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1 INTRODUCTION

In the process of human interaction participants rely primarily on the use of language in their efforts to convey and understand meanings, to achieve their communicative intentions and to identify and react to the communicative intentions of others. In order to make purposeful interaction possible, participants collaborate in their endeavours to derive an understanding which furthers communication, i.e. they strive to negotiate an interpretation of discourse which, if not identical for all interactants, overlaps sufficiently. Since language is socially motivated, an adequate interpretation of meanings and intentions conveyed cannot be based only on what is said or written: it is also affected by the interpretation skills and background knowledge of the participants, by their attitudes, opinions and beliefs, social identities, roles and relations, and by the situational, socio-cultural and pragmatic contexts in which the interaction takes place. Thus in social interaction language is used not only to create a reflection of the world and to transmit the communicative intentions of the speaker/writer; it is also a powerful tool for constructing discourse worlds in which individuals, groups and institutions are assigned identities and roles, and actions and events are presented from the points of view of different discourse participants.

Coherence, viewed as the subjective perception of meaningfulness and purposefulness of discourse, is a key aspect of discourse interpretation, which encompasses conceptual connectedness, evaluative and dialogical consistency and textual relatedness. Obviously, communicative strategies used in processing spoken and written discourse differ. While in spoken discourse interactants are actively involved in meaning negotiation, in written discourse there is no direct contact between the reader and the writer, and therefore, there is no explicit co-construction of meaning. Thus, when encoding a written text the writer has to anticipate the reactions of the reader and to use various signals to guide him/her towards an intended text interpretation. It should be noted, however, that the listener or reader may derive an interpretation which while coherent to him/her, differs considerably from the one intended by the speaker or writer.

This study is conceived as an exploration of discourse coherence; it endeavours to conceptualize coherence as a constitutive component of human communication and to explore the interplay of different aspects of coherence in the genre of diplomatic opening.
addresses. The choice of the genre under investigation is motivated by its specificity – as planned, typically scripted texts intended for oral performance, diplomatic addresses bear features of both written and spoken discourse and thus can be assumed to display most, if not all, facets of discourse coherence. In addition, since as specimens of political discourse opening addresses are intended to promote a particular ideology, i.e. the way a social group or society views objects existing in its world, explains how the world functions, and assigns values to these objects and processes (Fowler 1986:11), they allow the analyst to investigate the strategies orators use to influence the views and opinions of their audience so as to guide them towards an intended coherent discourse interpretation.

1.1 Discourse and communication: basic terms and concepts

Research into linguistic phenomena is to a large extent defined by the perspective from which language is analysed. This study adopts a functional view of language, which accounts for both the sender’s and the receiver’s ends of the communicative process, i.e. the encoding and decoding of the message; it is based on a process model of language (Leech 1983) which views the stages of linguistic production and interpretation as mapped onto the language macro-functions defined by Halliday (1978, 1981, 1985, 1989) – the ideational, the interpersonal and the textual – and represents the linguistic act of communication as “constituting a transaction on three different planes: as (a) an interpersonal transaction, or discourse; as (b) an ideational transaction or message-transmission; and as (c) a textual transaction or text” (Leech 1983: 59):

Figure 1- Leech’s process model of language (Leech 1983)
Since the complementarity of the ideational, interpersonal and textual planes of communication and their functional specialization are essential to this research, they require more detailed discussion. Within Halliday’s systemic-functional approach language is seen as a carrier of a meaning potential, the linguistic system being an essential component of the social system. The variety of meanings which may be expressed via language in social interaction are realised by three relatively independent but interrelated functional components of the semantic system of a language, or macro-functions:

Figure 2: Halliday’s taxonomy of language functions (Halliday 1978)

1 ideational (language as reflection)
   (a) experiential
   (b) logical

2 interpersonal (language as action)

3 textual (language as texture, in relation to the environment)

The ideational function, which realizes the general purpose of language use to understand the environment, comprises the experiential component serving for the expression of content, i.e. the representation of experience of the phenomena of the real world and the internal world of one’s own consciousness, and the logical component reflecting relations holding between events and phenomena represented in discourse. The logical function, however, is not confined to the ideational plane, since logical relations also hold between speech acts interactants perform in an act of communication (Halliday 1989: 21); this pertains to the interpersonal plane, the one which reflects the interaction taking place between the participants in the act of communication, i.e. the expression of participants’ relationships, attitudes and evaluations. The last, textual function is regarded by Halliday (1981: 331) as an enabling function (instrumental to the ideational and interpersonal) which is intrinsic to language, being concerned with its internal organisation and encompassing the internal links established in the text and between the text and its situational context. It should be mentioned that Halliday’s framework of language macro-functions shows a degree of consensus with alternative influential functional frameworks, e.g. compared to Bühler’s (1934) and Jakobson’s (1960) frameworks, Halliday’s ideational function corresponds closely to Jakobson’s referential function, termed representational by Bühler, while his interpersonal function subsumes Jakobson’s conative and emotive (called
expressive in Bühler’s classification) functions. However, as Halliday states, his functional conception differs from those of his predecessors: though still extrinsic, it has an intrinsic purpose, being “designed to explain the internal nature of language in such a way as to relate it to its external environment” (Halliday 1978: 48).

Interpreting the meaning potential of language in the context of social interaction involves an understanding of the functional values on all planes of the linguistic transaction which are interwoven with each other (Martin and Rose 2003: 6). Consequently, deriving coherence from a text in purposeful interaction presupposes the cooperative efforts of the participants to interpret simultaneously the ideational, interpersonal and textual meanings transmitted in the act of communication.

Within the process model of language (See Figure 1 above), verbal interaction is described as “discourse by means of message by means of text” (Leech 1983: 59). Although text and discourse are concepts central to any investigation of language in use, their definitions are still not clearly established and their use is “generally based on the theoretical framework adopted” Tárnyiková (2002: 20); therefore, before proceeding to the discussion of the theoretical framework of this research, it is essential to explain how these terms are understood in the present study. Despite the tendency to use the terms text and discourse interchangeably to “refer to a unit of language larger than the sentence” (Chafe 1999[2003]: 439), numerous researchers in the field of text and discourse analysis consider these as distinct but interdependent phenomena (Widdowson 2007: 4), while applying different criteria for delimitation between the two concepts, such as the medium used (Coulthard 1985: 6), the presence or absence of contextualization (Schiffrin 1994: 41, Van Dijk 1990: 164), and the static or dynamic character of the phenomenon (Brown and Yule 1983: 26).

In agreement with the functional approach adopted here, in the present study text is defined as a functional-semantic concept realized by a particular set of lexicogrammatical choices performing a specific communicative intention (Tárnyiková 2002: 23). Thus in the process of social interaction a text, regarded as a product of this interaction characterized by a number of basic categories such as informative value, integrity, completeness and recurrence, functions from a communicative, structural and semantic point of view as an autonomous whole. Discourse emerges within the process of interpretation of meanings encoded in a text, which is affected by the social context and the background and cultural knowledge of the participants, who also draw on their previous experience in text
interpretation to activate, re-create and negotiate the meaning potential of a text in a particular context (e.g. Brown and Yule 1983: 225, Mey 1991: 404, Miššíková 2005: 85). It should be noted that my understanding of discourse is broader than the one suggested by Leech (1983: 59), whose model of communication is adopted in the present study, and who defines discourse as a sequence of utterances forming a transaction. In order to reflect the dynamic context-bound nature of the phenomenon, discourse is defined here as purposeful interaction via verbal and non-verbal means between a speaker/writer and a listener/reader which takes place in a certain context and in the process of which discourse is derived from a text (cf. Seidlhofer and Widdowson 1997: 207, Fowler 1986: 86, Hoey 2001: 11), i.e. it is the instantiation of the ‘interpretation potential’ (Sarangi 2004) of a text in context in which the participants make inferences based on their general background knowledge and experience to make sense of the interaction. Since the main focus of this study is the (re-)construction of coherence – the subjective perception of meaningfulness and purposefulness in discourse – it is essential to stress that this approach views discourse as a constitutive-of-reality process (Wodak 1996, Miššíková 2007) within which interactants construct a subjective representation of reality moulded by their attitudes, views and relations, i.e. in the process of a particular interpretative decoding the hearer/reader creates his/her own discourse from the text by assigning it intentionality and recreating its meaning, which need not be identical to the one perceived by the other interactants in the act of communication.

As the discussion above suggests, discourse interpretation is affected by several contextual factors. The analysis of discourse coherence in the present research takes into consideration four types of context traditionally acknowledged in linguistic studies, namely the linguistic, cognitive, social and socio-cultural contexts. The linguistic context, or co-text (Halliday 1978:133, Brown and Yule 1983: 46-50, Mey 2001: 134), comprises the language material surrounding the object of investigation, including the appropriate extent of the co-text to be taken into consideration in the interpretative process, as well as “all the other relevant prior texts which the various textual clues in a given utterance conjure up for a given language user on a given occasion to use” (Hatim 1997: 200). It is important to stress that the extent of the intertextual connections that an interactant is able to activate is highly individual and that in case of failure to identify key meaning connections it may result in inadequate discourse interpretation and disturbed coherence.
The influence of mutually dependent extra-linguistic types of context on discourse interpretation is highly complex. The cognitive context reflects the personal knowledge of individuals, covering mental representations, assumptions, intentions and cognitive efforts of the participants involved in discourse interpretation; however, since this knowledge is acquired in the process of social interaction, it is inherently connected to the shared beliefs of the social groups to which the individuals belong (Van Dijk 1997: 190). The social and socio-cultural contexts are closely interwoven. The socio-cultural context, which comprises the total set of meanings available to a discourse community, including routines and activity types, associated communicative intentions and goals, and general background knowledge, i.e. its semiotic potential (Hasan 1989a: 99), may be seen as a ‘filter mechanism’ (Fetzer 2004: 10) which allows the participants in an interaction to interpret the social context, i.e. situational factors such as the identity and roles of interactants, spatio-temporal settings and knowledge of the general ‘types’ of situation (Shiffrin 1994: 373), so as to fit the existing socio-cultural constraints and requirements. It may therefore be argued that when involved in purposeful social interaction participants construct and interpret discourse by performing subjective situationally-motivated choices from a set of options offered by the semiotic potential available to a discourse community; these choices are based on an assumption of coherence (Brown and Yule 1983: 224) which presupposes that what is being communicated is relevant to the general topic and purpose of the interaction and is in agreement with existing situational constraints.

1.2 Research outline

The present corpus-based research is undertaken primarily from the viewpoints of discourse analysis and pragmatics; its aim is to conceptualize coherence as a constitutive component of human communication and to analyse how coherence is manifested in a particular kind of English discourse – the genre of diplomatic opening addresses.

The main objective of my research is to explore the interplay of different aspects of coherence in discourse comprising conceptual connectedness, evaluative and dialogical consistency, and textual relatedness. Since coherence is conceived here as a scalar notion (Bublitz 1997), i.e. it is regarded as a matter of degree, the present study will argue that the overall perception of coherence in discourse is based on relatively independent but interrelated aspects of coherence – propositional (Van Dijk 1977) and topical (Giora 1985
coherence on the ideational plane, evaluative (Thompson and Zhou 2000) or interpersonal (Fetzer 2008) and interactional (Stubbs 1983) on the interpersonal plane, and cohesion (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 1989, Hoey 1991, Tanskanen 2006) on the textual plane of discourse – which need not be perfectly convergent. Consequently, discourse participants may derive different interpretations and perceive different degrees of coherence on the three planes of discourse, e.g. divergence in coherence on the interpersonal level may stem from a failure to interpret irony or a joke, while on the ideational plane misunderstanding may reflect a difference in inferences based on the knowledge frames available to individual interactants.

When making predictions about meanings exchanged in the process of communication, participants have to draw on established patterns available in their background and discourse knowledge. Since genres are conventional forms associated with particular types of social occasion (Hatim 1997), in creating a text the speaker/writer interacts with the existing generic patterns by reproducing or modulating them, and in making sense of a text a listener/reader is likely to activate the relevant genre-specific meaning potential in order to derive discourse coherence. Taking into consideration this intertextual dimension of text and discourse production and interpretation (Kristeva 1969:85), this study investigates the constraints that the genre of opening addresses imposes on the interpretative potential of texts.

In political discourse the interpretative process of assigning intentionality and creating meaning involves the (re-)construction and negotiation of identities, social roles and views, the (re-)definition of participants’ interpersonal and institutional relations and the (re-) interpretation of events, i.e. language is used not only to reflect reality; it also has the power to redefine the values assigned to individuals, relations and events. Drawing on the assumption that a political speech opens a dialogic space in which the speaker tries to build a coherent subjective representation of a discourse world, this research will focus primarily on speaker meaning, while considering the resources orators have at their disposal to try to impose on the audience an interpretative perception of the semantic unity and purposefulness of their discourse which reflects their communicative intentions with regard to the situational, socio-cultural and pragmatic context in which the interaction takes place. It will also consider how the context and the anticipated audience reaction affect speaker choices and the interpretation potential of speeches which the listeners can activate when making sense of the interaction.
This research is carried out on a corpus of speeches delivered by three consecutive Directors-General of UNECO over a thirty-year period; therefore, it may be regarded as approaching the material from both the synchronic and the diachronic points of view. Nevertheless, it should be noted that differences in rhetorical style and discourse strategies used by the three speakers reflect their ideological background, the policy of the organization and the global political situation in the period of their term of office, rather than a change in the rhetorical and discourse strategies used in the genre of opening addresses.

The organization of this study reflects my primary concerns in the present research. The chapter dealing with theoretical preliminaries and methodological issues opens by drawing a demarcation line between the notions of coherence and cohesion and explaining my understanding of the terms; then it proceeds to a detailed discussion of previous research on coherence focusing on approaches considering coherence cues at different planes of discourse, and finally it provides an outline of the framework for the analysis of coherence applied in my research. The third chapter introduces the genre of diplomatic opening addresses as a specimen of political discourse in international settings; it describes the material under investigation and analyses the rhetorical structure of opening addresses which is considered as a key element enhancing the perception of interactional coherence in this kind of discourse. The fourth chapter deals with the analysis of coherence in opening addresses, focusing on the interplay of ideational, interpersonal and textual meanings in building up discourse coherence. It considers the strategic devices that orators use in order to impose on listeners an intended interpretation which suits their communicative purposes, as well as potential interpretations that listeners may derive from the speeches. Finally, it endeavours to highlight some differences in the rhetorical styles of the three Directors-General and relates them to contextual factors affecting this specific kind of institutional interaction.
2 THEORETICAL PRELIMINARIES AND RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter explores the concept of coherence as a constitutive component of human interaction. It opens with a brief review of different understandings of the concept which have emerged over the last four decades and explains the complex relationship between coherence and cohesion. Then it proceeds to a discussion of previous research considering different approaches to the analysis of coherence which highlight the contribution of phenomena at different planes of discourse to the perception of discourse coherence and relates the interpretative scalar nature of coherence to features of discourse which may result in disturbed coherence. Finally, this chapter outlines the analytical framework applied in this investigation.

2.1 Defining discourse coherence

While the concept of ‘coherence’ has undoubtedly been central to developments in text and discourse analysis over the last four decades, it is still the subject of ongoing discussion, and despite the variety of definitions and analytical frameworks suggested (e.g. Halliday and Hasan 1976, 1989, Widdowson 1979, Van Dijk 1980, 1983, Beaugrande and Dressler 1981, Brown and Yule 1983, Hobbs 1983, 1985, Mann and Thompson 1988, Sanders and Noordman 1992, Campbell 1994, Giora 1985, 1997, Givón 1983, 1995, Hoey 1991, 2001, Kehler 2002), there is as yet no consensus among members of the international linguistic community about how this complex language phenomenon should be understood. The study of coherence is intended to describe texts and discourses and the processes of creating, reading/listening to and understanding them, and it has typically been associated with issues of connexity, sequentiality, continuity, informativity and comprehensibility of text and discourse. Since over the years the originally text-based conception of coherence has evolved to reflect cognitive, psychological and interactional considerations, the following brief overview of approaches to coherence aims at clarifying its nature and outlining the background to my understanding of this notion.

Early research on coherence, defined in general terms as the semantic unity of a text, was to a large extent confined to a static text-based formal approach, according to which coherence is the product of textual connectivity and cohesion (e.g. Bellert 1970,
Coherence, together with cohesion (accepted as a well-established analytical category after the publication of Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) seminal work *Cohesion in English*), was seen as a constitutive property of a text which distinguishes it from a non-text. Thus Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) take coherence and cohesion as two of their seven basic standards of textuality (the other five being acceptability, informativity, situationality, intentionality and intertextuality). However, while Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) define cohesion as the organizational patterns of the surface text that uphold the stability of the text as system via continuity of occurrence, they regard coherence as a continuity of meanings in the textual world, which contains more than the sense of the expressions in the surface text, and which, therefore, should be interpreted thanks to the contributions of expectations, experience, and knowledge configurations in the mind of the participants in the communication. This suggests that the roles of cohesion and coherence in text processing differ; therefore, before proceeding with the discussion of different approaches to coherence, a consideration of the complex relationship between these two concepts is indispensable.

Despite the fact that most researchers agree that coherence is influenced and signalled by markers of cohesive relations holding in the text, i.e. relations between lexical items and grammatical structures which overtly connect clauses and/or clause complexes (e.g. Widdowson 1979, Halliday and Hasan 1976, Lindeberg 1985, Hoey 1991, 2001, Tanskanen 2006), there is considerable variation in their views on the interdependence of cohesion and coherence. Thus while Hasan (1989: 94) approaches cohesion and coherence as closely related phenomena and argues that “variation in coherence is the function of variation in the cohesive harmony of a text”, many linguists tend to draw a stricter distinction between these two categories and hold that coherence is independent of cohesion (e.g. Enkvist 1978: 110, Hoey 1991: 3, Thompson 1994: 63, Hellman 1995: 193, Tanskanen 2006: 21, Povolná 2007: 108, Dontcheva-Navratilova 2007a: 128). Cohesion and coherence may be differentiated according to the scope of the established relations – as Mey (2001: 154; see also Van Dijk (1980) on local and global coherence) points out “cohesion establishes local relations between syntactic items (reference, concord and the like), whereas coherence has to do with the global meaning involved in what we want to express through our activity”. Another distinction reflecting the interactive character of human communication, is highlighted by Widdowson (1979) and Stubbs (1983), who
restrict the role of cohesion to overt structural linking between sentences as formal items, while they view coherence as the link between the communicative acts that sentences are used to perform. The most important difference, however, is highlighted by those who argue that while cohesion is a property of text, coherence pertains to discourse (e.g. Widdowson 2004, Bublitz 1997). According to this view, coherence is not inherent to a text; it is “rather a function of the text and of the equipment the hearer or reader brings to its interpretation” (Enkvist 1985: 15). It is “the outcome of a dialogue between the text and its listener or reader” (Tanskanen 2004: 89), i.e. a property of discourse which is derived within the process of instantiation of the interpretation potential of a text (Dontcheva-Navrtilova 2009). It follows that “human beings do not require formal textual markers before they are prepared to interpret a text. They naturally assume coherence, and interpret the text in the light of that assumption” (Brown and Yule 1983: 66), in other words they use their common sense and impose coherence on the text (Tárányiková 1995: 24) while trying to achieve a coherent interpretation. Hence, “cohesion is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for coherence” (Bublitz 1988: 32), i.e. a text, either written or spoken, can be perceived as coherent without cohesive means, and equally, “textual cohesion provides no guarantee of discourse coherence” (Seidlhofer and Widdowson 1997: 207). This approach brings to the fore the cognitive aspects of the communication process, which assumes that coherent discourse interpretation is derived not only thanks to explicit and implicit markers of cohesion, but also as a result of inference based on contextual and background knowledge and on experience in discourse processing.

Returning to the discussion of different approaches to coherence, it seems useful to conceive them as grouped into two major strands, a text-based and a discourse-based strand, although, drawing on Enkvist (1985), the latter may be further subdivided to broadly correspond to his text-linguistics models of analysis, namely the predication-based, cognitive and interactional models. As already mentioned, the text-based strand, which works with sentence-based text models, approaches text as a product and is characterized by an interest in the study of cohesion, focusing on overt linguistic mechanisms connecting textual units at sentence and paragraph level, such as anaphora, cataphora, ellipsis, conjunctions and lexical cohesion (e.g. Halliday and Hasan 1976), patterns of placement of old or new information and theme and rhyme articulation (e.g. Daneš 1974, Halliday 1974, 1985, Firbas 1975, 1987, 1992), and sentence topic (e.g. Lautamatti 1978). While dealing primarily with syntactic and lexical features of text, some analysts stress the importance of
a presupposed knowledge of the preceding context in utterance interpretation (e.g. Bellert 1970); others consider syntactic rules insufficient to account for the disambiguation of reference expressions and use pragmatic strategies in anaphor interpretation (e.g. Enkvist 1978b). Relating coherence to consistency and relevance, Reinhart (1980) views cohesion in terms of linear relations between pairs of sentences that are linked referentially or by a semantic connector; she argues further that for a text to be coherent it has to meet the consistency condition, and she specifies that only referential links connected to the topic or scene-setting expression of the sentence may be regarded as cohesive. Supporting the view that reference to topical cohesive chains is essential to the perception of coherence, Wikborg (1985) points out that misleading sentence connectors and information structure may result in cohesion and coherence breaks in a student’s writing.

The impact of information structure on the perception of cohesion and coherence has been evidenced by all theoretical frameworks dealing with the management of themerheme articulation in the sentence and given-new organization in discourse (cf. Mathesius 1966, Daneš 1974, Firbas 1975, 1992, 1995, Halliday 1985, Hajičová 1993, Sgall 1994). While differing slightly in their analysis of speaker’s/writer’s organization of the clause as a message (the divergence in their views concerns mainly the treatment of theme and rheme as position-bound phenomena), the proponents of these approaches generally agree on a definition of the theme as the element which serves as a point of departure for the message and establishes a framework for the rest of the clause (i.e. it is the element carrying the lowest degree of communicative dynamism) and of the rheme/topic as the high point of the message (the elements carrying the highest degree of communicative dynamism). Due to the close semantic association of theme-rheme articulation and given-new information organization resulting from the tendency shown by thematic elements to indicate what is given and retrievable for the listener/reader and by rhematic elements to locate the climax of the new in the message (Halliday 1985a), both phenomena contribute to the perception of discourse coherence. The cohesive force of thematic elements is due to the establishment of referential relations between them, the resulting topical cohesive chains facilitating the perception of semantic connectedness between sentences in the process of text interpretation.

The interdependence of theme-rheme articulation and given-new information is conceptualised in Daneš’s thematic progression procedures (1974, 1995), which explicitly relate sentence themes to discourse topic and consider the contribution of utterances to the
The idea of topical progression is taken up in Lautamatti (1978), who argues that it helps describe how individual sentences cohere locally and how all sentences within a text cohere globally. Her three types of topical progressions – parallel, sequential and parallel sequential – broadly overlap with those suggested by Daneš (1974). Lautamatti’s (1978) topical structure analysis introduces the concept of ‘topic depth’ to refer to the length of the string of sequential progression in a text, the longest string being related to the highest level topic (cf. Hasan’s text-exhaustive cohesive chains). A further extension of Daneš’s (1974) patterns of thematic progression is proposed by Lindeberg (1985), who has suggested a number of coherence patterns, defined as sequences of rhetorical functions holding between units in discourse, such as assertion, specification, contrast, and cause and result, the occurrence of which she uses as a basis for measuring coherence in students’ writing. As Connor (1996) points out, topical structure analysis has proved to be extremely helpful in the analysis of coherence from the perspective of contrastive rhetoric.

It is obvious, however, that while the functional sentence perspective approach is primarily sentence- and text-based, the thematic progression framework is rather discourse oriented and hence may be seen as a kind of a bridge between the text-based and the discourse-based strands in the study of coherence. The discourse-based strand approaches coherence as a property of discourse instantiated in the process of meaning interpretation, which is affected by the context and the background knowledge of the individuals involved in interaction. The different analytical frameworks share a dynamic view of meaning interpretation which is based on the assumption that discourse coherence is a collaborative achievement on the part of the participants in the interaction, who use their experience of the world and discourse processing when (re-)constructing meanings encoded in texts.

An important aspect of coherence is explored by the proponents of the discourse-based approaches, who share the understanding that discourse interpretation relies on the existence of underlying relations among the propositions in a text, which need not be consciously realized by the interactants (Martin 1992). These essentially rhetorical relations, whose function is the staging of discourse structure, have been referred to as clause relations (Winter 1994, Hoey 1996, 2001), conjunctive relations (Martin 1992), coherence relations (Hobbs 1979, 1983, 1985, Sanders et al. 1992, Sanders and Noordman 2000, Sanders and Spooren 1999, 2009, Kamalski et al. 2008, Kehler 2002, 2004) and rhetorical relations (Mann and Thompson 1988, Taboada 2004); in the present study they
will henceforth be termed coherence relations. Despite the general agreement that coherence relations reveal an important aspect of discourse coherence, there is considerable variation in the classifications of these relations as to the number of relations to be considered. Thus while Winter (1994) suggests two clause relations – sequential and matching, Kehler (2002) proposes eleven coherence relations grouped into three categories – resemblance, cause-effect and contiguity – and Mann and Thompson’s (1992) taxonomy includes a set of 23 rhetorical relations grouped in eleven categories, although the set is considered to be open-ended. As Taboada (2004: 106) summarises the Rhetorical Structure Theory approach (which similarly to some other coherence relations frameworks was originally developed as part of the studies of a computer-based text generation), “the number of relations is supposed to be flexible, but manageable, and they need to be attested in naturally-occurring discourse”; however, despite the fact that its explanatory potential is indisputable, this theory has been criticized for the high number of relations which makes its application difficult.

Coherence relations can be regarded as cognitive mechanisms, typically text-type or genre-specific, which speakers/writers draw upon to organise their texts and which readers are expected to recognize in the interpretative process. They express primarily logical meanings pertaining to the ideational plane of discourse. When signalled explicitly by discourse markers (cf. Schiffrin 1987, Blakemore 2004), the interpretation of coherence relations is facilitated by connectives, i.e. markers of cohesion, or by pragmatic particles and expressions, e.g. *Oh, now, you know*, which serve as guides to interpretation. Discourse markers have the potential to signal both relations holding between adjacent segments of discourse, i.e. local coherence relations, which can be expressed by, e.g. *and, I mean, so, but, now, then*, and relations holding across longer stretches of discourse, i.e. global coherence relations, expressed by, e.g. *actually, however, still* (Lenk 1998b). It should be noted, however, that, as Blakemore (2004: 235) points out, discourse markers cannot be regarded as direct indicators of coherence relations; moreover, in most cases coherence relations are implicit, i.e. not signalled by explicit markers (Taboada 2006, 2009). Since the establishment of coherence relations is affected by the discourse processing experience of the interpreter (degree of familiarity with the respective text-type or genre) and his/her specific and general background knowledge (different inferences may result in different ways in which propositions and text units can be integrated), each interpretation is considered to bear a degree of subjectivity. This suggests that coherence is
an intrinsically indeterminate interpretative notion and “not an invariant element of text or discourse that can be isolated and then identified similarly by different people” (Lenk 1998b: 16).

The view that coherence is independent of cohesion and that it is not an inherent quality of a text is also shared by scholars working in the field of discourse comprehension and memory storage (e.g. Giora 1985, 1988, 1997, 1998, Longacre 1979, Givón 1983, 1995, Van Dijk 1977, 1980, 1995, Van Dijk and Kintsch 1983). Taking a cognitive perspective, they argue that coherence is derived from a text by establishing connections between concepts supported by inferences based on the activation of mental representations in the mind of the interactants (schemata, frames, scripts and scenarios). These connections enable the participants to interpret the interaction as being about a discourse topic and thus to consider it as coherent, while the activation of high-level schemata provides an interpretative framework for discourse comprehension (e.g. Anderson et al. 1977, Van Dijk 1977, 1980).

While claiming that the aboutness criterion is crucial for the perception of coherence, Giora (1985) relates discourse coherence to the notion of relevance (based on Grice’s (1975) maxim of relation) arguing that relevancy (to a discourse topic) does not obtain linearly between pairs of sentences (although she acknowledges that thematic unity of paragraphs is affected by the recurrence of sentence topics), but between a set of propositions and a discourse topic (Giora 1985: 705), also termed hyper-theme (cf. Daneš 1974, 1995). According to Giora’s (1997) theory of discourse coherence, in an informative well-formed (i.e. coherent) discourse all propositions are conceived as related to a discourse-topic proposition (comprehension is facilitated by stating the topic in initial position, e.g. title), each proposition in the sequence is more informative and thus less accessible than the previous one (this view is akin to the concepts of given-new information as used by, e.g. Mathesius 1966, Halliday 1985, Firbas 1975, 1992), and any deviation from the relevance and graded informativeness principles are marked by an explicit signal (e.g. by the way, after all).

