

## **FSP AND COHESION: COHESIVE RELATIONS WITHIN AN FSP ANALYSIS OF A THEOLOGICAL TEXT**

*Martin Adam*

### **Abstract**

The Firbasian theory of functional sentence perspective (FSP) has been an integral part of the research into information processing. Analysing clauses (horizontal axis) and texts (vertical axis) from the point of view of distribution of the degrees of communicative dynamism, and studying the dynamic processes in functional macrofields, FSP logically deals with cohesion of discourse. The paper will discuss the cohesive means functioning in the text in the light of FSP, namely in terms of co-referential strings and dynamic semantic tracks. It will also look at the phenomenon referred to as semantic (notional) homogeneity. The paper analyses and interprets cohesive relations found within one New Testament theological text of epistolary character, employing FSP methods of analysis.

### **Key words**

cohesion, FSP, Firbas, macrofield, structural analysis, homogeneity

### **1 Introduction**

The theory of functional sentence perspective (FSP) as elaborated by Jan Firbas (see especially Firbas 1992, 1995) has had its safe place within the theories of information processing. It will be fair to acknowledge that even before the birth of the theory of FSP, the theme-rheme articulation operating within individual clauses (the core distinction in FSP) had attracted attention of many and has been so far observed from various angles in functional linguistics (cf. in chronological order e.g. Weil 1844, Gabelentz 1891, Mathesius 1975, Daneš 1974, Hajičová & Vrbová 1982, Halliday & Matthiessen 2004 [1985], Firbas 1992, Svoboda 1996).

FSP has been understood primarily as a phenomenon operating on the level of a clause. The principles adopted in FSP can be, however, applied in an analogous way to other hierarchical levels of discourse. Recently attention has also been paid to the functional picture of higher hierarchical levels of text. This research has shown that an FSP analysis of a distributional macrofield is a promising step in the study of FSP and that it can reveal significant characteristic features of a whole text (cf. Adam 2004, 2006, Pípalová 2005, Firbas 1995, Svoboda 1989, 1996).

## 1.1 FSP

Combining the approaches adopted both by formalists and functionalists, the theory of functional sentence perspective draws on the findings presented by the scholars of the Prague Circle. The founder of FSP, Jan Firbas, drew on the findings of his predecessor, Vilém Mathesius. As early as 1911, Mathesius noticed the language universal of every utterance having a theme (topic) and a rheme (focus/comment), and formulated the basic principles of what was to be labelled FSP only later.

According to Firbas, the sentence is a field of semantic and syntactic relations that in turn provides a distributional field of degrees of communicative dynamism (CD); Firbas defines a degree of CD as “the extent to which the element contributes towards the development of the communication” (Firbas 1964: 270). The most prominent part of information is the high point of the message, i.e. the most dynamic element; other elements of the sentence are less dynamic (have a lower degree of CD). The degrees of CD are determined by the interplay of FSP factors involved in the distribution of degrees of CD: linear modification, context and semantic structure (Firbas 1992: 14-16). In spoken language, the interplay of these factors is joined by intonation, i.e. the prosodic factor.

Since the sentence is a field of relations, it is necessary to define what is meant by a basic distributional field. Firbas (1992: 15-17) agrees with Svoboda (1989: 88) that “a sentence, a clause, a semi-clause and even a nominal phrase serve as distributional fields of CD in the act of communication, and their syntactic constituents (e.g. subject, predicative verb ...) serve as communicative units”. Through the interplay of FSP factors, it is then possible to identify the degrees of CD carried by the communicative units: according to the gradual rise of CD, it is theme proper (ThPr) – diatheme (DTh) – transition proper (TrPr) – transition (Tr) – rheme (Rh) – rheme proper (RhPr). It is important to note that there is no one-to-one correspondence between communicative units and grammatical structures (a communicative unit may be a whole clause or e.g. a noun phrase). In the FSP analysis, subordinate clauses are usually taken as separate units (and so their constituents are interpreted in the framework of the whole unit, e.g. thematic, even though – if taken separately at Level 2 – these would be considered rhematic); see e.g. subordinate clauses containing *Although* or *wherever* in clause 6 in Table 1 below. In other words, only main clauses are analysed further into individual communicative units. If a syntactic constituent (Level 1) is realised by further communicative units (clauses, semi-clauses or noun phrases), it provides a sub-field, i.e. a field of lower rank (Level 2); within such a sub-field all its constituents operate as separate communicative units with their own FSP. (For further details and for terminology, see Firbas 1992.)

