

UDC 811.163.6'42

Tomo Korošec

Faculty of Social Sciences, Ljubljana

ON ELEMENTS OF TEXT LINGUISTICS IN SLOVENIAN LINGUISTICS

The article surveys a selection of linguistic works by Slovenian authors which have from the mid-1970s, and especially from the beginning of the 1980s, to the present employed a text-linguistic approach to texts written in the Slovenian language. In concise excerpts it presents the more interesting works that are, compared with foreign text linguistic research, informative enough to give an apt overview of Slovenian text linguistics.

Prispevek prinaša izbor jezikoslovnih del slovenskih avtorjev, ki iz sredine sedemdesetih, zlasti pa iz začetka osemdesetih let 20. stoletja do sodobnosti izpričujejo besediloslovni pristop k pojavom v besedilih slovenskega jezika. S skrčenimi izvlečki so prikazane bolj zanimive in glede na tuje besediloslovje toliko informativne obravnave, da dajejo primeren pregled čez slovensko besediloslovje.

Key words: textology, hypersyntax, connectors, cohesion-coherence level, headline block, various text-formational relations, common communication circle

Ključne besede: besediloslovje, hypersintaksa, vezalniki (konektorji), kohezijsko-koherenčna ravnina, naslovje, različna besedilotvorna razmerja, skupni sporočanjski krog

Neither at home nor abroad has Slovenian linguistics participated in the preliminary discussions on theoretical issues of text linguistics, the theory of texts, which were at first on the level of a program for the development of a new linguistic field (textology, text grammar, hypersyntax, macrostylistics, and the like). Those debates ran from the end of the 1960s and throughout the 1970s, and were centered on issues such as whether it is justified to go beyond the border of the clause to a higher level, i.e. the text,¹ then about the relation between stylistics (in a large proportion rhetoric as well) and pragmatics as the theory of speech act, as well as whether text is, according to the old Saussurian dichotomy, the product of the language system (*langue*) or it belongs as a communication unit to the use of this system, i.e. to the language performance (*parole*). Today it is a well-established fact that text linguistics is a highly interdisciplinary field,² especially because grammar and stylistics are intertwined, with text considered a result of a discourse act and as an element of communication (the theory of communication, pragmatics, and stylistics), strongly influenced by the communicative situation (the so-called context). It was also duly noted that there is a need for a more flexible view of the language system, since the rules of composition valid for a considerable number of texts are at the same time the rules of grammar, and as such enter the grammars of national languages.

¹ In Isenberg (1974) this is reflected in the terms *Satzbezogene* and *Textbezogene Grammatik*.

² Although the treatise by Anton Breznik on word order in Slovenian from the beginning of the 20th century is in fact the first step to functional sentence perspective (which effects text structure and is one of the elements of the language system) the author – as expected – remains within the framework of sentence as the highest syntactic unit.

1 The first linguistic article that uses the Slovenian term *besediloslovje*³ instead of the widely spread loanword *tekstologija* ('textology', which had been used with a different meaning in Slovenian), was published in the beginning of the 1980s. With some delay it presented mainly the data from the abovementioned discussions and reservations concerning the novelties.⁴ The author's pro-text-linguistic standpoint was at that time reasonably vague and »pragmatic«:

Whichever direction those two approaches take in the future – one considers text a unit which can be described and explained by the same means that are applied at the level of a sentence, while the other makes a distinction between the sentence and the text levels – (the model of the propositional and the communication approaches to text as supposedly equally valid alternatives (Isenberg) is a probable development), at this stage, when the two approaches are on the level of programs and not yet fully developed theories, the most convenient stance is to follow Sgall, who suggests that text linguistics should merge suprasentential syntax with the theory of linguistic communication, i.e. with linguistic pragmatics (Korošec 1981: 175, Trans. M. Hladnik).

In the same article – in accordance with the topical discussions on text structuring elements of the language system – a question is raised as to the text properties of individual national languages:

The aim is of course not to find in a given national language a typical, characteristic text, the structure of which would be derived from the features of that language only, but rather to find out which elements of a national language are relevant for the text linguistics, in other words, whether there exist any text rules on the level of individual languages, or text linguistics is subject to universal linguistic rules (175–176, Trans. M. Hladnik).

As an example of a text structuring rule which is at the same time a universal linguistic rule, one of the so-called types of thematic gradients, i.e. the »development of a complex rheme« type, where the two-part rheme is either *obscured* or *revealed*, from Daneš (1968) is presented in the article. On the basis of material from a Slovenian technical text, the pattern Daneš uses is developed further so that the technique of organizing a text in, for example, a textbook follows the movement from an obscured to a revealed, and from a revealed to an expanded rheme. This is how the content of a rheme is realized (for example, by the information about the topic in question). It is not so important that the pattern can be expanded with other ways of providing content (for example an obscured rheme can be expanded or unexpressed), because the point is to illustrate the initial investigation into the text linguistic inventory, which includes functional sentence perspective as well, together with the almost unmanageable interdisciplinary network of professional fields of research, as it will be men-

³ The very first use of the word was in the name of a course dealing with this topic at the Department of Slovenian at the Faculty of Arts in Ljubljana in 1977 and 1978. Reflecting the current discussions on text linguistics in Europe, the course dealt with questions about the development of the general text theory, the so-called »parole linguistics«, with Dressler (1972) being one of the primary items on the course reading list. The lectures were held by T. Korošec.

⁴ For example Sgall (1937).

tioned later on. Today we agree that functional sentence perspective belonging to the sphere of communication (we always communicate *about something* and always say *something* about it) is also an element of the language system, which is – at least in European languages – involved in text structuring, certainly governs the word order in Slavic languages and affects sentence phonetics (stress patterns and intonation), and enables the formulation of patterns important for coherent writing of shorter texts or individual paragraphs as far as non-literary texts are concerned, which can then be learned as guidelines in the domain of practical stylistics⁵. We can claim with negligible risk of being wrong that there is no element among the language system elements of functional sentence perspective that would be a text structuring element *per sé* of the Slovene language.

One of the features that belong to the level of text and are at the same time subject to the rules of Slovene (as part of the descriptive grammar of the language) is undoubtedly the extensive – and far from thoroughly identified – array of coreferential elements, especially the so-called *conjuncts* (connectors), which have an anaphoric and cataphoric function. Such is the anaphoric conjunct *še kako* ('and how', often appearing together with the anaphoric particle *pa*: *pa še kako*) when it clears some doubt expressed in the preceding (linearly left) sentence, or it gives an affirmative answer to a question in the preceding sentence. If the phrase is not in this – anaphoric – function, but only a set phrase meaning 'very', such use is considered a token of deficient language awareness. The same text structuring function is performed by the morphological particle *le* (-*le* and *le-*), also mentioned in the same article; -*le*: e.g. *tale, tistile, onile, tule, tamle, takole*; *le-*: (almost exclusively with the demonstrative pronoun *ta*, and always hyphenated in writing) *le-ta*.⁶

2 The use of the pronoun *ta* ('this') is indeed interesting. As the definite article (*ta nova obleka*, 'the new suit' – only in colloquial Slovenian) it is not considered a demonstrative pronoun, because it is anomalous, with a zero gender and case morpheme (it is »extra-textual«). Attention was drawn to the demonstrative's text structuring properties along the lines of textual definiteness by Vidovič Muha (1996: 118 ff.) in a paper on text linguistics: »The pronoun that appears in the text is the anaphoric *ta* /.../ in the function of an unambiguous textual coreferent; the extra-textual importance of the (relative) spatial distance from the speaker /.../ is replaced within the text by an unambiguous textual coreference (118, Trans. M. Hladnik).«

As a nominalized demonstrative pronoun, though, *ta* has a distinct coreferential function only when it refers to an antecedent which is not a person. This function of the pronoun *ta*, a complex issue also from the viewpoint of standard Slovenian, was researched by Zadravec-Pešec (2000), who also formulated suggestions for the stan-

⁵ Included in secondary school textbooks *Slovenski jezik 3* ('The Slovenian Language 3') and *Slovenski jezik 4* (cf. below).