Givón’s (1983: 7) treatment of topic continuity is based on an assessment of three basic factors affecting topic availability in the process of text comprehension: referential distance (cf. Firbas’s retrievability span), interference from other topics, and availability of semantic and thematic information. While Givón (1983) considers several aspects of continuity, namely thematic continuity, action continuity, and topics/participants
continuity, his primary focus is on participant continuity, termed referential coherence (cf. Givón 1997, 2001). The view that referential continuity is a key aspect of discourse coherence is also evidenced by Geluykens’s (1991, 1994) research on anaphora interpretation in relation to the given-new distinction and topic negotiation in spoken discourse. In a later development of his model Givón (1997: 59) conceptualizes coherence as “a complex, composite meta-phenomenon, involving multiple strands”; still, he approaches coherence primarily as an observable property of text based on continuity of recurrence of referents, temporality, aspectuality, modality/mood, location and action/script. These surface cues guide the text processor in the construction of a coherent mental representation of the text, which is affected by the cultural, discourse and specific shared knowledge of speaker/hearer (cf. Schmied 2007: 15). Thus coherence is regarded as a collaborative achievement of the interlocutors emerging during discourse production and comprehension.

Approaching coherence from the point of view of discourse comprehension, Gernsbacher’s (1997) Structure Building Framework assumes that comprehension involves general cognitive processes and mechanisms that aim at the elaboration of a coherent mental representation. While, similarly to Givón (1997), Gernsbacher (1997: 5) considers several interdependent types of coherence (referential, temporal, locational, causal and structural), she regards the process of constructing a coherent mental representation as comprising three steps: laying a foundation, mapping information onto a foundation, and shifting to build new substructures. During the mapping stage, comprehenders interpret various explicit (cohesion) and implicit (inferences) cues learnt through their experience of the world and their experience in discourse processing, to check whether incoming information coheres with previously processed information. This approach highlights the knowledge-based nature of discourse interpretation and seems to support Townsend’s (1997) view that text processing involves both the interpretation of logical interclausal relations and reliance on background information. It also aligns with the view that sequentiality, “the coherent structuring of sequenced utterances” (Fetzer and Meierkord 2002: 4), is a key aspect of discourse processing which involves the configuration of a whole from its constitutive parts within a sequence of cognitive states experienced by the participants in the process of interaction.

Most studies on the role of background knowledge in discourse interpretation draw on developments in cognitive psychology and artificial intelligence to explain the
processes of discourse production and comprehension. While assuming that discourse interpretation is based to a large extent on the principle of analogy with what we have experienced in the past (Brown and Yule 1983: 233), these studies conceive background knowledge as the ‘cognitive universe’ of the interpreter, which mediates between perceptions of the real world and the textual world (Lindquist 1989: 123). There are different approaches to the representation of knowledge of the world, e.g. Minsky’s (1975) frame theory, which defines frames as stereotyped situations stored in memory, Van Dijk’s (1977) schemata, conceptualized as high-level knowledge structures which may be affected by cultural and social background variables, and Johnson-Laird’s (1983) and Kintsch and Van Dijk’s (1983) mental models, which while showing some variation in their treatment of this concept share an understanding that mental models are representations of the external world and the inner world of interactants. Despite some differences among these approaches to the representation of background knowledge, they all assume that a general and specific knowledge of the world organized in the human memory is activated in the process of discourse understanding in order to enable interactants to derive coherence through the application of the top-down processing strategy of inferencing (Miššíková 2005). It follows that the success of an interaction is dependent on the ability of the speakers/writers to make predictions concerning the scope of shared background knowledge and inferences that listeners/readers can make during discourse interpretation. This evidences the dynamic interpretative character of discourse coherence which can be conceived as a collaborative achievement of the participants in an interaction.

The relation between propositional coherence on the ideational plane of discourse and ‘interactional’ coherence on the interpersonal plane of discourse is explored by Lautamatti (1982), who argues that interactional coherence is inherent to any kind of discourse. Although Lautamatti (1982) considers that interactional coherence stemming from the continuity of communicative acts in discourse is independent of propositional coherence associated with the organization of the content in relation to a discourse topic, she argues that there is a correlation between types of communicative event and types of coherence. Thus interactional coherence is typically more prevalent in discourses characterized by shared pragmatic context of communication, all-participants involvement in discourse production and possibility of immediate feedback, while propositional coherence is more prominent in discourses characterized by the presence of a dominant
participant controlling the topic, advanced planning, explicitness, lack of shared pragmatic context and lack of immediate feedback. Consequently, the relationship between the type of communicative event and type of coherence may be seen as a continuum representing a cline from prepared monologic discourse associated primarily with propositional coherence to spontaneous dialogic discourse associated primarily with interactional coherence. This variation is also affected by the functional features characteristic of spoken and written discourse, namely the surveyability and permanence of written utterances and the immediateness and emotiveness of spoken language (Vachek 1976).

Coherence on the interpersonal plane of discourse has been investigated primarily within conversation analysis and is related to the Gricean cooperative principle (Grice 1975), speech-act theories (Austin 1962, Searle 1969, 1975, Bach and Harnish 1979, 1992), politeness and face (Brown and Levinson 1978) and turn-taking (Sacks et al.). Within a process view of language, discourse production and comprehension are related to an assessment of success or failure in communication. Thus interactional coherence may be conceived as the perception of unity in a sequence of adjacency pairs, i.e. sequential coherence (Schegloff 1990, Herring 1999), which following the principle of relevance is established when “an individual turn ideally relates locally to the previous turn, and globally to the discourse topic” (Herring 1999: 5); it also reflects how people relate to statements and other people (Erickson et al. 2002). Seen metaphorically as the “glue” of text and discourse, coherence in face-to-face interaction is not restricted to the notion of ‘aboutness’ (Schegloff 1990: 53), since the sequence of turns is an organization of actions and not of topics only. According to Berlung (2009), coherence establishment and maintenance is based on a collaboratively constructed organization of the interaction, in which participants rely on three main strategies: the use of cohesive devices, sequential structures, and continued attention. It should be noted that following Lautamatti (1982) on a more global level interactional coherence may be seen as constructed by the sequence of macro-communicative acts which are discourse-type specific, and thus seen as broadly overlapping with the rhetorical moves of a genre (Swales 1990, 2004, Bhatia 1993, 2002, 2004). In fact, drawing on Halliday’s systemic-functional approach, Eggins (2004: 29) uses the concept of generic coherence, defined as the unified purpose motivating the language use, usually expressed through a predictable generic or schematic structure, to refer to one of the key aspects of contextually bound coherence.

Interpersonal coherence, however, is not restricted to conversation, and as recent
research has shown, it pertains to any kind of discourse; as Thompson and Zhou (2000: 139) argue “coherence in text can only be adequately understood if the concept of propositional coherence is complemented by that of evaluative coherence”. The construction of interpersonal coherence in discourse is considered anchored to illocutionary force and attitude, typically related to the expression of modal meanings (Fetzer 2008). Drawing on Thompson and Zhou (2000: 123), who use the term ‘evaluative coherence’, interpersonal coherence may be defined as the way in which speakers or “writers work to convey a consistent personal evaluation of the topic they are dealing with”. Hunston and Thompson (2000: 6) consider three main functions of evaluation, which correlate with ideational, interactional and textual meanings respectively: a) to express the speaker’s/writer’s opinion, and reflect the value system of that person and their community (cf. Komlosi’s (1989) perspectivization); b) to construct and maintain relations between the writer and reader; and c) to organize discourse. The view that interpersonal meanings are related to ideational and textual meanings is also supported by Martin and Rose (2003), who focus on the study of the interactive nature of written and spoken discourse and reflect on how language expresses power and ideology. The key notion in Martin and Roses’s (2003) framework is ‘appraisal’, seen as a system of interpersonal meaning for negotiating social relations and expressing attitudes, opinions, feelings and emotions. Despite considerable variation in the frameworks suggested for study of linguistic resources indicating the speaker’s/writer’s opinions, attitudes and relationships to the audience (e.g. stance (Biber et al. 1999), evaluation (Thompson and Hunston 2000), appraisal (Martin 2000, 2005), metadiscourse (Hyland 2005)), all these approaches clearly indicate that the consistent expression of a subjective point of view, dialogicity and the negotiation of attitudes are an inherent aspect of coherence in discourse. Evaluative or attitudinal unity of discourse may be enhanced by metaphorical coherence (Shen and Balaban 1999, Sopory 2008). The assumption that underlies this view is that the persuasive effect of metaphor is derived from “an emergent structural match between linguistic and conceptual metaphor that produces coherence between the structural components of attitude” (Sopory 2008), thus contributing to discourse coherence at the global level.

The conclusion which emerges from this brief discussion of different approaches to coherence is that over the years it has been possible to witness a considerable shift in how coherence is understood, namely a shift from a static text-based descriptive approach, according to which coherence is the product of textual connectivity and cohesion, to a
more dynamic understanding, according to which coherence is conceptualized as a potentially variable co-operative achievement of the speaker/writer and the hearer/reader which can be seen as a context-dependent, hearer/reader-oriented and comprehension-based, interpretative notion (Bublitz 1997: 2). This approach stresses the collaborative nature of coherence and the dependence of discourse interpretation on the entire situational context, i.e. the linguistic co-text, the social and cultural environment, communicative principles and conversational maxims, and the interpreter’s encyclopedic knowledge, serving to underscore that the deriving of coherence from a discourse is a dynamic process which comes into being in the process of human interaction (Tárnyiková 2002: 56). Discourse coherence, therefore, can be regarded as an instantiation of the interpretation potential of a text, which is activated in the process of a particular interpretative decoding in which the hearer/reader creates his/her own discourse from the text by assigning it intentionality (not necessarily the one intended by the speaker/writer) and recreating its meaning, while projecting his/her personal opinions, attitudes, feelings and emotions onto the interaction. Since building up discourse coherence is inherently subjective and depends on the interpreter’s own resources for interpretation, including “knowledge and expectations about human action in and surrounding discourse” (Gough and Talbot 1996: 224), attempts to position the addressee as someone sharing the beliefs, assumptions and presuppositions of the addressee may fail, i.e. the addressee may lack the resources to derive coherence from the discourse or, drawing on different knowledge representations, build up a coherent interpretation which contests the one intended by the addressee. This reflects the scalar nature of coherence and suggests that discourse understanding is a matter of degree.

Since when (re)creating discourse coherence, interactants negotiate and interpret ideational, interpersonal and textual meanings encoded in text, discourse coherence may be seen as a multifaceted discourse property encompassing propositional or topical coherence on the ideational plane, interactional or evaluative coherence on the interpersonal plane, and cohesion on the textual plane of discourse. While these aspects of discourse coherence need not be perfectly convergent, i.e. discourse participants may derive different interpretations and perceive different degrees of coherence on the three planes of discourse, their relative importance may vary according to text-type and genre as a function of the various constraints different text-types and genres impose on the interpretation potential of texts.
2.2 State of the art

This section discusses previous research dealing with coherence at the ideational, interpersonal and textual levels of discourse, focusing on those approaches which have influenced directly the analytical framework adopted in the present study. It is obvious that while attempting to reflect the state of the art in this field of investigation, this review cannot take into consideration all approaches to the analysis of coherence suggested over the years. Nevertheless, the following discussion is considered to provide a sufficient background for the influences which have moulded my approach to the analysis of discourse coherence.

2.2.1 Coherence on the ideational plane of discourse

As the outline of different conceptualizations of coherence (Section 2.1) clearly shows, coherence on the ideational plane, dealt with under the headings ‘semantic’, ‘propositional’, ‘topical’, ‘conceptual’, ‘referential’ and ‘logical’ coherence, has been the most frequently explored aspect of coherence. A distinctive feature of the frameworks developed within this strand of research is that coherence is considered in relation to cohesion devices available for the explicit marking of coherence. The following discussion considers four frameworks for the analysis of experiential meanings which focus on discourse topic/theme and on the description of logical relations holding in discourse.

2.2.1.1 Given-new information and patterns of thematic progression: Daneš

The role of information structure in the perception of discourse coherence can be approached from two perspectives: the first refers to the givenness of a piece of information, which is available to participants in a communication from the co-text, or is presupposed from the context or assumed shared knowledge; the second refers to the division of a sentence into two complementary parts: the topic/theme and the focus/rheme (cf. Gundel and Fretheim’s (2006) referential and relational distinction). The first approach is more relevant to the processing of extended discourses, where opening and paragraph initial sentences/utterances typically convey new information which is developed in the following parts of the text. The second approach is primarily sentence-based and draws on the functional sentence perspective theory, which sees the theme as the point of departure of the message and the rheme as coinciding with the point of prominence or importance contained in an utterance. It is obvious, however, that since theme and rheme are also
involved in structuring information and may reflect given and new values, the two perspectives may be interrelated.

Daneš’s thematic progression theory (1974, 1995) represents a conceptualization of the interdependence of theme-rheme articulation and given-new information by explicitly relating sentence/utterance themes to discourse topic in order to consider the contribution of utterances to the total communication process. Daneš (1974: 113) defines thematic progression as “the choice and ordering of utterance themes, their mutual concatenation and hierarchy, as well as their relationship to hyperthemes of the superior text units (such as the paragraph, chapter...) to the whole text, and to the situation” (Daneš 1974: 113). The three major patterns of thematic progression are simple linear thematic progression with thematization of rhemes (i.e. the rheme of each utterance becomes the theme of the following utterance), thematic progression with a continuous theme (i.e. the same theme appears in a sequence of utterances), and a derived theme (i.e. utterance themes are derived from a hypertheme, the paragraph or discourse theme). Although the notion of hypertheme is not clearly defined (Taboada 2006: 88), it has been used to refer to a general discourse topic, a title, sub-title, paragraph topic or a higher-order topic present over a certain stretch of text. Drawing on Daneš (1995), Martin (1992) and (Pípalová 2008a, 2008b), however, it is possible to consider a three-layer hierarchy of hyperthemes, namely the Global Theme (upper-case letters are used to refer to the macrostructural phenomenon and thus to differentiate it from the microstructural sentence/clause theme, as defined within the functional sentence perspective framework) of the whole text, the hierarchically lower Textual Hyperthemes of stretches of text longer than a single paragraph, and Paragraph Themes. Thus, patterns of thematic progression are related to topical coherence on the ideational plane of discourse.

Since genres are characterised by specific communicative purposes and semantic potential they may be associated with a certain type of hierarchical organization of the text; thus they have been found to show a tendency towards a consistent use of patterns of thematic progression with consistent lexicogrammatical realizations of the theme (e.g. Nwogu and Bloor 1991, Ghadessy 1995, Dontcheva-Navrátílova 2009). Therefore, despite the fact that as Fries (1995) points out there is no one-to-one correspondence between genre types, genres or generic elements and patterns of thematic progression, it can be argued that coherence strategies related to the organization of information in discourse may be regarded as partially genre-dependent.
2.2.1.2 Macrostructures and strategies of discourse comprehension: Van Dijk and Kintsch

The cognitive model of discourse comprehension suggested by Van Dijk and Kintsch (1983) is an interdisciplinary model drawing on research into semantic memory and psychology. It is based on the assumption that discourse comprehension presupposes a set of discourse strategies used in forming coherent multilevel mental representations based on actual linguistic input, inferences from the comprehender’s world knowledge and the beliefs and goals of the participants in the interaction. An important aspect of the model is that it views discourse comprehension not only as a cognitive, but also as a social event; in addition, (although this aspect is seen by the authors as a limitation of the model) it acknowledges the individuality of people and their cognitive processes, and of their styles and modes of comprehension.

Van Dijk and Kintsch’s (1983) model is based on the concept of macrostructure devised by Van Dijk (1980a,b) to distinguish between two kinds of coherence pertaining to monological and dialogical discourse, namely local and global coherence. While local coherence refers to the relations holding between sentences of a textual sequence (micro-level relations), global coherence operates over larger units or discourse as a whole. Within the strategic process of discourse comprehension, the participants in an interaction construct a ‘textbase’, i.e. the semantic representation of the input discourse in memory, which is defined in terms of propositions and relations between propositions. At the same time, discourse understanding involves the activation, updating, and other uses of the so-called ‘situation model’ available in the memories of the interactants. It is this mental model of situations or events that Van Dijk (1995: 394) regards as one of the key concepts of Van Dijk and Kintsch’s theory of discourse comprehension. A situation model is the subjective mental representation of a fragment of reality in the mind of a discourse processor which in the process of discourse comprehension serves as a basis for the construction of a new mental model which would accommodate the textbase input and personal associations, inferences and previous experiences of the participants in a communication. Thus mental models may be seen as providing a frame to account for discourse coherence.

According to Van Dijk and Kintsch (1983), global semantic coherence, i.e. the topic or gist of a discourse or passage of discourse, is made explicit in terms of semantic macrostructures, which are derived from sequences of propositions in the textbase by macrorules governing the deletion, integration, construction and generalization of
information. Semantic macrostructures interact with pragmatic macrostructures representing sequences of speech acts which are mapped (also via the same macrorules of deletion, integration, construction and generalization) onto a macro-level where only one macro-speech is relevant; these macro-speech acts are the basis for what Van Dijk (1980a) calls pragmatic coherence in discourse. While semantic and pragmatic macrostructures represent the content and the communicative purpose of a discourse, superstructures are defined as discourse-type specific schemata which provide “a kind of overall functional syntax for the semantic macro-structures” (Van Dijk and Kintsch 1983: 242). Thus superstructures are seen as a more or less conventionalized or institutionalized ordering of elements in discourse, such as headlines, lead, context and event in news discourse, or exposition, complication, resolution and evaluation in narrative discourse, which may be used by the user as a powerful top-down processing device. Obviously, there is a close association between the concept of superstructures and the rhetorical moves structure of a genre as used by Swales (1990, 2004) and Bhatia (1993, 2004).

What is particularly important about Van Dijk and Kintsch’s approach to discourse comprehension is that it accounts for the interdependence of global and local coherence and their relation to background knowledge. Discourse coherence may hence be seen as involving both bottom-up and top-down processing. Bottom-up processing takes as a starting point the establishment of local relations based on co-reference and logical relations between propositions from which macrostructures and superstructures may be derived, while top-down processing involves thematic and schematic global understanding which determines the comprehension of the local level in terms of relating the agents, circumstances, time, place and possible world, to the central persons or objects, goals and motives established in the discourse. The lack of a complete match between the local and global levels indicates topic boundaries which can be signalled by semantic topic-shift markers, such as change of time or place or introduction of new participants, and formal topic-shift markers, such as adverbial linkers; these can be used by the interpreter as a guide to maintain or change the current macrohypothesis of coherence holding at the global level of discourse (Kintsch 1998: 68).

2.2.1.3 Refential coherence – Givón

While holding that coherence is generally not an objective property of a text, Givón (1995: 63) assumes that the mental representation of a text is represented “at least in part as
a network of connected nodes”. Similarly to Van Dijk and Kintsch (1983), however, Givón (1995: 61) considers “the continuity or recurrence of some element(s) across a span of (or spans) of text” as an aspect of coherence which is an observable property of a text, i.e. it is to a large extent supported by cohesion. The six elements he considers trackable on the basis of recurrence broadly overlap with those suggested by Van Dijk and Kintsch (1983), namely referents, temporality, aspectuality, modality/mood, location and action/script; these give rise to referential, temporal, spatial and thematic coherence on the local and global levels which may be grammar-cued or lexically-guided. One of the key aspects of Givón’s approach to coherence is that continuity of recurrence is related to ‘grounding’, i.e. the connectivity of individual nodes (on the basis of hierarchical or sequential adjacency) to the overall structured mental representation of a text. Thus from the point of view of the receiver connectivity allows coherent storage, and from the perspective of the text producer it makes it possible to create a text that the receiver can comprehend (Givón 1995: 64).

Within Givón’s (1995, 2001) cognitive framework of discourse comprehension, referential coherence is based on anaphoric and cataphoric grounding. It presupposes the categorization of reference expressions as important, topical and thus persistent, or as unimportant, non-topical and thus non-persistent. Topical referents are typically grammatically marked, while non-topical ones are left unmarked, which facilitates the recognition and processing of their coherence value during discourse comprehension. Givón’s list of cataphoric-grounding grammatical markers for topical referents includes, for instance, the demonstrative ‘this’ (typically with a subject item) as opposed to items marked by the indefinite articles ‘a’ (typically in non-subject position) and the restrictive relative clause (typically postmodifying a subject item marked by an indefinite article) indicating the salience of a newly-introduced topical referent in the subsequent discourse.

Anaphoric grounding is associated with definite reference which assumes that the referent is identifiable and accessible to the receiver, i.e. it is retrievable from the current mental representation of the interaction. The mental structures in which reintroduced referents are grounded comprise the situational and verbal context, and background knowledge. Grounding in the situational context may be achieved by using indexicals to indicate spatial and temporal relations to the discourse participants; this involves the use of personal pronouns identifying interlocutors (e.g. I, you, we) and others (e.g. he, she, they, it), and deictic adverbials for specifying location and time from the perspective of the text-
producer (e.g. *here, there, now, last week*). Givón discusses two ways of grounding in
background knowledge: the first concerns globally-accessible generic definite referents
(e.g. *the sun, the president, daddy*), and the second refers to frame/script-based grounding
(e.g. *the bus, the waiter*). In the latter case, there is actually double grounding through an
anaphoric cue available in the preceding verbal context which primes a knowledge frame
available in the mind of the interactants. The selection of devices involved in anaphoric
grounding in a current text depends on referential distance, i.e. the number of clauses
between the referent’s current location and its last previous occurrence (cf. Firbas’s (1992)
retrievability span). If seen as marking a cline between items signalling maximum
continuity and those signalling discontinuity, anaphorical reference devices may be seen as
ranging from grammatical devices with no or minimal lexical information, such as
anaphora (or ellipsis) and pronouns, to lexically heavier devices, such as definite full-noun
phrases, supported by syntactic features, such as case role (subject vs. object), restrictive
modifiers, and word-order devices.

While considering referential continuity a key aspect of discourse coherence, Givón
highlights the cognitive basis of reference by stressing the close relation between
exophoric and endophoric reference and the dependence of reference devices on topicality
and referential distance. Also of major importance is his view that the deriving of
coherence is a collaborative cognitive process in which both interactants strive to achieve
their goals; if these goals are in conflict, “the collaboration between the interlocutors
toward resolving such conflicts and achieving their respective goals is a matter of degree”
(Givón 1995: 60).

2.2.1.4 Coherence relations – Kehler

Kehler’s (2002, 2004) theory approaches coherence from the point of view of
logical relations holding between the meanings of parts of a discourse established by the
processor during discourse interpretation. Kehler argues that coherence relations may be
seen as based on a small set of basic types of cognitive principles originally suggested by
David Hume (1748) and elaborated on by Hobbs (1990), which comprise the principles of
resemblance, contiguity in time or place and cause or effect. While holding that when
interpreting discourse interactants assume coherence and attempt to recover the logical
relations between utterances in communication, he conceives that coherence relations are
established as a result of inference processes which may but need not be guided by the use
of cohesive devices. When considering the role of conjunctions and linking adverbials typically associated with the different kinds of relations, Kehler notes that they impose constraints on the type of relation that can be inferred, although there is no one-to-one correspondence between connectors and coherence relations. The establishment of coherence relations is also affected by other cohesion markers, such as ellipsis, pronoun and tense interpretation.

Kehler’s theory comprises a larger set of relations subsumed under the three cognitive principles or macro-relations of resemblance, cause-effect and contiguity. The class of resemblance relations presupposes the recognition of commonalities or contrasts between sets of entities or relations, which give rise to parallel, contrast, exemplification, generalization, exception, and elaboration relations. The processing of resemblance relations may be facilitated by the use of syntactic parallelism. As Kehler (2002: 19) notes, apart requiring analogical reasoning and the identification of arguments, the inferencing process involved in resemblance relations may require background knowledge input. The second class discussed by Kehler is that of cause-effect relations, in which he includes the result, explanation, violated expectations and denial of preventer relations. Cause-effect relations presuppose the establishment of an implication between two clauses; it should be mentioned that Kehler defines implication in a rather loose sense, to mean “could possibly follow form” (Kehler 2002: 20). While also relying on background knowledge for an assumption of the expected normal state of affairs, cause-effect relations differ from resemblance relations in that they operate on the clause level and not on the level of clause components. The last class of coherence relations, contiguity, contains a single relation taken over from Hobbs (1990). This is the occasion relation seen as “a mechanism communicating a complex situation in a multi-utterance discourse by using states of affairs as points of connection between partial descriptions of that situation” (Kehler 2002: 22), which, as Kehler points out, cannot be confined to a temporal progression. It is obvious that interpretation of the occasion relation depends on mental models, frames or scripts stored in the background knowledge of the interactants.

The set of coherence relations suggested by Kehler bears some features of similarity with numerous other frameworks that have been proposed to account for logical coherence (e.g. Mann and Thompson 1987, Hobbs 1990, Sanders et al. 1992). The advantage of Kehler’s theory resides in the relatively small, finite set of relations suggested, which are based on general cognitive processes for establishing connections
between ideas. This makes the categories applicable to different levels of discourse structure and to various types of texts.

2.2.2 Coherence on the interpersonal plane of discourse

While the study of interactional coherence in terms of analysis of discourse structure into sequences of moves and adjacency pairs has a relatively long tradition in conversation analysis (e.g. Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, Sack et al. 1978, Widdowson 1978, Schegloff 1990), the analysis of monologic and written texts with regard to interpersonal coherence became a topic of research relatively recently. However, since the material under analysis in this study is a specimen of prepared monologic spoken discourse, the discussion of approaches to the analysis of coherence on the interpersonal plane of discourse will focus primarily on those which deal with the contribution of a consistent expression of attitude and evaluation to the perception of discourse coherence and on interaction in monologic discourse. It should be noted that despite considerable variation in the terminology used, e.g. ‘attitude’ (Halliday 1985), ‘stance’ (Biber et al. 1999, Hyland 2005), ‘appraisal’ (Martin 2000), ‘metadiscourse’ (Hyland 1998), ‘evaluation’ (Hunston and Thompson 2000), all approaches to the study of linguistic resources indicating the speaker’s or writer’s opinions, attitudes and relationships to the audience, are seen as broadly covering the same linguistic phenomena and thus laying the foundations for the study of coherence on the interpersonal plane of discourse.

2.2.2.1 Evaluation in discourse: Hunston and Thompson

Hunston and Thompson (2000: 5) introduce the concept of ‘evaluation’ as a superordinate, “cover term for the expression of the speaker or writer’s attitude or stance towards, viewpoint on, or feelings about the entities or propositions that he or she is talking about”; this suggests that the umbrella term may be used together with more specific terms, such as modality or appraisal. Considering the appropriateness of the term, Hunston and Thompson argue that despite showing the typical ‘slipperiness’ of most terms in the field, evaluation is well-established in discourse analysis both in that broad sense, and in a more restricted sense referring to the speaker or writer’s emotional attitude reflected primarily in lexical expressions, i.e. as a near-equivalent to Martin’s (2000) ‘appraisal’, Conrad and Biber’s (2000) ‘attitudinal stance’, or ‘point of view’ as used in literary stylistics to imply
that “both modality and appraisal must have a source – the person whose viewpoint is being expressed” (Hunston and Thompson 2000: 5).

As conceived in Hunston and Thompson’s (2000) approach, the functional potential of evaluation – to express the speaker’s or writer’s opinion reflecting the value system of that person and their community, to construct and maintain relations between the speaker or writer and hearer or reader and to organize the discourse – shows its centrality to the perception of discourse coherence. Owing to the correlation between the functions of evaluation with the ideational, interactional and textual aspects of meaning, a consistent expression of the value judgments, attitudes and feelings of the interlocutors can be seen as enhancing coherence on all planes of discourse.