## 1.2 Topic of the paper: FSP and cohesion

The aim of the present paper is to discuss one specific aspect of FSP that seems to have been somewhat neglected – the relationship of FSP and the general concept of cohesion. Above all, the paper explores how different types of cohesion are manifested in the FSP analysis, or, in other words, how FSP gets reflected in light of cohesive relations of a text.

First of all, it is necessary to differentiate between two terms: cohesion and coherence. This paper will rely on Hoey's assumption that "cohesion is a property of the text, and that coherence is a facet of the reader's evaluation of a text" (Hoey 1991: 11-12), cohesion being objective and coherence subjective phenomenon respectively. While cohesion is understood as a surface structure connectedness of the text, coherence is viewed as the underlying, deep structure logical connectedness. In this sense, both the textual parameters have a share with the theory of FSP, which studies both cohesive and coherent links and relations within the text. In relation to coherence, de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) speak of the concept of informativity of syntactic units (the way in which parts of the text have communicative value); similarly, FSP operates with the notion of communicative dynamism (cf. Firbas 1992).

The study of cohesion entered linguistics as early as 1972 when Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, and Svartvik published their famous grammar book; in it, several chapters were devoted to how a sentence is grounded in its context (Quirk et al. then expanded the treatment of cohesion in 1985). In 1976 perhaps the most frequently referred to theory in the field of cohesion appeared: Halliday and Hasan's monograph. In their view, the organisation of text (texture) is formed especially by cohesive ties, falling into the five following categories: conjunction, reference, substitution, ellipsis, and lexical cohesion. Furthermore, if the Hallidayan conception of cohesion and coherence is taken into consideration, then the theory of functional sentence perspective is usually understood in terms of so called structural cohesion (the term was introduced in Halliday & Matthiessen 1985). Basically, structural cohesion includes the study of standard paragraph structures, clause and phrase level parallelism, and the very theme-rheme relations within sentences. The present paper is going to manifest how other types of cohesion (roughly speaking grammatical and lexical ones) may be traced by means of an FSP analysis.

To make the introductory mosaic of research into the area of cohesion more complete, Hoey's (more recent) contributions must be mentioned (Hoey 1991). Looking at texts "as interrelated packages of information", Hoey claims that e.g. repetitive items in a text are capable of revealing different characteristic features

of it (ibid.: 26-48); he shows how matrix nets of bonded (tied-together) sentences can create “intelligible abridgements” of texts and goes on to classify such related pairs (ibid.: 125-147). The bonded pairs, in Hoey’s opinion, are almost invariably related and frequently coherent (ibid.: 183). Using numerous examples, he asserts five types of lexical repetition, namely simple lexical repetition, complex lexical repetition, simple paraphrase, complex paraphrase, superordinate, hyponymic, and co-reference repetition.

### 1.3 Text material

As the author’s research into the area of FSP is predominantly anchored in a religious discourse analysis, also the discussion on the relation between cohesion and FSP is going to be exemplified on this type of text. At this point it should be noted that religious texts are, of course, stylistically marked and represent a highly ritualised text type, manifesting a number of lexical, syntactic and stylistic features *sui generis*, such as different forms of reiteration or parallelism. Consequently, the validity of concluding generalisations drawn toward the end of the paper is restricted to this particular text type.