⁶ In connection with this example we should mention the rule that *le-ta* is appropriate in a text only in the case when it refers to an immediately preceding antecedent, while as an adjectival premodifier it is an indication of poor literacy.

dardization of its use. The text structuring function of the relative pronoun *ki*⁷ was defined on the basis of examples from scientific texts by Gorjanc (1998). He recognized two functions of the connector *ki*:

/.../ it can introduce a relative clause, restricting the referential field of the antecedent /.../; in this case it is bound to its content. In the other case it introduces a clause which is only formally subordinate, and can be from the point of view of text structure superordinate in meaning; **a textual element, therefore, that can carry the text forward** (*emphasis by T. K.*), e.g. *Krivilja je simetrična na abscisno os, ki jo seče v eni ali treh točkah* (348, Trans. M. Hladnik).

3 In the mid-1980s elements of text linguistics were extensively discussed in two secondary school textbooks of the Slovenian language (Dular and Korošec (1985), and Korošec and Dular (1985)⁸), although there had been as of yet no fundamental study in Slovenian text linguistic literature. The author (Korošec) used foreign research to describe those features of Slovenian for classroom use, in particular Agricola, Dressler, (the then not yet translated) de Beaugrande and Dressler, Daneš, Harweg, Isenberg, Lang, Sgall, Schmidt, and Werlich.⁹ In *Slovenski jezik 3* elements of text linguistics are contained in the chapter titled »Nadpovedna skladnja« (»Suprasentential Syntax«), where the differences between textual and non-textual characteristics¹⁰ are briefly presented (to the extent proposed in the curriculum by the board of education). The elements of suprasentential syntax presented are anaphoric and cataphoric references, and reiterations with the subcategories of repetitions, synonyms, antonyms, hypernyms, and hypernyms with exclusive reference, while functional sentence perspective is represented with three types of text patterning (adapted from Daneš), i.e. linear thematic progression, progression with derived themes, and progression with theme iteration (in *Slovenski jezik 4* a fourth patterning is added, viz. contextual ellipsis). In *Slovenski jezik 4* appears a separate chapter with the title »Besediloslovje« (»Text Linguistics«) with the first subchapter on pragmatic elements of text. Here the significance of pragmatics¹¹ in relation to lexicology and syntax is demonstrated, and some basic examples of message interpretation based on the context of situation explained together with its text structuring function. The second subchapter »Povezovanje povedi v besedilu« (»Connecting the Sentences Within a Text«) deals with the most common cohesive ties. It starts off with the already familiar pronominalization (from *Slovenski jezik 2*), and continues with demonstrating the antecedent – ana-

⁷ Dippong (1999/2000: 272f) believes that *ki* can also be a subordinate conjunction, which is not entirely convincing if we consider the properties of this word class (conjunctions are indeclinable!), but is more acceptable if we take into account its connector, i.e. strictly referential, role.

⁸ Reprinted four times, most recently in 1998.

⁹ The list of sources can be found in Korošec (1968: 59).

¹⁰ The definition of text herein is the following: A text is an ordered sequence of sentences that comprise a meaningful and formal unit of communication.

¹¹ A work on the topic was first written a year before (Kunst-Gnamuš 1984), later a handbook on pragmatics by Zadravec-Pešec from the same academic circles appeared in 1994. The fundamental work *Understanding Pragmatics* was only translated into Slovenian in 2000 (Verschueren).

¹² First named *naveznik* in Slovenian, later revised to *navezovalnik*.

phora¹² – cataphora relations. It goes into more detail with regard to reference by demonstrative pronouns and pronominal adverbs, relativization (expanded from *Slovenski jezik 2*, and not limited only to condensation of text, but seen as a method in accordance with the principles of sentential dynamics). The notions of theme indicator and identifying anaphora from Slovenian linguistics are presented, and in the field of the so-called repetition avoidance (which is a stylistic device in literary texts, but undesired in scientific texts and downright wrong in legal ones) the following referential expressions are demonstrated, adopted from Harweg: pronominalization, hypernyms, stylistic synonyms, stylistic contextual hypernyms, and paraphrases (e.g., *dog: it, animal, mutt, beast, man's four-legged friend*). Temporal and causal relations as elements of coherence are represented inadequately with regards to their importance, while condensation and its most frequent indicators are explained, however.¹³

The subchapter »Členitev besedila« (»Text Structure«) stays within the domain of the traditional horizontal division of text, known from approaches (Slovenian as well) to guidelines in rhetoric and poetics, and is included in the so-called text structuring steps (the level of orientation: towards an objective, towards the situation, and towards the solution; the level of planning: choice of topic, mode, and composition planning; the level of structuring: according to the mode and according to the sociolect and functional style). The division is demonstrated on a – in our textbooks yet undiscussed – functional example, viz. a telephone conversation (between two engineers, one of them the other's superior, who have to come to an agreement about the works on a construction site). The following units are singled out: opening, signals for establishing communication and identification of the speakers; topic introduction, goal-oriented opinion, introduction to giving a suggestion; orientation; goal: suggestion of an agreement, advocating the suggested solution, additional justification; (demand for the explanation of the suggestion), explanation of the suggestion; (demand for further explanation of the suggestion); agreement on steps to be taken to achieve the goal; confirming the agreement; conclusion: signals for ending the conversation.

The papers that share the stylistic and text linguistic approaches to (technical) text structure include two works from the second half of the eighties (which do not take into consideration earlier research in the field). Pogorelec (1986) deals with reference by repetition in technical texts, while in another paper the same author (1986a) discusses recurrent reference by synonyms and metaphors in non-technical texts.

¹² The listed elements were found too demanding by the reviewer, who was negatively inclined: ».../ quite some terms that are as such too difficult to master, not only for the students, but for the teacher as well« (Toporišič 1993: 14, Trans. M. Hladnik). The terms were of course not included in the reviewer's *Enciklopedija slovenskega jezika* (*Encyclopedia of the Slovenian language*), published in 1992. The reason: »The main items from the text linguistic vocabulary are indeed outlined in Slovenian linguistics as well. Still, there is a lot of work lying ahead before everything is adequately sampled, then uniformly established in linguistic and other works, and finally also appropriately represented by a definition in a terminology handbook, in compliance with the standards newly set by *Enciklopedija slovenskega jezika*« (ibid. 14, Trans. M. Hladnik). Let us add that in the encyclopedia the following items are »appropriately represented by a definition«: kašljanje ('coughing'), sopihanje ('panting'), hlipanje ('sobbing'), and the like.