What is particularly important about Hunston and Thompson’s understanding of evaluation is the distinction they make between opinions about entities, which are attitudinal and involve positive and negative feelings, and opinions about propositions, which are epistemic and involve degrees of certainty. As Hunston and Thompson point out, every act of evaluation related to the expression of opinion reflects the value-system associated with the ideology of the discourse community to which the speaker or writer belongs, and at the same time contributes to the building up of this value system. By affecting the way in which people organize, compare and categorize information stored in their background knowledge, ideologies influence their opinions and ideas (cf. Fairclough 1989, Fowler 1991, Hodge and Kress 1993). Drawing on their ideologies, people label things in the world, thus assigning them a certain status and value, such as good or bad, true or untrue, should or should not happen; as a result evaluation constructs the ideological basis of a text and at the same time positions the interactants in an ideological space (Hunston 2000: 205). This implies that evaluation is closely interwoven with experiential meanings expressed in discourse and that discourse “can only be adequately understood if propositional coherence is complemented by evaluative coherence” (Thompson and Zhou 2000: 139).

The second function of evaluation concerned with building and maintaining relations between interactants is considered in relation to manipulation, hedging and politeness. Manipulation, or persuasion, is associated with making others accept the speaker’s or writer’s point of view. To accomplish this goal, speakers or writers use various linguistic and rhetorical choices aimed at changing or affecting the beliefs or behaviour of others, or at strengthening the existing beliefs or behaviour of those who already agree, the beliefs
and behaviour of persuaders included (Halmari and Virtanen 2005: 5). Persuasion is regarded as a highly complex, interactive, intentional and genre-specific aspect of discourse in which participants negotiate for meaning and adapt their perception of coherence to that of others.

As Hunston (2005: 178) points out, one of the crucial devices for influencing the position of the listener or reader is the choice between averral, assuming speaker or writer responsibility for what is claimed, and attribution, delegating responsibility to a source. Reflecting the dialogic character of persuasive discourse and its dependence on intertextuality, the interplay of averred and attributed statements is a powerful device in constructing a coherent persuasive argument. Another aspect of evaluation is associated with assigning the status of fact, assumption or hypothesis to statements or larger parts of discourse; this allows the speaker or writer to restrict the possible reactions to these statements and thus enhances the persuasive force of the discourse (Hunston 2000). This can be supported by adjusting the truth-value or certainty attached to a statement by the use of hedging, which as Hunston and Thompson (2000: 10) claim, may be interpreted as being related to politeness. In playing an important role in the building of a relationship between participants in a communication, politeness contributes to coherence by working towards the establishment of shared attitudes and continued focus of attention.

Within Hunston and Thompson’s (2000) framework, the role of evaluation in organizing discourse is associated with staging the interaction and keeping track of the progression of the text. While building the relationship between the participants, evaluation contributes to a shared awareness of the boundaries in the discourse and the nature of the connections between its various parts. In this respect, of particular importance from the point of view of coherence is Sinclair’s (1987) comment that, both in speech and writing, evaluation tends to occur at boundary point in discourse, thereby providing a clue for a coherent change of topic or rhetorical move. Another key aspect of Hunston and Thompson’s approach is the tenet that it is evaluation that enables monologic discourse to be interactive and to fulfil a communicative function (Hunston and Thompson 2000: 13).

When discussing how to identify evaluation, Hunston and Thompson approach the issue from both a conceptual and a linguistic point of view and consider how subjectivity, social value and comparison may be signalled by a wide range of linguistic devices. From the conceptual point of view, this reflects the understanding that evaluation implies the comparison of something to a value-laden norm from the subjective point of view of the
discourse participants. Thus the linguistic signals of evaluation may be grouped into three categories (reproduced in full below), each prioritizing different inherent characteristics of evaluation (Hunston and Thompson 2000: 21):

(1) Comparators (involve the comparison of object of evaluation against some kind of norm): comparative adjectives and adverbs; adverbs of degree; adverbs such as just, only, at least; expressions of negativity (morphological, e.g. un-, -less; grammatical, e.g. not, never, hardly; and lexical, e.g. fail, lack etc.)

(2) markers of subjectivity: modals and other markers of (un)certainty; non-defining adjectives; certain adverbs, nouns and verbs; sentence adverbs and conjunctions; report and attribution structures; marked clause structures used in changing the point of view and/or functional sentence perspective of the clause or sentence

(3) markers of value: lexical items typically used in an evaluative environment; indicators of the existence of goals and their (non-)achievement (e.g. “what is bad” may be glossed as “what impedes our goals”).

The first two categories of evaluation signals are rather grammar-oriented, while the third one is primarily lexical and may also involve metaphorical expressions. Considering the function of evaluation at discourse level, Hunston and Thompson (2000: 19) note the importance of continuity of the expressed attitude, viewpoint and feelings throughout the discourse; moreover, it is suggested that in some cases evaluation may be identified because of its position in a text and the role it plays in this position. This supports the claim that patterns of evaluation may be text-type and genre-specific.

Assuming that the act of evaluating can be done along several parameters, Hunston and Thompson (2000: 22-25) consider four such dimensions, comprising bad-good, certainty, expectedness and importance, noting that they are to a certain extent culture-dependent. While the first two parameters are experientially oriented, expectedness and importance are rather text-oriented and can serve to link together steps in an argument, while presenting the speaker’s or writer’s point of view as coherent. In an attempt to reflect in more detail the multifaceted nature of evaluation, Bednarek (2006) suggests a set of more specific parameters for the analysis of evaluation, namely emotivity, importance, expectedness, comprehensibility, possibility/necessity and reliability. While it is difficult to agree that any list of parameters can cover reliably the vast area of evaluation, it seems reasonable to claim that the use of a ‘parameter-based’ approach to evaluation highlights its complexity and multifunctionality.
The implication that emerges from Hunston and Thompson’s approach is that evaluation plays a key role in the construal of ideology and in achieving the purpose of persuasive discourse. By expressing the author’s point of view of the world and by guiding the listener or reader through the argumentation in the unfolding discourse, evaluation contributes decisively to the build-up of discourse coherence.

2.2.2.2 *Appraisal: Martin*

Working within systemic-functional linguistics, Martin and White (2005: 33) conceive interpersonal meanings as being articulated by three interpersonal systems at the level of discourse semantics; these systems comprise appraisal, negotiation and involvement. Appraisal can be seen as an aspect of evaluation related to the use of lexical means for the expression of emotions, judgments and valuations contributing to the construal of power and solidarity in discourse (Martin 2000: 145). Negotiation complements appraisal by focusing on interactive aspects of discourse, speech function and exchange structure, while involvement concerns non-gradable resources for negotiating tenor relations, especially solidarity (e.g. terms of address, interjections, lexical resources signalling group affiliation, markers of social dialect). It is obvious that the contribution of the three interpersonal systems to the construal of discourse coherence lies in the negotiation of continuous tenor relations of power and solidarity throughout the discourse.

The appraisal system is seen as subsuming three interacting domains: attitude, engagement and graduation (Martin and White 2005: 35). Attitude is conceived as comprising the sub-categories of affect, dealing with resources for construing emotional reactions, judgement, concerned with assessment of behaviour from an ideologically-biased perspective, and appreciation, associated with assigning value to things. Engagement is defined broadly as the positioning of the speaker or writer with respect to the value position advanced and with respect to potential responses to that value position; it is typically expressed by essentially dialogic resources such as modality, polarity, concession, quoting and reporting. Finally, graduation is concerned with gradability. It can be seen as adjusting the force of evaluation, i.e. the degree on the strong-weak cline, or the focus of evaluation, the adjustment of the strength of boundaries between categories.

Within the attitude domain, which is concerned with encoding feelings, affect can be regarded as the basic system. While considering a wide range of formal realizations presenting affect as quality, process and comment (e.g. adjectival, verbal, adverbial),
Martin’s framework provides a detailed classification of emotive evaluation taking into account several factors, such as the culture-specific positive or negative value attributed to the feelings, gradability/intensity and the agency involved. As Martin (1999: 155) observes, “affect (and the appraisal system in general) can be directly construed in text [inscribed affect], or implicated through the selection of ideational meanings which rebound with affectual meanings [evoked affect]”. Inscribed affect imposes an evaluation and can hardly be resisted or ignored, while evoked affect is open to different interpretations. As regards the evaluative force of metaphorical language, Martin argues that compared to non-metaphorical language, which simply invites a response, metaphorical expressions provoke an affectual response and thus greater reader or listener involvement.

Judgement is associated with evaluating behaviour from an ethics or moral perspective, reflecting culture-specific norms about how people should and should not behave; thus similarly to affect it has a positive and negative dimension. Judgements can be divided into those dealing with ‘social esteem’ in terms of normality, capacity and tenacity, and those dealing with ‘social sanction’ in terms of veracity and propriety (Martin and White 2005: 52). While social esteem values are involved in creating social networks and are typically associated with spoken interaction (e.g. chat, gossip, jokes etc.), social sanction values are often codified in writing (e.g. laws, decrees and rules regulating social behaviour, including penalties for those who break the rules) and are associated with praising and condemning. Since the parameters of judgement can be seen as reflecting usuality (normality), ability (capacity), inclination (tenacity), probability (veracity) and obligation (propriety), they can be realized by markers of modality. It should be noted that within Martin’s framework modality is interpreted in accordance with Halliday’s (1985) treatment of modality as comprising modulation and modalization, which can be seen as broadly corresponding to deontic and epistemic modality respectively, as used by Lyons (1977) and Quirk et al. (1985).

Appreciation, which also has a positive and negative dimension, covers a range of evaluative meanings comprising emotive reaction to things, perception of the composition of things in terms of balance and complexity, and valuation or assessment of the worth of things. As Martin and White (2005: 57) stress, valuation is “especially sensitive to field, as the value of things depends so much on institutional focus”.

While attitude is concerned with expressing assessments, engagement and graduation are related to the expression of point of view or the positioning of the authorial voice with
respect to these assessments. Assuming that texts, both written and spoken, are essentially dialogic (Bakhtin (1975), Martin’s approach to authorial stance or position is associated on the one hand with the alignment of the speaker or writer with the audience and the level of solidarity established between them, and on the other, with the position of the speaker or writer towards prior and future stands of others on the topic under discussion. Thus, when expressing a value position, the speaker or writer negotiates this position with the audience by expressing (dis)agreement with socially shared attitudes and beliefs. While doing so the speaker or writer negotiates his/her relationships with the intended reader or listener by assuming that the addressee shares a particular point of view, or, when anticipating disagreement, by using persuasive devices to support his/her position. This approach suggests that Martin and White’s framework (2005) is suitable for the analysis of meanings in context and of rhetorical effects which can contribute to the construal of coherent authorial stance in persuasive discourse.

The resources for the expression of engagement considered by Martin and White can be subsumed under four categories: negation and contrast/concession for the expression of disagreement (disclaim), adverbial marking of stance and clausal forms for the expression of position (proclaim), epistemic modality markers suggesting alternative views (entertain) and reporting clauses for attributing the expressed point of view (attribute). By using these resources for the expression of intersubjective stance, the speaker or writer can construct a coherent argumentation, thus helping him/her to achieve the intended communicative purpose of the discourse.

The last category of appraisal, graduation, is associated with the assigning of lower or higher degree to attitudinal meanings and engagement values. The force of evaluation is related to the assessment of intensity and amount which may be realized figuratively or non-figuratively primarily by lexical means, such as adverbs, adjectives, nouns and repetition. The effect of graduation resides in enhancing solidarity when the speaker or writer is presented as maximally committed to the value position being advanced and is thus inviting the reader to align with this position. When downscaling the meaning, the speaker/writer expresses partial or attenuated affiliation with the value position advanced.

What is particularly important about Martin and White’s approach to evaluation is the view that there are patterns of use of evaluative resources which reoccur across text-types and genres and may be associated with particular rhetorical effects, authorial identities of personas. Martin and White refer to these as ‘styles’ or ‘regimes’ of evaluative
positioning, reserving the term evaluative ‘key’ for situationally-motivated evaluative positioning (i.e. register-specific), and the term evaluative ‘stance’ for patterns of use of evaluative options within a ‘key’ associated with particular rhetorical objectives and the construction of authorial personae (Martin and White 2005: 164). It is the use of consistent evaluative key and stance that contributes decisively to the perception of discourse coherence.

2.2.2.3 Interactional coherence in monologic discourse: Hoey and Bolivar

As mentioned above, the interactional dimension of coherence is studied primarily within the tradition of conversation analysis (e.g. Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, Sack et al. 1978, 1992, Widdowson 1978, Schegloff 1990). Although as Geluykens (1999: 35) observes, the term coherence is “conspicuous by its absence” in the literature of conversation analysis, the analysis of interaction in terms of acts, moves, exchange structure, adjacency pairs and turn-taking is essentially cognitively based and aims at explaining how people make sense of discourse by assuming coherence, while using context and background knowledge to provide the necessary inferences and negotiate trouble spots (Brown and Yule 1983, Târnyiková 1995). This negotiation of meaning is achieved through mutual influencing of the participants, who project their own, subjective understanding of the unfolding conversation while monitoring the interpretation derived by other participants. Thus each contribution affects the understanding of conversational coherence derived by all participants involved in the communication (Lenk 1998a: 246). Interactional coherence may be explored at local level, i.e. the level of moves and adjacency pairs, episodic level, i.e. the level of the exchange, and global level, i.e. the level of the whole conversation (Tomlin et al. 1997). The essentially collaborative nature of interactional coherence (Geluykens 1999) involves the simultaneous management of rhetorical moves, reference, topic and focus negotiation (e.g. Taboada 2004, Tomlin et al. 1997).

The interactional dimension is obviously also present in prepared written and spoken monologic discourse in which the writer or speaker produces all the language and controls the interaction (Hoey 2001: 13), and “there is no reciprocal management of the discourse” (Seidlhofer and Widdowson 1997: 209). In the following discussion I assume that despite existing differences in the mode of communication (spoken vs. written) and in audience response (since in the case of spoken monologue the moment of delivery coincides with
the moment of interpretation, there may be some audience response, such as applause, shouting or even verbal contributions), spoken and written monologue share similar interactional characteristics. Approaching the text as a site of interaction, Hoey (2001: 14) points out that text can be conceived as “the product of an interaction not between two participants but amongst four: the author, the writer, the audience and the reader”. The author (an individual or organization; often identical with the writer) authorizes the text, i.e. takes responsibility for the factual information, the ideology and the communicative purpose the text is trying to achieve. The writer (‘writer’ subsumes here the draftsman of a speech, lecture or any other prepared script for oral presentation) composes the text and selects the style and rhetorical devices to express the intended meaning. Hoey’s audience is the imaginary group of people whom the writer addresses and whose expectations and reactions he/she attempts to predict and manipulate. The reader or listener refers to the actual receiver(s), who interpret the text and derive a coherent discourse which need not be identical with the one intended by the writer. It should be noted that a much more detailed account of participation roles is provided by Goffman (1981) and his concept of ‘footing’, i.e. “the alignment we take up to ourselves and others present as expressed in the way we manage the production and reception of an utterance” (Goffman 1981: 179).

What Hoey’s (2001) conception of the text as a site of interaction suggests is that when creating a spoken or written monologic text, the writer deals with the management of rhetorical moves, reference, topic and focus, while interacting with the expectation and the reactions assigned to the intended audience. Thus he/she has to anticipate the ideas, values and expectations of the reader and to use various signals (e.g. cohesive ties, patterns of information processing, rhetorical strategies) to guide the reader or listener towards an intended interpretation of the text. The reader or listener, however, interacts with the text and interprets it as discourse by relating it to his/her background knowledge and intentions in a particular situational context, while making inferences to connect sentences and larger parts of the text; therefore the resulting interpretation may differ considerably from the interpretation intended by the writer. It follows that a written or spoken monologic text can be regarded as a carrier of interpretation potential (Sarangi 2004), which is activated in the process of a particular interpretative decoding in which the reader or listener creates his/her own discourse from the text by assigning it intentionality and recreating its meaning. An additional aspect of the interaction between the author and writer and the reader or listener is related to the possibility (not available with written texts where the split context involves
a considerable time span, e.g. the author or writer is not existing at the moment of the reader’s reaction to the text) that the reaction of the reader or listener may affect the ideas, attitude and position of the author and the style of further texts produced by the writer. Thus the reader or listener may be seen as interacting both with the author and the writer via the text and related discourse.

Within Hoey’s (2001) framework, expectations which writers assign to readers or listeners and those that readers or listeners actually have, work at several levels. From a larger perspective, the dialogue between author and audience and writer and listener or reader is affected by expectations triggered by the genre or text-type, which may be associated with patterns such as the problem-solution model. The experience of processing genres and text-types allows the writer to create intertextual connections, thus anticipating the expectations of readers and listeners in order either to abide by them or deceive them. From the reader’s or listener’s perspective, text processing also depends on his/her experience in discourse interpretation, on his/her ability to identify intertextuality and to infer contextually-based and ideologically-biased meanings, which enable him/her to derive a coherent discourse interpretation. At micro-level, Hoey conceptualizes the reflection of a text’s interactivity in terms of clause relations (cf. Winter 1994, Hoey 1996), guiding the reader towards an understanding of the logical connections established by the writer, which are further enhanced by cohesion relations.

Drawing on Hunston and Thompson’s (2000) concept of evaluation in discourse and Hoey’s (1996, 2001) understanding of text as a site of interaction, Bolívar (2001) relates interaction and evaluation to the social function of texts, source of point of view, and the way the writer guides the reader through the text. Assuming that evaluation is negotiated in interaction and has a structural function in written discourse, Bolívar suggests the ‘triad’ ‘Lead-Follow-Evaluate’ as the basic unit of interaction in written text, which she defines as “a coherent segment of text with a topic and a function in the discourse” (Bolívar 2001: 137). The main idea underlying this approach is that interaction is indicated by change, namely by break in topic continuity and/or change of rhetorical move. While in spoken discourse change is related to turn-taking and change of speaker, in written discourse change is considered to be indicated by internal changes in the text itself, such as changes in mood and modality, thematic progression, signals of involvement and detachment, prediction and anticipation and patterns of clause relations. It is these changes that Bolívar regards “as signals of interaction because they indicate the evaluations of the writer about
the state of knowledge and the evaluations of the target reader” (Bolívar 2001: 136). Thus the triad is conceptualized as consisting of three turns: the ‘Lead’ initiates and selects the topic, the ‘Follow’ continues and develops the topic, and the ‘Valuate’ has the structural function of closing the segment and providing an opinion or evaluation. According to Bolívar (2001: 137), from the perspective of information flow “the triad corresponds to the level of global coherence, the turns to episodic coherence and the orthographic sentences to local coherence” (cf. Tomlin et al. 1997). This aligns with the view that when interpreting discourse segments, interactants relate each segment retrospectively to those preceding, if necessary (re)adjusting their interpretation, and prospectively to those following, creating expectations used in the interpretation of subsequent discourse segments (cf. Gernsbacher 1997).

An important insight of Bolívar’s (2001) approach to interaction is the acknowledgement of the intertextual dimension of evaluation, related to the understanding that the evaluation triad can create connections across texts. Another point that Bolívar highlights is the genre-specific character of evaluation. By assuming that evaluation is inherent to some rhetorical moves or particular genres, Bolívar aligns herself with Sinclair’s (1987) view that evaluation marks a point of change in discourse, thus contributing to a coherent change of topic or rhetorical move.

2.2.3 Coherence on the textual plane of discourse

The contribution of the textual plane of discourse to the overall perception of coherence resides in the potential of overt linguistic mechanisms (lexical and grammatical) to establish internal links between parts of the text and between the text and its context, thus serving as signals available to, but not necessarily utilized by the speaker/writer (Brown and Yule 1983: 198), to guide the listener/reader towards an intended discourse interpretation. The following discussion of several approaches to cohesion relations is intended to clarify my understanding of the role of textual plane in constructing and interpreting coherent discourse.

2.2.3.1 Texture, cohesion and cohesive harmony: Halliday and Hasan

It is hardly possible to consider a review of approaches to the analysis of cohesion without beginning with the seminal work by Halliday and Hasan (1976). Within the Hallidayan systemic-functional theory of language, the textual semantic component, which is
instrumental to the ideational and interpersonal components, embodies the overt text-forming resources of the linguistic system. This approach posits textual unity, termed texture, as a constitutive textual component, the presence of which distinguishes a text from a ‘non-text’. Texture is regarded as involving three main aspects: (a) structural relations internal to the sentence (the theme-rheme organization of the clause as a message); (b) given-new information structure of a text; and (c) lexical and grammatical cohesion relations. This view is also shared by Fowler (1986), who refers to these three aspects of text organization as thematization, progression and cohesion, and stresses their relation to the perception of coherence on the part of the receiver, who expects “the propositions in a cohesive text to be arranged to make a progressive sequence of ideas” (Fowler 1986: 61).

Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) analytical model approaches cohesion as being realized by four classes of grammatical cohesive ties (conjunctives, reference, substitution and ellipsis) and two categories of lexical cohesion (reiteration and collocation). The conjunctives category, which expresses external experiential meaning relations between experiences of the participants, and internal discoursal meaning relations within discourse organization, is subdivided into additive, adversative, causal and temporal conjunctives. These clearly enhance discourse coherence by expressing overtly the logical relations holding between clauses, sentences and longer stretches of discourse. The categories of reference, substitution and ellipsis fulfil the same basic function – to refer repeatedly to the same entity, action or state in the discourse, thus making them available in the active memory of the participants in the interaction. A strict differentiation of these categories, however, is somewhat problematic, since as Hoey (1991) and Tárnyiková (2002) have already pointed out, the boundaries between them are rather fuzzy. It should be noted that some authors (e.g. Quirk et al. 1985, Tárnyiková 2002) extend the scope of grammatical cohesion by including such phenomena as voice, tense and aspect.

The treatment of reference requires particular attention, since this category is central to the present research. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), the cohesive force of reference is restricted to endophoric relations, which can be decoded by reference to other elements in the discourse without recourse to the situation. Exophoric reference (indicated by deictic personal pronouns, e.g. I, you, we, demonstratives, e.g. this, those, or adverbials e.g. here, now), the meaning of which is recovered by reference to the situational context or the shared cultural knowledge of the participants in the communication for supplying
the identity of things, people, ideas or spatial and temporal settings mentioned in the discourse, is not considered to have a cohesive effect and therefore is regarded as not directly related to coherence. However, as will be argued in the following sub-section, by taking a more cognitively-based approach it can be claimed that deictic reference contributes to discourse coherence and cohesion by assuring the continuity of shared mental representations in the minds of the interlocutors.

Despite the fact that Halliday and Hasan (1976: 292) consider cohesive lexical patterning indispensable to textuality (the quality of being a text according to de Beaugrande and Dressler’s (1981) terminology), their analysis of lexical cohesion is considerably less detailed, being restricted to the identification of two categories of lexical relations – reiteration and collocation. While reiteration is clearly defined as a cohesive link achieved by repetition of the same word and by the use of synonyms, superordinates and general words, the category of collocation is rather vaguely described as “association of lexical items that regularly co-occur” (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 284) and therefore called “a ragbag of lexical relations” by Hoey (1991: 7). Leaving aside the issue of the “unfortunate” use of the term collocation (Tanskanen 2006: 33), which may lead to misunderstanding since it does not coincide with the well-established meaning of this notion in the fields of lexical semantics and lexicography, where it refers to the frequency-based relationship of a word with other words with which it tends to co-occur, it is obvious that the relationship of collocation creates space for subjectivity in discourse interpretation resulting from differences in the discourse and background knowledge that each individual has at his/her disposal. It is this acknowledgement of the relation between the perception of cohesion in discourse and text- and world-knowledge (highlighted also by de Beaugrande (1980: 132) and Tanskanen (2006: 32)) that contributes most to my investigation into the interplay of aspects of coherence at the different planes of discourse, as it indicates that the subjective perspectives of the interlocutors in the construction of an intended discourse world affect the lexical cohesion relations which they are likely to establish.

The inconsistencies in the lexical cohesion categories suggested in Halliday and Hasan (1976) were acknowledged by the authors, and consequently addressed in their later publications. Thus in her studies on cohesive harmony and the texture of a text Hasan (1984, 1989a) subdivides lexical cohesion into general and instantial relations, while abandoning the collocation category altogether. General relations are based on the sense relations of synonymy, antonymy, meronymy and hyponymy, thus covering some aspects
of the collocation relation; relations based on subjective associations which cannot be accounted for in general semantic terms are left outside the scope of the analysis. Nevertheless, Hasan leaves some space for subjectivity in her new classification under the instantial relations category, which consists of text-specific relations based on equivalence, naming and semblance, the interpretation of which is to a large extent dependent on the background knowledge and discourse processing experience of the participants in the interaction.

A further redefinition of Halliday and Hasan’s models is suggested by Martin (1992, 2001) who relates cohesive resources to discourse structure and approaches cohesion as a set of discourse semantic systems comprising the expression of textual meaning by identification (concerned with resources for tracking participants in discourse), interpersonal meaning by negotiation (concerned with resources for exchange of information and interaction), logical meaning by conjunction (concerned with rhetorical and propositional linking relations) and experiential meaning by ideation (concerned with the semantics of lexical relations). Martin (1992) divides lexical cohesion relations into taxonomic (broadly corresponding to Hasan’s general relations), nuclear and activity sequence relations. The last two categories are a reformulation of the collocation category used in Halliday and Hasan (1976) and represent activity-based configurations of actions, people, places, things and qualities (nuclear relations) and the context-bound sequence of nuclear activities (activity sequence relations). While such an analytical framework may seem unnecessarily detailed and overcomplicated, its value lies in the fact that it shows how the interpretation of lexical cohesion relations is affected by the background knowledge of individuals through the knowledge of routines, activity types and more complex schemata, which are socially and culturally motivated.

The most important contribution of Hasan’s (1984, 1989a) model of cohesion is the introduction of the concept of cohesive harmony to reflect the assumption that grammatical and lexical cohesion are interdependent, as different kinds of semantic relations operate simultaneously through sizeable chunks of text. The components that enter into grammatical and lexical cohesive relations form parts of cohesive chains which may be sub-categorized into identity chains, the relation between their members being of coreferentiality, and similarity chains, the relation between their members being of co-classification or co-extension. The members of two or more distinct cohesive chains may interact on the basis of essentially syntactic relations, which by establishing semantic
relations between components of the message contribute to the building of coherence. The degree of coherence of a text is considered dependent on the proportion of focal chains, i.e. those which interact with a large number of other chains. Owing to its potential to enhance the continuity of related thematic meanings in recurrent syntactic patterns, chain interaction is frequently associated with parallelism, theme-rheme articulation and given-new information organization, all of which are regarded by Hasan (1989a) as aspects of structural cohesion.

What deserves to be stressed is that Hasan points to the interplay of the different language macrofunctions in the construction of discourse coherence by stating that the cohesive harmony of a text “harmonises the output of two macrofunctions: the textual and the experiential” (Hasan 1989a: 94), as the output of the textual function resides in the chains and their interaction, and the output of the experiential function is associated with the semantic entities and relations the interaction is built upon. However, while within Halliday and Hasan’s approach “variation in coherence is the function of variation in the cohesive harmony of a text” (Hasan 1989a: 94), i.e. cohesion and coherence are closely related phenomena, the present research draws a stricter distinction between these two concepts, claiming that “a text, either written or spoken, can be perceived as coherent without cohesive means, and furthermore a text can comprise cohesive means without being understood as coherent” (Dontcheva-Navratilova and Povolná 2009: 6).

It remains to be noted that Halliday and Hasan’s approach connects cohesion to context through the range of meaning potential offered by registers and genres and thus takes into account that cohesion may display genre-specific and register-specific features. However, as their model was elaborated for the study of narrative discourse, it could be questioned whether it is applicable to the study of cohesion in all registers and genres (cf. Hoey 1991, Taboada 2004).

2.2.3.2 Interpreting reference: Cornish

The cohesive force of reference results from its potential to connect items across different stretches of discourse and by referring to them repeatedly to keep mental representations continuously active in the discourse world of the participants in the communication. As mentioned in the previous sub-section, within the systemic-functional approach to language, reference, as an indicator of cohesive relations, is associated exclusively with endophoric reference (anaphoric and cataphoric), while exophoric or
situational reference (deixis), is not regarded as contributing directly to cohesion; however, the existence of numerous ambiguous cases is acknowledged (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 33). A more cognitively oriented conception is adopted by Cornish (2008), who considers deixis and anaphoric reference (understood rather as reference to shared representation in discourse rather than to previous text) as ‘complementary discourse referring procedures which the user exploits when processing, modifying and assessing the contents of mental models of an unfolding discourse within the minds of speaker and addressee’ (Cornish 2008: 999).

