaplan (1996: 67) point out the lack of consensus among scholars regarding the relative contribution of both phenomena in text construction. Whereas Halliday & Hasan (1976)   think cohesion decisively contributes to the coherence of a text, other

---

[2] This debate was in the limelight in the 1980s (Reinhart 1980, Bernárdez 1982, Nuttall 1982, Carrell 1982 and 1983, Brown and Yule 1983, Urquhart 1983, Connor 1984, Giora 1985, among others). Following the same line of argument, Carrell (1983: 690) points out that "cohesion does not create coherence, or texture. Cohesion can be a meaningful concept only if we assume that coherence is a logically prior concept; we cannot speak sensibly of linguistic cohesion unless we can assume psychological coherence." In an earlier article, Carrell (1982) argues that there is no relationship between the proportion of cohesive ties and the grade of coherence in a text.

authors (e.g., Widdowson 1978, Brown & Yule 1983, Urquhart 1983, Connor 1984, Hoey 1991) affirm these two phenomena can exist independently, and provide examples of cohesive texts which lack coherence and coherent texts which do not display any cohesive device. Although Hasan (1989: 78) admits such possibility, she argues that:

> whenever scholars have attempted to prove that it is possible to have texts without cohesion, in order to demonstrate their point they have normally created [...] 'minimal texts' consisting of either a single message by one participant, or one message per participant.

That cohesive devices contribute to the coherence of texts is also asserted in rhetoric guides such as *The Little, Brown Handbook*: "Coherent paragraphs convey the relations among sentences in many ways" (Fowler 1983: 67), and, among the relations mentioned in the handbook that writers can establish are transitional words (i.e. conjunctions or conjunctives), parallelism, repetitions or restatements, and pronouns (i.e. reference). As a way of conclusion, then, even if cohesion and coherence can take place independently, it seems widely accepted that these two textual phenomena (*text-centred notions* in Beaugrande & Dressler's 1981 terms) frequently co-exist and co-operate in the effective transmission of messages.

Next, we will explain the cohesion model applied for analysis in the present paper, which is based on the combination and adaptation of two widely recognized categorizations of cohesive devices: those of Halliday & Hasan (1976, taking into account later modifications of the model included in Halliday & Hasan 1985, 1989) and Beaugrande & Dressler (1981).

4. TOWARDS AN INTEGRATED MODEL FOR THE ANALYSIS OF COHESION

Although Halliday & Hasan's *Cohesion in English* has been widely accepted among the linguistic community, who considered the notion of *cohesion* as a well-defined and useful category, their model has also received considerable criticism on the part of linguists, such as Huddleston (1978), Green & Morgan (1981) and Brown & Yule (1983), among others.

In a review article of Halliday & Hasan's *Cohesion in English*, Huddleston considers Halliday & Hasan's taxonomy of phoric relations, which they had subdivided in "endophora" (i.e. a cohesive relation between to elements inside the same text) and "exophora" (i.e. when the relation is established between an element in the text with one in the situation) as two cases of the same phenomenon. According to him, no distinction should be made between endophoric and exophoric references, since, in both cases, the antecedent is identified with the referent. Huddleston (1978:

304) also disagrees with Halliday & Hasan's notion of *replaceability* (i.e. in substitution and ellipsis it is always possible to 'restore' the presupposed item) and with their total identification between a referential anaphor and its antecedent. Moreover, Huddleston further criticizes Halliday & Hasan's opposition between referential anaphora and substitution based on the fact that the former involves identity of reference between anaphor and antecedent and the latter does not, since he claims that co-referenciality can be found in both.

In turn, Brown & Yule (1983: 195-6) disapprove of Halliday & Hasan's notion of texture as the element that contributes to the identification of texts through the explicit expression of the semantic relationships that hold between items in a text. For the former, even when no explicit links are used marking the relationships between sentences, it is possible to affirm that they constitute a text because there exist underlying semantic relations that hold the sentences together. They further criticize Halliday & Hasan's distinction of endophoric relations. According to Brown and Yule (1983: 200-1), it is more likely to occur that "the processor establishes a referent in his mental representation of the discourse and relates subsequent references to that referent back to his mental representation, rather than to the original verbal expression in the text." That way the reader would not need two kinds of representation of the world: a mental representation of the real world for endophoric relations and a mental representation of the world created by the discourse of the text for exophoric relations.

Both Huddleston and Brown and Yule point out that Halliday & Hasan's view of substitution as an element that can be substituted by another one in the text is far too narrow to cover all cases. While Halliday & Hasan's model serves to explain those examples where there is total identification between antecedent and pronoun, it cannot explain those where the referent has undergone changes.

Finally, Halliday & Hasan's view of lexical cohesion has also received profuse criticism by different authors (e.g. Morgan & Sellner 1980, Green & Morgan 1981, Stotsky 1983, Carrel 1982, Green 1989, Tyler 1994) and, in more general terms, they claim that Halliday & Hasan's model is text-based rather than founded on principles of pragmatic interpretation, attaching excessive weight to the contribution of cohesion to coherence and disregarding the processor's contribution to the interpretation of a text. Notwithstanding, for Tyler lexical repetition makes contributions to the overall discourse comprehensibility "because [it] cuts down on the risk of the listener assigning a different interpretation to the lexical item than that intended by the speaker (...) and reduces the amount of processing the listener has to engage in" (1994: 686). Another criticism on lexical cohesion was Hoey's (1991), who disapproves of the term "collocation", which Halliday & Hasan used to name an heterogeneous group of lexical relations that appear at random in a text.