4 A step towards a more detailed discussion of the most distinct property of text, viz. cohesion and coherence, was made in Korošec (1986: 49-59). The word *soveznost* in the title of the paper is a (not entirely effective) attempt at merging the terms 'sovisenost' (cohesion) and 'veznost' (coherence) in this approach where there is no methodological distinction between the surface and deep levels of language representation¹⁴. Pronominalization, i.e. pronominal reference, is – also in other languages – known to cause problems due to the nature of pronouns themselves. In the so-called cohesive ties (i.e. the simple antecedent – anaphora relation: *brother* ← *he*), where the reference is supported either by the semantic property of the verb or coupled with a morphemic reference (which is a sentence structure element), the meaning is still unambiguous, while in cohesive strings (which include two agents or actants: *the neighbour* and *the brother* ← *he*; *the neighbour* gave it to *the brother* ← *he*) not even the propositional information ensures unambiguity (if the original patterning of propositional elements is not known, as is shown on the example of a specific genre, viz. curriculum vitae). Disturbances in communication due to these problems with reference are of various degrees. In the textbook example¹⁵ from English (tense analysis) only the co-text, from which we learn that Mr. Smith's neighbor had come on the train in the last moment and had not been able to buy a newspaper, can help us, or perhaps also the well-known reserved politeness of the English gentleman can put us in the right direction when interpreting the exchange of the propositional roles of the agent and the actant.

In Slovenian newspaper reporting, ambiguous cohesive strings are common, and for that reason a relatively extensive extract from the paper we are referring to (further discussed and revised in Korošec 1998: 218 ff. and 2004: 27–29) is presented here to illustrate the need for creating a series of rules for cohesion (in the form of a handbook, for example). A passage from a newspaper report about court proceedings in the case of alleged people smuggling (*Delo* 2 August 2004: 8) is analyzed in the paper:

Slednji [i.e. the accused Mavrin; (T. K.)] je baje tujce vodil peš čez mejo in jih skrival v okolici Ptuja, Veršič, Zelenik in Prelog so menda od tam vozili v Ljubljano, Zidarič pa pazil na policijske patrulje in jih usmerjal.

The text contains three asyndetically linked sentences, where (a) and (c) consist of two clauses in copulative coordination, and (b) and (c) are linked by the cohesive particle *pa*:

*Slednji je baje tujce vodil peš čez mejo in jih skrival v okolici Ptuja,
Veršič, Zelenik in Prelog so menda od tam vozili v Ljubljano,
Zidarič pa pazil na policijske patrulje in jih usmerjal.*

If we indicate the cohesion markers in sentences (a), (b), and (c) (and leave out the arguable and completely unnecessary reference particles *baje* and *menda*), we get:

¹⁴ Based on Hoffman (1983: 51), who believes that the distinction between cohesion and coherence is only pertinent when we make a methodological difference between the two. Therefore she uses the term »syntactic-semantic level of text«.

¹⁵ »Mr. Smith soon noticed that his neighbour, without turning his head, was reading his paper with him. /.../ But he did not want to show that he had noticed he was reading; he was afraid of offending him.«

- (a) Slednji¹ je tujce² vodil¹ peš čez mejo in jih² skrival¹ v okolici Ptuja,
- (b) Veršič, Zelenik in Prelog^{3 (3+3+3)} so od tam vozili³ v Ljubljano,
- (c) Zidarič⁴ pa pazil⁴ na policijske patrulje⁵ in jih^{5 (or 3 or 2?)} usmerjal⁴.

The two-clause compound sentence (a) is formed by the coordination of two simple sentences (pattern: subject – predicate (+ predicative) – object – adverbial), but the second clause in the coordination – despite still having a simple sentence pattern – is no longer independent (e.g. *Slednji¹ je tujce² skrival¹ v okolici Ptuja.*), but forms a cohesive string with the morphemic anaphora *skrival¹* (the antecedent here is the agent *slednji*) and the pronominalized actant *jih²*. This is actually the most common stylistically unmarked coordination of all.

Sentence (b) is a simple sentence with a plural agent (let us render it as *tihotapci³* ('smugglers') for the sake of our analysis) and the agreeing predicate *vozili³*. The sentence, though, is poorly formed both grammatically and textually. Grammatically because the verb *voziti* (its second meaning listed in *SSKJ – Dictionary of Standard Slovenian*) requires an object (here: *tujce²* or *jih²*) and gives without its complement the impression at least of jargon use, and textually because the asyndetically coordinated sentence (b) is better incorporated textually if we at least repeat the pronominalized actant *tujce²* from sentence (a), i.e. *jih²*. Therefore sentence (b) should read: *Veršič, Zelenik in Prelog³ so jih² od tam vozili³ v Ljubljano.* Thus sentences (a) and (b) would be textually, that is coreferentially, cohesive, because the pronominal anaphora *jih²* still is properly referring to the only possible (considering the form and the meaning) antecedent *tujce²*, for the cohesive string is not interrupted by any other antecedent.

Precisely such an interruption occurred in the second clause of the compound sentence (c), where the cohesive tie *patrulje⁵ ← jih⁵* ascribes a role to the smuggler Zidarič which he surely did not have in the situation, i.e. to guide police patrols. The mistake is called *a false cohesive tie*. The rule for forming a cohesive string that prevents such mistakes is:

If the linear development of a cohesive string (with an expressed antecedent) is interrupted by a sentence with an agent / bearer of the same grammatical properties as the antecedent of the developing string, then the string must continue after the interruption with the repetition of the antecedent.

Let us apply the rule to our example: The introductory cohesive string in sentence (a) is completed with the tie *tujce ← jih*, but it could – as it has been shown above – continue for the sake of greater cohesion between (a) and (b) uninterruptedly into (b), and come to a close at the end of unit (b), as the word *tujci* does not appear anymore as the antecedent. Every further appearance of the pronominal anaphora *jih* can, as it were, enter **only the existing** cohesive string on condition that no further antecedent with the same grammatical properties appears in its linear development.¹⁶ This condition is not fulfilled, because the plural agent *Veršič-Zelenik-Prelog* follows, and serves as an actant and an antecedent for sentence (c) when referred to by the pronominal

¹⁶ At this point we could (to avoid any confusion) add the following to the rule application: In the text this can be either an agent or an actant. A textbook example: *The father ploughs the field. The son helps him.* The agent *the father* is the antecedent, referred to by the pronominal anaphora *him* in the next sentence, where the new agent is *the son*, and *him* is an actant.

anaphora *jih*, which creates a false cohesive tie *patrulje*⁵ ← *jih*⁵. This happens because before *jih* stands an actant bearing the same grammatical properties (*patrulje*), and thus a new cohesive string opens. The development of the string with the antecedent *Veršič-Zelenik-Prelog* is clear only when we repeat the antecedent (e.g. by the synonym *tihotapci*): *Zidarič*⁴ *pa pazil*⁴ *na policijske patrulje*⁵ *in tihotapce*³ *usmerjal*⁴.