Cornish suggests a typology of indexicals (i.e. non-clause-bound reference expressions) from the point of view of their potential to operate at the level of memory organization, enabling the speaker to guide the addressee’s coherent processing of incoming segments of text, and distinguishes between a) indexicals bearing an anaphoric interpretation, which continue the existing focus of attention and thus contribute to the establishing of cohesive links, and which may perform a unit-demarcating function in discourse; b) indexicals with a deictic interpretation, which draw on contextual clues and may indicate a change of referent and/or function as signals of a coherent transition to a new discourse unit (this category includes discourse deictic expressions, which encode reference to portions of unfolding discourse in which the utterance is located (Levinson 1983); and c) ‘anadeictic’ interpretation of indexicals, i.e. an interpretation which involves partly anaphoric (presupposes the existence of a shared representation of the object) and partly deictic reference (the speaker guides the addressee’s attention towards a shared representation of the object in long-term episodic memory). Indexical reference may thus be seen as a cline including two polar types – ‘pure’ deixis, e.g. first- and second-person personal pronouns, and ‘pure’ anaphora, e.g. third-person reflexive pronouns – and transitional cases of what has been termed ‘anadeictic’ (Cornish: 1000) or ‘quasi-anaphoric’ (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 1471) expressions combining anaphoric and deictic reference (cf. Givón’s double-grounding into a frame/script), e.g. distal demonstrative reference (Cornish 2008: 1000). The choice of proximal and distal forms typically indicates the accessibility and importance of the intended referent; proximals are psychologically marked and refer to objects that have low accessibility and/or are important, while distals are neutral and refer to objects that have a high accessibility and are less important (Piwek et al. 2008).
When discussing reference resolution, Cornish considers Levinson’s (2000) neo-Gricean pragmatic account of (non-) co-reference in discourse and in agreement with Blackwell (2001) argues that when the most likely interpretation of indexicals fails, interlocutors apply a hierarchy of interpretation constraints, namely semantic entailments, general semantic constraints, background knowledge, antecedent salience, and choice of linguistic devices. It should be noted that the linguistic realizations of inherently ambiguous deictic reference expressions (e.g. the plural first-person pronoun *we*) may allow for multiple interpretations; this is often used intentionally by the speaker/writer to enhance the dialogicity and persuasive force of his/her discourse.

Apart from acknowledging the fact that indexical reference is not purely a text phenomenon, Cornish’s conception contributes to the study of indexicals by extending it beyond the problem of reference resolution and considering the discourse signalling and discourse-structuring properties of indexical reference devices. This issue is also explored by Elrich (1992), who analyses the use of deixis in the organization of scientific texts and argues that deictic procedures may frame texts both at macro- and the micro levels. Framing a whole text can be performed by indicating its perceptual accessibility by a combination of situational and discourse deixis when introducing a new entity in the discourse world; in addition, discourse deictic elements may contribute to the organization of longer stretches of text into lists; and finally, at the micro-level of sentences and paragraphs, the deictic function of ‘shell-nouns’ (Aktas and Cortes 2008), termed also general nouns (Halliday and Hasan 1976) or anaphoric nouns (Francis 1986), can be used to manage a shift of focus and perspective.

2.2.3.3 Patterns of lexis: Hoey

The main tenet of Hoey’s (1991) conception is that lexical cohesion is the dominant mode of creating texture as it has the highest frequency of occurrence and regularly forms multiple relations. (This approach accords with his recent lexical priming theory (Hoey 2005), which views lexis as a primary structural relation in language, the role of grammar being relegated to a resource for the adaptation of lexis.) While drawing on Winter’s (1979) repetition-replacement relations (cf. also Hasan’s (1989) reiteration and De Beaugrande and Dressler’s (1981) recurrence and paraphrase relations), Hoey defines a cohesive relation as encompassing both lexical and grammatical items which allow the speaker/writer to “say something again”, i.e. the repetition relation is posited as the basis of
lexical cohesion, which is extended to cover some categories treated as grammatical cohesive devices by Halliday and Hasan (1976) and Hasan (1989). Thus Hoey’s classification of lexical cohesion categories includes simple and complex lexical repetition, simple and complex paraphrase, substitution, co-reference (considered as the only grammatical cohesive device with the potential to form multiple relations), ellipsis and deixis. It should be noted that Hoey’s approach shows some features of similarity with that of Hasan (1989) in that it restricts reference to endophoric relations and excludes collocation, although, as Tanskanen (2006: 43) points out, complex paraphrase seems to refer to relations considered instances of collocation within Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) framework.

What is particularly important about Hoey’s approach to cohesion is that it shows how lexical relations contribute to the processes of discourse production and interpretation. Lexical relations are considered to create links holding between lexical items in two or more sentences; local cohesion, relating neighbouring sentences, may be based on any kind of cohesive relation, while distant cohesion, operating across sentences separated by at least five other sentences, may be realized only by the lexical relations of repetition and paraphrase, which are regarded as stronger than grammatical relations. The “connection made between any two sentences by virtue of there being a sufficient number of links between them” (Hoey 1991: 91) is termed bonding; it reflects the strength of the meaning relations between sentences in a text (the number of links necessary for the creation of a bond is text-type-specific and is to a certain extent dependent on the decision of the analyst). As Hoey argues, by creating bonds between sentences lexical cohesion relations ensure topic continuity and reveal the organization of the text.

Since the main aim of Hoey’s analysis is to propose a methodology for the production of understandable summaries of non-narrative texts, he considers the function of bonded sentences and divides them into central, i.e. those related by a substantially higher number of bonds based on lexical items expressing the main topic(s) (cf. Hasan’s (1989) focal chains), and marginal, i.e. those that form no bonds or very few bonds and therefore are not developing the main argument in the text. An understandable summary can thus be produced by removing the marginal sentences from the text; the remaining central sentences should either form a coherent whole or at least be closely related. As Hoey’s (1991) and Zapletalova’s (2009) analyses indicate, this procedure shows convincingly that lexical cohesion relations contribute decisively to discourse coherence by
keeping the mental representation of key entities and arguments continuously active in the memories of the participants in the communication; in addition, there seems to be enough evidence to claim that the location of bonded sentences in a text may be genre-specific. Creating and identifying lexical bonds in a text may therefore be regarded as a procedure facilitating coherent discourse interpretation both by tracing topic continuity and by activating relevant discourse-processing knowledge.

2.2.3.4 Collaborating with cohesion: Tanskanen

The last model for the analysis of cohesion considered here is the one proposed by Tanskanen (2006), which aims at “capturing all cohesively meaningful lexical relations in texts, and to find out if and how their use varies depending on the conditions under which texts have been produced” (Tanskanen 2006: 12). The distinctive feature of Tanskanen’s model is the strong emphasis on a collaborative view of cohesion which takes into consideration both the producer and the receiver and reflects the dialogism inherent in all kinds of discourse. This collaborative approach reveals the cognitive aspects of the communication process, stressing the seemingly obvious fact that “while the producer is trying to provide the necessary linkage in order to lead the receiver towards the interpretation of the message, the receiver is trying to identify this linkage in order to arrive at an interpretation” (Tanskanen 2006: 26). Owing to differences in the communicative conditions under which a text is produced, a basic difference is drawn between face-to-face conversation, where collaboration takes place in the here-and-now of discourse production, and monologue, seen as a two-stage process consisting of the production stage, during which the producer interacts with the implied receiver with the help of mental representations, and the interpretation stage, during which the receiver assumes collaboration and looks for its signals in the message.

The terminology Tanskanen proposes to identify lexical cohesion categories differs from that used in several previous models, since instead of referring to semantic categories, it uses more general concepts, enabling us to regard discourse as the starting point (Tanskanen 2006: 49). The two main kinds of relations are termed reiteration, which can be subdivided into simple and complex repetition, substitution, equivalence, generalisation, (co-) specification and contrast, and collocation, which consists of ordered set, activity-related and elaborative collocation.
When considering reiteration, unlike Halliday and Hasan (1976), Tanskanen takes into consideration both intra- and intersentential cohesion, thus reflecting the necessity to account for lengthy clause complexes in spoken discourse and excessively complex sentences in written discourse. Since the classification is functionally motivated, in agreement with Hoey (1991), some categories previously regarded as grammatical cohesion (e.g. reference, substitution) are subsumed under lexical relations with the potential to take part in a lexical chain with semantically heavier items. Of particular importance for my research is the suggested treatment of deictic pronouns (e.g. I, you, we); these are considered cohesive both as part of a repetition chain and as a part of a reference chain, assuring the continuity of a mental representation in the mind of the participants in the interaction. It should be noted that, as Tanskanen (2006: 60) herself acknowledges, there is some fluidity in her reiteration sub-categories; this results from the collaborative nature of cohesion and coherence and the role of background knowledge in discourse interpretation, which allows participants to choose which potentially available meaning relations to establish when perceiving cohesion in a text. This view of cohesion as a set of meaning potentials is also supported by Carter and McCarthy (1988: 204), who hold that vocabulary items are associated with particular discourse-specific schemata or frames, and after the activation of the appropriate schema or frame readers are more or less looking for cohesive links between lexical items associated with that mental construct.

The role of frames and schemata is even more important in the analysis of collocation relations, which as the discussion of the above-mentioned approaches to lexical cohesion suggests, have typically been avoided by analysts due to their vagueness and complexity. Tanskanen, however, considers the collocation relation as an indispensable component in a model of lexical cohesion which attempts to account for all potentially existing meaning relations in discourse, although, as her findings clearly show, the number of collocation relations is very low in comparison with that of reiteration relations. While the relations of ordered-set and activity-related collocation (inspired by Martin’s (1992) nuclear and activity sequence relations) are relatively well-defined, the elaborative collocation relation depends heavily on the shared general and specific knowledge and discourse processing experience that the participants bring to the collaborative interpretative process. According to Tanskanen, elaborative collocation relations are established when a surface level lexical item assumes the function of trigger, activating a conceptual frame enabling the listener/reader to identify meaning relations with associated
lexical items, thus contributing to the perception of discourse coherence. It should be noted, however, that the listener/reader may fail to identify the trigger or lack the knowledge which has to be inferred to make sense of the text; while in conversation such a problem may be handled easily in the collaborative process of negotiation of meaning, in written discourse it may lead to disturbed coherence due to the absence of the possibility of feedback. It is therefore a question for further consideration whether the meaning relations considered within Tanskanen’s elaborative collocation category can be seen as cohesive, i.e. as indicating an overt surface relation holding between lexical items; however, the importance of such meaning relations in deriving coherence from a text is considered to be beyond any doubt.

When discussing how cohesion enhances the perception of coherence in discourse, Tanskanen points out that through chain formation lexical cohesion can mark unity across longer stretches of discourse. More specifically, by establishing their referents as thematic across larger parts of the text and thus organizing discourse by reflecting what Tanskanen (2006: 109) calls topical segments, cohesive chains contribute to the perception of topical coherence (Giora 1985, 1997) on the ideational plane of discourse. The length of topical segments may reveal whether the text is a single-topic text or a multi-topic one, while the beginning and end of a chain are likely to coincide with places of topic shift.

In terms of variation according to the communicative conditions of text production, Tanskanen’s research proves that there is variation in the choice of cohesion strategies in different types of discourse, namely between spoken dialogue, written monologue and prepared speech. However, her findings suggest that although some situational contextual factors, e.g. written versus spoken mode of communication, affect to a certain extent the cohesion of a text, it is the cognitive contextual features that can explain most of the differences, in particular the real-time production and interpretation constraints versus smaller temporal constraints.

2.2.4 Disturbed coherence

The majority of the approaches to coherence discussed above hold that the interpretation of meaning derived by participants in an interaction is flexible and subjective (Seidhlofer and Widdowson 1999: 218), since it is based on the text and on background information inferred by the interactants, who operate on a default assumption of coherence and accept mutual responsibility for achieving coherence. Thus these approaches regard
coherence as an interpretative scalar notion and consider the potential overlap between the understanding different participants derive from a discourse as a matter of degree. This sub-section deals with factors that may lead to the perception of disturbed coherence or incoherence in discourse. It should be noted that all the studies referred to below deal with face-to-face spoken interaction.

Since texts are assumed to be only partly coherent for their hearers, coherence may be conceptualized as a cline ranging from full agreement between the interpretations of the discourse derived by the participants to total lack of agreement between them leading to a break in communication, which can be termed incoherence. According to Bublitz and Lenk (1999: 161) incoherence occurs primarily in the speech of persons whose command of language is impaired, e.g. schizophrenics. Incoherence is thus regarded as a result of a lack of willingness or ability on the part the interpreter(s) to assume that the text is coherent. It follows that full coherence and incoherence are the extremes of the scale and their occurrence is not particularly frequent.

‘Disturbed coherence’ is the term introduced by Bublitz and Lenk (1999: 155) to refer to a situation in which the mismatch between the understanding of the discourse derived by the participants in a communication is no longer tolerated by one or more of them. In most cases disturbed coherence is related to ambiguous meanings and misunderstanding (Bazzanella and Damiano 1999: 176). Thus divergence in coherence is seen as the result of the cooperative effort (Grice 1975) of the interlocutors to ascribe coherence to the speaker’s ongoing discourse, which leads to the creation of two or more divergent contexts of interpretation for the unfolding discourse; at the same time, lack of coherence signals the occurrence of misunderstanding. While this accidental type of disturbed coherence associated with a wrong assumption by the speaker that the listener is able to derive coherence is by far the more frequent, there is also another type of disturbed coherence which is the outcome of a meaningful choice made by the speaker. Bublitz and Lenk (1999: 163) term this ‘deliberate’ disturbed coherence, since it reflects the speaker’s intent to prevent the hearer from ascribing coherence, usually by violating an expectation.

Among factors that may lead to disturbed coherence, topic drifts and topic change are perhaps the most frequently mentioned (Van Dijk 1977, Wikborg 1985, Fowler 1986, Giora 1997, Herring 1999), since they can result in considerable divergence in discourse interpretation on both the local and global levels. Other factors affecting the global degree of coherence are frame breaks, register breaks and information processing problems
Enkvist 1978, Bublitz and Lenk 1999). At local coherence level, misinterpretation may be caused by unclear reference and sentence connectors (Wikborg 1985, Bublitz and Lenk 1999). While discussing coherence in computer mediated communication, Herring (1999) relates ‘interactional incoherence’ to disruption of turn-taking and adjacency, and overlapping exchanges; apart from potentially impairing discourse processing, however, these discourse features might be seen as encouraging linguistic playfulness and participation in multiple simultaneous threads within the same discussion. When there is a break in coherence, successful communication can be restored on the basis of a cooperative effort by the participants to signal the misunderstanding, reconstruct the lost common ground, negotiate meanings and agree on a coherent discourse interpretation.

When making assumptions about their hearers’ state of knowledge, speakers use different strategies of guiding (cohesive devices) and monitoring (meta-discoursal phrases) to prevent excessive divergence in coherence. In some cases the excessive effort made to prevent problems in discourse interpretation by the use of unnecessary clusters of cohesive means and paraphrases may lead to over-coherence (Bublitz and Lenk 1999: 159).

2.3 Analytical framework

This study undertakes to explore the interplay of different aspects of coherence comprising conceptual connectedness, evaluative and dialogical consistency, and textual relatedness in the genre of diplomatic opening addresses delivered within the UNESCO context. Before proceeding to the analysis, it is essential to clarify my understanding of coherence, and to outline the approach adopted to the investigation of its manifestations in discourse and the analysis of the rhetorical structure of the genre of opening addresses with regard to its contribution to the perception of discourse coherence.

The analytical framework adopted in the present research is rooted in the discourse analysis tradition, considered to be “one of the most vast and least defined areas in linguistics” (Schiffrin 1994: 406). It shares the tenet of text linguistics that language choices reflect the contextually-bound intentions and expectations of the participants in the act of communication (Van Dijk 1977). The concerns of discourse analysis may be grouped into three large areas: the study of language in use, the study of stretches of language units beyond the sentence, and the study of discourse as a culturally, institutionally and ideologically determined social practice, i.e. the domain of critical
discourse analysis (Schiffrin et al. 2001: 1). It should be noted that the study of coherence has been a prominent strand of research in discourse analysis over the last forty years.

The present research explores political speeches, i.e. stretches of language beyond the sentence, while taking into consideration the communicative strategies used in social interaction, their contextual motivation in the communicative event and their role in the construal of discourse coherence. Thus it can be also seen as sharing the interest of critical discourse analysis in the social and institutional aspects of discourse, such as the linguistic representation of ideology, social relations and institutional practices, and in particular the relations of power between participants (cf. Hodge and Kress 1979, Fowler 1986, 1991, Fairclough 1989, 1995, Caldas-Coulthard and Coulthard 1996, Van Dijk 1993, 2002, Wodak 1996, 2008). A useful conceptualization of discourse as text, discourse practice and socio-cultural practice is suggested by Fairclough’s (1989, 1995) approach involving the description and explanation of the interdependence of the properties of language texts, discourse processes, and the nature of socio-cultural processes (Fairclough 1995: 97-98). This approach allows the analyst to account for the constitutive-of-reality potential of discourse (Wodak 1996, Miššíková 2007), i.e. the potential of discourse to reflect and simultaneously (re)construct reality.

As this investigation explores coherence in a particular genre, it also draws on the genre analysis framework (Swales 1990, 2004, Bhatia 1993, 2002) applied by discourse studies, which combines socio-cultural, cognitive and interactional considerations in order to explain form-function correlations as manifested in different discourse forms. Within this approach genres are conceived as conventional communicative events recognized by an occupationally or institutionally defined discourse community. Genres are associated with particular types of social occasions, and have a specific set of communicative purposes imposing constraints on the choice of content and style (Swales 1990:46-58, Bhatia 1993:13). Since genre knowledge presupposes an awareness of the communicative purpose(s), content, discourse structure, style, and genre-specific coherence strategies associated with a particular genre, it can be seen as part of the background knowledge and communicative competence of the members of a particular discourse community based on a shared experience of co-occurring content, form and contextual configuration. Genre knowledge is therefore an important aspect of the background knowledge which participants in an interaction draw upon when deriving discourse coherence.
Since the aim of this study is to analyse the interplay of different aspects of discourse coherence, the analytical framework adopted should have the potential to show how these aspects interact to achieve a particular communicative purpose and to explain how discourse is constructed and interpreted in the context of a specific kind of social interaction. The following subsection outlines the approach applied to the analysis of discourse coherence in the present research.

2.3.1 Analysing coherence

As the review of different approaches to the analysis of coherence has shown, research into coherence is a prominent field of concern in the study of discourse. The present inquiry aligns with a dynamic conceptualization of coherence as a potentially variable collaborative achievement of the speaker/writer and the hearer/reader seen as a context-dependent, hearer/reader-oriented and comprehension-based interpretative notion (Bublitz 1999: 2).

Discourse coherence is defined here as the subjective perception of meaningfulness and purposefulness of discourse. Coherence is derived in the process of a particular interpretative decoding of a text in which all participants in the interaction make up their own meaningful discourse from the text by assigning it intentionality and recreating its meaning, while projecting their personal opinions, attitudes, feelings and experience in discourse processing onto the interaction. Coherent discourse interpretation is thus conceived as dependent on the context, i.e. the linguistic co-text (including intertextual connections), the social-cultural and institutional environment, and the related discourse conventions, and on the interpreters’ encyclopedic knowledge, ideology, awareness of discourse conventions and norms of interaction, and communicative purposes. Deriving coherence from a text is an intentional process in which the interpreter assumes that all the participants in the communication adhere to the cooperative principle (Grice 1975) and impose coherence on the text (Tárnyiková 1995: 24) in their collaborative effort to make sense of the interaction. It follows that while coherence is not inherent to a text, it is a constitutive property of purposeful discourse. Since building up coherence is inherently subjective and depends on the interpreters’ intentions and experience in discourse interpretation, their efforts to construct shared beliefs, assumptions and presuppositions may fail due to lack of collaboration, or of resources to derive coherence from the text (Edmondson 1999). Moreover, when drawing on different knowledge representations
and/or intentions, the interactants may build up divergent discourse interpretations which, though coherent for each of the participants, lack agreement and thus lead to misunderstanding or breaks in communication (Bublitz and Lenk 1999, Bazzanella and Damiano 1999). The awareness of this scalar nature of coherence implying that discourse understanding is a matter of degree suggests that in the process of interaction participants use different strategies for preventing misunderstandings or repairing divergence in coherence.

When deriving coherence from a text, the interactants negotiate and interpret ideational, interpersonal and textual meanings. Discourse coherence may therefore be seen as a multifaceted discourse property encompassing propositional or topical coherence on the ideational plane, interactional or evaluative coherence on the interpersonal plane, and cohesion on the textual plane of discourse. The following review of aspects of coherence on the three planes of discourse does not pretend to be exhaustive; however, it intends to highlight the main aspects of coherence under analysis in the present research.

2.3.1.1 Analysing coherence on the ideational plane

Coherence on the ideational plane is related to the perception of continuity and interdependence of ideational meanings expressed by the text and inferred by the interpreters in the process of communication. In agreement with Van Dijk and Kintsch (1983) and Givón (1995, 2001), it is assumed that the perception of continuity and interdependence of meaning components is derived from the mental representation of the text including the activated mental models in the mind of the participants used as a basis for inferencing. The most prominent aspects of coherence on the ideational plane are continuity of discourse topic and logical relations holding between segments of discourse.

Topical (or propositional) coherence (cf. Giora 1985, 1997, Givón 1995, 2001, Gernsbacher 1997) refers to the organization of the discourse content in relation to a discourse topic. When involved in purposeful interaction participants can interpret a discourse as coherent if they can relate the individual propositions and larger segments of the discourse to a discourse topic on the basis of continuity of referents, action frames, time, location and logical relations holding between entities and actions in the mental representation of the text. In agreement with Van Dijk and Kintsch (1983) and Givón (1995, 2001), the continuity of referents, action frames, time, location and logical relations is considered to be traceable in a text and potentially fostered by cohesion relations.
Cohesion relations are instrumental to the construction of continuity of occurrences of conceptual content items in discourse, since they make it easier for the interpreter to access other occurrences of the same item in his/her mental representation of the text (de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981: 48). The cohesive role of discourse markers facilitates the interpretation of coherence relations of resemblance, cause-effect and contiguity (Kehler 2002, 2004), indicating logical relations holding between events and phenomena represented in discourse. However, since coherence relations are often implicit, their interpretation depends on inferences based on mental models, frames or scripts stored in the background knowledge of the interactants.

From the perspective of this research, which aims at exploring the interplay of coherence on the three planes of discourse, continuity of reference is considered as a key aspect of ideational coherence, since it interacts with coherence on the interpersonal plane through categorization and evaluation of the referents, and is frequently indicated by cohesion on the textual plane of discourse. The approach to reference adopted here draws on a cognitively oriented understanding of this concept (e.g. Brown and Yule 1983, Lyons 1977, Levinson 2004) holding that when interpreting reference (indicated by proper names, nouns or pronouns) the participants in the communication identify an entity and establish it as a referent in their mental representations of the discourse, while relating subsequent references to that referent back to this mental representation, rather than to the original verbal expression in the text. Reference interpretation is therefore pragmatically determined (Mey 2001: 91); it can be conceived as a dynamic collaborative achievement of the speaker/writer and listener/reader in which the speaker/writer selects reference expressions which reflect his/her ideology and serve best his/her communicative goals, while the listener/reader’s task is to infer the entity which the speaker/writer intends to activate (cf. Ribera 2007). The success or failure of reference interpretation thus depends to a large extent on the shared background knowledge of the participants in the communication and their experience in discourse processing. Since the interpretation of pronominal reference is dependent on the socio-cultural and pragmatic context, it can rarely be seen as fully determinate; thus pronominal forms may indicate different categories of individuals or groups and vary in their communicative functions. The cognitive approach to the interpretation of pronominal reference makes it possible to regard deixis and anaphoric reference as complementary discourse referring procedures.
organizing the content of mental models of the unfolding discourse within the minds of the participants in the interaction (Cornish 2008: 999).

The relation of the propositional content to the discourse topic may be approached at the macro- and micro-level of discourse organization. Drawing on Daneš’s theory of thematic progression, this research considers the relevance of sentence/utterance themes to discourse topic at the local level of paragraphs and discourse segments longer than a paragraph, and global level, i.e. the level of the discourse as a whole. While regarding the three types of thematic progression (linear, continuous theme and derived theme) as the basic principle of topic organization, it is also acknowledged that in some cases content organization in relation to discourse topic may be genre-specific (Fries 1995). Thus coherence may be derived on the basis of the function of a rhetorical move in the generic structure even if the relevance of the paragraph/discourse segment topic to the global discourse topic is indirect.

Another issue related to the perception of discourse coherence on the ideational plane is that of coherent change of topic at boundaries in the discourse. Topic change is signalled by a lack of a complete match between coherence at the local and the global level of discourse (Kintsch 1998), indicated by semantic topic-shift markers, such as change of time or place or introduction of new participants, and formal topic-shift markers, such as adverbial linkers. In accordance with Van Dijk (1977), in the present inquiry a change of topic is regarded as not disturbing discourse coherence if it is operated within the range of the possible individuals and properties of the discourse world, i.e. changes of referents, properties or relations are operated with respect to referents, properties or relations which are already given. This should enable discourse participants to identify boundaries in discourse and to integrate new information into their existing mental representation of the discourse in a coherent way. Since, as Sinclair (1987) observes, evaluation tends to occur at points in discourse marking a change of topic or rhetorical move, it also plays an important role in creating a shared awareness of boundary points in discourse and the nature of the connections between its various parts, thus helping the participants to process discourse coherently.

2.3.1.2 Analysing coherence on the interpersonal plane

While coherent interaction in dialogue involves collaborative negotiation of meaning and reciprocal management of discourse, in monologue, interaction comprises two stages:
at the production stage, the producer interacts with the implied receiver with the help of mental representations, while at the interpretation stage the receiver can take this collaboration into account and look for its signals in the message, while deriving his/her subjective perception of discourse coherence (Tanskanen 2006). Since the present inquiry investigates political speeches, i.e. specimens of prepared monologic discourse, it takes into consideration two aspects of coherence on the interpersonal plane of discourse: coherent construction and interpretation of evaluative meanings, i.e. the speaker/writer’s attitude and feelings towards the entities and phenomena about which he/she is talking or writing, and coherent (re)construction and interpretation of the relations between the participants in the interaction, associated primarily with addressing the audience, the management of rhetorical moves and discourse topic.

The analysis of evaluation draws primarily on Hunston and Thompson’s (2000) approach, and assumes that while expressing the speaker/writer’s opinions reflecting his/her social and individual value systems, evaluation (re)constructs and maintains relations between the interactants and organizes the discourse. The potential of evaluation to combine interpersonal meanings with ideational and textual aspects of meaning makes it central to the present research, since a consistent expression of the value judgments, attitudes and feelings of interlocutors can be seen as enhancing coherence at all planes of discourse.

The point of view expressed in a discourse necessarily reflects the social ideology associated with the discourse community to which the speaker or writer belongs. By categorizing referents and actions as good or bad, true or untrue, desirable or undesirable, the speaker/writer assigns them status and value and (re)constructs the world and the relationships between the participants in the interaction, thus expressing both evaluative and ideational meanings. Drawing on Martin’s (2005) appraisal framework, it should be noted that evaluations associated with social esteem and social sanction values are crucial to the ideological positioning of the participants in the interaction. When expressing a value position, the speaker or writer involves the listener or reader in the discourse by expressing (dis)agreement with socially shared attitudes and beliefs, thus inviting the listener/reader to react by either accepting the perspective of the speaker/writer, or disagreeing with it; in the case of expected disagreement, the speaker/writer can use different persuasive strategies to try to prevent disagreement.
The investigation into the interplay of aspects of coherence involving experiential and interpersonal meanings in this research draws on Van Leeuwen’s (1996) approach to the representation of social actors in public discourse and Chilton’s (2004) framework for the representation of discourse worlds, which are related to the legitimization of the views, actions and intentions supported by the speaker/writer. The coherent representation of actors, events and actions involves their positioning in the value-laden discourse world from the perspective of the speaker or writer, posited as the deictic centre of the discourse. While (re)constructing the discourse world, the speaker/writer also endeavours to build up a consistent self-representation, based on a continuity of attitudes, opinions, actions and relations with the other actors in the discourse world. When deriving a coherent discourse from a text, the listener/reader may accept the perspective of the speaker/writer, or reinterpret the discourse from his/her own point of view to derive coherence which may differ from the one intended by the speaker/writer.