A great deal of texts under analysis fall into the category of the Old and New testaments of the Bible; following Firbasian tradition (see especially Firbas 1989, 1995, 1996), the author’s own research has dealt with poetic, narrative, and dialogic biblical texts respectively (Adam 2004, 2006). Most recently, the sub-genre of epistolary theological texts has been the focal point of FSP investigation. For the purpose of this paper, a part of Chapter 3 from the Epistle of James (namely James 3:1-12) from the *New International Version of the Bible* (Kohlenberger 1997) is going to be used. In other words, the present paper will make use of just a fraction of the entire corpus of texts of religious discourse gathered by the author; the whole corpus is formed by texts of approximately 60,000 words and their FSP analyses. Here, due to space limitations, only one short extract of theological (epistolary) character will be used to illustrate the nature of Biblical dialogues.

Below is the text of the passage in full, with the following typographic arrangement: the thematic elements are *italicised*, the transitional ones are underlined and the rhematic elements are in **bold print** in verses 4-6; they are not marked in this way in the rest of the distributional fields. What follows then is a sample chart of FSP analysis (substantially abridged to verses 4-6) so that the analysis proper may be demonstrated (see Table 1)<sup>a</sup>.

(1) Not many of you should presume to be teachers, my brothers, because you know that we who teach will be judged more strictly. (2) We all stumble in many ways. If anyone is never at fault in what he says, he is a perfect man, able to keep his whole body in check.

(3) When we put bits into the mouths of horses to make them obey us, we can turn the whole animal. (4) Or **take ships as an example**. *Although they are so large and are driven by strong winds, they are steered by a very small rudder wherever the pilot wants to go.* (5) **Likewise the tongue is a small part of the body**, but it **makes great boasts**. **Consider what a great forest is set on fire by a small spark**. (6) *The tongue also is a fire, a world of evil among the parts of the body. It corrupts the whole person, sets the whole course of his life on fire, and is itself set on fire by hell.* (7) All kinds of animals, birds, reptiles and creatures of the sea are being tamed and have been tamed by man, (8) but no man can tame the tongue. It is a restless evil, full of deadly poison. (9) With the tongue we praise our Lord and Father, and with it we curse men, who have been made in God's likeness. (10) Out of the same mouth come praise and cursing. My brothers, this should not be. (11) Can both fresh water and salt water flow from the same spring? (12) My brothers, can a fig tree bear olives, or a grapevine bear figs? Neither can a salt spring produce fresh water. (Kohlenberger 1997: 1576-1569)

Verse	Clause	Conjunction	Theme Proper (ThPr)	Diatheme (DTh)	Transition Proper (TrPr)	Rheme / Rheme Proper (Rh/RhPr)	Rheme Proper (RhPr)	Scale
4	5	Or <sup>1</sup>	^(you)		take <sup>2</sup>	ships <sup>3</sup> as an example <sup>4</sup>		Q
4	6		Although they ... are driven by strong winds <sup>1</sup> they <sup>2</sup>		are steered <sup>3</sup>	by a very small rudder <sup>4</sup> wherever the pilot wants to go <sup>5</sup>		Q
5	7	Like-wise <sup>1</sup>		a small part of the body <sup>4</sup>	is <sup>3</sup>		the tongue <sup>2</sup>	Pr <sup>b</sup>
5	8	but <sup>1</sup>		it <sup>2</sup>	makes <sup>3</sup>	great boasts <sup>4</sup>		Q
5	9				Consider <sup>1</sup>	what a great forest is set on fire by a small spark <sup>2</sup>		Q
6	10		The tongue <sup>1</sup> also <sup>2</sup>		is <sup>3</sup>	a fire, a world of evil among the parts of the body <sup>4</sup>		Q
6	11		It <sup>1</sup>		corrupts <sup>2</sup>	the whole person <sup>3</sup>		Q
6	12		^(it)		sets <sup>1</sup>	the whole course of one's life <sup>2</sup> on fire <sup>3</sup>		Q
6	13	and <sup>1</sup>	itself <sup>3</sup>		is set <sup>2</sup>	on fire <sup>3</sup> by hell <sup>4</sup>		Q