In spite of the criticisms that Halliday & Hasan's work has been subjected to, *Cohesion in English* has given invaluable insights into the study of analysis of discourse and has been the basis of later studies that have complemented it. Besides,

Halliday & Hasan's later contributions (Hasan 1984, Halliday & Hasan 1985/1989) improve some of the previous criticisms, particularly with regards to lexical cohesion.

For the analysis of cohesion, we propose a coding scheme model that includes all the types of cohesion that Halliday & Hasan distinguished with changes to ameliorate some of the most important criticisms and one that includes other devices to complement it taken from Beaugrande & Dressler (1981), since they can be pervasively found in rhetoric. These latter authors distinguish two types of cohesive devices: those that contribute to text stability (or equivalence) and those which contribute to economy. These are two somehow contradictory linguistic principles, since the first set implies some sort of repetition (either of content and/or form), whereas the second one conforms with the general linguistic principle of economizing resources in communication, avoiding to repeat those references or concepts known by the addressee of the message.

The cohesive devices contributing to stability are, according to Beaugrande & Dressler: Recurrence (i.e. the same as Repetition in Halliday & Hasan's taxonomy), Partial Recurrence (i.e. repetition of a word but shifting the word class, for instance, from a noun to a verb, e.g. *discovery-discover*), Parallelism (i.e. repetition of the structure but filling it in with different elements, e.g. "Our nation is at war… Our economy is badly weakened… Our health care is too costly...", taken from Obama's Inaugural Address), Paraphrase (i.e. repeating content but conveying it with different expressions; this subsumes both traditional synonymy (e.g. *freedom-liberty*) and paraphrase (e.g. *bankrupt- insufficient funds*). Regarding the devices that contribute to economy are Pro-form, which is equivalent to Halliday & Hasan's Reference and Substitution (it consists in the replacement of lexical words by grammatical words, i.e. nouns by pronouns like *him* or *one*, verbs by pro-verbs like *do*, and clauses by adverbs like *so*), Ellipsis, and other resources such as tense and aspect maintenance, functional sentence perspective (i.e. distribution of old and new information throughout the text) and intonation.

Thus, for the present paper, we have followed a model initially proposed in Díez (2001), which adopted Beaugrande & Dressler's dichotomy of stability and economy devices and comprehended the devices proposed in their classification and those of Halliday & Hasan's, taking into account the equivalences in both. Furthermore, we have also adapted the aforementioned taxonomy to ameliorate the major flaws in Halliday & Hasan's classification, as previously proposed in Cabrejas (2005). Following Huddleston's (1978) suggestion, for referential cohesion, we distinguish between identity and non-identity of reference between the anaphor and its antecedent. For the substitution type of cohesion, we include Huddleston's (1978) and Brown & Yule's (1983) distinction between non-identity of reference and implicit reference for those elements whose referent had undergone some kind of change. Finally, Hasan's (Halliday & Hasan 1985/1989) modification of lexical cohesion was adopted. Thus, the classification developed has been established as follows:

A. Mechanisms that contribute to stability: Repetition, subsuming the following types:
1. Total repetition (repetition of the exact same word or expression).
2. Partial repetition (repetition with word class change).
3. Parallelism (repetition of structure).
B. Mechanisms that contribute to economy:
B. Reference (pronominal, demonstrative and comparative)
B1. Identity of reference:
B1.1. Ponominals.
B1.2. Dmonstratives and definite article.
B2. Non-identity of reference: comparatives
C. Substitution (nominal, verbal and clausal):
C1. Non-co-referential.
C2. Implicit reference.
D. Ellipsis (nominal, verbal and clausal)
E. Lexical replacement: synonym, superordinate and general word.
F. Other lexico-semantic relations: antonymy, hyponymy (including co-hyponyms), and meronymy (including co-meronyms).
G. Linking devices: conjunctives.

5. EXPERIMENTAL STUDY ON COHESION

The politicians and texts selected for analysis are *The Gettysburg Address* by Abraham Lincoln, *I have a dream* by Martin Luther King and *Obama's Inaugural Address* by Barak Obama[3]. Apart from comparing the types of cohesive devices used in these three political speeches delivered by three widely considered charismatic leaders, a further objective of the present study is to prove that these texts echo each other through intertextual connections. This echoing of ideas can be considered as a means to establish cohesion among different texts (i.e. a sort of *intertextual cohesion*), since the same entities and concepts are repeated in the three speeches. The meaning of these intertextual cohesive ties cannot be fully understood (or, at least, to its richest interpretation), without resource to the *presupposed items* (as Halliday & Hasan 1976