The linguistic devices associated with a coherent expression of evaluative and experiential meanings are lexical means for naming and categorizing actors (nouns and adjectives) and processes (verbs, adverbials and nominalizations) and indexical pronouns and adverbs for indicating proximal and distal persons, temporal and local settings, and thus they express the speaker’s perspective or point of view. Apart from the cohesive relations which typically hold between lexical items and indexicals referring to the same mental representation of an entity or event, there is a specific kind of nominal-group lexical cohesion termed ‘shell-nouns’ by Aktas and Cortes (2008) (cf. Halliday and Hasan’s (1976: 274) general nouns, Francis’s (1994) labelling), which contributes to the interplay of ideational and evaluative coherence and has topic-shifting and topic-linking functions. Shell-nouns refer to the use of a noun (e.g. fact, problem, solution) to sum up and encapsulate what has been expressed by a clause, thus guiding the reader/listener in discourse interpretation. As Hunston and Thompson (2000) note, lexical evaluative means are frequently metaphorical. In agreement with Martin (1999), the evaluative force of metaphorical language is regarded as stronger than that of non-metaphorical language which simply invites a response, for metaphorical expressions provoke an affectual response and thus greater reader or listener involvement. By enhancing the evaluative or attitudinal unity of discourse, metaphorical coherence (Shen and Balaban 1999, Sopory 2008), associated primarily with the use of conceptual metaphors, fosters the persuasive effect of discourse and contributes to discourse coherence at the global level.
By categorizing referents and actions in the discourse world, the speaker/writer tries to persuade the listener-reader to share his point of view, thus imposing his/her ideology on the audience. Persuasion is considered in relation to politeness strategies aimed at managing the relations of power and solidarity between the participants in the interaction. The linguistic and rhetorical devices associated with persuasion are deontic and epistemic modality, expressed by modal verbs, nouns, adverbials, and clausal forms, such as *I think* and *I believe*, the choice between averral and attribution, associated with the use of intertextuality and reported statements, and the choice between assigning the status of fact, assumption or hypothesis to statements or larger parts of discourse.

The interactional aspect of discourse coherence is related to the establishment of contact and relations between the participants in the interaction and the staging of discourse. In spoken discourse, the establishing of contact and continuous appeal to the interlocutor and/or the audience is realized by the use of forms of address, with lexical resources signalling group affiliation and markers of social dialect (Martin and White 2005), which in turn are related to politeness considerations and thus also contribute to the evaluation of social actors and their positioning in the ideologically-biased discourse world. In monologic discourse, the relationship between participants depends to a large extent on the footing selected by the speaker or writer, which while not necessarily continuous, should be interpreted as coherent by the listener-reader. Change of footing is typically associated with personal vs. impersonal constructions, singular and plural deictic pronouns (often ambiguous in meaning) and the choice between averred and attributed statements.

The coherent staging of argumentation in discourse related to speech function and exchange structure (cf. Martin and White’s (2005) negotiation system of discourse semantics) reflects the communicative intentions of the speaker/writer and the structure or rhetorical moves associated with the genre. The present research aligns with Hoey’s (2001) view that in the complex communicative situation of monologic discourse, the speaker or writer interacts with his/her audience via the text by anticipating the expectation and reactions assigned to the intended audience and using various signals, such as cohesive ties and rhetorical strategies, to guide the reader/listener towards an intended interpretation of the text. This interaction may be explored at several levels. While the present investigation concentrates primarily on the macro-level of generic structure and studies the structure of rhetorical moves, seen as dependent on the main communicative purposes of the discourse,
it also takes into consideration micro-level structures, such as clause relations (Winter 1994) or Bolivar’s (2001) evaluative triad.

2.3.1.3 Analysing coherence on the textual plane

On the textual plane, coherence is associated primarily with the use of cohesive devices utilized by the speaker/writer for guiding the listener/reader towards the intended interpretation of the text. The approach adopted in the present research, which views coherence as a context-dependent collaborative achievement on the part of the interactants, who use input from their background knowledge to derive their subjective interpretations of the text, suggests that coherence is considered here as independent of cohesion, since discourse can be perceived as coherent without cohesive means, and the use of cohesive devices provides no guarantee of discourse coherence.

Operating on both the global and local levels, cohesive devices enhance the perception of coherence due to their potential to establish internal links (lexical and grammatical) between parts of the text (at intraclausal and interclausal level) and between the text and its context, thus establishing meaning relations as available in the mental representations of the participants in the interaction. In the present research grammatical and lexical mechanisms for establishing cohesion relations are regarded as interdependent; thus both grammatical and lexical cohesive means can participate in building cohesive chains operating on the local or global level of discourse (Hasan 1989a, Hoey 1991). Drawing on Hasan (1989), cohesive chains are seen as reflecting the interplay of coherence on the textual and ideational plane of discourse, as the cohesive means activate and maintain the availability of referents in the mental representations of the interactants. By establishing their referents as thematic across larger parts of the text, cohesive chains indicate the boundaries of global and local topical segments (Tanskanen 2006), thus contributing to the perception of topical coherence on the ideational plane of discourse.

The main cohesive relations considered in this investigation are reference, conjunctives and lexical cohesive relations. As already mentioned, in agreement with Cornish’s (2008) cognitive approach, both deixis and anaphoric reference are seen as contributing to the establishment of cohesion and coherence relations, since they are regarded as referring directly to mental representations and not to the occurrence of lexical or grammatical items in the text. In addition, by the choice of proximal of distal indexicals,
the speaker/writer can indicate his/her relationship with and attitude towards the referent, thus contributing to the perception of evaluative coherence.

Conjunctives, understood here broadly as any discourse markers that can be used to indicate explicitly logical relations between experiences of the participants and within discourse organization, contribute to the interpretation of the coherence relations of resemblance, cause-effect and contiguity (Kehler 2002, 2004). Apart from expressing cohesive relations, by presenting connection between actors and events in the discourse world, coherence relations contribute to the perception of ideational and evaluative coherence. In the present research, Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) set of markers of cohesive relations is extended to include markers indicating parallel (e.g. and), contrast (e.g. but), exemplification (e.g. for example), generalization (e.g. in general), exception (e.g. however, nonetheless) and elaboration (e.g. that is), subsumed under resemblance relations, markers of result (e.g. as a result, therefore, and), explanation (e.g. because), violated expectations (e.g. but) and denial of preventer (e.g. even though, despite), expressing cause-effect relations, and markers of temporal sequence (while, then) for indicating the occasion relation. It should be stressed that the establishment of coherence relations interacts with other cohesion markers, such as ellipsis, pronominal reference and tense interpretation.

The approach to lexical cohesion adopted in this research draws on Martin (1992, 2001) and Tanskanen (2006) in acknowledging that the interpretation of lexical cohesion relations is affected by the background knowledge of interactants through the knowledge of routines, activity types and complex schemata motivated socially, culturally and ideologically. This implies that the establishment of lexical cohesive relations is seen as affected by the attitudes and opinions of the participants and thus is also associated with evaluative meanings. The taxonomy of lexical cohesive relations draws on Tanskanen (2006), who recognizes two main categories of relations: reiteration and collocation. The reiteration category comprises the relations of simple and complex repetition, substitution, equivalence, generalization, (co-)specification and contrast, while the collocation category includes the relations of open set, activity-related collocation and elaborative collocation. It should be noted that the establishment of cohesive relations is regarded as a collaborative achievement on the part of the participants, since they have to negotiate the mental models used in the interpretation of discourse.
2.3.1.4 Analysing the interplay of aspects of coherence on the three planes of discourse

The analysis of aspects of coherence in opening addresses undertaken in the present study focuses on the interplay of ideational, interpersonal and textual meanings in building up discourse coherence. My key assumption is that since the discourse world constructed by a speaker/writer reflects his/her culturally and ideologically-biased attitude towards the actors positioned in the discourse worlds, and the events and actions related to them, the point of view adopted by the speaker/writer affects to some extent the perception of coherence at all planes of discourse. By assigning status and value to actors and events, the speaker/writer tries to impose his/her ideological perspective and his/her perception of discourse coherence on the listener/reader. When interpreting a text, however, the listener/reader can either accept the point of view of the speaker/writer and derive discourse coherence which to a considerable extent overlaps with the one intended by the speaker/writer, or construct a different discourse world and derive coherence which diverges from that intended by the speaker/writer but agrees with the culturally- and ideologically-biased point of view of the listener/reader. Thus the expression of ideational meanings cannot be sharply delimited from the expression of attitudes, opinions and feelings of the participants towards entities and processes in the constructed discourse world and from the relationship between the participants in terms of power and solidarity. The availability of mental representations of actors and their actions in the discourse world is maintained by cohesive chains, the establishment of which is affected by a collaborative effort by the participants to identify the mental models required for a coherent discourse interpretation. In addition, the markers of logical relations guide the listener/reader through topic shifts and argumentation in the unfolding discourse. The organization of the discourse, however, is also dependent on generic conventions and the speaker/writer’s point of view and relationship with the audience. Thus genre-specific evaluation and interactional patterns may reflect the interdependence of interpersonal and textual aspects of coherence. Figure 3 represents diagrammatically the interplay of different dimensions of coherence on the three planes of discourse.
It remains to be stressed that while the different aspects of discourse coherence need not be perfectly convergent, i.e. discourse participants may derive different interpretations and perceive different degrees of coherence on the three planes of discourse, their relative importance may be seen to a certain extent as genre-specific since it is affected by the constraints different genres impose on the interpretation potential of texts.

2.3.2 Genre analysis

The analysis of the genre of diplomatic opening addresses adopts a situation-driven procedure for genre analysis (Swales 2004:73) and draws on the analytical model outlined by Bhatia (2002), which studies discourse from three complementary perspectives – the socio-critical, the socio-cognitive and the textual. Within this framework, the socio-cultural context of language use, including the social roles and identities of the participants in the communicative event and the social structures and relationships the genre is intended to establish, maintain, or change, is seen as imposing constraints on the rhetorical structure.
and interpretative potential of a text activated in a particular social, institutional and situational context in which the genre is used to achieve specific goals and communicative purposes. These goals and communicative purposes in their turn impose constraints on the set of phonological, graphological, lexico-grammatical, semantic and text-level features which the speaker or writer can use to construct coherent discourse. It should be noted, however, that when producing and interpreting discourse, the existing generic patterns may be modulated and thus eventually result in a change in discourse conventions or the appearance of a new genre.

The analysis of different aspects of coherence in the genre of opening diplomatic addresses takes into consideration the social identities and roles of the participants in the communicative event and the existing social relations, which are to be maintained or changed. Since these contextual factors affect the relations of solidarity and power between interactants and the communicative goals they are trying to achieve, the rhetorical and linguistic choices aimed at managing these relations are considered as crucial for the construction of discourse coherence on the interpersonal plane. The following brief outline of the analytical procedure used in this investigation applies the framework adopted in Dontcheva-Navratilova (2009).

2.3.2.1 Analysing the context

A context-driven analysis of genre necessarily begins with a description of contextual factors affecting the set of meanings which correlate with this genre. This inquiry into opening addresses delivered within the UNESCO discourse community uses the model of contextual analysis suggested in Dontcheva-Navratilova (2009: 15). While drawing on Hymes’s (1975) description of speech events as used by a speech community defined on the basis of a shared language, cultural background and group solidarity, and Halliday’s (1978) and Biber’s (1994) analytical models for register classification, this framework focuses on the situational variables, institutional relations, communicative conventions and communicative purposes which a discourse community, defined in terms of shared occupational/professional interests, common goals and conventional forms of interaction among its members, associates with a genre (Figure 4). The model comprises closed-set and open-set parameters; in the closed-set parameters possible values are provided in brackets.
Figure 4 – A model for contextual analysis of a genre (Dontcheva-Navratilova 2009)

**SITUATIONAL PARAMETERS**

1) Spatio-temporal setting – public/private, (not) shared deictic centre by all discourse participants
2) Scene – presence/absence of explicit definition of shared cultural and institutional knowledge
3) Subject area

**DISCOURSE PARTICIPANTS**

1) Identity of the participants
   a. addressee (personal/professional/institutional/unspecified)
   b. addressee (personal/professional/institutional/unspecified)
2) Presence/absence of (un)specified audience
3) Social roles of the participants (including status and power)
4) Extent of shared knowledge (high/medium/low)
   a. shared professional knowledge, including content and terminology
   b. shared knowledge of institutional/professional communicative conventions and discoursal expertise
   c. shared cultural knowledge

**COMMUNICATIVE PURPOSES**

1) Communicative purposes
2) Speech act performed
   a. Participation (group speech acts/‘monologic’ speech acts)
   b. Type of speech act (performatives/non-performatives; directives/declarations/commissives/representatives /expressives)
   c. Directness (direct/indirect)
3) Attitude of the participants towards the discourse and the message (purported to be based on fact, speculative, imaginative, symbolic, mixed)

**COMMUNICATIVE CONVENTIONS**

1) Medium (written/spoken), channel and type of transmission (taped/transcribed/typed/printed/handwritten/e-mail/other; published/unpublished)
2) Level of interactiveness (high/medium/low)
3) Simple or complex discourse type (genre/text-type blending of mixing)
4) Institutional/professional norms of interaction and interpretation, conventions of discourse production, processing mechanism and circumstances, based on prior experience with specimens of the genre

The situational parameters used in the model identify the subject area and specify the relationship between the participants in the communication with regard to the spatial and temporal setting of the communicative event. The institutional, psychological and cultural dimensions of the context, subsumed under the scene component, outline the extent of the shared cultural knowledge and knowledge of institutional norms of interaction on which the participants can rely when inferring meanings to derive coherence and when disambiguating the interpretation of the communicative intentions of the speaker (Akman 2000: 751).
A detailed description of participants’ identities, social roles and attitude to the message is indispensable for an understanding of the ideological positions and mutual relations of interactants. Since in intergovernmental institutional interaction discourse participation is multilayered, the analysis of participant structure relies on Hymes’s (1974) and Hoey’s (2001) frameworks, which reflect complex participation, and on Goffman’s (1981) concept of footing, which accounts for possible changes in the alignment of the speaker with the audience. While allowing the analyst to differentiate between the institutional identity of the orator representing an institutional ideology and his/her professional identity and personal views (Van de Mieroop 2007), this approach also considers the presence of a larger audience, thus stressing the pressure exercised by the extended social context of the interaction on the structure of social forces and power relations in the society. In the case of highly specialized discourse communities, the amount of shared professional knowledge and discourse expertise may be such that a larger audience including the general public may fail to understand all discourse implications and thus derive coherence from a text which diverges considerably from that of the speaker. It should be noted that in political discourse potentially ambiguous meanings may be used intentionally.

Despite the variability that exists in the definitions of the concept ‘communicative purpose’ (cf. Askehave and Swales 2001, Swales 2004), most approaches to genre analysis agree that it is the key criterion for assigning genre membership (cf. Swales 1990, 2004, Bhatia 1993, 2002, Martin 1985). The communicative purposes associated with a genre predetermine its rhetorical moves structure. In addition, they affect the communicative functions of discourse identified in relation to speech acts intended to establish, maintain, or change institutional, professional and social relations (Trosborg 1997). In the discourse of international governmental organizations, these are usually related to formality and politeness considerations (Brown and Levinson 1987, Grice 1975, Holmes 1995, Watts 2003).

Genre-specific communicative conventions, comprising the institutional, professional, social and cultural norms of interaction and interpretation, predetermine the participants’ attitude to and understanding of the discourse (Duranti 1985: 221) by affecting the mental models available in the shared knowledge of the members of the discourse community. While modifying slightly Hymes’s (1974: 51) understanding of these concepts, norms of interaction refer here to discourse conventions related to a genre,
including discourse production and processing procedures, while norms of interpretation implicate an institutional ideology and social goals that the genre is expected to realize. When interpreting discourse, and especially in the context of highly conventionalized intergovernmental communication, participants have to infer meanings based on explicit and implicit intertextual referencing to the network of existing or potential texts available to the discourse community, with which each instance of the genre engages in an inner polemic.

As culturally recognizable constructs elaborated by a recurrent repetition of social and institutional actions associated with a conventionalized kind of text, situation types play a decisive role in deriving discourse coherence, for they are part of the shared knowledge the members of a discourse community draw upon when interpreting the relation between text structure and context.

2.3.2.2 Analysing generic structure

Within the context-driven approach to genre analysis, generic structure is regarded as reflecting the communicative purposes that a genre is expected to accomplish in a particular type of conventionalized context. The approach adopted here considers the impact of text-external, non-linguistic factors, and of text-internal, compositional, functional and rhetorical factors on generic structure. It draws on Swales's (1990) rhetorical moves analysis of the structural organization of a genre and Hasan’s (1989b) concept of generic structure potential.

While assuming that a genre imposes structural and rhetorical constraints on text organization, Swales’s (1990) rhetorical moves analysis relates text structure to the communicative purposes of the addressee. Thus at a very general level the cognitive structure of any genre can be conceptualized as comprising a beginning, body and end which perform specific communicative and rhetorical functions. When considering the structure of a specific genre, however, these components can be further analysed into rhetorical moves which indicate the sequence of communicative intentions of the addressee in constructing the text and thus are considered as discriminative components of generic structure. Since instances of genres differ in their prototypicality (Swales 1990: 49), some genres can gradually display systematic variation in the realization and organization of moves and rhetorical features, thus giving raise to sub-genres.
Rhetorical moves are realized by obligatory and optional components of generic structure, whose arrangement reflects the progression of the text in agreement with the communicative purpose it is intended to perform in a particular context (Hasan 1989b). Hence, in terms of composition, a genre is defined by the sequence of obligatory textual components, while the total range of obligatory and optional components and their ordering (including possible variation in their sequence and reiterative potential) form the structure potential of the genre, realized as the actual structure of a concrete text. By acknowledging the functional specialization of structural components in the build-up of the text, this approach highlights the fact that knowledge of generic structure is a matter of social experience and complements the analytical potential of rhetorical moves analysis.

The analytical approach adopted in this study conceives generic structure as “composed of sequentially arranged obligatory and optional components which perform a genre-specific set of rhetorical functions reflecting the communicative purposes the genre is expected to accomplish in a specific social and institutional context” (Dontcheva-Navratilova 2009: 18). Thus while a genre is defined by a set of primary communicative purposes realized by obligatory functionally- and rhetorically-motivated components, variation in secondary communicative purposes may lead to intra-generic variation. An awareness of the genre-specific sequence of rhetorical moves facilitates coherent interpretation of discourse.

2.3.2.3 Analysing genre-specific language choices


This investigation into the genre of opening addresses aims at providing a description of significant language means used to build up discourse coherence, complemented by an explanation of the cognitive and rhetorical reasons for genre-specific selections. Such an approach typically presupposes a quantitative and qualitative study of
selected language features carried out on a representative corpus of texts. While taking into consideration distinctive language features at all relevant levels of linguistic realization, the analysis focuses on tactical use of text-patterning to guide the listener towards an intended perception of discourse coherence, including devices intended to prevent misunderstandings or repair divergence in coherence. It also considers inherently ambiguous language means, such as the plural first person pronouns we, which can be used strategically to foster the persuasive effect of political discourse.

Since the aim of this research is to study the interdependence of the ideational, interpersonal and textual dimensions of coherence, the analysis scrutinizes features which can express meanings pertaining to different planes of discourse, such as discourse topic management, forms of address, nominal and pronominal reference, modality markers, evaluative adjectives and adverbs, which are considered distinctive of the genre of opening addresses.

2.3.3 Applying the analytical framework

The analytical framework discussed above outlines the approach and issues to be considered in the analysis of aspect of coherence in the genre of diplomatic opening addresses. The model for contextual analysis is used as a starting point of the investigation, as it describes the socio-cultural background, institutional settings and discourse-processing procedures associated with the genre, which predetermine the scope of the shared background knowledge required for discourse interpretation. By relating the communicative purposes the genre is intended to achieve to the sequence of rhetorical moves, the analysis considers the constraints which the genre imposes on the choice of content, rhetorical structure and language means; these form part of the discourse-processing experience of the members of the discourse community and thus facilitate coherent discourse interpretation.

In the present study the contribution of ideational, interpersonal and textual meanings to discourse coherence is approached primarily from the speaker’s perspective; however, the perspectives of the listeners and the audience are also taken into account. Since in political speeches, the orator is in control of the discourse and there is no explicit co-construction of meaning, he/she has to use various signals to guide the audience towards the intended coherent discourse interpretation. The markers of coherence used by Directors-General of UNESCO in speeches analysed in this research include discourse
topic management and markers of dialogicity, such as forms of address, nominal and pronominal reference, modality markers, evaluative adjectives and adverbs. While considering the role of these devices in building up coherence in the genre of opening addresses, this investigation studies the persuasive strategies used by the orators to impose their ideologically-biased points of view on listeners in an effort to persuade them to share their attitudes and beliefs.
3 THE GENRE OF OPENING ADDRESSES

This chapter introduces the genre of diplomatic opening addresses as a specimen of political discourse in international settings. After dealing with the specific features of political discourse and political speeches in general, it describes the institutional and situational context of UNESCO and outlines the contextual factors influencing the rhetorical and linguistic selections in the genre of opening addresses. Then, it describes the material under investigation, specifying the selection criteria, size and limitations of the corpus. It also presents the three speakers, three Directors-General of UNESCO, in order to outline the specificities of their terms of office and their policies, which are used in the analysis to explain differences in their rhetorical styles. The last section analyses the rhetorical structure of opening addresses, which is considered as a key element enhancing the perception of interactional coherence in this kind of discourse.

3.1 Political discourse

Politics can be defined broadly as “the total complex of relations between people living in society”, and more specifically as “the art or science of government” or “competition between competing interest groups or individuals for power and leadership” (Merriam Webster On-line Dictionary). These aspects of meaning may be seen as reflecting two main aspects of social life: the struggle for power between those who seek to impose and assert their power and those who seek to resist it, and the cooperative effort of people and institutions in society to resolve clashes of interests (Chilton 2004: 3). It is therefore not surprising that the study of political discourse reflects its multifaceted nature and covers a broad range of subject matter approached from different analytical perspectives. As Wilson (2003: 398) argues, the potentially ambiguous nature of the term ‘political discourse’ has resulted in at least two main tendencies in political discourse analysis: the analysis of political discourse which is itself political, i.e. the analysts become themselves political actors by trying to support or condemn particular ideologies (as is the case of most researchers working within critical discourse analysis, e.g. Fairclough 1995, Wodak and Chilton 2005, Van Dijk 2002, who have been criticised for not delimiting clearly their political commitments as social actors from their analytical approach to discourse, e.g. Widdowson 2004); and the analysis of political discourse as an example of
a discourse type (e.g. Wilson 1990, Ng and Bradac 1993). The present research seeks to align itself with the latter strand in the analysis of political discourse; however, any subjective interpretation of discourses dealing with issues of power, solidarity and conflict runs the risk of demonstrating a certain degree of partiality.

The study of political discourse has to account for the interdependence of socio-cultural and linguistic practices, since on the one hand, the language of politics reflects the ideologies of participants involved in the process of social interaction, while on the other, it is by the use of language that politicians construct power relations and try to manipulate others to accept their ideological representations of reality. Thus research into political discourse is bound to be a cross-disciplinary enterprise exploring the social, psychological, cultural, ideological and linguistic factors affecting the ways in which political actors convey social meanings and make rhetorical and linguistic choices in order to align themselves with the audience and to legitimate their ideological views and power status.

The ideological dimension of discourse, seen as a constitutive-of-reality social practice, is explored by critical linguistics and critical discourse analysis (e.g. Fowler 1986, 1991, Wodak 2008, Wodak and Chilton 2005). Approaching language as ideology, i.e. “as a system of categories and rules based on fundamental assumptions about the world” (Hodge and Kress 1993:5), the proponents of these strands in the study of discourse analyse how language may be used to maintain and change power relations in society related to such issues as racism, discrimination, and gender bias in the media (e.g. Hodge and Kress 1993, Fowler 1985, 1986, 1991, Fairclough 1989, 1995, Van Dijk 1993, Caldas-Coulthard and Coulthard 1996).

When discussing the role of language in political discourse, Chilton and Schäfner (1997: 211-15), as revised later in Chilton (2004: 45-46), consider three basic and interrelated ‘strategic functions’ of linguistic expressions: these are (1) coercion (claiming authority to select topics, enforce actions and control others’ use of language), (2) (de)legitimization (claiming obedience and approval of self, views and actions, through positive self-representation and negative representation of others) and (3) (mis)representation (claiming control over the representation of reality in terms of quantity and quality of information provided). These strategic functions of language may be used by the speaker to enhance his/her credibility, i.e. “the audience’s evaluation of the coherence of ‘what has been said’ and ‘what has been meant’” (Fetzer 2002: 185), and to build up an existentially coherent image of him/herself and the institution he/she represents, i.e. the
representation of his/her behaviour and attitude to people, values, facts and ideas as consistent and continuous (Duranti 2006). This allows the speaker to increase the persuasive force of his/her discourse and to guide the audience towards an intended coherent discourse interpretation which reflects the speaker’s understanding of reality and serves best his/her communicative intentions with regard to the situational, socio-cultural and pragmatic context in which the interaction takes place.

A detailed framework for the analysis of the language of legitimization from the perspective of pragmatics is suggested by Van Leeuwen (2007), who explores how specific configurations of linguistic resources can be used to legitimize political values, identities and ideologies. He considers four key categories of legitimization, namely authorization, moral evaluation, rationalization and mythopoesis, associated with specific linguistic means supporting the justification of institutional order and social practices. Legitimization by authorization, often expressed by intertextual reference and quotations, is based on reference to values and patterns of behaviour established by the force of tradition, custom or law, or to the attitudes and opinions of a person in whom some institutional authority is vested. Moral evaluation involves judgements based on a value system acknowledged by society, while rationalization relies on reference to socially established practices and on the natural order of things. Finally, mythopoesis uses narratives to present social actions as desirable and thus rewarded or undesirable and sanctioned by punishment.

Another aspect of legitimization is explored by Chilton (2004) and Cap (2007), who take a cognitive approach to the analysis of political discourse and situate political actors with respect to a particular place, time and social group, seen as a ‘deictic centre’ shared by the in-group and associated with the values of true and right. Thus the discourse world is presented as coherent from the ideological point of view of the speaker and imposes the ideologically-biased conceptualization of entities and events of the addressee in order to legitimize values, beliefs and intended actions. This is also reflected in Van Leeuwen’s (1996) framework for the representation of social actors in discourse. Within this framework, social actors are allocated different roles and positions in the discourse world by the use of different linguistic procedures, such as generalization and specification, individualization and assimilation, association and dissociation, (over)determination and indetermination, personalization and depersonalization. By categorizing the social actors from his/her point of view, the speaker legitimizes his/her
value system, actions and intentions and thus enhances the persuasive force of his/her discourse.

Exploring further some pragmatic aspects of the analysis of political language, Wilson (1990), Van Dijk (1997), Chilton (2004), and Wodak (2007) consider the role of implicature and presupposition in political talk. The potential of the English pronominal system to indicate social relations and attitudes, the evaluative force of definite descriptions and the potential of metaphors to generate implicatures reveal their crucial role in deriving a coherent text interpretation. As pragmatic choices are intentionally performed by the speaker in order to convey additional meanings and manipulate meaning in context, they should be differentiated from sociolinguistic choices, which represent a consequence of the influence of contextual factors on meaning (Wilson 1990). Following a similar train of thought, Ng and Bradac (1993) approach the use of language as a goal-directed activity which has the power to impress and influence the receiver and to depoliticize influence messages by mitigating, misleading and masking. While assuming that the linguistic choices orators perform are indicative of powerful and powerless styles of speaking, they argue that by skilful use of equivocal words and metaphors the speaker can mitigate his/her purposes and views and mislead the audience. In agreement with the critical linguistics approach, the role of masking devices, such as active/passive transformations, nominalizations etc., is related to the power of language to manipulate the audience and to construct an ideologically-biased representation of reality which approximates to the one intended by the speaker.

Political speeches are a prototypical example of political discourse. When considering the specificity of political speeches, the purpose of which is “primarily persuasion rather than information or entertainment” (Dedaić 2006: 700), it is important to bear in mind that they are marked by features of both written and spoken discourse, i.e. they are an instance of what Havránek (1983) defines as oral public discourse using a ‘complex discourse medium’ (Crystal and Davy 1969). On the one hand, the text of speeches is typically scripted in advance and at the moment of performance cannot be easily adapted to the audience’s response, i.e. similarly to written discourse, the context is “split” (Fowler 1986) and “there is no reciprocal management of the discourse” (Seidlhofer and Widdowson 1997: 209). On the other hand, the oral performance in front of an audience involves visual contact and overt interpersonal and interactive aspects, i.e. similarly to spoken discourse, for the audience the moment of delivery coincides with the
moment of perception. As a result, the orator has to anticipate the reactions of the listeners and to use various strategies involving all the planes of discourse to influence their views and opinions so as to guide them towards an intended coherent discourse interpretation. Since to derive coherence from a speech the listeners draw on their beliefs, assumptions and presuppositions to infer meanings and fill missing links, constructing discourse coherence in political speeches is predetermined to a large extent by the social identity of the interactants. Moreover, in agreement with Gough and Talbot (1996: 227), it may be argued that by constructing or failing to construct coherence interactants are further constituted as social subjects.