Table 1: An abridged sample of FSP analysis of James 3:1-12

## 2 FSP and cohesion: An analysis

Since the pioneering work of Jan Firbas' research into the theory of functional sentence perspective, the interpretative analysis of the clause has been the corner stone of FSP. Indeed, it is the FSP analysis of a basic distributional field (clause) that is the starting point of the functional interpretation. The functional analysis of a basic distributional field is, in its essence, a horizontal process and the relation between individual segments are purely syntagmatic.

As has been tentatively suggested above, the principles adopted in the basic FSP analysis of a clause are applicable also to other hierarchical levels of text. Research has shown that also higher levels of texts – such as paragraphs or chapters – may be analysed by means of FSP. The dynamic relations appear not to be restricted to the level of individual clauses but to exceed them, to operate on the suprasentential, macro-structure level of a communicative macrofield (for details, see Adam 2006).

In the scope of the present paper, four main phenomena traceable within an FSP analysis of a text will be discussed in terms of their relations to the concept of cohesion: (1) co-referential strings; (2) dynamic-semantic tracks; (3) semantic (notional) homogeneity; and (4) FSP of a distributional macrofield. All these will be illustrated by examples taken from the extract of James 3:1-12.

### 2.1 Co-referential strings

Co-referential strings are chains of elements that denote one referent and are usually expressed by different items; they are actually created by a set of individual cohesive ties. In such a chain, there is an opening member (the referent), and then referential words anaphorically referring to the opening member. The string usually starts in the rhematic layer and, moving across the transitional layer, it finally establishes itself in the thematic layer (Firbas 1992). In the thematic layer, if the notion remains context-dependent, the process may continue within a number of distributional fields.

In Table 2, one can easily follow the vertical run of one sample co-referential string, viz. that of “the tongue”. Such a string may be presented in a simplified way as follows:

Theme	Diatheme	Transition	Rheme
			RhPr – THE TONGUE [7] <sup>c</sup>
	DTh – IT [8]		
ThPr – THE TONGUE [10]			
↓			
ThPr – IT [11]			
↓			
ThPr – IT [12]			

**Table 2: A sample co-referential string found in James 3:1-12**

Firbas defines the co-referential strings as “linguistic elements naming or indicating the same extralinguistic phenomenon, in other words having the same referent” (Firbas 1995: 62). In the flow of communication, co-referentiality links elements together, producing co-referential strings (Firbas 1992, 1995). Apparently, the co-referential strings – in contrast with the syntagmatic quality of the FSP analysis of the clause – run in the text in vertical direction, forming thus a field of paradigmatic relations.

Apparently, these co-referential strings traced within the FSP analysis in the chart are identical with what is usually called “reference relations” in the scope of former Hallidayan concept of cohesion (cf. Halliday & Hasan 1976); along with conjunction, substitution, and ellipsis, reference would fall into the category of grammatical cohesion. Later on, Halliday and Hasan (in harmony with Hoey’s concept of co-referential repetition) reclassify reference as a tie of more or less lexical nature; co-referential strings may thus come under the label of lexical cohesion. This is not to say that exclusively FSP analysis can show the texture of cohesive ties; rather, the chart of FSP analysis is capable of providing a lucid view of the text under examination, offering transparent columns with individual elements (referents).

It will be worth noting that the “journey” of referring elements through the text was studied and congenially described by Daneš, who labelled it “patterns of thematic progression” and was the first to speak of so called topic sentence and to distinguish the linear progression, thematic progression with a continuous theme, and a hierarchical pattern with a hypertheme (Daneš 1974).