5 Towards the end of the 1960s, stylistics as a linguistic field was on the decline in the world, and it seemed as if the approach to text and its units based on judging the selection with respect to the realization of the communication intention was losing energy. In Slovenia, with a short delay but nevertheless intensely and in many works, it focused on the study of functional styles, and within the journalistic style especially on (newspaper) reporting. It quickly became apparent that the description and interpretation of such texts considering only the inherent stylistic values of words and phrasemes (as defined by lexicography) as system elements is rather inadequate. The analysis of stylistic values of words with a whole spectrum of markedness, from archaisms to nonce words and new words (even with comprehensive lists of neologisms) gave only an insight into – no doubt surprising – communication intentions of the authors, but not into elements characteristic of a functional style, in this case journalistic. Therefore the extensive study in this field (Korošec 1976) was necessarily text linguistic oriented: it is dealing with text structuring relations between titles and texts, particularly – which is typical of newspaper reporting – the relations between the units of »the smallest texts«, viz. headline blocks, and the typology of headlines based on those relations. For the first time textual elements that point from the text to the non-verbal parts of the message, e.g. photographs, are analyzed, together with the typology based on the position and type of those elements, as well as the openings of newspaper reports (as »textemes«) and their typology. Text linguistic approach to these types of texts developed further later on, and in the book on newspaper report stylistics (Korošec 1998) it occupies the better half of the volume (pp. 161–328). Although we did not get a comprehensive and systematic text linguistic study of reportorial texts with this work that rather offers some partial insights, they are relevant for the development of Slovenian text linguistics to such an extent that we present them in this paper – meant as a brief overview only – in a form as concise as possible.

[1] Headline as Text

The headline relates not only to the text, but at the same time also to other titles of the same text in different ways, and thus forms a specific reporting unit: a headline block. A headline block, particularly the one consisting of bound units, is a written (and thus graphically emphasized) text construction, which is – also developmentally – adapted to a specific type of reading the newspaper, where the most important facts of the reportorial text appear in a graphically emphasized position. Headline blocks have textual properties, their textual organization is manifested in the following:

They are constructions which developed to serve a specific communication intention in written reporting.

It follows from this that every individual unit of the headline block demonstrates a function, and as these functions support one another, a unity of the headline block is created.

Units of the headline block are autonomous (the outer, non-verbal manifestation of this autonomy is their graphic design), but there exists a hierarchy of relations between the upper headline, the big headline, and the lower headline based on the number of headline functions each unit can perform: big headline – lower headline – upper headline, with the big headline having the largest autonomy.

The positioning of each unit is automated, i.e. conventionalized in the author – addressee relation, at the same time the choice of stylistic features is also limited by the rules for each individual unit (e.g. topical elements are limited to the big title, the upper title must be stylistically unmarked, etc.).

Among the otherwise autonomous units of the headline block various text-formational relations can occur, but not each and every one of them. Those that limit or take away the autonomy of a unit are inappropriate, although they create a clear and stable new unit out of two units. If any of the units limits the autonomy of the big headline, the whole of the headline block is weak.

If at least one of the units is in a textual relation to another unit, such headline block is said to consist of bound units, otherwise it consists of free units.

Headline texts consisting of bound units have, according to the seven criteria of textuality¹⁷ (de Beaugrande, Dressler, Derganc, and Miklič 1992), the value of text.¹⁸

Periphrase is rare in headline texts, but it distinctly structures them. First a name or a designation must appear, and then in the following (not necessarily immediate) unit the anaphora is a periphrase referring to the name antecedent.

Cohesion is achieved also when one element simply points to another, structuring the headline block. The adverb *takó* ('thus') is not interchangeable with the pronoun *to* ('this'), as the adverbial function is to indicate manner. In principle this distinction should be maintained, still, the substitution cannot cause any big disturbance. If the demonstrative *to* refers to the big headline as a whole (a statement or quote), the tie between the headline and the lower headline is clear. Should that not be the case, the pronoun *to* could be coreferent with an element in the headline. The element, as a rule, must be a feminine or a neuter noun in the accusative (*pogodbo* ← *to*; *zasedanje* ← *to*), else the headline block is weak, and the uncertainty can be cleared only in the synopsis. From the point of view of the typology of lower headlines this is insufficient, because the *lower headline layout*, i.e. the »frame« below the big headline reserved

¹⁷ These criteria are: cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality, and intertextuality.

¹⁸ The typology of headline texts is extensive. In order not to burden this overview with examples (the interested reader can find them in the book) let us give here only a basic example of cohesion by repetition of lexemes: Headline: **Le ena Kitajska** Lower Headline: *ZDA priznale, da »obstoji samo ena Kitajska in da je Formoza njen sestavni del« – Kissinger je odšel v Tokio.* Synopsis: Tokio, 14. nov. (Reuter, Tanjug). Združene države Amerike so v skupnem ameriško-kitajskem sporočilu o končanem štiridnevnom obisku ameriškega zunanjega ministra Henryja Kissingerja v Pekingu priznale, da »obstoji **samo ena Kitajska** in da je Formoza njen sestavni del«.

for it, must be observed, and filled by either a single unit (a verbal or a non-verbal sentence) or several such units: two, tree, or even four (there are no typologically relevant examples in real-life reportorial texts of more than four-unit lower headlines). The first level of the lower headline analysis tells us whether there is only one lower headline unit, or more. In the first case we speak of *single lower headline*, otherwise of *lower headline clusters*. The criterion for further division of *single lower headlines* is the already mentioned headline block relation criterion. If the lower headline is in a textual relation with any other unit of the headline block, it is called *bound*, otherwise *free*. The criterion is of course also applied to lower headline clusters where one of the lower headlines is bound, forming a *lower headline cluster with a derived lower headline*. For example:

Headline: Nezadržno širjenje puščav

Lower Headline: *V Nairobi se je končala mednarodna konferenca organizacije za okolje OZN – Srhljivi podatki o vsakoletnem krčenju obdelovalne zemlje na svetu*

As we can see, the initial lower headline (in this example) provides the information about the end of a conference (the meeting, a period of activity in general), while the second lower headline is its derivation (a conclusion/finding/outcome). The meaning relation between the two lower headlines could be expressed as follows:

At the conference ⇒ there emerged → shocking results of cultivated land reduction.

[2] Vague Headlines

The relation between headline and the text, a typical text linguistic matter (unfortunately limited to the examples from the daily newspaper *Delo* only), is discussed in more detail in the chapter on *vague headlines*. These are headlines that fail in its function because of the misuse of linguistic means available, i.e. the deviation resulting from breaking the rules of the headline – text relation. There are two types of obscured headlines: *empty headlines* and *hyperbolic headlines* (the latter often include elements of sensationalism). An extensive corpus of examples is of course presented.

[3] Common Communication Circle

We introduce the name *common communication circle* (CCC) for those instances when the three communication parameters (speaker, message, and addressee) are oriented to the same context of situation. This is done in order to fully encompass the activity of communication, and avoid the largely inadequate labels used in the field of reportorial language. The CCC is not synonymous with *the public*; in some contexts of situation it corresponds only partly to *the audience* and the grammatical labels *the participant, the speaker, the addressed*. The CCC includes also the perception of space in geographical sense, as well as nationality and statehood, although the CCC is excluded from the area of influence and understanding of reportorial language as it manifests in the specific reportorial style in journalism, resulting in stylistic effects, disturbances in communication, as well as abuse. The CCC is therefore understood as a concept of experience, which in the course of reporting establishes from the coorientation of the three parameters the here and the now of the communication situation.

Textually and as far as the understanding of the CCC is concerned, personal pronouns and verb forms play an important part: first and second person plural forms (the latter being rarer) have an exophoric function and, in contrast with third person forms, which form cohesive ties and strings, i.e. antecedent ← anaphora(s) relations, in the text, refer (or better: point to) elements of extra-textual reality; because the referent is not named, it can vary even within the same text, despite being signaled by the same forms of markers. Referential identity is thus established on the basis of CCC markers.