The interpretation of the meaning of a political speech is not confined to the immediate reaction of the audience present at the place of delivery, in front of TV screens, PC monitors, and radio-receivers (this investigation does not attend to mediated political talk, cf. e.g. Fetzer and Weizman 2006), regardless of whether the orator has achieved his/her communicative purpose, or persuasion fails. Irrespective of the distance from the moment of delivery, it is further interpreted in the context of the previous discourses of the same politician and the institution he/she represents and contrasted to the discourses of his/her opponents. This interdiscoursal dimension of coherence in political talk (the term ‘interdiscoursal’ indicates relations across different discourses; by stressing the purposefulness and contextual dimension of the phenomenon, it is akin to the meaning of ‘intertextuality’ as used by Kristeva, who draws on Bakhtin’s dialogical principal) is related to the efforts of the orator to construct a representation of the world imposing ideologies, social roles and identities of interactants, while projecting and maintaining an existentially coherent image of him/herself (and the institution he/she represents). This reflects the concern of politicians to gain credibility in front of an audience that evaluates their actions and works, and the need to address their own sense of integrity.

3.2 The genre of opening addresses in the UNESCO context

The present research explores a relatively neglected type of political discourse – diplomatic opening addresses delivered by high officials of an intergovernmental organization at international meetings and conferences, i.e. a highly conventionalized form of discourse in institutional settings. Diplomatic opening addresses are an instance of what Maingeuneau (2002: 322) calls ‘third level instituted genre’, i.e. this is a genre for which there is a ‘generic scene’ which assigns roles to actors, the medium to be used and the
discourse structure, and in which the speaker has to obey a relatively inflexible script, though occasional distortions are tolerated. As such, it is a genre which imposes considerable constraints on the interpretative potential of texts (Dontcheva-Navratilova 2007: 129) which are produced and processed in a highly conventionalized institutional context. It is therefore important to describe the specific features of the institutional context which influence the discourse under investigation.

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) was established in 1946 after the end of the Second World War as one of the first specialized agencies of the United Nations Organization. It was intended to support the joint efforts of the countries of Europe and their allies to find ways and means of reconstructing their systems of education once peace was restored. The ideology underlying the mission of UNESCO to promote a genuine culture of peace and prevent the outbreak of another world war is outlined in the Preamble to the Constitution of UNESCO, which states that ‘since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed’; it also declares that all states party to the Constitution believe ‘in full and equal opportunities for education for all, in the unrestricted pursuit of objective truth and in the free exchange of ideas and knowledge’. The main purpose of UNESCO as defined in its Constitution, which is frequently cited in various documents issued by the organization and quoted in the speeches of its officials in order to reaffirm the importance of shared common values, is:

‘to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among nations through education, science and culture in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the peoples of the world, without distinction of race, sex, language or religion, by the Charter of the United Nations’.

This clearly shows that UNESCO’s ideals, aims and goals are firmly rooted in an ideology shared by all the organizations within the United Nations system, which is committed to the establishment of peace and security, justice and human rights, promotion of economic and social progress and better standard of living. By trying to create universal agreements on emerging ethical issues, the organization promotes international cooperation via dialogue based upon mutual respect and shared values, while enhancing dissemination and sharing of information and knowledge in the fields of education, science, culture and communication.
It is therefore obvious that similarly to all public speeches delivered within the United Nations system, the opening addresses of the Directors-General of UNESCO reflect conflicts over important world issues and promote worldviews across different cultures. Since human communication is deeply affected by culture-specific rules and norms of interaction and interpretation, awareness of cultural diversity is a pre-requisite to cross-cultural communication; misunderstandings can lead to conflict and frustration, and “when the arena is international affairs, the results of cross-cultural misinterpretation can be tragic indeed” (Tannen 1985: 212). Although it can be assumed that as a result of the distribution of power relations in the international arena and the use of English as the lingua franca of the modern world (French was the lingua franca of diplomacy for three centuries, but its importance has been clearly decreasing in the last decades) diplomatic communication at the United Nations uses discourse conventions and “rhetorical standards [which] appear similar to western conventions” (Donahue and Proser 1997: 4), it has to accommodate different cultural perspectives; consequently, the multicultural nature of diplomatic discourse requires frequent explicit reference to cultural structures and background knowledge which is activated in the process of discourse understanding (Miššíková 2005: 89). It should be noted that apart from English and French the official languages of UNESCO include Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, Italian, Portuguese, Russian and Spanish.

Owing to the intercultural character of diplomatic negotiations, diplomatic language is characterized by subtle signalling, which is often loaded with hidden meanings and ambiguities, and this may lead to misinterpretations. As Cohen (2001) and Matteucci (2001) argue, much of diplomatic interaction involves arguments about words and concepts, which explains why the decoding of meanings affected by the situational and socio-cultural context is a central issue in the analysis of diplomatic discourse. When deriving coherence from a text in diplomatic interaction, its interpreters have to rely on knowledge of the discourse conventions established in the diplomatic discourse community and to use disambiguating devices if they feel that there is risk of misinterpretation.

When approaching the analysis of speeches delivered within the United Nations system, it should be taken into consideration that the interaction between the speaker and the audience is slightly different from the interaction taking place when a political speech is delivered by candidates within an election campaign, or by leading politicians on issues of national importance. In the latter case the speaker is concerned for his personal image and the image of the political party or institution he/she represents, and the audience is a
socially and politically divided but culturally relatively homogenous general public; therefore the aim of the speaker is to manipulate the audience in order to achieve immediate political goals, i.e. to make people believe in certain things, vote for him/her or the political party in the upcoming elections etc. In the former case, however, the interaction is mediated; the speaker is seen primarily as a representative of an institution (government or international governmental organization) on behalf of which he/she is acting, and the audience is composed of representatives of different governments who are defending different national interests, i.e. they are representing institutional views and actions which have to be approved by the institution they represent. Therefore, since speeches at the United Nations cannot be expected to have an immediate effect on the behaviour of institutional addressees, they are rather ritualistic and act as declarations of intent or good will which are expected to affect the opinion of the general public and thus impose pressure on the position and actions of the institutional addressees.

Drawing on the Aristotelian mapping of the domain of rhetoric, the rhetorical genre of addresses delivered at the openings of international conferences and meetings by the Director-General of UNESCO can be defined as primarily epideictic oratory for ceremonial occasions. The values of the variables purpose, place, time and audience reactions for epideictic rhetoric, as compared to those of judicial and deliberative rhetoric, are presented in a tabular form below (Kovalyova 2005: 41).

**Table 1 – Characteristics of epideictic, judicial and deliberative rhetorics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of rhetoric</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judicial</td>
<td>to attack or defend</td>
<td>court</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>decides upon the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberative</td>
<td>to urge (not) to do</td>
<td>political gathering</td>
<td>future</td>
<td>decides upon the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epideictic</td>
<td>to praise or censure</td>
<td>ceremony</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>observes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a specimen of epideictic rhetoric, opening addresses focus on the present, though they may recall past events and point to the future. They presuppose a high personal involvement associated with an evaluative treatment of people, actions and events by emphasizing praise or blame, and they may also include deliberative aspects (Donahue and Prosser 1997: 4). The ritualistic function of these addresses is to reinforce the institutional identities of the participants and to establish the ideological framework in which the event takes place. Consequently, when assigning values to social actors and events, the orator has to take into consideration the attitude of his audience and anticipate favourable or hostile
reactions, in order to use adequate persuasive strategies to build a coherent discourse world which might be shared by all participants in the communication. The analysis of the situational context of the genre of opening addresses summarized in Figure 5 aims at identifying the values of the situational variables which predetermine its rhetorical structure and explain the motivation for the linguistic selections influencing discourse interpretation.

**Figure 5 – Contextual analysis of the genre of UNESCO opening addresses**

**Situational Parameters**

1) Spatio-temporal setting
   - public discourse; at the moment of delivery of the opening address, the deictic centre is shared by all discourse participants present at a conference or meeting; when the text of the address is published, the deictic centre is not shared by the discourse participants

2) Scene
   - explicit definition of the ideological, institutional, cultural and psychological background

3) Domain – cross-cultural governmental communication
   - evaluative treatment of concepts, people, actions and events by emphasizing praise or blame
   - request to express commitment to a position or a future course of action

4) Subject area
   - education, science, culture and communication

**Discourse Participants**

1) Identity of the participants
   a. addressee: individual institutional – the Director-General
   b. addressee
      - collective institutional – executive bodies of the organization, member states, other governmental and non-governmental organizations
      - individual institutional – executives of the organization, representatives of member states

2) Presence of an unspecified audience (the general public comprising the whole world)

3) Social roles of the participants – asymmetrical relationship defined in terms of the functions the organization, the member states and their executives have in the institution; the addressee has the authority to open the event and to grant the support of the institution

4) Extent of shared knowledge
   a. high level of professional knowledge shared by the representatives of the UNESCO discourse community; low level of professional knowledge shared by the audience
   b. high level of knowledge of institutional and professional communicative conventions and discoursal expertise shared by the representatives of the UNESCO discourse community; low level of knowledge of institutional and professional communicative conventions and discoursal expertise shared by the audience
   c. shared cultural knowledge – cross-cultural communication presupposes variation in the level of shared cultural knowledge
COMMUNICATIVE PURPOSES

1) Communicative purposes
   - establishment of social relationships, including social rituals such as thanking and paying tribute
   - stressing the importance of the event from the perspective of the institutional ideology
   - evaluation of actors and their actions from the perspective of the institutional ideology
   - encouraging audience support and participation in future action
   - identification of problems and suggesting solutions

2) Speech act performed
   a. Participation - monologic speech acts
   b. Type of speech act:
      - mostly non-performatives; occasionally performatives declaring the opening of a conference or performing an expressive speech act
      - representatives and expressives; rarely declarations and directives
   c. Directness – direct and indirect speech acts

3) Attitude of the participants towards the discourse and the message – purported to be based on fact; symbolic value of the act valorized as important, desirable and prestigious

COMMUNICATIVE CONVENTIONS

1) Medium channel and type of transmission – prepared monologic discourse, intended for oral performance, which is consequently published as an official written record of the address

2) Level of interactiveness – medium

3) Simple or complex discourse type – clearly defined genre

4) Institutional/professional norms of interaction and interpretation, conventions of discourse production, processing mechanism and circumstances, based on prior experience of specimens of the genre – the norms and conventions of the UNESCO discourse community

As the values of the situational parameters suggest, there are several variables which deserve attention. Firstly, this is the extent to which the spatio-temporal setting (the time and venue of the conference or meeting) is shared by the participants. The event itself is attended by a restricted number of participants, namely, the representatives of institutions and member states directly involved in the particular field of action of UNESCO with which the conference or meeting deals. However, after the delivery, the opening address is published as a written text which is intended for all officials of the organization, member states and their representatives, other organizations and the general public. Thus, while there is deictic simultaneity (Lyons 1977: 685) at the moment of delivery, the interpretation of the written record of the speech takes place in a ‘split’ context, as is typical of written language (Fowler 1986: 87). This results on the one hand in pressure on the speaker to use different signals to guide the audience towards an intended coherent interpretation of the speech, and on the other in the necessity of building up a shared ideological background on which the general audience can draw when deriving coherence.
from the text. Defining the ideological, institutional, cultural and psychological background is essential in the genre of opening addresses, since the aim of epideictic rhetoric is to praise and criticize ideas, people and actions from the point of view of a particular ideology, i.e. the persuasive force of the rhetoric depends on the ability of the speaker to establish a shared set of values with the audience.

The analysis of contextual features related to participants is of crucial importance for an understanding of the ritual character of the interaction. Apart from the standings of the participants defined according to their professional expertise, institutional role and position, and affiliation to a certain cultural, professional, institutional and discourse community, the relationship between the participants can be affected by the intentional pragmatic choices of the interlocutors. According to Goffman (1981), depending on what he/she seeks to achieve, a speaker may fulfil more than one role within his own person; thus a speaker may take up different footings in relation to his/her own remarks, showing greater or lesser involvement with what he/she says. The roles available to a speaker are those of animator, i.e. the person who actually utters the words, author, i.e. the person who has created the text and selected the point of view and the style, and principal, i.e. the party to whose position, stand, and belief the words attest. When delivering an opening address, the Director-General of UNESCO acts as speaker for the organization he/she represents; thus the speaker-identity constructed in the discourse is an institutional identity (Van De Mieroop 2007: 1121) and the ideology the speaker tries to impose is an institutional ideology. However, as the speech unfolds, to achieve greater persuasive effect the institutional identity may interact with the professional identity of the orator and his/her personal beliefs. As to the individual and collective addressees and the general audience, this can be conceived as including specific addressees, the discourse community of the speaker, the general nations/institutional audience, and the general international audience and potential eavesdroppers (in the case of UNESCO discourse, these might be people who are not aware of the activity of the organization, or even of its existence). Obviously, there are evident differences in extent concerning their shared background knowledge and experience in discourse processing, and these may affect considerably their perception of coherence in discourse. While it may be assumed that the officials of the organization and the representatives of member states involved in the activities of UNESCO share sufficient institutional and general background knowledge and experience in discourse processing to derive similar interpretations of the text, the extent of shared knowledge and discourse
processing expertise of the general audience is considerably lower and may be further affected by knowledge gaps due to cultural differences.

Institutional interaction is typically characterized by asymmetrical relationships between the addressee and the addressee in terms of power and expertise. As the highest representative on an institution, the Director-General is vested with an authority granted by the institution itself; during the delivery of the speech, he/she is also the person who controls the interaction. However, the relationship between the participants is even more complex. International organizations of the type of the United Nations, including UNESCO as its specialized agency, are considered to be in the position of an advisory authority for their members without having the right to infringe upon their sovereignty, or as Article 1 of the Constitution of UNESCO states:

> With a view to preserving the independence, integrity and fruitful diversity of the cultures and educational systems of the States Members of the Organization, the Organization is prohibited from intervening in matters which are essentially within their domestic jurisdiction.

Thus, the commitment of member states to the ideology promoted by UNESCO and their support of its actions is voluntary and cannot be enforced. In the context of highly formal diplomatic interaction, this results in the use of deference and politeness strategies to mitigate the unequal power relations between participants. Relations between participants are also affected by the place of delivery of the speech. When the event is convened by UNESCO and takes place at its headquarters, the Director-General acts as host and most of the people present are UNESCO officials or representatives of member states involved in the activities of the organization. When the event takes place in a member state, the Director-General is in the position of guest; he is faced with the task of creating a relationship with the local community attending the event, taking into consideration that his audience includes mainly people who are not members of the UNESCO discourse community, and thus may rely on a different ideological background and/or lack sufficient knowledge of the discourse conventions of the UNESCO discourse community. In the case of speeches delivered at the United Nations headquarters, the Director-General represents an agency dependent on a larger organization, which establishes the ideological framework and sets common goals for all institutions working within the United Nations framework; therefore he is expected to declare his institutional commitment to this ideology.

As already mentioned, opening addresses have primarily a symbolic and ceremonial function and serve five basic communicative purposes, an awareness of which
is essential for an adequate interpretation of this kind of discourse.

1) First of all, they draw the attention of the audience to the importance of the event and establish a social relationship.

2) By asserting the interest and participation of UNESCO in the event, the speaker aims at enhancing the feeling of belonging to a community which shares the ideology supported by the organization. The presence of the Director-General and the ceremonial address he/she delivers symbolizes the involvement of UNESCO in the event and supports the audience’s allegiance to its aims.

3) The main function of opening addresses is to offer an evaluation of a situation, process or event of regional or international importance from the point of view of the institutional ideology.

4) When situations, processes or events may be interpreted as problems, the speech offers solutions and suggests intervention pertaining to the scope of action of the organization. In these cases, addresses have a persuasive function related to the necessity of urging the audience to support the suggested course of action.

5) An additional function of opening addresses is to encourage the audience to participate actively in the event and to persevere in their efforts to contribute to the realization of common goals.

These communicative purposes are reflected in the generic structure of opening addresses and to a large extent predetermine the sequence of rhetorical moves associated with the genre.

### 3.3 Generic structure and rhetorical moves of opening addresses

In agreement with Swales (1990), the structure of opening addresses delivered by the Directors-General of UNESCO can be conceptualized as comprising three obligatory structural components – a beginning, body and end, which perform specific communicative and rhetorical functions, and which are:

1) Salutation - the opening part of an address defined as “the section of a speech by which the speaker gives acknowledgement to his or her host and to the audience” (Donahue and Proser 1997: 66). Since the salutation part of a speech typically provides an expression of gratitude for services rendered, appreciation of achievement and recognition of personal or professional association, it is marked by a high degree of formality and politeness.
2) Argumentation – the main part of the speech dealing with the issue under consideration, the internal structure of which depends on the topic and the position taken by the speaker. It can usually be subdivided into:
   a. introduction
   b. description of situation/problem
   c. evaluation
Thus the internal structure of the argumentation component may be related to Bolivar’s (2001) triad and to Hoey’s (2001) SPRE (situation-problem-solution-evaluation) model, which are discussed in sub-section 2.2.2.3 of the present volume. It should be mentioned, however, that in longer speeches this structure may be repeated and may include inserted narratives.

3) Closure – the ending of an address, which serves as a conclusion of the argumentation part of the speech and has a function similar to that of a coda in a narrative, i.e. the drawing of concluding remarks evaluating the value of the issue or event under consideration. From an interactional point of view, it marks the end of the contribution of the current speaker.

The arrangement of the elements of the generic structure is rather fixed; however, as the analysis of opening addresses will show, in some exceptional cases there may be some variation in the sequence of structural components.

The rhetorical structure of the genre reflects the communicative purposes that the discourse intends to achieve. Since the focus of this research is on aspects of coherence, the rhetorical structure of opening addresses suggested below is restricted to typical moves and sub-moves available in the genre, without accounting for intra-generic variation. It should be mentioned that the first and last rhetorical moves are strictly defined and invariably performed by the same structural components; therefore the terms used to identify rhetorical moves and structural components coincide, and these are:

1) Salutation – the opening section in which the speaker creates common ground with the audience by giving acknowledgements to his/her hosts and to the audience, such as gratitude for services received, or recognition of personal and/or professional association. It is frequently not related to the topic of the speech proper, and may be realized by two sub-moves:
   a) direct address to the audience, including congratulations to the current president of the proceedings, or a similar officer and, occasionally other members of the
audience

b) thanking the officials addressed for their support for the issue, event or activity central to the occasion and for their allegiance to UNESCO. This may often include personal involvement of the speaker with the person to whom he/she refers

2) Asserting centrality of the issue, event or programme to the UNESCO ideology and action plan. The related sub-moves are:
   a) claiming centrality of the issue, relating it to the programme and activities of UNESCO
   b) if another organization/member-state is involved, the speaker stresses the importance of cooperation between this institution and UNESCO, thus reinforcing common ground

3) Introducing the situation, comprising:
   a) evaluation of regional and world issues relevant to the event from the point of view of the UNESCO ideology
   b) evaluative description of facts relevant to the situation and related previous actions of UNESCO

4) Indicating a problem, which usually is performed in two steps:
   a) problem description, highlighting urgency
   b) problem evaluation, assuming that the audience shares the speaker’s assessment

5) Suggesting a solution to the problem. The two sub-moves available are:
   a) suggesting interventional measures
   b) motivating the necessity of the intervention and the necessity of urgent common action to achieve joint goals

6) Evaluating the contribution of the event or suggested action plan from the point of view of UNESCO and the regional or international community

7) Closure, which typically includes:
   a) wishing the event success
   b) thanking the audience for its attention

It is obvious that moves 3 – 6 draw on the SPRE (situation-problem-response-evaluation) model suggested by Hoey (1983, 2001), which has been proved to be applicable in the analysis of rhetorical relations above clause level in different discourse types (cf. Edge and Wharton 2001, Flowerdew 2008). It should be mentioned that these
moves are full-fledged in addresses which have a deliberative aspect.

Since within the analytical framework adopted in the present research knowledge of generic structure is considered to be a matter of social experience and a part of the background knowledge shared by a discourse community, an awareness of the structure of rhetorical moves associated with the genre of opening addresses is regarded as an important factor in coherent discourse interpretation. By outlining the rhetorical development of the text, it contributes to the perception of discourse coherence on the interpersonal, ideational and textual planes of discourse, as it helps the management of speaker’s and receiver/audience’s expectations concerning the development of the interaction, the identification of text boundaries and the perception of coherent change of discourse topic.

3.4 Material under investigation

The material under investigation comprises speeches delivered at the openings of international conferences and meetings by three diplomats from different cultural backgrounds in their capacity as Director-General of UNESCO, namely Amadou-Mahtar M’Bow (Senegal, term of office: 1974-1987), Federico Mayor Zaragoza (Spain, term of office: 1987-1999), Koïchiro Matsuura (Japan, Director-General of UNESCO since 1999). The speeches deliberate on similar topics, most of which reflect the main concerns of UNESCO, e.g. education, cultural heritage, science, and have a similar place of delivery, i.e. at least five of the speeches are made at conferences and meetings held outside UNESCO headquarters and at least one is given in front of a session of the United Nations General Assembly. All the addresses selected for the analysis were made during the second term of office of a Director-General, i.e. it can be assumed that the speakers have become experienced functionaries of the organization with extensive expertise in their work and have established political and managerial views and a well-formed speaking style; furthermore, they are not under the pressure of a re-election campaign.

The corpus consists of thirty opening addresses and its total size is approx. 50,000 words. Since an additional aim of this research is to address differences in the persuasion strategies used by the orators and idiosyncratic variation in the choice of coherence markers and related discourse strategies, the corpus is subdivided into three sub-corpora, each including ten speeches given by one of the Directors-General; the sizes of the sub-corpora are: M’Bow – approx. 16,800 words, Mayor – approx. 19,000 words and Matsuura
approx. 14,500 words. (A list of the speeches, including the places and dates of delivery and the numbers of the documents under which they are available on the web-site of UNESCO are included as Appendix at the end of this volume. The Appendix also provides samples of openings addresses, one by each speaker.) Since none of these politicians is a native speaker of English, a considerable number of their speeches were made in other official languages of UNESCO, or were multilingual; however, as the aim of this study is to investigate linguistic choices in the English language, only speeches the English version of which is the original have been included in the corpus. It should be noted that although it seems highly probable that some preparatory work on the speeches was done by teams of advisers and that the final version was proof-read, the Directors-General are the acknowledged authors of the addresses, both in terms of content and rhetorical style. An obvious limitation of the corpus is that the speeches are available only as printed documents and typically there are no video or audio recordings to allow the analyst to discuss the manner of delivery and the reaction of the audience. Nevertheless, since the delivery of opening addresses is highly ritualistic, and in addition, this is the main form under which the speeches become accessible to the general public, it is assumed that the written records yield enough grounds for analysis and interpretation of the dimensions of coherence in diplomatic discourse.

In order to understand the ideological perspective of the orators when constructing coherence in their speeches and their expectations in terms of the reactions of their audiences, it is necessary to introduce briefly their background, policies and visions and the institutional and global context of their respective terms of office. Obviously, these differences will also be used to explain differences in their rhetorical styles and the persuasive strategies they use to achieve their communicative purposes. Amadou Mahtar M’Bow, a former minister of education and culture in the first indigenous Senegalese government, was the first Black African to head a United Nations system organization. He was a strong supporter of the ideologically-loaded disarmament process and the causes of developing countries, which he saw as opposed to the interests of developed industrial nations. While M’Bow managed to integrate actively numerous developing countries in the activities of UNESCO, his political commitments and generous administrative and budgetary practices triggered strong criticism, especially from the Reagan administration, which led to several nations leaving the organization (e.g. the USA, the UK, Singapore). M’Bow’s successor, Federico Mayor Zaragosa, a professor of biochemistry, a writer, and
also a former minister of education and deputy in the European Parliament, took over the leadership of UNESCO with the aim of reunifying the organization. He managed to achieve this on the ideological plane by enhancing the idea of peaceful coexistence, human rights and international cooperation embodied in his Culture of Peace Programme; this was in harmony with changes in the international political climate after the fall of the Iron Curtain. Koïchiro Matsuura, whose education in the fields of law and economics explains his strong managerial predispositions, was elected to the post after a successful career with the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs. During his two terms of office, he completed the transformation of the organization by carrying out a large-scale administrative and financial reform in conformity with the global appeal to cut expenditure in international bureaucracies. It should be noted that speeches given by Irina Bokova (Bulgaria, term of office: 2009-present), the last politician to hold the office of Director-General of UNESCO, are not included in the corpus for, firstly, she became Director-General after most of the research was completed, and secondly and more importantly, because she is still at the beginning of her first term of office and therefore her speeches do not qualify according to some of the criteria for selection stated above.

Since coherence is a quality of discourse which is derived in the process of subjective interpretation of the meaning potential of a text in context, the main approach adopted in this study is that of a top-down qualitative analysis, taking into consideration contextual factors and pragmatic functions of selected language features. However, drawing on the view that quantification “should be treated as a starting point of investigation” (Hunston 2007: 46), quantitative analysis is also used to highlight some general tendencies, especially in the occurrence of personal pronoun and modal verbs, and to motivate the selection of representative sections of speeches for qualitative analysis. The quantitative analysis of opening addresses is carried out manually, using the MicroConcord and Antconc concordancers.

Before proceeding to the analysis it remains to be mentioned that all the texts of the speeches under analysis are available on the official website of UNESCO (http://www.unesco.org/new/en/unesco/), where they can be accessed by choosing first the ‘About us’ option, then ‘Director-General’, then ‘The Directors-General’ under the ‘Organization’ options, and finally by using the search engine to indicate the speaker and the abbreviation of the specific document (e.g. DG/2006/092).
4 ASPECTS OF COHERENCE IN OPENING ADDRESSES

This chapter is concerned with a detailed analysis of aspects of coherence in opening addresses, focusing on the interplay of ideational, interpersonal and textual meanings in building up discourse coherence. It opens by explaining the interconnection between coherence and persuasion, and proceeds to a discussion of strategic devices used by the orators for the management of discourse topic, which are considered in relation to the rhetorical structure of the genre seen as a key aspect of interactional coherence in this type of discourse. The third section analyses the role of reference and related cohesive chains in constructing a continuous representation of social actors and events evaluated and categorized from the points of view of the speaker and the institutional ideology he represents (since all Directors-General whose speeches are included in this research are men, in what follows they will be referred to by the pronoun he). The last section considers the role of modality in expressing a continuous point of view, by which the orators try to impose on the listeners an intended discourse interpretation which suits their communicative purposes. In addition, the analysis attempts to highlight some differences in the rhetorical styles of the three Directors-General and relates them to contextual factors affecting this specific kind of institutional interaction.

4.1 Coherence and persuasion: understanding and believing

Constructing coherence in political discourse is closely related to persuasion associated with making others accept the speaker’s point of view. The discussion of the interconnection between coherence and persuasion in this study is based on the assumption that when communicating, the interactants are striving to achieve two goals: to be understood, and to make their audience think or act according to what is to be understood; obviously, the audience may comprehend the message without accepting and believing it (Sperber et al. 2010). This approach to discourse processing is related to the concepts of epistemic trust and vigilance introduced by Sperber et al. (2010) to account for the way in which information is processed in human communication. The assessment of the trustworthiness of what is communicated is thus assumed to be carried out on the basis of two types of epistemic vigilance process:

a) assessment of the reliability of the speaker (source of information)
b) assessment of the reliability of the content conveyed

It follows that the speaker is expected to represent himself as a reliable source of information by constructing an existentially coherent image of himself and by establishing his relationship with the audience and his ideological position in discourse as continuous. According to Sperber et al. (2010), the main factors affecting the trustworthiness of a source are competence, i.e. the possession of reliable information, and benevolence, i.e. the intent to share this information with the audience. An additional factor affecting the reliability of the source is attractiveness, which in political discourse is associated with the reputation of the politician and of the institution he represents.

Content reliability is to a large extent dependent on discourse coherence on the ideational plane in terms of assessment of the consistency of new information with background knowledge and previously processed information. By building up a well-constructed argumentation the speaker strives to persuade the audience to believe his interpretation of the information conveyed. It is thus reasonable to claim that coherent shifts of topic and the use of explicit markers of logical relations enhance the persuasive force of a speech by helping the listener follow the speaker’s argumentation.