---

[3] For ease of reference, we will refer to the texts analyzed as GA (*Gettysburg Address*), Dream (*I have a Dream*) and IA (*Inaugural Address*), respectively. As a historical contextualization of the three speeches, let us recall that the GA was delivered the 19th of November, 1863, at the consecration ceremony of the Gettysburg Cemetery for soldiers killed in one the most bloody battles in the American Civil War; King's speech was addressed on 28th August, 1963, just one hundred years later, during one of the largest demonstrations in history against racial segregation. Lastly, Obama's speech was delivered on the 20th of January, 2009 (46 years after Dream and 146 after the GA) as his inaugural address after taking the presidential oath. The last two speeches took place in Washington D.C., the Capital of the United States

call the element with which the cohesive item is connected forming a cohesive tie). Recalling Renkema's definition of cohesion as "the connection which results when the interpretation of a textual element is dependent on another element in the text" (Renkema 2004: 49), we define *intertextual cohesion* as "the connection that results when the interpretation of a textual element depends on an element from another text". This intertextual cohesion, in turn, contributes to the coherence of texts by activating a series of common values shared, or, at least, well-known, by (a majority of) the American public. Schemata, the theory we have of the world (Rumelhart 1981: 37), contribute to the coherence of texts (Downing 1998) because, in the process of interpretation we activate the necessary schemata (or shared knowledge) to be able to make sense of them. Shared values are schematic conventions that people acquire by means "of being socialized into the accepted ways of behaving in the social groups they belong to" (Widdowson 2007: 34). Thus, in line with the aforementioned objectives, the research questions that guide the present study are:

1. What cohesive elements predominate in the texts *The Gettysburg Address*, *I have a dream* and *Obama's Inaugural Address*?
2. Do they differ in terms of cohesive devices?
3. How are the texts connected by means of intertextual cohesion?
4. What effect does the use of cohesive devices have on the text persuasion?

As mentioned above, the data chosen for analysis were the three speeches: *The Gettysburg Address* (239 words, 9 sentences and an average sentence length of 26.5 words), *I Have a Dream* (1,666 words, 80 sentences and 20.8 of average sentence length) and *Obama's Inaugural Address* (The text has 2,413 words, 113 sentences and 21.3 of average sentence length). The evaluation of cohesion was carried out by analyzing the texts in terms of their cohesive elements, classifying them per number and type and calculating the cohesive density and the number of cohesive ties per T-unit (Hunt1965). Further examination included calculating the percentages of cohesive ties and calculating whether or not the differences between all three texts were significant. For that purpose, the logistic regression analysis[4] was carried out by means of the SAS 9.0 statistical package. Since the length of each text is different, the calculations to compare the use of cohesive devices among them must be based on ratios and means and the differences tested by inferential statistics to check whether they are significant or not.

In the following table, we include the coding scheme we used to analyze the different types of cohesion mentioned above in the proposed framework, with an example of each type and the coding system developed to tag each instance.

---

[4] The logistic regression analysis measures the relationship between a dependent variable and one or more independent variables. It helps understand how the value of the dependent variable changes when one of the independent variables is varied and the rest are kept fixed (Hosmer and Lemeshow 2000: 1).

TYPE OF COHESION	*Examples*	CODING
Reference		R
a. Identity of Reference		a
I. Pronominals	*he, him, her*	Ia
II. Non-referential pronouns	*this, these, that*	II
b. Non-identity of Reference	*same, identical*	Ib
Substitution		S
Non-co-referential		
I. Nominal substitutes	*one, ones*	I
II. Verbal substitutes	*do, be, have*	II
III.Implicit reference		III
IV. Clausal substitutes	*so, not*	IV
Ellipsis		E
I. Nominal ellipsis		I
II. Verbal ellipsis		II
III. Clausal ellipsis		III
Conjunctives		C
I. Additive		I
II. Adversative	*and, and also*	II
III. Causal	*yet, though*	III
IV. Temporal	*so, then*	IV
V. Other	*then, next*	V
	now, of course	
Lexical		L
Replacement		
I. Synonymy		LI
II. Superordinate		LII
III. General word		LIII
Repetition		R
I. Total repetition		RI
II. Partial repetition		RII
III. Parallelism		RIII
IV. Paraphrase		RIV

Table 1. Classification of cohesive ties

6. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

6.1. COHESION DENSITY

The results on cohesion density suggest that GA has a higher cohesion density than the other two texts: a cohesive tie of some type occur once every .21 words of Lincoln's speech, .15 words of King's speech and .13 words of Obama's speech[5] (see Table 2 below). The greatest difference is between Lincoln and Obama, which accounts for .08 words. The results of the logistic regression analysis reveal that the differences are significant (p=.0012, p<0.01). It seems, however, that while GA is significantly different from Obama (p=.0022), Dream is not (p=.2711).