[4] Time and Temporal Structure (The Time Expression *today*)

The time of constructing the text, i.e. its dominant internal time, has in the same way as the time of reception its own point of reference in the physical time. A date is usually given in the so-called time-space entry of the text, which puts the text into a relation with the objective time, and thus gives meaning to all adverbs and adjectives, and other temporal relations as well. It seems that this makes it harder to recognize the time expressed by tense, because the textual »today« is at the time of reception objectively »yesterday«. Nevertheless the addressee (reader) can make those temporal transformations on the basis of understanding the nature of the written medium, as they belong to the ability to process reportorial texts. Therefore the addressee does not expect from the reporter to make the transformation and use the tense structure in the text that would match the time of reception. This would violate a convention as traditional as other linguistic, for example, orthographic, elements. The dominant time in a reportorial text is thus the time expressed by the temporal adverbs referring to the (objective) public calendar time. The dominant time of the text is transferred unchanged to the point of reception, where it meets the dominant experience of real time. From this collision arises the need for transformations. The use of the time expression *today* in written reports (written, because in radio reports the time of reception is always the dominant time) shows two main transformational relations:

(a) *Today* in the reporting text refers to the dominant time of text construction, and it coincides with the time of the reported event. In radio reporting, which features real-time coverage, such relation is usual and frequent, in written reports the overlap is experienced in evening editions of newspapers. The dominant tense is present.

(b) *Today* is expressed in the headline and coincides with the time of reception. It overlaps with the time of an event which was forecasted beforehand (usually a day before, that is »yesterday«) – when the dominant time of text construction was different – to take place »today«. This overlap effectively refers to the reported reality when an event is *stated* to happen »today«, which is used in the big title accordingly.

[5] Temporal Structure and Reporting Text Construction

The focus of the news report is the part of the text that is a reportorial reaction to *an event* – herein lies the crucial difference compared to literary texts – an element of reality, and so the focus is not subject to the author's imagination. In the focus there are signals of the dominant internal textual time, i.e. the time of text construction (and the time of the event as well in this case), which shows that the adverb *today* refers to the period of time expressed in the time-space entry.

Between the focus and the other, usually longer part of the news text, *the news background*, there appears a noticeable gap. It is called *a textual turning point*, which is in fact a signal of time change. The text following this turning point is as to its content *an explanation of causal relations*, or *an argumentation* of the focus, and it refers to the events before the event from the focus took place (we only learn after the turning point and with the help of background information, that the focus is a displaced unit of text, moved to the beginning). At the place of the textual turning point stand turning point signals. These are fixed phrases of the type *as we have reported before*, or different anaphoras such as repetitions of the words from the focus, and establish cohesion and coherence. In a continued piece of news, covering a longer time period, the part of the text included in the news background has been in fact already expressed in another, or several other pieces of news, which can be referred to by the textual turning point signal *as we have reported before*.

[6] The Openings of Texts

The beginning as an element of existence is a time-space category, and if limited to communication with signs (not only linguistic), the beginning of visual communication would be the point of appearance of something material in space, in written linguistic communication of something material in the space designated for writing. The appearance of a visual linguistic sign, contrary to artistic and design elements, is limited (at least in the Western culture) to a certain point in the part of the visual field meant for written communication, viz. the »upper«, »left« corner, following the »empty« space, which used to be emphasized by an ornamented initial letter. In auditory communication the beginning is defined by the appearance of audible sound waves, often, but not always, after the end of the absence of sound waves – after the end of »silence«.

The beginning is defined as the first textual sentence (consisting of one, two, or more clauses); it is a »texteme«, i.e. the smallest part of the text, standing at the beginning, which can be a text in itself. We call it the opening of the text. This shows that the introduction and the opening are not one and the same thing, but every introduction has, of course, its opening. Because the introduction usually is a longer segment in the linear division of the text, we cannot easily come across a text where the opening would be at the same time the introduction. The types of openings (recognized in the short texts of editorial-like columns under the title of *Tema dneva* ('The Topic of the Day') from *Delo*) are the following: *news, statement, thesis, quotation, question, and figurative opening*.

News opening

News openings establish the time-space coordinates of the text in two ways. They show the orientation towards an event, using the pattern of news. Thus we face a news-like beginning of a non-news text. »Tema dneva« usually deals with topical issues, the closest points around its own »now« point, which is not true for all *openings* of these texts (if in a news opening the adverb *now* appears, it always – at least vaguely – refers to those points in reality and never to the internal textual time). News opening

connects the text most directly of all opening types to an event, and give the addressee the information about the content.

Statement opening

This is the most frequent opening of »Tema dneva«. On the syntactic level it is also the most diverse one, including a subtype closely connected to news opening, but beginning with a statement nonetheless. It is an *opinion* about a topical issue, which provides the information about the content for the addressee.

Thesis opening

The word thesis is not used in quite the usual meaning here. It is not – at least not always – a real thesis, an affirming or negating statement to be confirmed or rejected with scientific methods. Sentences of these openings are similar to theses, as well as to propositions in logic that can be either true or false. It is not difficult to distinguish this type of opening from the others.

Quotation opening

It differs from other types only in the fact that the author begins *his* text with a foreign text and the information that he is not the *author* of the quoted text.

Question opening

The use of interrogative sentences is a common means in rhetoric and teaching, aiming at creating a sort of suspension and triggering interest with the (immediately present) addressees. In journalism the same effect is achieved already by simply using a question mark in cases when it stands after non-interrogative sentences, especially nominal ones.

Figurative opening

This is the most demanding type of beginnings observed in the texts we have analyzed, but not necessarily the most effective one. When deciding on that type of opening we need a good judgment on choosing the right figure of speech that is in accordance with the topic. A sound plan is needed as far as composition and methods are concerned, lest the text should become pompous and space consuming, or lose the crucial characteristics of the reportorial genre. Any trope is possible, with metaphor being the most frequent. It is apparent that this type is more the issue of stylistics than text linguistics in its narrower sense.

[7] The Textuality of Questions in Interview Initiations

We introduce the term *initiation*, which by its meaning indicates empathy, orientation towards another person. A dialogical sequence is thus a basic unit of dialogue and one of the basic patterns of linguistic activity. Dialogical sequences need also to be considered a basic unit of newspaper (including all the supplementary pragmatic and extra-linguistic means), as well as radio and television interview.

To analyze a dialogue, we need to build from the fact that it requires two persons who exchange a message, usually a linguistic one. From one person (the speaker) a

linguistic sign originates and is transferred to the other (the addressee, the addressed, the listener). Monologues are no exception; in this case an individual represents both persons needed for the linguistic performance (a monologue is a dialogue between an inner »me« and an inner »you«). We are interested in text linguistic issues of a dialogue, i.e. conversation between (usually) two persons, two real psychophysical entities, and not in the complicated ways of a monologue (a conversation with oneself).