The following analysis of aspects of coherence in opening addresses is based on the assumption that when delivering their speeches the orators try to achieve their communicative goals, and if necessary get past the epistemic vigilance of the audience, by enhancing speaker credibility through the establishment of a dialogic framework for the negotiation of a coherent presentation of identities, social roles, shared value systems and relationships with the audience, and by constructing a coherent logical argumentation for supporting their claims and suggestions for future actions. However, the audience may understand the message without necessarily believing in the ideological viewpoint suggested by the speaker.

4.2 Management of discourse topic and rhetorical structure

Since discourse coherence is regarded here as a collaborative achievement on the part of the participants in an interaction, who use their experience of the world and discourse processing when (re-)constructing meanings encoded in texts, the analysis of strategies for the management of discourse topic are considered in close association with the rhetorical structure of the genre, which in agreement with Lautamatti (1982) is seen as
a key element of interactional coherence. Drawing on Gernsbacher (1997), it is assumed that the construction of a coherent mental representation in discourse processing involves the interpretation of explicit (cohesion) and implicit (inferences) cues by interactants, who draw on their experience of the world and in discourse processing to check whether incoming information coheres with previously processed information. In order to guide the receivers towards an intended understanding of the discourse, the speaker/writer engages in what Donahue and Prosser (1997: 36) (drawing on Charniak 1979 and Minsky 1975, as quoted in Brown and Yule 1983) call framing, i.e. the use of cues guiding the listener/reader through the content and its arrangement in discourse, thus facilitating the mapping of incoming information onto background knowledge and previously processed information in discourse. In their analysis of diplomatic discourse, Donahue and Prosser (1997: 36) consider two kinds of frames: the outer frames (the term is attributed to Swales 1990) consist of topic indicators, participant alignments (the standings of the participants and footing of the speaker), content summation and final closure (typically including a tie back to the opening or earlier content of the speech); the inner frames direct the receivers to an understanding of purpose, content and organization, using metadiscourse markers giving an overview of the content via signposts of beginning, topic transition or summary, and marking explicitly logical relations. Since this approach is regarded as a useful framework for highlighting the interdependence of meanings at ideational and interpersonal level in deriving coherence from a text, it serves as a basis for the following discussion of the management of discourse topic and rhetorical structure in opening addresses delivered by Directors-General of UNESCO.

4.2.1 Introducing the discourse topic and establishing interpersonal relations

The crucial role of the aboutness criterion for the perception of coherence is pointed out by numerous researchers (e.g. Giora 1985, Van Dijk and Kintsch 1983), who argue that topical coherence is established on the basis of the relevance of propositions in discourse to a macro-level discourse topic or hyper-theme/Global theme (Daneš 1995). As Giora (1997) points out, discourse comprehension is facilitated by stating the topic in initial position, for instance in the form of a title or heading introducing the text. In the genre of opening addresses the discourse topic is contextually given by the topic of the conference or meeting to which the speech is addressed; thus, the participants in the event can anticipate it and activate the mental models necessary for adequate discourse processing.
Nevertheless, the Directors-General typically refer explicitly to the occasion and its topic in the very first sentence of the salutation part of their speeches, thus establishing the conference or meeting and the issue it deals with as the discourse topic (Global theme) of the opening address (1a, b, c). The use of the demonstrative *this* (1a, b), associated with introducing of a new topic in discourse, marks proximity and thus indicates involvement, attention and in-group solidarity.

(1a) *It is my honour and pleasure to welcome you to UNESCO for this international conference on Freedom of Expression and Media Development in Iraq.* (Matsuura, DG/2007/)

(1b) *I am very pleased to be with you at the opening of this symposium “Science and Culture: A Common Path for the Future”, which UNESCO is organizing in partnership with the UNU and the Japanese National Commission for UNESCO.* (Mayor, DG/95/43)

(1c) *It is with the greatest joy, Mr. President of the Republic, that I welcome you this evening to the Headquarters of UNESCO on the occasion of the Third International Forum on the Environment organized by the French Ministry of the Environment and the Quality of Life.* (M’Bow, DG/80/36)

The formulaic opening of the speeches by sequences marking subjectivity and allowing for minimal variation (*It is my honour and pleasure to welcome you…, I am pleased to be with you …, It is with the greatest joy that I welcome you …*) may be regarded as a marker of the beginning of a coherent discourse fragment (Brown and Yule 1983: 67). Similarly to the fairy-tale opening sequence *once upon a time*, these formulaic phrases set the frame of the ritual performance of the opening address, which is easily recognized and processed by the listeners. The explicit indication of shared spatio-temporal setting, positioning the audience in the deictic centre of the speaker, sets coherent spatial and temporal frames for the discourse.

While indicating explicitly the macro-level discourse topic, the salutation part of opening addresses has primarily an interpersonal function related to the opening of the channel of communication and the alignment of the speaker with the audience, and it is not directly relevant to the development of the discourse topic. The communicative purpose of the salutation may be seen as threefold: (1) to claim the authority to interpret the topic, to suggest actions and to position the self and others in specific relationships (Chilton and Schäfner’s (1997) and Chilton’s (2004) coercion), (2) to establish the speaker’s competence, which is to a large extent guaranteed by the authority vested in him as a Director-General of UNESCO, and (3) to create common ground, i.e. it is associated with the ethos mode of persuasion dealing with the construal of speaker credibility, existential
coherence and the establishing of group identity. Thus the speaker endeavours to lay the foundation for the legitimization of the political values, identities and ideologies of the institution he represents, which should allow him not only to make the audience understand his message, but also to persuade them to believe it.

This analysis of opening addresses draws on Trosborg’s (2000) approach to the study of interpersonal meanings, which takes into consideration the communicative functions (Jacobson 1990) language performs to transmit meanings associated with the rhetorical moves of the genre under investigation. Such an approach allows the analyst to consider genre-specific form-function correlations; however, since language forms may perform different functions on different occasions or more than one function simultaneously, the full interpretation potential of a text can be revealed only when taking into consideration the particular situational and socio-cultural context in which the interaction takes place. From an interactional point of view, the phatic function is the most important in spoken language (Urbanová 2008: 46), as it is related to the establishment of interpersonal relations by attracting the attention of the audience, ensuring that the channel of communication is open and creating an atmosphere of sharing and togetherness. Typical language devices realizing this function are cliché phrases used in social rituals, greetings, polite formulae, address terms, and the inherently polite speech acts of thanking and apologizing (Brown and Levinson 1987). While trying to persuade, convince, deter or mislead the audience into sharing a particular opinion or undertaking a particular action, the speaker may use direct appeal to the audience with the aim of having a specific effect on or influencing their opinions or behaviour, i.e. meanings expressed by the conative function. The main devices associated with this type of interpersonal meanings are vocatives, questions and direct and indirect commands. The inherently subjective emotions and attitudes of the speaker to the state of affairs at issue are conveyed by the expressive use of language, expressed by lexical items with connotative meaning, personal intrusions on the part of the speaker by means of self-reference personal pronouns, verbs of thinking and emotions, and the speech acts of apologizing, congratulating, wishing and thanking (Searle 1991). Subjectivity may also be expressed in utterances which perform primarily a representative function; by categorizing events, social actors and their actions which make up part of their representation of the world, the speakers evaluate the state of affairs from the point of view of their ideology as fair or unfair, desirable or undesirable etc. Such statements contribute to the persuasive effect of discourse and may be referred to as
verdictives (Austin 1962: 150, Trosborg 2000: 124). It should be stressed that it is the interplay of all these aspects of meaning that affects a coherent interpretation of the discourse by the participants in the communicative event; in addition, it is not always possible to distinguish these functions clearly, since individual stretches of discourse may convey several communicative intentions.

Returning to the discussion of interpersonal aspects of the salutation part of opening addresses, it is appropriate to begin with an analysis of the vocative address forms which open the channel of communication by appealing directly to the audience present at the venue of the conference or meeting and indicate the alignment of the speaker with the listeners. While most studies on forms of address, especially in the study of political speaking from the perspective of pragmatics (e.g. Wilson 1990, Ng and Bradac 1993, Jaworski and Galasiński 2000), focus on pronominal forms of address, Dickey (1997: 255) considers the study of nominal address forms as particularly important in English, because from the point of view of explicit indication of participants’ relations, they are “the only type of address available for study in languages like English which lack (or at least in most dialects) a distinction in address pronouns”. The main function of vocative address forms is to indicate the relative positions of participants in regard to one another, in regard to the social group(s) they belong to, and within the framework of a concrete communicative event; thus they contribute to the (re-)construction and negotiation of identities and social roles and the definition of participants’ interpersonal and institutional relationships (Bull and Fetzer 2006: 3). Although in diplomatic discourse most of the linguistic choices made by participants are categorical, i.e. the use of address forms is dictated by sociolinguistic norms, the present research intends to prove that “power is a significant determinant of strategic choice (or lack of choice)” (Harris 1995: 133) and that the choice of vocative address forms in opening addresses is connected to discourse strategies aimed at structuring the audience, modulating power relations and achieving existential coherence.

Since the use of forms of address and the negotiation of power relations, especially in political and diplomatic discourse, are typically associated with linguistic politeness and polite behaviour, before continuing this discussion it is necessary to explain the understanding of these concepts adopted in the present study. My understanding of politeness draws on Goffman’s (1967) and Watt’s (2003) concept of face, defined as “the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself by the line others assume he has taken during a particular contact” (Goffman 1967: 5), which is affected by approved
culture-dependent social attributes. This approach regards face as a dynamic context-dependent construct coming into being in the process of cooperative interaction between the participants in communication (based on Grice’s 1976 cooperative principle), which is dependent on a conscious implementation of behavioural and language strategies for the achieving of smooth interaction with the interlocutor(s) (e.g. Ide 1989, Thomas 1995, Wilamová 2006). In agreement with Watts (2003), a difference is drawn between politic and (im)polite behaviour. While politic behaviour is defined as “that behaviour, linguistic and non-linguistic, which the participants construct as being appropriate to the ongoing social interaction” (Watts 2003: 21), politeness refers to “salient linguistic behaviour beyond the structures of facework and politic behaviour” (Watts 2003: 141), where facework refers to the efforts of the interactants to preserve their own face and the face of others. It is obvious that this approach differs from Brown and Levinson’s (1987: 61) concept of politeness as interaction based on a mutual vulnerability of face associated with pre-established positive and negative face values, the former related to being appreciated by others and the later to being granted freedom from imposition. Nevertheless, since the focus of this study is not on politeness as such, the following analysis will refer to the positive and negative politeness strategies suggested by Brown and Levinson (1987), while acknowledging that their use may be required by the social context and not reflect a conscious choice made by the interactants.

Diplomatic discourse is characterized primarily by what Urbanová and Oakland (2002: 43) term ‘formal politeness’, i.e. politic linguistic behaviour predetermined by social norms and associated with distancing, complex grammatical structures and context-dependent implicature. However, the choice of whether or not to observe the norm is a pragmatic and stylistic choice made by the speaker in order to achieve his communicative goals. Moreover, since politeness is relative to context or situation, “polite language may be seen as deferential and indicative of low status in some situations but as effective and indicative of high status in others” (Ng and Bradac 1993: 37). In the context of diplomatic interaction, the co-occurrence of polite or politic language with a speaker’s use of a valued variety of language reinforces the impression of gentility, diplomacy and convergence, and fosters the perception of high communicator solidarity and persuasiveness of the discourse.

In opening addresses, contextually-sensitive vocative address forms reflect interpersonal relations in terms of power and solidarity and can be used to manipulate the stances which people adopt in relation to one another. Vocative address forms in
diplomatic speeches are strictly prescribed and reflect the position and institutional role of the social actor; they typically express determinate meaning and are used to signal deference, thus indicating the formality and respect towards the interlocutor required by the context. Deference address forms in English include titles (Doctor, Professor etc.) and honorifics (e.g. Madam, Sir), which indicate the relative status of the participants. The following nominal forms occur in the speeches under investigation (the list below includes nominal forms used both as forms of address and as reference to third persons in the salutation part of the speeches):

**Type of nominal reference**

**Determinate**
- Mr/Mrs + personal name (+ disambiguating devices)
- Mr/Mrs + title (+ disambiguating devices)
- Title (+ personal name)

**Rather indeterminate**
- Honourable + members of parliament, ministers
- Distinguished + Ambassadors, ministers, participants, guests, members of the Diplomatic Corps
- Excellencies
- Colleagues
- Professors

**Indeterminate**
- Ladies and Gentlemen

Although in diplomatic discourse the societal rules of address are firmly established, the fact that the participants in diplomatic communication are aware of the range of unmarked and marked linguistic forms available enables them to make pragmatic choices. Thus the choice of an unmarked form in a particular context indicates a desire to preserve the expected interpersonal relations, while the choice of marked forms signals an attempt to change these relations.

The salutation in the speech delivered by Mayor at the *Third International Symposium of the World Heritage Cities* in Bergen (Norway) provides an example of forms of address used to give deference and to define relationships with the audience (2). After addressing the institutional representatives involved in UNESCO’s *World Heritage Conventions* programme by honorific and title, namely the Chairman of the Conference, the Minister of the Environment of the host country, the President of the *Organization of World Heritage Cities* and the Mayors of *World Heritage Cities*, thus claiming a common commitment to an institutional ideology, the Director-General uses the marked form
friends to show personal involvement by expressively qualifying their relationship as that of in-group members.

(2) Mr Chairman,  
Mr Minister of the Environment,  
Mr President of the Organization of World Heritage Cities,  
Distinguished Mayors of World Heritage Cities,  
Friends,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

Two years ago I had the pleasure of being present in Fez at the official launching of the Organization of World Heritage Cities (OWHC). I am delighted to be with you again today in another beautiful city, whose living past is preserved in the site of Bryggen, protected under UNESCO’s World Heritage Convention. (Mayor, DG/95/28)

While introducing the discourse topic, i.e. activities of the Organization of World Heritage Cities, the opening paragraph of the salutation contributes to the existential coherence of the speaker by showing his long-lasting involvement with the organization, highlighted by temporal indicators, e.g. two years ago and again today, and by an implied link based on knowledge shared by the members of the UNESCO discourse community that Bergen, thanks to its historical part Bryggen, is like Fez on the list of World Heritage Cities. Drawing on Firbas’s (1992) approach to theme-rheme articulation, the initial paragraph can be interpreted as displaying a pattern typical of salutations of thematic progression with continuous theme, which positions the speaker, indicated by the first-person pronoun I, as a point of departure of the message which is oriented towards a rhematic discourse topic exponent, e.g. at the official launching of the Organization of World Heritage Cities (OWHC). The expressive vocabulary items delighted and beautiful enhance the involvement of the speaker and indicate shared values and strong positive evaluation of the activities in which the participants are involved.

Another example of the use of vocative address forms for categorizing and structuring the audience is provided by Matsuura’s address delivered at UN headquarters (3). In this opening address respect is shown by the choice of individuals mentioned and by the labels selected for identifying relationships with groups within the audience. Individuals are indicated by honorific or title and surname, i.e. the unmarked forms for this context, and when necessary further information is provided to specify the social role of the person (e.g. Dr Arima, representative of the Government of Japan for DESP Affairs). The order of listing is by social and institutional rank: Mrs Anan, as a woman and wife of the Secretary-General of the UN, the highest-ranking official of the super-ordinate organization, is mentioned first, followed by an official representative of a member
country, a deputy executive of an affiliated organization (UNICEF) and an individual who, as the following text reveals, is also taking part in the event as a speaker. The groups paid respect to are the members of the Diplomatic Corps, as official representatives of their governments, people working within the UN system, and guests present at the ceremony. The groups are referred to by formulaic address forms; however, the choice of the label colleagues may be interpreted as claiming in-group membership, highlighting the belonging of UNESCO to the United Nations system and ideology. Thus the use of vocative forms of address may be regarded as not only reflecting social status; they may also be exploited strategically for (re)constructing social relations.

(3) Mrs Anan,  
Dr Arima, representative of the Government of Japan for DESD Affairs,  
Mrs Rima Salah, Deputy Executive Director of UNICEF,  
Professor Rockefeller,  
Distinguished Members of the Diplomatic Corps,  
Colleagues from the UN system,  
Distinguished guests,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,  

It is a great pleasure and honour for me to address you on the occasion of the launch of the United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (DESD), 2005-2014. Let me first say how delighted I am to be joined at this event by Mrs Nane Annan, wife of the UN Secretary-General; I know this is a subject she cares about deeply and I very much appreciate her interest and support.  

I am very pleased to see that all four members of the High-Level Panel that I convened to advise UNESCO on the Decade are with us here today: President Konaré, who heads the Commission of the African Union; Mr Carl Lindberg of Sweden; Dr Arima, who is representing the Japanese Government, which sponsored the UN General Assembly resolution establishing the Decade; and Professor Steven Rockefeller, who kindly moderated the Expert Panel held earlier this afternoon. Dr Arima and Professor Rockefeller will also speak at this launching ceremony, as will Mrs Rima Salah, who represents our sister agency UNICEF. (Matsuura, DG/2005/036)

The text of the salutation which follows the forms of address provides further details on the alignment of the speaker with the audience, constructing coherent interpersonal relations by the use of personal pronouns and other indexical expressions which, on the one hand, are sensitive to the social context and reflect interpersonal relations in terms of power and solidarity, and on the other, may be exploited to (re-)construct such relations via language. The continuity of referents is enhanced by the cohesive relations holding between the personal pronouns and nominal reference tokens, including shell-nouns referring to the participants and the event itself. For instance, the Director-General pays tribute to the involvement of Mrs Anan, with the Decade on Education for Sustainable Development, while reintroducing the discourse topic by the
shell-nouns *event* and *subject* highlighted by the proximal marker *this*. In so doing, he shows strong personal involvement, indicated by the use of the personal pronoun *I* supported by mental-process verbs (*know, appreciate*) and adjectives and adverbs expressing emphasis and intensification (*how delighted I am, I know and I very much appreciate*); furthermore, he claims common attitudes and goals and shows strong interest in and approval of the beliefs and actions of Mrs Anan, thus claiming common ground with Mrs Anan and the audience as a whole.

In the second move of the salutation, which conveys both phatic and expressive meanings, the Directors-General show personal involvement and pay credit to officials, thanking them for their allegiance to the ideas and aims of UNESCO. Apart from the continuity of the spatio-temporal setting (the here-and-now of the event), a coherent transition between the sub-moves is assured by a pattern of thematic progression with continuous theme (the speaker indicated by the personal pronoun *I*), which in example (3) is established after the extraposed subject structure used in the initial sentence of the first sub-move, and extended into the second sub-move. Thus the second paragraph of the salutation reintroduces in the rhematic part of the sentence the individuals referred to by vocative address forms in the same order; by indicating their institutional affiliation and commitment to the *Decade on Education for Sustainable Development* or participation in the event (Professor Steven Rockefeller, Dr Arima and Professor Rockefeller are presented as speakers/moderators) this part of the salutation is coherently related to the discourse topic.

The explicit attribution of views and opinions to the speaker presents him as an active discourse participant, competent and willing to share his knowledge and ideas with the audience, thus making the speech more interactive and contributing to greater speaker visibility (Gosden 1993: 62-67). This is typically associated with the discourse strategy of self-disclosure involving the frequent use of first-person structures (Donahue and Prosser 1997: 74), which contributes to the credibility and existential coherence of the speaker by making explicit his attitude to people, facts and ideas, thus allowing him to represent these as continuous. Although a detailed analysis of the use of pronominal reference in relation to footing and coherent representation of social actors will be provided in the following section (4.3), it is necessary to mention here that the use of the first-person pronoun in direct appeal to the addressee referred to by the second-person pronoun (*1a,b,c; 2,3*) is intended to open the dialogic framework and create common ground, thus indicating the
inclusion of the addressees in the deictic centre of the speaker and assuming shared knowledge and ideology, which are indispensable for the negotiating of a shared coherent interpretation of the discourse. Taken from an address delivered by Mayor to the 58th session of the International Narcotics Control Board in Vienna (Austria), example (4) shows how the strong personal presence of the speaker combined with direct appeal to the audience (indicated by the pronominal forms you/your), showing deference towards the interlocutor (expressed by the use of title and honorifics and the act of thanking) and claiming common ground in a shared deictic centre (the session), gradually lead to the definition of commitments of social actors by the statement of an intention to undertake joint action against a common threat, thus transforming ‘I and you’ into ‘us’ against ‘them’. The discourse topic is introduced in the first sentence (the 58th session of the International Narcotics Control Board on the issues of drug abuse and control), and one of its exponents (drug abuse and drug trafficking) is reiterated at the end of the salutation, where it is qualified as a threat. Approval of the beliefs and actions of others is enhanced by politeness formulae containing strongly positive affective adjectives (honoured in this example; other adjectives marking subjectivity used in the corpus are, e.g. delighted, dedicated, happy, inspiring) which evaluate speaker-audience relations.

(4) I am very honoured by your invitation to address this 58th session of the International Narcotics Control Board and to discuss with you global issues of drug abuse and control and UNESCO’s aim of reducing the demand for drugs through a preventive education programme. To Professor Hamid Ghodse, President of INCB, I offer my personal thanks for inviting me to speak, and I should like to thank you all for being here around this table. I hope to spend this morning with you finding ways and means of tackling what I consider to be one of the most serious global threats to society, to health and to the economy - the threat of drug abuse and drug trafficking. (Mayor, DG/95/19)

As the analysis in section 4.3 will show, the continuity of the represented identities, roles and commitments of the social actors established in the salutation and their consistent evaluative treatment throughout the speech contribute to the perception of discourse coherence.

Addresses delivered at UNESCO headquarters differ slightly from those delivered at conferences held in different member states in the way the speaker creates common ground with his audience, since he is acting as a host welcoming conference participants. As example (5) taken from Matsuura’s address to the international conference on Freedom of Expression and Media Development in Iraq suggests, the location of the deictic centre at UNESCO headquarters allows the Director-General to assume shared values and common
goals supported by the readiness of the conference participants to attend the event. This is also indicated by the use of the plural first-person pronoun we, which has slightly ambiguous reference allowing it to be interpreted as referring to UNESCO and/or all present at the event, and by highlighting commitments of the participants which might not be directly relevant to the event, but show adherence to UNESCO’s programmes, such as the former minister of culture’s support for the protection of Iraqi cultural heritage. Special attention is paid to the members of the Iraqi Parliament and the Iraqi media and to their active participation in the organization of the conference, since the meeting addresses the ‘difficult context’ in which they have to promote values central to the UNESCO ideology, i.e. freedom of expression and the protection of human rights.

(5) It is my honour and pleasure to welcome you to UNESCO for this international conference on Freedom of Expression and Media Development in Iraq. Let me begin by extending a special welcome to our distinguished guests from Iraq. Many of you have arrived in Paris just this morning. I do hope that you have found some time to rest. The efforts you have made to be here are deeply appreciated. We are greatly privileged to have the presence of several members of the Iraqi parliament, including the Chair of the Media and Cultural Committee, and former Minister of Culture, Mr Mufid Jazairi. I have already had the pleasure to meet Mr Jazairi on several occasions, within the context of UNESCO’s work to help protect and rehabilitate the cultural heritage of Iraq.

I also wish to express my very warm welcome and thanks to the Iraqi Communication and Media Commission and in particular to its Chief Executive Officer, Dr Siyamend Othman, who have been instrumental in organizing this event. This young Commission has the heavy task of guiding the development of the media in a very difficult context. [...] I am particularly delighted to see so many representatives of the Iraqi media. Your professionalism and courage constitute a decisive contribution to the defence of basic rights and freedoms in Iraq. (Matsuura, DG/2007/001)

While establishing his institutional identity as a high representative of the hosting organization and building his relationship with the audience, Matsuura also takes a more personal stance, showing concern for those who have just arrived and might not have had enough time to rest. However, by suggesting that the conference participants may be ready to sacrifice their personal comfort to contribute to the discussion he assumes a high level of shared interest and a strong commitment to the issue at hand.

As the analysis of the salutation part of opening addresses has shown, the contextually-given Global theme of the addresses is typically introduced explicitly in the salutation; in the case of extended salutations, exponents of the discourse topic constitute discourse segment topics which typically develop along a thematic progression with constant theme anchored with the speaker. The (re)construction of the identities of referents, and the indication of the time and location of the event, contribute to the
perception of coherence on the ideational plane of discourse, which is enhanced by cohesion relations pertaining to the textual plane of discourse. Since the main communicative purpose of the salutation is the negotiation of interpersonal relations associated with showing respect to the listeners, (re)structuring the audience and establishing speaker credibility, it is obvious that it lays foundations for the construction of coherence on the interpersonal plane, which in opening addresses is associated with participant alignment and rhetorical structure.

4.2.2 Argumentative structure

The management of discourse topic in the main argumentative part of opening addresses depends on the issue under consideration and the persuasion strategy selected by the speaker to present his evaluative treatment of concepts, people, actions and events by emphasizing praise or blame. Generally, it can be claimed that paragraph themes are derived from the Global theme of the whole speech, with topic shifts occurring with every change of rhetorical move.

Major topic shifts at rhetorical move boundaries are typically indicated by the vocatives Ladies and Gentlemen and occasionally Excellencies or Mr President, the function of which is to check that the channel is open and to enhance continuous interpersonal contact. This is illustrated in (6), where the vocative, the metadiscourse marker realized by the first-person imperative Let me, “common when the speaker/writer is signalling an upcoming aspect of the text” (Carter and McCarthy 2006: 288), and the direct address to the audience by the personal pronoun you, draw the attention of the listeners to the importance of cooperation and action in Africa to UNESCO’s activities, i.e. the discourse segments topic (UNESCO’s approach to cooperation and action in Africa) is directly connected by the relation of specification to the Global theme (joint projects of UNESCO and ECOWAS, i.e. Economic Community of West African States), thus explicitly marking a coherent transition to rhetorical move (2a) – ‘claiming centrality of the issue, relating it to the programme and activities of UNESCO’.

(6) Ladies and Gentlemen,
Let me first of all briefly remind you of UNESCO’s approach to the crucial question of cooperation and action in Africa. Since the inception of the African Union and the NEPAD programme, UNESCO has sought to align its work with the development goals of the region. We have strengthened our collaboration with ECOWAS and other regional economic communities. We have also supported the African Union Commission in the elaboration and implementation of programmes that lie within our competence – namely:
education, science, culture and communication. This support was recently demonstrated in our active participation at the 6th African Union Summit, held in January 2006 in Khartoum, whose special theme was education and culture. Major decisions were taken at this Forum, including the launching of the Second Decade of Education in Africa, the foundation of the African Fund for World Heritage, the Declaration of 2006 as the Year of African Languages, and the agreement on an updated Language Plan of Action for Africa. We are now in the process of assisting the African Union Commission in developing the operational plan for the Second Decade of Education. I am sure this issue will constitute one of the core themes of discussion at next month’s third Conference of Ministers of Education in Ouagadougou. (Matsuura, DG/2006/092)

Since it is important to indicate the continuity of the involvement of UNESCO with the development of the African region, the paragraph is organized along a temporal axe relating coherently past activities to present actions and future plans. The lexical items identifying the activities enumerated by the Director-General form a cohesive chain of co-specification stretching across the whole paragraph. UNESCO, referred to by the institutional exclusive we, is established as the thematic agentive subject in most of the sentences making up the paragraph; the active position of the institutional subject towards these activities implies highly positive evaluation of the development of the African region and of the collaboration of UNESCO with the African region and related organizations. The next sentence is marked by a change of the thematic element (this support) and the pattern of thematic progression. The strong statement of the argument that UNESCO has sought to align its work with the development goals of the region is elaborated on in the following two sentences, by specifying that this encompasses collaboration with ECOWAS and other regional economic communities, and support for programmes of the African Union Commission. The replacement of the progression with continuous theme by linear thematic progression, which establishes a rhematic element of the preceding utterance as the theme of the following utterance (this support), enables the orator to specify the involvement of the organization in the operational plan for the Second Decade of Education in Africa: this support refers anaphorically to the predicate of the previous sentence, while reference to the African Union Summit (at this forum) relates coherently the decisions taken at the forum, enumerated in the final non-finite clause, to present action, i.e. the assistance provided by UNESCO in developing the operational plan for the Second Decade of Education. The shift to present action and future plans is indicated by a return to the initial thematic progression pattern using the institutional agent (we) as theme, while in the last sentence, it is the interplay of the institutional and personal identity of the Director-General, indicated by the personal structure indicating a high degree of certainty.
(I am sure), that strengthens the persuasiveness of the argumentation. It is obvious that apart from the patterns of thematic progression and the coherent temporal and action frames, the coherence of the argumentation is promoted by the implied coherence relation of elaboration and cohesive chains based on reiteration (e.g. UNESCO – we, Africa – region; collaboration – support – the process of assisting; summit – forum – conference) and collocation (e.g. competence – education – science – culture – communication).