	The Gettysburg Address		I have a dream		Obama's Inaugural Address	
Total ties	50		247		307	
Total words	239		1,666		2,413	
Total t-units	10		85		138	
Cohesion density: **Ratio: tie to word count**	0.21		0.15		0.13	
Tie / T-unit	5.0		2.91		2.22	
Ties	N	% of ties	N	% of ties	N	% of ties
Lexical	29	58	184	74.49	192	62.54
Reference	17	34	39	15.79	76	24.76
Substitution	2	4	0	0	2	0.65
Conjunction	2	4	24	9.72	37	12.05
Ellipsis	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lexical ties						
L1 (Synonymy)	4	13.79	23	12.5	34	17.71
L2 (Superordinate)	1	3.45	19	11.33	9	4.69
L3 (General word)	5	17.24	2	1.09	1	0.52
L4 (Antonymy)	3	10.34	16	8.70	8	4.17
L5 (Hyponymy)	1	3.45	17	9.24	14	7.29
L6 (Meronymy)	0	0	9	4.89	18	9.37
LR1 (total repetition)	12	41.38	89	48.37	68	35.42
LR2 (partial repetition)	2	6.90	8	4.35	31	16.14
LR3 (parallelism)	3	10.34	1	0.54	9	4.69

Tabla 2. Cohesion analysis of Lincoln's, King's and Obama's speeches

―――――――

[5] The analysis of cohesive density does not include the first cohesive item of each chain.

Analyses of the number of ties per T-unit also reveal that King and Obama make similar numbers (2.91 and 2.22 ties), whereas Lincoln employs 5.0 ties per T-unit, a difference of 2.09 and 2.78 words, respectively. The reason for this difference lies on the fact that Lincoln's speech contains longer T-units, which makes these figures not comparable: 23.9 words per T-unit *versus* 19.6 and 17.49 words for King and Obama, respectively.

Comparisons of uses of the different types of cohesion in the three speeches reveal that Lincoln outstands in the use of reference (34%) and substitution (4%), King in the use of lexical devices (74.49%) and Obama in the use of conjunctions (12.05%). None of them use any ellipsis, which is not rare taking into account that this device, together with substitution, is more typical of the oral language (Díez 2003: 218). However, Lincoln uses much more substitution than the other two politicians. Contrariwise, King and Obama employ higher proportions of conjunctions than Lincoln, which implies that these speeches express logical relationships between sentences more explicitly. By looking at the percentages of the different types of cohesive devices, it is possible to conclude that, of all three politicians, Obama makes the most balanced use of the different devices, whereas Lincoln relies heavily on reference and lexical cohesion and King on lexical cohesion. The ratio of total lexical ties to total words in each text reveals that Lincoln, with a ratio of .12, uses a greater number of lexical ties than either King or Obama, with ratios of .11 and .08, respectively (see Table 3). The pattern follows the trend of ratios in Table 2. The results for lexical ties among the three texts are statistically significant ($p=.0047$, $p<0.01$), although the regression analysis shows that Dream is significantly different from Obama for lexical ties ($p=.0021$), while GA is not ($p=.1195$).

	The Gettysburg Address	***I have a dream***	***Obama's Inaugural Address***
Total words	239	1,666	2,413
Lexical ties	29	184	192
Lexical density (ratio lexical ties to total words)	0.12	0.11	0.08

Table 3. Summary of lexical ties in the three political texts

Despite the differences, this study also finds that all speakers rely primarily on lexical ties, of which total lexical repetition is the most important way of achieving cohesion in text and less on partial repetition of words, as in "have died" and "dead" in Lincoln's speech, "promise" and "promissory" in King's speech and "Americans" and "America" in Obama's speech, where the words share a stem but vary in the use of prefixes or suffixes. Repetition is so important for all three speakers that their total proportion of total and partial repetition amounted to 50% or over (see Table 2).

Repetition was used with the purpose of emphasizing the ideas expressed by the speaker and of convincing the audience of the truth of the ideas expressed.

Lincoln, Obama and especially King used repetition of a word or phrase at the beginning of two or more successive clauses, thus contributing to create a speech very strong in passion. This figure of speech is called anaphora[6], which in some of the following examples works together with parallelism, resulting in a strong cohesive effect:

SPEAKER		Examples
Lincoln	(1)	*We* are met *We* have come to (anaphora and parallelism)
	(2)	*It is* for the living *It is* rather for us (anaphora and parallelism)
King	(3)	*I have a dream that one day* … *I have a dream that one day* … *I have a dream that one day* … *I have a dream that* … *I have a dream today!* *I have a dream that one day* … *I have a dream today!* *I have a dream that one day* …
	(4)	*Now is the time* to make real the promises of democracy. *Now is the time* to rise from the dark and desolate valley … *Now is the time* to open the doors of opportunity … *Now is the time* to lift our nation from the quicksands … (anaphora and parallelism)
Obama	(5)	*So* it has been … *So* it must be … (anaphora and parallelism)
	(6)	*On this day*, *we* gather *On this day*, *we* come (repetition + parallelism)
	(7)	*Our* nation … *Our* economy … *Our* health care … (repetition + parallelism)

Lincoln also repeats the same word at the end of a series of clauses or phrases, which has a rhythmic effect that may also stir the emotions of the audience[7]. This rhetorical

---

[6] **Anaphora** this time does not refer to its meaning as a cohesive device, but as a rhetorical device that consists of repeating a sequence of words at the beginnings of neighboring clauses, thereby lending them emphasis (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anaphora_(rhetoric).