## 2.2 Dynamic semantic tracks

As a rule, having identified the basic perspective of the clause, and having constituted thus one of the basic interpretative scales (Quality Scale or Presentation Scale), one can establish the thematic, the transitional and the rhematic layers of

the text (Firbas 1995). They are formed by all thematic, transitional and rhematic elements of the text respectively. In other words, the rhematic track of a text, for example, may be described as a complete set of all the rhematic elements found in the given passage.

It must be added that since the rhematic layer is the most dynamic section of every piece of text (Rh-elements carry the highest degrees of CD), it is usually the rhematic track that is central to the functional analysis of a text. The enumeration of the rhematic elements neatly shows the semantic structure of the text and, at the same time, corroborates the significance and prominence of the rhematic layer. Also the thematic and even transitional tracks are, however, capable of chaining into separate dynamic-semantic tracks.

Below, in Table 3, is a set of sample dynamic-semantic tracks of the text under analysis: the thematic, the transitional and the rhematic one:

Theme	Transition	Rheme
IT [8]	IS [7]	THE TONGUE [7]
↓	↓	↓
THE TONGUE [10]	MAKES [8]	GREAT BOASTS [8]
↓	↓	↓
IT [11]	IS [10]	GREAT FOREST SET ON FIRE BY A SMALL SPARK [9]
↓	↓	↓
(IT) [12]	CORRUPTS [11]	A FIRE, A WORLD OF EVIL... [10]
↓	↓	↓
ITSELF [13]	SETS [12]	THE WHOLE PERSON [11]
	↓	↓
	IS [13]	THE WHOLE COURSE OF ONE'S LIFE.../ ON FIRE [10]

**Table 3: A schematic view of the sample dynamic-semantic tracks found in James 3:1-12**

The dynamic semantic tracks may obviously be viewed as a vertical phenomenon; they run through all the distributional fields “downwards”. Following a track (for instance a rheme proper track), we get a vertical cut through all the text, creating a line of successive members of the RhPr layer. It is then possible to make use of simplified outlines of all the members of the respective dynamic-semantic track. In this sense, they are – along with co-referential strings – a vertical field of paradigmatic relations, though each of them is of a different character.

In terms of cohesion reflected within this sort of analysis, one inevitably arrives at the conclusion that the outline of the dynamic-semantic tracks shows



transparently the subtle texture of the theme-rheme articulation within the text. In other words, such an analysis is fully compatible with what came to be labelled as structural cohesion (cf. Halliday & Hasan 1985). In Halliday and Hasan's view, a text has texture and this is what distinguishes it from something that is not a text; texture consists of the following two aspects: structural and non-structural. While non-structural texture refers to the grammatical cohesive ties (reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction), the structural sort of texture refers to inter-sentence or intra-sentence structures like theme-rheme structure (Halliday & Hasan 1985). The FSP analysis – in harmony with the Hallidayan concepts of cohesion – obviously makes it possible to view the individual tracks of structural ties within the text.

### 2.3 Semantic homogeneity

Taking a closer look at the separate dynamic semantic tracks, one may observe a suggestive notional (semantic) unity; each of the tracks is semantically homogeneous to a certain extent. It is apparent that individual members of a track usually have a common denominator (are semantically associated). Semantic homogeneity is present in every thematic, transitional and rhematic layer; the degree of homogeneity, however, differs, depending on how the text is perspectived and how the author allows the layers to assert themselves.

Generally speaking, the rhematic track always introduces elements that either enter the communication for the first time (such as prominent actors + key actions) or that are simply most dynamic for other reasons (e.g. specifying a quality). The transitional layer, as a rule, consists predominantly of verbs; this is related to the tendency of the English verb to be somewhat emptied in meaning, giving way to nominal predication. Finally, the thematic track typically contains context dependent participants of communication and setting items, such as spatial or temporal adverbials.