In a dialogical situation a text emerges, the authors of which are persons A and B. Person A realizes his or her communication intention by addressing his or her linguistic message to person B; this message serves as a *stimulus* for person B to reply. As soon as A's stimulus (initiation turn I) and B's reply to it (response turn R) are expressed, the complementary initiation and response form one dialogical sequence as a unit of text. In every initiation and response both anaphoricity and cataphoricity can be either communicational (or weak) or sign-bearing (or strong), we could also call the two types implicit and explicit. A dialogical text has a high degree of cohesion and coherence when both types complement each other. An interesting type of a dialogical sequence emerges when B's answer is an interrogative sentence, asking for repetition or clarification of A's question. Linguistically, we arrive at the so-called *directional neutralization*, the dialogical sequence is *neutralized*. It depends on the continuation of the dialogue whether it will develop as *unidirectional* or *bidirectional*, as A can either repeat his or her interrogative sentence or otherwise clarify the supposedly unclear question and thus begin a new sequence, or decides (consciously or not) to pass on the role of maintaining the unidirectional dialogue to B by answering B's question. The neutralized sequence in this case changes to a *direction-changing* one, starting a bidirectional dialogue.

The types and subtypes of initiations are the following:

1) *interrogative initiation* (subtype: *interrogative initiation with insistence*); 2) *interrogative-indicative initiation*; 3) *initiatory assertion*; 4) *two-part initiation* (consisting of an *introduction* and a *derived initiation*, which is most frequently an interrogative or an imperative sentence. The introduction paves the way for the question, introduces a topic, or suggests an answer. A subtype is a *presentation introduction*.); 5) *one-part initiation*; 6) *imperative initiation*; 7) *interruption* (the extreme case of it is *unsuccessful interruption*, when the interlocutor wants to express disagreement with the answer, but the other speaker ignores that); 8) *initiatory adoption* (with the subtype *interrogative adoption*), 9) *initiatory repetition* (subtype: *revised initiatory repetition*), 10) *initiatory ellipsis*.

[8] Inserts

What is here considered an insert – a typical way of reportorial text structuring – is broader in meaning than the traditional parenthesis. The latter is marked in Slovenian orthographic tradition by a pair of dashes, while the use of commas or brackets is rarer and less appropriate. In reportorial text this feature appears more often than in other text types. A view according to which all expressions between two dashes are discussed in the common context of *text construction* is presented, with the relatively unproblematic parenthesis being just one of such units. In this view all that appears

between two dashes is an *insert*, which may fall either into the group of *highlights* or *additions*, with traditional parenthesis being a type of addition.

Real additions are the product of specific circumstances of newspaper text construction, and are typical of the reportorial style. They occur when the author has already

- decided on the proposition for a given content,
- chosen propositional structure,
- set the syntactic pattern,
- based on all that, started to verbalize the content,

but then in the course of writing (by association or otherwise) at some point he recalls new, in his opinion important, information, which complements the previous text, but cannot be syntactically included in the present syntactic pattern (anymore).¹⁹ In order not to abandon the pattern and start all over, the author uses a syntactically non-obligatory signal (a typical obligatory signal in Slovenian orthography is a comma!), develops his or her thought (on a parallel level of text), marks it off with the same signal, and continues the interrupted, but not abandoned syntactic pattern. This procedure becomes a pattern that also applies to reportorial circumstances different from the described one.

[9] The Relation between Textual and Graphic Elements

Despite the undisputed fact that text structuring elements are parts of individual sentences, and that they operate beyond its borders, we can only identify and understand them if we take a broader viewpoint, i.e. the viewpoint of text.

The role of special textual means in the relation between a picture and a textual message is performed by special textual units with the function of linking a textual message more or less closely to a graphic message. We could largely include them in the list of pragmatic means, which organize relations between parts of texts as to clarity, authorial comments on the content, its evaluation, etc. These special units, characteristic of captions (in printed journalism mostly photograph captions), are adverbs, various prepositional phrases (usually prepositional-adverbial phrases), as well as adjectival phrases (with demonstrative pronouns). In reportorial texts we found them only in such environment, otherwise they are similar to stage directions in drama texts. They are called *free*, *accompanying*, and *demonstrative binders*.

Free binders

These are: (left), (right), (in the photo), (in the photo above), (from left to right), (below). They are without any syntactic relation – freely – inserted *after* the information, *beside* the information, and bind it to the graphic part of the message. Such binders are graphically marked, written in brackets.

¹⁹ It is interesting to call the attention to Viehrveger (and others), who claims that the speaker cannot imagine the entire text structure in advance, and thus develops its stages gradually.

Accompanying binders

The most frequent accompanying binder is *In the picture* (in modern time: *In the photo*). Its role is similar to that of a reporting clause introducing direct speech. Its appearance is conventional.

Demonstrative binders

These are demonstrative pronouns with the verb *to be* functioning as a copula (or as an auxiliary): *this is ...*, *such is ...*, *that is what he looked like ...*, *such it was ...*. Demonstrative binders stand at the beginning of those captions referring mainly to the situation, not to the event shown in the graphic message.

Binders appear in longer reportorial units as captions. They link the text and the photograph in a technical sense, not as far as the content is concerned. The text is made dependent on the photograph by the binders directing attention to certain elements of it (without caption, the photograph is informative largely as an illustration only, and it has a documentary function). The author of the text believes that the elements of the photograph will illustrate and support the textual part of the message in terms of the identification of elements in reality the text is referring to. Seven basic types and four subtypes of such text – photograph relations are identified.

6 It is probably not an exaggeration to claim that the publication of the translated work of de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), where the translators cooperated with the authors by inserting examples from Slovene at certain points in the text, had a substantial and positive influence on Slovene text linguistics (de Beaugrande, Dressler, Derganc, and Miklič 1992). This work in many ways filled the gap created by the lack of Slovene theoretical studies. It brings an overview of a large number of select text linguistic sources and useful short presentations of different approaches to the topic.

In the nineties, text linguistic research was tackled by the younger generation of linguists in particular. Their PhD (Hudej (1998), Kalin Golob (1998), and Zadravec-Pešec (2000)) as well as MA theses (Gorjanc (1998a), Krajnc (2004a)) served as the basis for many papers on text linguistics: Kalin Golob (1998), Gorjanc (1999b), Kalin Golob (2000), Kalin Golob (2002), Hudej (2002), Hudej (1994), Krajnc (2004b), Krajnc (2004c), and Krajnc (2005a). It is characteristic of them that the text linguistic approach is emphasized already in the titles.²⁰ The research lead to valuable book editions, e.g. Kalin Golob (2003), which contains a text linguistic approach to newspaper reports, comparing German and Slovenian text material from historical archives, and Krajnc (2005b), which is the first Slovenian comprehensive text linguistic study of spoken discourse.

A text linguistic approach is employed also in works that are essentially not text linguistic. A thorough monograph on lexical synonymy by Zorman (2000), for example, deals with co-textual synonyms and their text structuring role (142–169).

²⁰ An unusual exception in this respect is Pogorelec (1997), who in her extensive analysis of Ivan Cankar's prose works despite the phrase »Text Linguistic Aspects« in the title stays within the domain of literary theory, traditional stylistics and poetics.

7 The relations between two semiotic categories, the language and the picture, exist of course not only on the level of cohesion, but coherence as well. These are much more complex. The content of textual and graphic elements refers to the addressee's world of experience on many levels; what is more, it involves him or her in the communication process not only as an addressee, but as a co-creator as well. This sphere of the creative interplay of the two semiotic categories is most clearly apparent in advertising, where the linguistic and non-linguistic (graphic) means are joined in radio advertising by the only non-linguistic means available in that medium – sounds, noises, non-verbal expression, and the like.