[7] As signalled in the transcript of the GA included in Grimes (1982), the audience reacted to Lincoln's words with applause a total of six times. The longest prolonged applause was at the end of his

figure is called *epiphora*. In the previous examples, the repetition at the end of the expression is also accompanied by parallelism (repetition of structure). All this repetition seems imbued of a discursive persuasive force. As Johnstone (1987: 208) puts it: "repetition serves to create rhetorical *presence*, the linguistic foregrounding of an idea which can serve to make it persuasive even without logical support" (italics in original):

> (8) what we say *here*, but … what they did *here* (epiphora and parallelism)
> (9) government of *the people*, by *the people*, for *the people* (epiphora and parallelism)

Words are also repeated throughout the speeches to create a sense of topic maintenance that contributes to the coherence of the text, where all parts are linked. For example, Lincoln repeated "nation" 4 times, "dedicate" 5 times, "hallow" twice, "here" 7 times, "dead" 3 times, "war" twice, "consecrate" twice and "great" 3 times.

There are few examples of parallelism as a source of cohesion in text, although the parallel structures found draw the audiences' attention to the meaning of words, "mak[ing] things believable by forcing them into the affective field of the hearer and keeping them there" (Johnstone 1987: 208). This effect can be seen in the examples below:

Obama	(10)	For us, they packed up their few worldly possessions and travelled across oceans in search of a new life. For us, they toiled in sweatshops and settled the West; endured the lash of the whip and ploughed the hard earth. For us, they fought and died, in places like Concord and Gettysburg; Normandy and Khe Sahn. (parallelism and anaphora)
King	(11)	[…] have come to realize that their destiny is tied up with our destiny. And they have come to realize that their freedom is inextricably bound to our freedom.
Lincoln	(12)	we can not dedicate we can not consecrate we can not hallow, this ground (parallelism and anaphora)

Finally, a variety of lexical ties, which include synonyms, superordinates, general words, antonyms, hyponyms, and meronyms, are used throughout all three texts. However, they differ in the types selected: Lincoln and King are proportionately very

---

speech, when he makes the audience a direct protagonist of their own destiny using the words: "[…] and that government of the people by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth". The points of audience reaction were taken by Grimes from a *New York Tribune* account reproduced in Everett (1863, in Grimes 1982: 165).

similar in their use of synonymy, antonymy, and repetition; however, they are different from Obama's speech in the numbers of these ties. Obama's text displays proportionately fewer antonyms and more synonyms, meronyms and repetitions.

Synonymy is common in all three speeches, such as *God* and *Lord*, *country* and *nation*, *liberty* and *freedom* in King's speech; *land* and *nation*, *America* and *nation*, *struggled* and *fought*, *worked* and *toiled* in Obama's speech, all of which are semantic and syntactic substitutes. There are however semantic substitutes that are not necessarily syntactic, such as *battlefield* and *here* in Lincoln's speech. Antonymy is used to express contrast between words and serves the purpose of emphasizing ideas: for example, the antonyms *today* and *tomorrow*, *justice* and *injustice*, *segregation* and *freedom*, *white people* and *the Negro* in King's text express the main ideas of the speech, that is, inequality of black people in the society of his age and the change of mentality that America must undergo for the near future. Other semantic relations, such as superordinates, general words, hyponyms and meronyms add lexical variety and word relations to the speeches, other than equivalence for synonymy and opposition for antonymy. Each speech favors a type of these lexical devices: general words in GA, such as *do* and *dedicate a portion*; synonyms and superordinates in Dream, such as *decree* and *Emancipation proclamation;* and synonyms and meronyms in IA, such as *nuclear threat* and *threats*.

Once the cohesive analysis has been addressed, we will now tackle the intertextual connections between the three texts to show that, not only do the three texts display the same types of cohesive devices with the same presupposed intended persuasive function, but they also echo one another in terms of the subjects addressed in them.

6.2. ANALYSIS OF INTEXTEXTUAL COHESION

These days, Barack Obama's speeches are of interest, not only for journalists or the general public, but also for scholars from different disciplines. This is the case of Capone (2010), who has recently published a study on one of Obama's speeches addressing issues of personification, footing and polyphony in Obama's speech. He points out the intertextual character of his speeches, which echo, not only himself, but also others such as Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s *I Have a Dream*. Intertextuality among the three texts analyzed in the present paper was the main reason to choose them for a comparative analysis on the cohesive devices used by the three politicians. In this section further evidence of such echoing from the texts is offered.

The first and most evident link between the Dream and the GA is the way both texts start: "Four score and seven years ago…" (GA) and "Four score years ago…" (Dream); by the time reference, Lincoln is recalling the Declaration of Independence, signed by the Fathers of the Nation (itself an intertextual device between the GA and that legal document). Also, King remembers Lincoln ("a great American, in whose symbolic shadow we stand today") and his signing of a document that was issued to

(supposedly) meliorate racist segregation: the Emancipation Proclamation, issued in the same year as *The Gettysburg Address*. In fact, GA, Dream and IA dedicate some commemorative words to their ancestors, who designed the legal documents that established America as a free nation: "Our fathers brought forth, on this continent, a new nation, conceived in Liberty" (GA), "When the architects of our republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence" (Dream), and "Our Founding Fathers (…) drafted a charter to assure the rule of law and the rights of man" (IA). All three politicians seem to recall this collective memory to move the audience into believing they are part of a historical chain.