The occurrence of semantic homogeneity will be demonstrated on two distinctive rhematic chains that are extracted from six verses (3-8) from the sample text (see Table 4 below):

<p>THE <b>WHOLE</b> (ANIMAL) [4] → <b>WHEREVER</b> [6] → <b>WHOLE</b> (PERSON) [11] → THE <b>WHOLE</b> (COURSE OF ONE'S LIFE) [12] → <b>ALL</b> (KINDS OF ANIMALS) [14] → <b>FULL</b> (OF POISON)... [17] (idea of "totality")</p> <p>ON <b>FIRE</b> [9] → A SMALL <b>SPARK</b> [9] → A <b>FIRE</b> [10] → (SET) ON <b>FIRE</b> [12] → ON <b>FIRE</b> BY HELL ... [13] (idea of fire)</p>
---

Table 4: Two sample Rh- tracks manifesting semantic homogeneity in James 3:1-12

To be specific, the two sample chains clearly consist of semantically related elements and thus evoke and estrange the power of the rhematic track. Namely, the six biblical verses in question convey the ideas of “totality” and of “fire” created by a number of semantically related items. In this respect, such notionally-homogeneous tracks correspond with what Halliday labels lexical cohesion; this sort of cohesive ties deals with phenomena like similarity or identity of lexical environment, or even repetition or synonymy etc. (Halliday & Hasan 1985). Halliday understands lexical cohesion to come about “through the selection of [lexical] items that are related in some way to those that have gone before” (Halliday & Hasan 1985: 310). On top of that, the lexical means is sometimes accompanied by traces of parallelism, which would point also to the realm of structural cohesion.

Research has led to conclusion that a mere enumeration of the members of the rhematic layer “tells the story“; it communicates the most important events, introducing the participants and describing their basic action and/or qualities (Adam 2006). Thanks to this notional homogeneity, the dynamic-semantic strings are capable of summarising and communicating the main points of the message conveyed. The tendency towards semantic homogeneity suggests that the text **were** written effectively – the author was able to convey the message to the reader, and, having done so, fulfilled his communicative purpose. Last but not least, it should be noted that the occurrence of semantic homogeneity of the RH-track is especially vital in texts that are to communicate ideology, such as the Epistle of James.

## **2.4 FSP of a distributional macrofield**

The phenomenon of the distributional macrofield (as a higher level of functional analysis of text, such as paragraphs or chapters) has been discussed predominantly in relation to narrative discourse, especially in terms of the process of establishment and development of the thematic and the rhematic layers within a text. In recent publications (Adam 2006, 2008), the idea of higher levels of text functioning as distributional macrofields was presented; it seems that such a macro-structural approach may reveal – among other things – essential syntactic-stylistic characteristics of a text.

The above observations are in concord with Daneš’s conception on “hyper-sentential relationships between the units (such as Th-Rh bipartition, given-new information), and global structures defining ... text patterns or superstructures” (Daneš 1995: 185) on the one hand, and on the other they correspond with van Dijk’s understanding of “macro-structures”. In van Dijk’s opinion (van Dijk

1977), macro-structures represent a natural and inherent quality observed on the textual level, being “available when it is necessary to explicitly summarise a text (...)” (van Dijk 1977: 27-8). In this respect, van Dijk’s theory of macro-structures not only serves as a solid basis for, but also is in harmony with the functional analysis offered by Firbasian theory of FSP.

In FSP analyses of different text types (such as narrative, dialogic, poetic texts, sermons; cf. Adam 2006, 2008), I was able to trace Th-Tr-Rh structure within a whole distributional macrofield. I demonstrated that particular sections of the text have similar qualities as the elements within clauses do; the structure of the text generally resembles the theme-rheme structure in a sentence, showing inner dynamism that is capable of distributing the degrees of communicative dynamism over higher hierarchical unit.