This is a prominent field of text linguistics. Let just a few examples from the book edition (Korošec 2005) serve as an illustration in this overview. They appeared in several subchapters with the common title »Oglasna pribesedilnost« (»By-textuality (Non-verbal Elements) in Advertising«):

An advertisement consists of linguistic and non-linguistic (non-verbal) elements.²¹ The totality of all linguistic elements is called text; everything else is paralinguistic and by-textual elements.²² We use the term *advertisement by-textuality* to denote all non-linguistic elements of an advertisement which have – same as linguistic ones – a sign value, and are as such subject to the character of the communication channel in question, either visual or auditory. These are pictures, images, including animations, drawings, colors, shapes, as well as the size of the advertisement space, graphics (fonts, e.g. printed vs. hand-written), music, sounds, noises, etc., therefore we could in general speak of by-textuality of printed, radio, and television advertisements.²³ It is obvious that radio by-textuality has the smallest, and television the largest – by way of digital imaging practically unlimited – range of possibilities.

²¹ Non-verbal elements include also the so-called paralinguistic means of communication, which (can) accompany linguistic means of one or both physically present participants in a conversation. These are above all mimics, gestures, and proxemics (the physical distance between the participants, the speaker and the listener/s). Mimics, e.g. a smile, raised eyebrows, etc. are a very important element of communication, which, according to some research, are even more decisive than linguistic elements when it comes to interpreting the meaning of message. They are therefore decidedly sign elements, for they do not merely accompany, but convey a meaning on their own, without linguistic elements, e.g. a raised eyebrow expresses ambiguity or irony.

²² By-textuality of a text is a semiotic category, and therefore we should not confuse it with the so-called *co-text*. This term is used in some foreign works alongside the term context. The latter is called in Slovenian *sobesedilo*, and refers to the elements of text structure, its cohesion, coherence, and other features. It would be appropriate to use the Slovenian term *sporočanska okoliščina* ('communicative circumstance') in Slovenian text linguistics when speaking of *co-text*. This term is supposed to cover non-semiotic, extra-textual elements, which of course affect – in one way or another – the text itself, e.g. the inferior or superior relationship between the speakers in a dialogue, whether the text was prepared in advance or not, time pressure, public vs. private communication, etc. The foreign terms *text – context – co-text* are systematically rendered in this book as *besedilo – sobesedilo – sporočanska okoliščina*. Cook (1992: 1) defines the terms the other way around: *co-text* is the text that precedes or follows the analysed part of the text, and is considered a part of the discourse by the participants, which would correspond to the definition of *sobesedilo* (context) in Slovenian text linguistics, while we refer to Cook's *inter-text* as *medbesedilo*.

²³ The listed elements are considered by Cook (1992: 1f) as part of the context, which includes the following: substance, music and pictures, paralinguistic means, circumstances, co-text, and inter-text.

Considering the criterion of cohesion and coherence between the text of an advertisement and its by-textuality, we can identify two types of by-textuality:

1) Completely independent by-textuality, which is only a decorative accompaniment of the advertisement, but plays the role of an attention seeking device²⁴ and directs the attention to the textual part of the message. In radio advertising this is first and foremost music, and in television advertising a series of pictures and images, often with no reference to outer reality. By means of color and composition these refer to themselves, similar as in abstract painting (which is in this view in fact »concrete«). This artistic by-textuality has a limited sign value outside the artistic sphere itself. This is no more the field of language stylistics.

2) Visual and auditory elements which are a necessary part of the advertisement as they either give the advertisement text (or one of its elements) referential support, or the other way around, because the visual part of by-textuality gives sense to the verbal part of the message. Those two possibilities are realized in a varied array of types of interdependency. On the one hand we have a linguistic element (e.g. a demonstrative pronoun in ostensive function, i.e. defining an existing referent by direct demonstration) which refers to an element of by-textuality in a way that without any by-textuality the text would not make any sense. On the other hand, we have (moving) pictures – most common in television advertisements – which convey »a story«, but the images only make sense together with the verbal part of the advertisement.

Slogans as (relatively) independent units in advertisements also contain text structuring elements. One of the criteria for typological classification of slogans is their connection to the text of the advertisement. This criterion is in fact a text structuring one, which means that we are interested in whether there exists an anaphoric textual element in the slogan or not. *Cohesive* slogans contain such element, while *free* slogans do not. Cohesive slogans are in this way more effective.²⁵ Because slogans are exclusively linguistic formations, anaphoric elements in them can only be linguistic elements as well. They point to linguistic, that is, textual antecedents, or even more often to by-textual ones.

In the closing sentence of a television advertisement there appears for example the slogan *»In tako sem začel uporabljati papirne robce Paloma«* ('Thus I began to use Paloma paper tissues'), the contextual meaning of which depends on the story and is derived from it as the final sentence in an account of an event that leads to the use of Paloma paper tissues. The dependence is clear: the sentence with the demonstrative element *in tako* cannot appear as an independent sentence, without the background story, and cannot stand at the beginning of the advertisement.

V angleščino prevedel
Marko Hladnik.

²⁴ *Attention seeking* is a broad term, and by its use here we do not mean extreme, Benetton-style – publishing of photos of various objects, e.g. the shirt of a killed soldier – however effective it may be, it is not meant as real advertising.

²⁵ This is but a tendency observed in stylistics. It should not be considered *an instruction*.

REFERENCES

AGRICOLA, E., 1976: Vom Text zum Thema. *Probleme der Textlinguistik*. Ur. F. Daneš in D. Viehwegwer. *Studia Grammatica XI*. Berlin. 15–27.

BEAUGRANDE, Robert Alain, de, DRESSLER, Wolfgang Uirich, DERGANC, Aleksandra, MIKLIČ, Tjaša, 1992: *Uvod v besediloslovje*. Ljubljana: Park.

COOK, Guy, ²1994: *The Discourse of Advertising*. Routledge: London.

DANEŠ, František, 1968: Typy tematických posloupností v textu. *Slово a slovesnost* 29. 125–141.

DIPPONG, Horst, 1999/2000: Tehnika oziralne zvezne in oziralni zaimki. *Jezik in slovstvo XLV*. Ljubljana. 265–276.

DRESSLER, Wolfgang, 1972: *Einführung in die Textlinguistik*. Tübingen.

DULAR, Janez, KOROŠEC, Tomo, 1985: *Slovenski jezik 3*. Maribor: Obzorja.

GORJANC, Vojko, 1998a: *Besediloslovni vidiki slovenskega znanstvenega jezika*. Magistrsko delo: Ljubljana.

— — 1998b: Konektorji v slovničnem opisu znanstvenega besedila. *Slavistična revija XLVI /4*. Ljubljana. 367–388.

— — 1999: Kohezivni vzorec matematičnih besedil. *Slavistična revija XLVII/2*. Ljubljana. 139–159.

HARWEG, Roland, ²1972: *Pronomina und Textkonstitution*. München.

HOFFMANNOVÁ, Jana, 1983: Sémantické a pragmatické aspekty koherence textu. Praha: Ústav pro jazyk český ČSAV.

HUDEJ, Sonja, 1994: *Šolske ure besediloslovja: temeljni pojmi besediloslovja in jezikoslovne analize besedila*. Zavod republike Slovenije za šolstvo in šport. Ljubljana: Zbirka Matura.

— — 1998: *Besediloslovni vidiki uteheljevanja, prepričevanja in pregovarjanja*. Doktorska disertacija. Ljubljana. 304 str.