These politicians also remind the American public that their predecessors fought for a common cause in order to build a better future for the nation which they are now enjoying: "The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here" (GA), "With this faith, we will be able to work together, to pray together, to struggle together" (Dream), and "Time and again these men and women struggled (…) so that we might live a better life" (IA). Remembering these deeds, the speakers are implying that the inheritors should be thankful to those who fought for them and should continue their task, so that their sacrifice is not wasted: "It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us" (GA), "We must forever conduct our struggle on the high plane of dignity and discipline" (Dream), and, even more elaborately, in the IA:

> What is required of us now is a new era of responsibility - a recognition, on the part of every American, that we have duties to ourselves, our nation, and the world, duties that we do not grudgingly accept but rather seize gladly, firm in the knowledge that there is nothing so satisfying to the spirit, so defining of our character, than giving our all to a difficult task (IA).

This remembrance of a shared past and a present duty contributes to the coherence of the texts –since shared schemata are activated- and, at the same time, it has a strong persuasive effect, since a feeling of gratitude and responsibility is instilled in the audience in order to move them. This aptitude of mobilizing audiences to make the necessary sacrifices for victory, is a faculty recognized in McPherson (1991: 93) as a pre-eminent quality of leaders in times of war, but, it certainly works as well at other difficult times in history.

The three speakers make reference to the spatial and temporal context of the historical moment when the address is taking place, as well as the cause for their gathering: "We are met on a great battlefield of that war (…) Now we are engaged in a great civil war (…) We have come to dedicate" (GA), "We have also come to this hallowed spot (…) the fierce urgency of now" (Dream), and "I stand here today … On this day, we gather because (…) On this day, we come to proclaim (…) That we are in the midst of crisis is now well understood" (IA). And they all invoke that, according to their democratic principles, all men are equal, they are all free: "the proposition that all men are created equal (GA), "We hold these truths [unalienable

Rights of Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness] to be self-evident, that all men are created equal" (Dream), and "the God-given promise that all men are equal, all are free, and all deserve a chance to pursue their full measure of happiness" (IA). Elmore (2009: x) points out that Obama's *Inaugural Address* also echoes GA in his use of "new", including "a new age" and "a new life", which reminds of "a new nation" and "a new birth of freedom" from GA. Indeed, "new" was used not fewer than eleven times, which testifies for its importance in the overall meaning of the text. He also mentions that Lincoln invoked the name of God throughout their speeches, and so does Obama in the IA, who used it up to five times (*ibid.*). As Lincoln and Obama, in *I have a dream* King also invoked the name of God and he did so four times as "God" and once as "Lord".

Dunne (2009), in his article 'Passing the Torch' (a title that echoes the well-known phrase by Kennedy, used in 1961 in his Inaugural Address "The torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans", Dunne 2009: 14), tries to anticipate what Obama will say in his Inaugural Address by analyzing the resonance of this type of speeches addressed by previous Presidents of the United States. His reflection is, thus, in line with the analysis being carried here: intertextuality in American political rhetoric. According to him, three topics are recurrent in Inaugural Addresses: "the essential unity of the American people, their shared values and their common though vicarious history as a nation of immigrants" (Dunne 2009: 15). The first two topics are present in the three texts analyzed in the present study with different degrees of explicitness (the IA, being the longest one, resorts to them in several occasions); the third topic, that of the immigrant origin, is treated subtlety in GA ("Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth, upon this continent, a new nation…"), more explicitly in the IA:

> For we know that our patchwork heritage is a strength, not a weakness. We are a nation of Christians and Muslims, Jews and Hindus - and non-believers. We are shaped by every language and culture, drawn from every end of this Earth).

However, it is not really present in the Dream (the African Americans as being slaves are recalled, but no mention to their African origin is made. King also says that "one hundred years later, the Negro is still languished in the corners of American society and finds himself an exile in his own land". In any case, those three themes have the function to unite and uplift a diverse nation and different politicians contribute to this resonating effect by using what we have termed *intertextual cohesive devices*: they repeat each others' words (*score, ago, struggle, our fathers, promise, equal, freedom*), use synonyms (*architects of our republic-fathers-ancestors, promissory note-charter*) and parallel structures (*the proposition that all men are created equal-the God-given promise that all men are equal*), all of them devices that contribute to the stability of texts (Beaugrande & Dressler 1981). Each of these politicians paraphrases his predecessors' words: Obama's *Inaugural Address* celebrates King's dream has come

true ("and why a man whose father less than sixty years ago might not have been served at a local restaurant can now stand before you to take a most sacred oath", IA), King borrows Lincoln's words to initiate his speech by using his very words and praising his deeds ("Five score years ago, a great American, in whose symbolic shadow we stand today, signed the Emancipation Proclamation"), and both Obama and King are inspired by Lincoln's sentences in *The Gettysburg Address* (Dunne 2009: 16).