Below (Table 5) is an example from the text of James 3:1-12; it reflects the functional picture of the whole passage in Th-Tr-Rh arrangement that, in this case, implements the so called Quality Scale:

ThPr	DTh		Tr	RhPr
<i>Setting</i>	<i>Setting</i>	<i>Bearer of Quality</i>	<i>Quality</i>	<i>Specification</i>
we all stumble in life	bits turn the horse;  rudder steers the ship	the tongue	is likewise	sets the whole course of life;  whole person full of poison...

**Table 5: The functional structure of the macrofield (James 3:1-12)**

To put the phenomenon of the FSP analysis of a distributional macrofield in the context of cohesion, it is possible to conclude that it goes hand in hand with Halliday’s concept of the texture of discourse, which is said to be a typical feature of macro-structures (Halliday & Hasan 1976). By the texture of the discourse Halliday means “the larger structure that is a property of the forms of discourse themselves: the structure that is inherent in such concepts as narrative, prayer, folk-ballad, formal correspondence ... and the like” (ibid.: 326-7). Halliday uses the term to refer to “the structure of some postulated unit higher than the sentence” (ibid.: 10). In this sense the epistolary theological texts behave in the same way as, for instance, narratives: the passage under examination contains inner dynamism that is capable of distributing the degrees of communicative dynamism over higher hierarchical unit.

### 3 Conclusions

The present paper shows how a thorough (i.e. two-dimensional) FSP analysis reflects the set of different cohesive processes existing in the text. Specifically, making use of the substrate of a New Testament epistolary text, the theory of FSP was discussed in terms of its relations to the concept of cohesion in the fields of: (1) co-referential strings; (2) dynamic-semantic tracks; (3) semantic (notional) homogeneity; and (4) FSP of a distributional macrofield. On the basis of an FSP analysis of a number of biblical theological texts (see information on the corpus above), the following phenomena related to cohesion were traced within FSP categories:

- grammatical/lexical cohesion in (1)
- structural cohesion (theme-rheme structure; parallelism) in (2) and (3)
- lexical cohesion (similarity and identity chains, repetition, synonymy) in (3)
- texture of discourse in (4)

In other words, the theory of FSP is in full concord with the concept of cohesion (Halliday 2004, Hoey 1991); not only does FSP go hand in hand with its classification but – by means of the charts of analysis – it also offers a more transparent view of different types of cohesive ties.

Despite stylistic markedness of religious texts (see above), the validity of concluding generalisations does not seem to be restricted to this particular text type. Also other registers (especially fiction narrative, fairy-tale, or poetic texts) have shown identical tendencies and appear to display different sorts of cohesive ties at different levels of FSP analysis (cf. Tillhonová 2009, Wachsmuthová 2009).

By way of a more general conclusion let me summarise the benefits derived from a two-dimensional approach to the FSP study of text. When both the directions – horizontal and vertical – are applied, the functional picture of the text consequently becomes more plastic and distinct. Such a study apparently enriches the set of methodological tools available, both in FSP and in the study of cohesion. It seems that functional implementation of the vertical axis that broadens the FSP analysis is worth investigating and that the two-dimensional approach to FSP opens new vistas to further research within text and corpus analysis.

#### Notes

<sup>a</sup> Note that the numbers in brackets, such as (5), mark verse numbers in the text of the Bible (see also Column 1 in the chart). In the chart of FSP analysis, the superscripts mark the real sequence of the

basic communicative units – in other words the actual linear arrangement of the clauses; the original verse numbers are to be found in the very first column of the charts.

<sup>b</sup> It may be argued that the interpretation of Clause 7 (Verse 5) may be reverse; indeed, this communicative unit manifests a certain degree of interpretative potentiality. In the author's opinion, also the opposite perspective of the clause would be justifiable: Likewise (Tr; conj.) the tongue (DTh; B) is (Tr; copula) a small part of the body (Rh; Sp).