— — 2002: Uspešnost uresničevanja tvorčevega namena v šestih besedilnih vrstah. *Slavistična revija 50/1*. Ljubljana. 61, 81.

ISENBERG, Horst, 1974: *Texttheorie und Gegenstand der Grammatik*. Linguistische Studien. Reihe A, Arbeitsberichte 11. Berlin.

KALIN-GOLOB, Monika, 1998: Jezikovno-stilni razvoj v slovenskih poročevalnih besedilih do začetka 20. stoletja. Doktorska disertacija. Ljubljana. 306 str.

— — 2000: Razvoj sklicevalnih avtomatizmov v prvem slovenskem dneviku. *Slavistična revija 48/1*. Ljubljana. 1–26.

— — 2002: Začetki slovenskega poročevalstva: sklicevalni avtomatizmi glede na nezanesljivost o dogodku. *Slavistična revija 50/3*. Ljubljana. 295–317.

— — 2003: *H koreninam slovenskega poročevalnega stila*. Ljubljana: Založništvo Jutro.

KOROŠEC, Tomo, 1976: Poglavlja iz strukturalne analize slovenskega časopisnega stila. Doktorska disertacija. Ljubljana. 650 str.

— — 1981: Besediloslovna vprašanja slovenščine. *XVII. seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulturo*. Zbornik predavanj. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta. 173–186.

KOROŠEC, Tomo, DULAR, Janez, 1985: *Slovenski jezik 4*. Maribor: Obzorja.

KOROŠEC, Tomo, 1986: K besedilni soveznosti časopisnega sporočila. *XXII. seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulturo*. Zbornik predavanj. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta. 49–59.

— — 1998: *Stilistika slovenskega poročevalstva*. Ljubljana: Kmečki glas.

— — 2004: Stilistika poročevalstva – španska vas. *Poti slovenskega novinarstva – danes in jutri. Znanstveni zbornik ob 40. obletnici študija novinarstva na Slovenskem*. Ur. Melita Poler Kovačič in Monika Kalin Golob. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede.

— — 2005: *Jezik in stil oglaševanja*. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za družbene vede.

KRAJNC, Mira, 2004a: *Besediloslovne značilnosti pokrajinskega pogovornega jezika. Na gradivu mariborščine*. Magistrsko delo. Ljubljana.

– 2004b: Besedilnoskladenske značilnosti javne govorjene besede (Na gradivu mariborščine). *Slavistična revija* 4. Ljubljana. 475–498.

– 2004c: Začetniki oziroma sredstva za vzpostavljanje in ohranjanje stika v komunikaciji. *Jezikoslovni zapiski* 10/2. Ljubljana: Založba ZRC. 121–136

– 2005a: Poskus oblikovanja meril za tvorbo učinkovitega javnega govorjenega političnega besedila. *Slavistična revija* 1. Ljubljana. 27–47.

– 2005b: *Besedilne značilnosti javna govorjene besede. Na gradivi sej mariborskega Mestnega sveta*. Maribor: Zora.

POGORELEC, Breda, 1986: Znanstveno besedilo, njegove jezikoslovne prvine in slog. Ur. Vidovič Muha, A. *Slovenski jezik v znanosti*. Filozofska fakulteta: Ljubljana. 11–22.

– 1986a: Okvirna tipologija metafore v slovenski prozi 20. stoletja. *XXII. seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture*. Zbornik predavanj. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta. 7–20.

– 1997: Besediloslovni vidiki Cankarjeve proze. *Jezikoslovne in literarnovedne raziskave*. Zbornik referatov 6. srečanja slavistov Celovec – Ljubljana. Ur. Breda Pogorelec in sod. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.

SGALL, Petr, 1973: K programu lingvistike textu. *Slovo a slovesnost* 24/1. 39–43.

TOPORIŠIČ, Jože, 1993: Pojmovanja in izrazje slovenskega besediloslovja (V priročnikih za / srednje/ šole). *XXIX. seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture*. Zbornik predavanj. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta. 5–14.

– 1995: Besedilna skladnja. *Slavistična revija* 43/1. Ljubljana. 13–23.

VERSCHUEREN, Jef, 2000: Razumeti pragmatiko. Ljubljana: Založba *cf.

VIDOVIČ MUHA, Ada: 1996: Določnost kot besedilna prvina v slovničnam opisu slovenskega jezika (Ob Kopitarjevi slovnici). *Kopitarjev zbornik*. Mednarodni simpozij v Ljubljani, 29. junij do 1. julij 1994, Jernej Kopitar in njegova doba, Simpozij ob stopečesetletnici njegove smrti. Ljubljana : Filozofska fakulteta. 115–129.

ZADRAVEC-PEŠEC, Renata, 1994: *Pragmatično jezikoslovje*. Temeljni pojmi. Ljubljana: Pedagoški inštitut pri Univerzi v Ljubljani.

– 2000: *Besedilotvorni vidiki navezovanja v slovenskih neumetnostnih besedilih*. Doktorska disertacija. Ljubljana. Ljubljana. 136 str.

ZORMAN, Marina, 2000: *O sinonimiji*. Ljubljana: Znanstveni inštituta Filozofska fakultete.

POVZETEK

Do sredine sedemdesetih let 20. stoletja se je slovensko jezikoslovje v pristopih k besedilu – zlasti v učbenikih in jezikovnih priročnikih – zadrževalo v okvirih tradicionalne poetike in retorike, npr. glede horizontalne členitve besedil (uvod – jedro – zaključek), retoričnih predbesedilnih faz, itd. Proti koncu sedemdesetih in v začetku osemdesetih let postajajo pri nas posamezne refleksije evropskega (češkega, nemškega, nekoliko poznejne angleškega) besediloslovja, ki prinašajo zahteve po raziskovalnem širjenju od povedi k višjim tvorbam, k besedilom, sicer določnejše, vendar še zmeraj omejene na besedila določenih funkcijskih zvrsti, npr. časopisnega poročevalstva in strokovnih besedil. Pristopi zajemajo kohezijsko-kohеретna besedilotvorna razmerja, npr. razmerje naslov-besedilo, kohezijska (deiktična itd.) razmerja med enotami naslovij, tipološke značilnosti začetkov besedil, koherenčno razmerje med enotami podnaslovnih sklopov, tipologija vprašanj in njihova besedilnost v intervjujskih nagovorih, tipologija razmerij med dvema semiološkima kategorijama, tj. med poročevalnim spremenim besedilom in prvimi fotografske slike itd. Pestra in zapletena razmerja med besedilom in široko pojmovano

(gibljivo itd.) sliko, t. i. pribesedilnostjo, so obravnavana v tipih oglaševanih besedil, kar vse se pri nas obravnava v okviru stilistike.

Sorazmerno samostojen teoretični pristop h koheziji (slovenskih poročavalskih) besedil predstavlja oblikovanje t. i. naveznih parov in naveznih nizov in zasnova za skupek pravil, ki bi zagotavljala besedilno sovisnost in veznost med antecedenti in navezovalniki, ki so zaimenski in besednomorfemski.

Pod vplivom prevoda knjige *Uvod v besediloslovje* (Beaugrande-Dressler 1981), ki je izša l. 1992, se je besediloslovno raziskovanja pri nas precej razmahnilo tudi v disertacijah, samostojnih razpravah in knjižnih monografijah, npr. o sobesedilni sinonimiji, o govorjenih javnih političnih besedilih ipd.