7. CONCLUSIONS

The cohesion analysis carried out in three political speeches – *The Gettysburg Address*, *I have a dream* and *Obama's Inaugural Address* – reveals that all three texts were cohesive and, although they share similarities, they also show differences in terms of which cohesive devices are favored. The analysis of cohesion density reveals that Lincoln's speech has a higher cohesive density than Obama's and King's speeches, as the number of ties per word and the number of ties per T-unit demonstrate. The cohesive analysis further shows that the three speakers rely primarily on lexical and referential cohesion to achieve cohesion in text and these are followed by the rest of the cohesive ties, of which conjunctive cohesion was the most important to express relations between sentences or parts of sentences. Repetition is the most important lexical tie in all three speeches. Anaphora, simple repetition and parallelism are employed in Lincoln's, King's and Obama's speeches, which contributed to emphasize the speakers' ideas by making the words echo in the addressees' ears. Also, parallel structures help to get a rhythmical and sonorous sentence structure, which leads the audience to think of the speakers' meaning. Finally, lexical variety is expressed through other semantic relations, such as general words, hyponymy, meronymy and superordinates, which added different meaning relationships. We are aware of the fact that a more extensive analysis of speeches by the same authors or even by other politicians would have been desirable to draw more conclusive results on the use of cohesion as a rhetorical device of persuasion. Therefore, the present study could be considered as a first attempt to carry out an analysis that opens avenues of research that may provide fruitful results. The scope of the present paper and the meticulous analytical framework used did not allow us to cover a wider ground.

   In the same vein, the analysis of intertextual cohesion reveals that all three speeches can be recognized as examples of a common American rhetoric: the use of some of the same contents (i.e. repetition, synonymy and more complex types of paraphrase) and some of the same structures (i.e. parallelism) demonstrate that politicians *pass the torch* to one another in their desire to uplift American people by believing they are a free nation and they should contribute with their work so that freedom survives and succeeds. Whether this is reality or just a dream may not be

clear, but we agree with Dunne when he claims that everybody can recognize the force of these words:

> In the English-speaking world, American political rhetoric is unsurpassed (…) Later generations [of Americans] know just how problematic this picture of [a free] American history can be; they know how these fine words [Lincoln's words in *The Gettysburg Address*] need to be decoded and contextualised, racialised and gendered; they know that they cannot be used as simple shorthand for the complex narrative of the American past. Equally, we can recognize their force; and –as shown by Martin Luther King- we can realise that words may still be used to change the direction of American history (Dunne 2009: 16).

REFERENCES

Barzilay, Regina and Mirella Lapata (2005). Modeling local coherence: An entity-based approach. In Proceedings of 43rd Annual Meeting of the ACL. Ann Arbor, USA. 141-148.

Beaugrande, Robert de and Wolfgang Ulrich Dressler (1981). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman.

Bernárdez, Enrique (1982). *Introducción a la Lingüística del Texto.* Madrid: Espasa Calpe.

Brown, Gillian and George Yule (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bublitz, Wolfram (1999). Introduction: views of coherence. In Bublitz Wolfram, Uta Lenk, and Eija Ventola, eds. 1-7.

Bublitz, Wolfram, Uta Lenk, and Eija Ventola, eds. (1999). *Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse: How to Create it and How to Describe it.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub. Co.

Cabrejas Peñuelas, Ana Belén (2005). *A Comparison of the Revising Processes of Spanish Speakers and English Native Writers: Similarities and Differences*. Valencia: Universidad de Valencia.

Capone, Alessandro (2010). Barack Obama's South Carolina speech. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 2964-2977.

Carrell, Patricia L. (1982). Cohesion is not coherence. *TESOL Quarterly 16* (4): 479-488.

Carrell, Patricia L. (1983). The author responds.... *TESOL Quarterly 17*: 687-691.

Cole, Peter, ed. (1981). *Radical Pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press.

Connor, Ulla (1984). A study of cohesion and coherence in English as a second language students' writing. *International Journal of Human Communication 17*: 301-316.

Duermeier, Daniel, Stefan Kaufmann, Bei Yu, and Jean-François GODBOUT (2007). 'Language and ideology in Congress'. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, April 12-15, 2007.

Díez Prados, Mercedes (2001). Hacia una integración de enfoques para el estudio del discurso. *Estudios de Filología Moderna 2*: 71-85.

Díez Prados, Mercedes (2003). *Coherencia y Cohesión en Textos Escritos en Inglés por Alumnos de Filología Inglesa (Estudio Empírico)*. Alcalá de Henares: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Alcalá de Henares.

Downing Rothwell, Angela (1998). Organisational frameworks of coherence in discourse and text. In Downing Rothwell, Angela, A. Jesús Moya Guijarro y José Ignacio Alabentosa Hernández, eds., 13-30.

Downing Rothwell, Angela; Antonio Jesús Moya Guijarro y José Ignacio Alabentosa Hernández, eds. (1998). *Patterns in Discourse and Text. Ensayos de Análisis del Discurso en Lengua Inglesa*. Cuenca: Ediciones de la Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha.

Dunne, Michael (2009). Passing the torch. *History Today 59* (1): 14-16.

Elmore, A. E. (2009). *Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. Echoes of the Bible and Book of Common Prayer*. Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.

Flood, J., ed. (1984). *Understanding Reading Comprehension*, Delaware: International Reading Association.

Fowler, H. Ramsey (1983). *The Little, Brown Handbook*. 2nd ed. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.

Foz Gil, M. Carmen and Ignacio Vázquez Orta (1995). The persuasive function of lexical cohesion in English: A pragmatic approach to the study of Chairmen's Statements. *Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense 17*: 87-100.

Giora, Rachel (1985). Notes towards a theory of text coherence. *Poetics Today*, *6* (4): 699-715.