<sup>c</sup> The numbers in square brackets, such as [8], refer to the individual clauses, i.e. the basic distributional fields in the chart (Column 2).

## References

- Adam, M. (2004) 'FSP analysis of a distributional macrofield.' *Brno Studies in English* 30, 13-19.
- Adam, M. (2006) *Functional Macrofield Perspective (A Religious Discourse Analysis Based on FSP)*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- Adam, M. (2008) 'Secondary religious discourse: Sermon as a distributional macrofield.' *Discourse and Interaction* 1/2, 5-18.
- Beaugrande de, R., Dressler, W. U. (1981) *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Daneš, F. (1974) 'Functional sentence perspective and the organization of the text.' In: Daneš, F. (ed.) *Papers on Functional Sentence Perspective*. Prague: Academia. 100-128.
- Daneš, F. (1995) 'A static view and a dynamic view on text and discourse.' *Prague Linguistic Circle Papers* 1, 185-199.
- Firbas, J. (1964) 'On defining the theme in functional sentence analysis.' *Travaux Linguistiques de Prague* 1, 267-280.
- Firbas, J. (1989) 'Interpreting Psalm 91 from the point of view of functional sentence perspective.' In: Breivik, L. E., Hille A., Johansson, S. (eds) *Essays on the English Language in Honour of Bettil Sundby*. Oslo: Novus Forlag. 107-116.
- Firbas, J. (1992) *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Firbas, J. (1995) 'On the thematic and the rhematic layers of a text.' In: Wårvik, B., Tanskanen, S.-K., Hiltunen, R. (eds) *Organization in Discourse: Proceedings from the Turku Conference, Anglicana Turkuensia 14*. Turku: University of Turku. 59-72.
- Firbas, J. (1996) 'A case study in linear modification: On translating Apo. 21.6b.' *Brno Studies in English* 22, 23-48.
- Gabelentz, G. von der (1891). *Die Sprachwissenschaft, ihre Aufgaben, Methoden und bisherigen Ergebnisse*. Leipzig: Weigel.
- Hajičová, E., Vrbová, J. (1982) 'On the role of the hierarchy of activation in the process of natural language understanding'. In: Horecký, J. (ed.) *COLING 82. Proceedings of the ninth international conference on computational linguistics*. Praha: Academia. 107-113.
- Halliday, M. A. K., Hasan, R. (1976) *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Halliday, M. A. K., Hasan, R. (1985) *Language, Context and Text: A Social Semiotic Perspective*. Deakin: Deakin University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004 [1985]) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold.
- Hoey, M. (1991) *Patterns of Lexis in Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Kohlenberger, J. R. (ed.) (1997) *The Contemporary Parallel New Testament*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mathesius, V. (1975) *A Functional Analysis of Present Day English on a General Linguistic Basis*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Pípalová, R. (2005) 'On the global textual theme and other textual hyperthemes.' *Linguistica Pragensia* 15, 57-86.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, S., Svartvik, J. (1972) *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: Longman.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, S., Svartvik, J. (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Svoboda, A. (1989) *Kapitoly z funkční syntaxe*. Prague: SPN.
- Svoboda, A. (1996) 'Syllable as a microfield in functional sentence perspective.' In: Hajičová, E., Leška O., Sgall P., Skoumalová Z. (eds) *Prague Linguistic Circle Papers 2*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 194-195.
- Tillhonová, G. (2009) *FSP: Dynamic Semantic Tracks in Fairy Tales*. An unpublished Master's thesis. Brno: Masaryk University.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1977) *Text and Context. Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse*. London: Longman.
- Wachsmuthová, Z. (2009) *On Some Aspects of Semantic Homogeneity (Based on FSP Analysis)*. An unpublished Master's thesis. Brno: Masaryk University.
- Weil, H. (1844 [1978]) *De l'ordre des mots dans les langues anciennes comparees aux langues modernes. [The Order of Words in the ancient languages compared with that of the modern languages]*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.