Grabe, William and Robert B. Kaplan (1996). *Theory and practice of writing: An applied linguistic perspective*. London: Longman.

Green, Georgia M. (1989). *Pragmatics and Natural Language Understanding*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Green, Georgia M. and Jerry L. Morgan (1981). Pragmatics, Grammar, and Discourse. In COLE, Peter, ed., 167-181.

Grimes, Joseph E. (1982). Topics within topics. In Tannen, Deborah, ed., 164-176.

Guthrie, John T., ed. (1981). *Comprehension and Teaching Reviews*. Newark, Del.: International Reading Association.

Gitwinski, Waldemar (1976). *Cohesion in Literary Texts: A study of some Grammatical and Lexical Features of English Discourse*. The Hague: Mouton.

Halliday, M. A. K. and Ruqaiya Hasan (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Halliday, M. A. K. and Ruqaiya Hasan (1985/1989). *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. 1st and 2nd editions. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hasan, Ruqaiya (1984). Coherence and Cohesive Harmony. In FLOOD, J., ed., 181-219.

Hoey, Michael (1991). *Patterns of Lexis in Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hosmer, David W. and Stanley Lemeshow (2000). *Applied Logistic Regression*. Canada: Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics

Huddleston, Rodney (1978). On classifying anaphoric relation. *Lingua* 45: 333-354.

Hunt, Kellogg (1965). *Grammatical Structures Written at Three Grade Levels*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Johnstone, Barbara (1987). Introduction: Perspectives on repetition. *Text* 7: 205-214.

Klebanov, Beata Beigman, Daniel Diermeier and Eyal Beigman (2008). Lexical cohesion analysis of political speech. *Political Analysis* 16: 447-463.

Klebanov, Beata Beigman and Eli SHAMIR (2007). Reader-based exploration of lexical cohesion. *Language Resources and Evaluation* 41: 27-44.

Laver, Michael, Kenneth Benoit and John Garry (2003). 'Extracting policy positions from political texts using words as data'. *American Political Science Review 97* (2): 311-331.

Marcu, Daniel (2000). *The Theory and Practice of Discourse Parsing and Summarization.* Cambridge: Mass MIT Press.

McPherson, James M. (1991). *Abraham Lincoln and the Second American Revolution*. Oxford: oxford University Press.

Monroe, Burt L. and Ko Maeda (2004). 'Talk's cheap: Text-based estimation of rhetorical ideal points'. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Political Methodology. Stanford University, July 29-31, 2004.

Morgan, Jerry L. and Manfred B. Sellner (1980). Discourse and linguistic theory. In SPIRO, Rand J., Bertram C. BRUCE and William F. BREWER, eds., 165-200.

Morgan, Nick (2009). The greatest 250-word speech ever written. *Public Words: Helping People Tell their Stories.* <http://publicwords.typepad.com/nickmorgan/2009/04/the-greatest-250word-speech-ever-written.html> (Accessed 9 July 2012).

Morris, Jane and Graeme Hirst (2005). 'The subjectivity of lexical cohesion in text'. J. C. Shanahan, Y. Qu, and J. Wiebe (eds.) Springer, Dodrecht, The Netherlands.

Nuttall, Christine (1982). *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language*. London: Heinemann.

Quinn, Kevin M., Burt L. Monroe, Michael Colaresi, Michael H. CrespingN, and Dragomir R. Radev (2006). 'An automated method of topic-coding legislative speech over time with application to the 105th-108th US Senate'. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association Chicago, April 20-23, 2006.

Reihart, Tanya (1980). Conditions for text coherence. *Poetics Today*, *1* (4): 161-180.

Renkema, Jan (2004). *Introduction to Discourse Studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Rumelhart, David E. (1981). Schemata: The building blocks of cognition. In Guthrie, John T., ed., 5-26.

Shanahan, James G., Yan Qu and Janyce Wiebe (2005) (eds.). *Computing Attitude and Affect in Text*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Siddharthan, Advaith and Ann Copestake (2004). 'Generating referring expressions in open domains'. Proceedings of ACL 04. Barcelona, Spain. 407-414.

Spiro, Rand J., Bertram C. Bruce and William F. Brewer, eds. (1980). *Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension: Perspectives from Cognitive Psychology, Linguistics, Artificial Intelligence, and Education*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Stoddard, Sally (1991). *Text and Texture: Patterns of Cohesion*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, Pub. Corp.

Stotsky, Sandra (1983). Types of lexical cohesion in expository writing: implications for developing vocabulary of academic discourse. *College Composition and Communication 34* (4): 430-446.

Taboada, Maite (2000). Cohesion as a Measure in Generic Analysis. Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación/Circle of Linguistics Applied to Communication, accessible online http://www.ucm.es/info/circulo/no3/taboada.pdf.

Tannen, Deborah, ed. (1982). *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk.* Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Tyler, Andrea (1994). The role of repetition in perceptions of discourse coherence. *Journal of Pragmatics 21* (6): 671-687.

Urquhart, Alasdair (1983). Sticky aspects of cohesion. *MALS Journal 8*: 86-104.

Widdowson, Henry G. (2007). *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wills, Gary (1992). *Lincoln at Gettysburg. The Words that Remade America*. New York: Touchstone.