In the case of the opening address delivered by M’Bow on the occasion of the Commemoration of the fortieth anniversary of UNESCO, the Global theme defines and praises the ideology, mission and purpose of the organization from the point of view of the speaker. Since it is a commemorative event, the address does not include a problem-solution sequence, and the rhetorical move structure is restricted to claiming centrality of the issue, description of the situation and evaluation, i.e. structurally it corresponds to Bolívar’s (2001) evaluative triad. The whole speech uses a coherent temporal frame to outline the mission and activities of UNESCO over the forty-year period of its existence. Example (7) below illustrates the opening of the argumentative part, in which the speaker argues for the importance of the set of values promoted by UNESCO, establishing the reliability of the position claimed by frequent quotes from the Constitution of the organization, a document signed by all member states and thus considered as representing shared attitudes and beliefs.

(7) Forty years ago, just a few weeks after the end of the Second World War, the Conference of the Allied Ministers of Education, which was to adopt the Constitution of UNESCO, met in London. To the terrible toll of six years of desolation and death that the world had just experienced was now added the threat foreshadowed by the explosion of the two atomic bombs at Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Over the ruins of the annihilated cities, in the grief present everywhere, and confronted by the prospect of new forms of mass destruction, the International community became aware of the collective responsibilities which it would have to shoulder in order to preserve the future of the species.

UNESCO’s Constitution conveys both the concerns and hopes of mankind at this decisive turning point in its history. It does not merely call for the establishment of a just and lasting peace; it sets out the conditions that are vital for its advent and the bases of its continuing consolidation.

It starts with the fundamental statement: “That since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed”.

It states in greater detail: “That a peace based exclusively upon the political and economic arrangements of governments would not be a peace which could secure the unanimous, lasting and sincere support of the peoples of the world, and that the peace must therefore be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind”.

And it declares, consequently, that: “the States Parties to this Constitution, believing in full and equal opportunities for education for all, in the unrestricted pursuit of objective truth, and in the free exchange of ideas and knowledge, are agreed and determined to develop and to increase the means
of communication between their peoples and to employ these means for the purposes of mutual understanding and a truer and more perfect knowledge of each other’s lives”.

Within the framework of the United Nations system that had just been set up, UNESCO was thus given the task of advancing international peace and the common welfare of mankind through ‘the educational and scientific and cultural relations of the peoples of the world’ – in other words, international intellectual co-operation. (M’Bow, DG/85/41)

The first paragraph, referring to the signing of the founding documents of the organization in London in 1946, relates explicitly the establishment of UNESCO to the end of the Second World War and indicates the purpose of UNESCO as stated in its constitution as the discourse segment topic. In the second paragraph, which sets the context, the thematic parts of the sentences depict the effects of war, mentioning in particular the atomic bombs used by the United States Army at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, thus assigning the bombing the status of shared knowledge of the international community and assuming a shared negative evaluation of war and its effects, enhanced by expressive vocabulary items functioning as markers of value (the terrible toll of six years of desolation and death, the threat foreshadowed by the explosion of the two atomic bombs, the ruins of the annihilated cities, grief, new forms of mass destruction), which are connected by cohesive relations (e.g. Hiroshima and Nagasaki – annihilated cities; atomic bombs – new forms of mass destruction). The use of a linear thematic progression pattern permits the speaker to move gradually from the terrors of war to highlighting the newly-gained awareness of the collective responsibility of mankind for its future, which is presented as a matter of life or death (to preserve the future of the species).

The third paragraph introduces explicitly as the discourse segment topic the Constitution of UNESCO and the values it promotes. The Constitution of UNESCO is also the thematic element of the rest of the extract, organized by a pattern of thematic progression with continuous theme. The coherence of the passage is enhanced by cohesive chains anchored in parallelism (it does not merely call – it sets out – it starts with – it states – it declares) and elaboration coherence relations. The persuasive strategies used by the speaker include a strong statement of the orator’s argument that UNESCO’s constitution conveys the hopes of mankind for peace supported by a sequence of quotes from the text of the constitution of UNESCO praising values and actions central to the ideology of the organization – peace; unanimous, lasting and sincere support of the peoples of the world; intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind; full and equal opportunities for education for all; unrestricted pursuit of objective truth; free exchange of ideas and knowledge; mutual understanding; international peace; common welfare of mankind. These are in striking
contrast to the description of war and destruction at the beginning of the extract. By claiming that the constitution of UNESCO not only expresses the hopes of humankind, but also *sets out the conditions that are vital for its advent and the bases of its continuing consolidation*, M’Bow seems to invite the listener to infer that UNESCO may be regarded as an instrument for the safeguarding of peace, a view which is much more explicitly stated at the very end of the extract, where he states that within the United Nations system *UNESCO was thus given the task of advancing international peace and the common welfare of mankind* through intellectual cooperation, a task which might be regarded as essentially political. It is this politicized understanding of international intellectual cooperation seen by M’Bow as the major mission of UNESCO that triggered strong criticism from some Western countries and resulted in the withdrawal of the USA from the organization in December 1984. Considering that M’Bow’s speech commemorating the fortieth anniversary of UNESCO was delivered in December 1985, it is possible to interpret the reference to the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki as categorizing the USA as ‘others’ who do not share the institutional ideology M’Bow’s vision of the organization endeavours to promote. However, the fact that in February 1986 26 countries officially announced their decision not to support M’Bow’s re-election as Director-General of UNESCO, and the fact that consequently he was not re-elected in October 1986, clearly shows that while he certainly managed to make his audience understand the message of his address, he nevertheless failed to persuade the majority of the international community to believe in and accept his ideological point of view. This seems to reflect a decline in his popularity within the UNESCO community (due to his budgetary practices and political commitments) which strongly affects the credibility of the speaker.

Matsuura’s argumentation in his address to the 6th Meeting of the High-Level Group of EFA (Education for All) in Cairo (Egypt) is much more dynamic and interactive. Example (8) shows the transition to rhetorical move (3) – introducing the situation by evaluating the issue at hand from the point of view of the UNESCO ideology. After marking the move boundary and the related topic shift by vocative address forms, the orator specifies the discourse segment topic, i.e. early childhood care and education, the principal theme of the *EFA Global Monitoring Report 2007*, which is directly related to the Global theme – the meeting of the High-Group of EFA (a group of about 30 ministers of education and other high officials monitoring the realization of the *Dakar Framework for Action*, whose aim is to promote education worldwide). The Director-General refers
explicitly to the shared institutional and procedural knowledge of the participants by thematic initial adverbials (as is customary at this meeting, as usual), thus inviting the audience to activate an available mental frame.

(8)  Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

As is customary at this meeting, we will examine the findings of the newly published EFA Global Monitoring Report 2007, whose principal theme is the first EFA goal, namely, early childhood care and education (ECCE). [...] As the Report argues, ECCE provides strong foundations on which efforts to eradicate poverty and improve health and nutrition may be built.

As usual, the Report also gives an overview of progress across all six Dakar goals. It is gratifying, on the one hand, to note significant progress in EFA - for example, through further reductions in out-of-school children, greater movement towards gender parity, and increasing international aid. On the other hand, these achievements are not unreserved successes. The Report notes that the figures on out-of-school children do not capture how many children fail to attend school regularly; [...] Furthermore, the numbers of adult illiterates are decreasing only slowly, and in some regions teacher numbers are still too few to ensure that children in school receive good quality education.

My purpose is not to diminish the important and steady progress that we are making in EFA, but rather to underline the need to accelerate the efforts required to meet the 2015 targets. Indeed, the Report itself challenges us to return to the comprehensive agenda of the Dakar Framework for Action, and to pay urgent attention to those of all ages for whom quality basic education still remains a distant dream. (Matsuura, DG/2006/157)

Matsuura’s argumentation in this speech is based on highlighting positive and negative aspects of the situation in the process of evaluating past achievements and outlining future goals, thus leading the audience to the logical conclusion that while what has been done is undoubtedly positive and deserves praise, it is still not sufficient. The two aspects of the situation are juxtaposed by the use of contrastive conjunctives (on the one hand, on the other hand; not ..., but) and evaluative vocabulary. Positive value is assigned to the following actions: eradicate poverty, improve health and nutrition, reductions in out-of-school children, greater movement towards gender parity, increasing international aid, which are assessed as being progress and gratifying. However, the speaker also qualifies the results achieved as not unreserved successes, the double negative highlighting his view that despite the positive developments there are also negative aspects of the situation. These are indicated by comparators, involving the comparison of the object of evaluation against the norm, i.e. the negative particle not (referring to insufficiency of data) and the negative-meaning lexical items fail, illiterates, decrease only slowly and too few. The overall negative evaluation of the situation is enhanced by the use of the reinforcement conjunctive furthermore, explicitly indicating a parallel coherence relation. In the opening
sentence of the last paragraph of the extract, Matsuura uses a personal intrusion (*my purpose*), a litotes (*not to diminish*) and positive vocabulary (*steady progress*) to hedge this negative evaluation. By relating the dissatisfaction with the extent of the progress made to his personal identity (*my purpose*), while assuming his institutional identity expressed by the in-group marker *we* referring to UNESCO and all institutions and individuals involved in the EFA framework for action, he manages to reinforce the expression of positive evaluation of the efforts of the EFA community (*important and steady progress*), and at the same time to stress the *need to accelerate the efforts required* to achieve the intended goals. The conviction of the speaker of the necessity of improving the current state of affairs, intensified by the connector *indeed*, results in the claim that without undertaking urgent action the goals EFA is trying to achieve will remain *a distant dream*. It is relevant to note that while the Director-General uses a mixed pattern of thematic progression, in all sentences expressing negative evaluation the thematic subject is the Report; this implies objectivity and factuality of the information conveyed. The persuasive force of Matsuura’s argumentation is enhanced by the coherent development of his speech, which stresses continuously the positive and negative aspects of the situation supported by explicit marking of contrastive relations and lexical cohesion.

Before moving on to a discussion of the closure rhetorical move, it should be noted that the choice of the vocative form of address at rhetorical move boundaries may be used to (re-)indicate the alignment of the speaker. Thus in example (9), the institutional character of the communication is highlighted by the vocative form of address appealing to the President of the International Narcotics Control Board, i.e. to the institutional representative of a partner organization. While signalling a coherent transition to rhetorical move (5) ‘suggesting a solution’, it also indicates a topic shift from describing the situation of drug addicts, specifying the problem and describing possible solutions, to specifying the contribution that UNESCO can make to drug-abuse prevention. While using a sequence of metadiscourse markers to make an emphatic claim and establish intratextual and intertextual connections (*I repeat – I repeat; At the last meeting of the [ACC], I placed special emphasis...*), Mayor stresses the temporal frame of the continuous commitment of UNESCO to this cause and its ability to undertake action in order to contribute towards the solution of the problem. The coherence of the passage is promoted by the establishing of UNESCO as the theme of the first two sentences, thus presenting an institutional point of view. In what follows, however, the main thematic element is the Director-General of the
organization, referred to by the personal pronoun I; this adds a personal attitude to the institutional position expressed by the discourse.

(9) Mr President,
UNESCO is keen on bringing its specific expertise to bear in the field of drug abuse prevention, within the United National international drug control system. It wishes and is able to do so – I repeat – particularly through education. At the last meeting of the Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC), held here in Vienna on 27 and 28 February last, I placed special emphasis on the need to combat drug abuse through education and public information, notably by means of media campaigns, while at the same time addressing the root causes of such abuse. I repeat that we need the help of the media – together with that of the municipal and local authorities – to create the necessary awareness, commitment and involvement. (Mayor, DG/95/19)

As the examples above suggest, the coherence of the argumentative part of addresses is constructed on the basis of selected pattern(s) of thematic progression, cohesion and coherence relations implied or explicitly marked by the speakers, which not only highlight the logical connections in the speech, but also indicate the point of view of the speaker. Of particular importance is the discourse structuring function of vocative forms of address, which seems to have developed gradually as a distinctive feature of the genre, since it is rather rare in M’Bow’s speeches, while its use in Matsuura’s speeches is highly systematic. Coherence on the interpersonal plane of discourse is related to the persuasion strategies used by the speakers, which by the use of expressive and evaluative lexical items commonly state a strong argument, high personal involvement, contrastive presentation of actions or events and emphatic evaluation of aspects of the issue under consideration.

4.2.3 Evaluation and closure

The last two rhetorical moves in the structure of an opening address are evaluation and closure. The evaluation of the importance of the event has a conclusive function and may be closely interwoven with the closure move which follows. As extract (10) illustrates, this move is also introduced by vocative address forms structuring the audience into institutional representatives, people sharing the institutional ideology and commitments of UNESCO and undertaking joint action, and the general public. A coherent transition to the evaluation move is signalled by an explicit metadiscourse marker (I should like to conclude); it attracts the attention of the audience to the forthcoming end of the interaction and to the importance of the evaluative part of the speech, which is marked by a high level of subjectivity indicated by markers of personal involvement of the speaker (I
should like, I also wish, I wish, I am convinced). By pointing to the contribution of the event to the realization of the policy of the organization, this move highlights the existential coherence of UNESCO; furthermore, it indicates solidarity with the host country by expressing gratitude for the services provided. By the use of a tie back underlined by the expression once more, the speaker reintroduces the conference as the Global discourse topic, expresses gratitude to the host country (Chinese scientists, Chinese authorities) and thus signals the upcoming closure move.

(10) Excellencies, Colleagues, Ladies and gentlemen,
I should like to conclude by underlining once more the importance of this present Conference for a better sharing of knowledge and for the strengthening and development of the ability of nations to innovate and shape their own infrastructure in such a vitally important area of research as the human genome. I also wish to express my gratitude to Chinese scientists and the Chinese authorities for having agreed to host the Conference and for all the facilities they have provided to the participants. I wish this Conference every success, and I am convinced that it marks the beginning of a new chapter in international co-operation in the biological sciences under UNESCO’s auspices.
Thank you. (Mayor, DG/94/38)

Similarly to the salutation, the last and very brief rhetorical move in addresses – the closure – is primarily associated with interpersonal coherence related to phatic and expressive meanings, conveyed by pronominal reference and the polite acts of wishing success and thanking (11). The pronoun you, which is used in combination with the self-reference pronoun I, represents the addressee as sharing the deictic centre of the speaker. The act of thanking, realized by cliché phrases with minimal variation, is a conventional indication of the end of a speech.

(11) I wish you rich and fruitful deliberations.
Thank you. (Matsuura, DG/2006/180)

The highly ritualistic first and last moves of the opening addresses have a crucial role in the construction of interpersonal relations between the participants and the perception of interactional coherence, since they open and close the channel of communication and, thanks to the personal involvement of the speaker and direct address to the audience, enhance continuity and coherence of interpersonal relations.

To conclude the discussion of the management of discourse topic and the rhetorical structure of opening addresses, it should be stressed that they contribute decisively to the
construction of both global and local coherence by involving language features pertaining to all planes of discourse. Thus, while the hierarchy of discourse topics, topic continuity based on the pattern of thematic progression, temporal and referential coherence, coherent topic shifts at discourse segment, and rhetorical move boundaries are involved in enhancing coherence on the ideational and textual planes of discourse, the related continuous alignment of the speaker with the audience, appeal to the audience and consistent expression of evaluative judgements and attitudes from the point of view of the institutional ideology contribute to the perception of coherence on the interpersonal plane of discourse.

4.3 Strategic uses of reference

This section of the present investigation into coherence in political speeches focuses on the role of reference in the construction of identities, related social roles and interpersonal and institutional relations. The aim of the analysis is to show that consistent self-representation (together with other-presentation) based on referential strategies, such as the use of personal pronouns with anaphoric and deictic interpretation and related nominal categorization, contributes to the perception of coherence on all planes of discourse. In addition, since in the genre of opening addresses the establishment of existential coherence of the speaker (Duranti 2006) and the institution he represents is a crucial factor for acquiring credibility and thus enhancing the persuasive power of the discourse, consistent self- and other-representation are regarded as key components in building up an interdiscoursal dimension of coherence.

As already stated in the previous sections, political speeches are a site of purposeful interaction between the speaker and the audience, in which the communicative intention of the speaker is to persuade the audience to accept and support his world views and suggestions for action. This involves the (re-)construction of representations of people, institutions, objects, ideas and spatio-temporal settings, and relations between them, and the establishment of a dialogical framework for creating space for the negotiation of assumed or imposed identities, social roles and value systems. Since in political discourse group identities and value systems are frequently conceptualized in terms of binary oppositions (Chilton 2004: 202), one of the most common ways of structuring the ideological space is the assertion of group identity and solidarity in opposition to outsiders,
opponents or enemy groups; this can be expressed by a variety of linguistic resources, such as pronominal reference and lexical choice for categorization and evaluation of social actors, actions and events. Therefore, it can be argued that the perception of the ‘existential coherence’ of the speaker, i.e. the projection of a coherent image of him and of the institution he represents, which is constantly under construction in the negotiating of the relationship between the self and the other(s) (Duranti 2006: 469), and the coherent interpretation of his discourse are functions of the continuity of the identities of social actors, their relationships, actions and value systems, and the evaluative attitude of the speaker towards them.

Establishing speaker credibility and the construction of the identity of the speaker in all its complexity is commonly regarded as one of the major aspects of persuasive rhetoric. As numerous studies rooted in Halliday’s systemic-functional approach have evidenced (e.g. Hodge and Kress 1993, van Leeuwen 1996), referencing strategies and patterns of categorization carry ideological assumptions indispensable for the introducing of the speaker’s perspective in the construction of the intended discourse world. Since the discoursal construction of an institutional identity (constitutive rhetoric) in an international context cannot rely on ethnic identification, common language, culture and territory, the main concern of leaders of international governmental organizations is to establish group identity by the assertion of a “community of ideology: a shared system of beliefs about reality” (Fowler 1985: 66) and to represent the institution and its members as involved in common actions, while referring intertextually to texts which record or codify common values and agreements. In the specific context of the United Nations’ system, which accommodates a variety of cultural and ideological backgrounds and often reflects a tension between humanity’s love of peace and the determination to maintain separateness (Prosser 1970), institutional identity is constructed on the basis of “a sense of ‘belonging’, which may be defined primarily by the drawing of a boundary defining the group” (Honohan 2008: 69). This boundary is drawn in a document to which most subsequent discourses in the United Nations system refer intertextually, either overtly or covertly – the Charter of the United Nations, which outlines the common value system of all its members:

‘WE THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS DETERMINED
– to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and
to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

**AND FOR THESE ENDS**

- to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and
- to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and
- to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and
- to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples ...

It can therefore be assumed that in the opening addresses of the Directors-General of UNESCO the representation of social actors and the evaluation of their actions and relationships will reflect an ideological point of view praising values such as the maintaining of international peace and security, the reaffirming of equal human rights for all, the respecting of obligations arising from treaties, and the promoting of economic and social advancement for all peoples, and condemning those people, actions and events which threaten these.

In addition to the ‘in-group’ – ‘out-group’ distinction, participant’s roles may be considered from the point of view of the type of their involvement in an action or event. Thus, in agreement with Dowty (1991) and Chilton (2004) the traditional roles of referents indicated by reference expressions (i.e. agent, source, patient, experiencer etc.) may be seen as subsumed into two prototypical categories: agent and patient. The properties of the prototypical agent and patient, as listed in Chilton (2004: 53), are:

**Properties of the prototypical agent:**
- volitional involvement in the event or state
- sentience (and/or perception)
- causing an event or change of state in another participant
- movement (relative to the position of another participant)
- (exists independently of the event named by the verb)

**Properties of the prototypical patient:**
- undergoes change of state
- incremental theme
- causally affected by another participant
- stationary relative to movement of another participant
- (does not exist independently of the event, or at all)

The assignment of prototypical roles defines the position of participants with regard
to issues of volition, sentience and causation and related questions of responsibility, victimhood and intention, which are highly salient in political discourse. The continuity of the roles assigned is one of the major factors affecting the perception of coherence in political speeches.

4.3.1 Pronominal reference: referential domains and scale of distancing

Since this research into the interplay of aspects of coherence involving experiential, interpersonal and textual meanings draws on Van Leeuwen’s (1996) approach to the representation of social actors and Chilton’s (2004) framework for the representation of discourse worlds, it is essential to consider how reference indicates the positioning of social actors, as well as actions and events in which they are involved, in the value-laden discourse world from the perspective of the speaker, which is posited as the deictic centre of the discourse. The positioning of social actors, including the speaker and the audience, with regard to the situation may be metaphorically conceptualized as related to their physical location, to the moment of production of the ongoing utterance, to where they are in the ongoing discourse and to their mutual relationship (Chilton 2004: 56). As pronouns can perform deictic functions reflecting power relations, group identity, and psychological distance, their role in political discourse is associated with the imposition by the addressee of a coherent ideologically-biased conceptualization of entities and events on the audience in order to legitimize values, beliefs and intended actions.

The political significance of temporal, spatial and modal deixis arises from its potential to indicate proximal and distal social actors associated with different ideological values and temporal and local settings from the point of view of the speaker. Figure 6 (based on Chilton 2004: 58) below shows the three dimensions along which the discourse world can be conceptualized from the point of view of the deictic centre (the self of the speaker, i.e. I/we, located here and now); these are the dimensions of space (s), time (t) and modality (m).

As Chilton (2004) points out, the time dimension, anchored in the moment of speaking, can be conceptualized as motion through space and thus seen as ‘near’ or ‘distant’. In political discourse both recent and remote past or future events can be foregrounded as prominent and thus ‘close’ to ‘us’ and the institutional ideology supported by the speaker. The modal axis is related to what the speaker considers ‘true’ and ‘right’ and thus central to his value system. (The modal dimension will be discussed in the
following section – 4.2 – of this research.) The role of personal pronouns in indicating the spatial dimension is paramount. The speaker, referred to by I or we, is positioned by default here and now and considered as the source of the ideological point of view in the discourse. Pronominal other-reference, expressed by second- and third person pronouns (you, he/she/it and they) and some demonstratives (these, those), can point to either the immediate addressee, who in the case of political speeches typically shares the ‘here-and-now’ of the speaker, or to individuals and groups who are seen as more or less distant in terms of spatio-temporal settings and/or affective or ideological treatment.

**Figure 6: Dimensions of deixis** (Chilton 2004: 58)

Before proceeding to a detailed analysis of the role of pronominal reference in constructing a coherent discourse world, it is useful to discuss in greater detail the referential domains of pronouns which predetermine their potential functions in expressing the attitude of the speaker towards the intended referent. When deriving coherent meaning from a discourse, the referent of a pronoun is retrieved by inference based on the verbal and/or situational context and the background knowledge of interactants. The contribution
of endophoric reference (anaphoric and cataphoric) is associated primarily with the textual plane of discourse, i.e. cohesion. However, since in agreement with the cognitive-based approach adopted in this research, deixis and anaphora are seen as complementary discourse reference procedures involved in processing the contents of mental models activated in an unfolding discourse within the minds of interactants, anaphoric and deictic reference together with various types of repetition contribute to the continuity of referents and topics in a text (e.g. Hoey 1991, Tanskanen 2006) and thus to the perception of coherence on the ideational plane of discourse. In addition, this approach acknowledges the evaluative potential of reference devices, which, in the case of personal pronouns, is further enhanced by their interpersonal rhetorical potential. As a result of the influence of sociocultural and pragmatic context on the interpretation of indexical expressions in discourse, pronominal reference can rarely be seen as fully determinate. Thus pronominal forms may indicate different categories of individuals or groups and their interpretation is the result of a cooperative effort by the participants in the communicative event. The discussion of the referential domains of personal pronouns draws on Quirk and Greenbaum (1985), Mühlhäusler and Harré (1990), Leech and Svartvik (1994), Wales (1995) and Huddleston and Pullum (2002).

Pronominal self-reference and other-reference may be determinate or indeterminate in meaning; I and we have a typically determinate meaning, while you, we and they may be both determinate and indeterminate. According to Wales (1995: 51) first- and second-person pronouns may be best described as pointing to ‘the one who is speaking’ and ‘the one(s) who is/are being addressed’, i.e. they refer to definite individuals in the speech situation. While most researchers agree that the first person singular pronoun I refers unambiguously to the speaker and “no further commentary is needed” (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 1465), the referential domains of the other personal pronouns are not so straightforward. The case of the first person plural pronoun we is particularly complex because of the inherent, context-motivated ambiguity between an exclusive and inclusive meaning with regard to the speaker (Leech and Svartvik 1994. 58); in addition, drawing on Mühlhäusler and Harré (1990) the inclusive we may be subcategorized into (a) an integrative use, which refers to both speaker and hearer(s), and (b) expressive use, which refers to both speaker and hearer(s) but additionally expresses solidarity. Moreover, in the unmarked case of reference to a group, the boundaries of the group to which we points may be far from clear-cut. As Table 2, which summarizes the potential referential domains of
the pronoun *we*, suggests, neither the domain of reference anchored to the noun phrase for which it stands nor retrieved contextual information need disambiguate sufficiently the referent of *we* in order to guarantee identical interpretation by all interactants.

Table 2: Referential domains of the first person plural pronoun *we*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exclusive <em>we</em></th>
<th>Inclusive <em>we</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>exclusive₁ of the hearer</td>
<td>group of people including the speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>speaker only (royal <em>we</em> and authorial <em>we</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exclusive₂ of the speaker</td>
<td>third party only (hearer or other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inclusive <em>we</em></strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaker and hearer(s)–</td>
<td>group of people including the speaker and hearer(s) (integrative or expressive use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reference to context of situation</td>
<td>inclusive authorial <em>we</em> for reader involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaker and hearer(s)–</td>
<td>rhetorical <em>we</em>–collective senses of “the nation”, “the party”, “the organization”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reference to socio-cultural</td>
<td>indefinite group–generic <em>we</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pronominal choice in political speeches, and especially the selection of different communicative functions of *we* against *I*, enables speakers to indicate the position they are taking in relation to their own remarks. Thus politicians may choose different footings (Goffman 1981: 144) to meet the demands of a particular situational context and to display greater or lesser involvement with the topic and/or the audience: they may act as animator, author or principal, or use a change of footing, e.g. they may opt to switch from author to principal in order to “downplay their personal role, thereby avoiding the appearance of immodesty” (Bull and Fetzer 2006, 35). Both the exclusive₁ and the inclusive *we* referring to a group contribute to the construction of group identity by pointing to a set of human individuals introduced in the preceding discourse, identifying this set as a group by categorizing it and by excluding others from membership of this group (Helmbrecht 2002: 31). In addition, by stating his/her membership of the group, the speaker defines his/her interpersonal relations with the interlocutions by anchoring the group to his/her deictic centre and determining it as proximal in terms of the dimensions of space, time and modality. By adding an interpersonal appeal, the integrative and expressive uses of *we* prototypically indicate alignment and solidarity, which may be further enhanced by setting up an explicit or implicit opponent (Bull and Fetzer 2006: 14). The lack of a clear-cut
distinction between the exclusive\textsubscript{1} and inclusive exophoric reference allows the politician to use *we* with the double inference and presumption that he is speaking not only on behalf of the institution he represents (exclusive\textsubscript{1}), but also on behalf of the audience and larger, typically unspecified, groups (inclusive) (Wales 1995: 62). When using this pragmatic strategy of over-inclusion, i.e. reference to indeterminate groups including the audience, the orator assumes wider support for the ideology and policy suggested (Bull and Fetzer 2006: 15).

It should be mentioned that recently Wieczorek (2009) has suggested an account of participant alignment in political discourse using the umbrella term ‘clusivity’, originally introduced by Cysouw (2005) to refer to the marking of the difference between inclusive and exclusive personal pronouns. Within Wieczorek’s approach the meaning of clusivity is extended to encompass “a variety of linguistic patterns expressing inclusionary and exclusionary status of the actors (with in-group, as well as out-group status) involved in events presented” (Wieczorek 2009: 66). Drawing on Chilton’s (2004) conceptualization of group identities and relations as insiders and outsiders from the point of view of a deictic centre anchored with the speaker, Wieczorek (2009) considers clusivity in relation to Brown and Levinson’s (1987) politeness strategies, point-of-view operations, spreading and narrowing of the deictic centre, proximizing and distancing, and impersonalization. While not adopting the term ‘clusivity’, the present research considers the assigning of in-group and out-group status as one of the key strategies for the structuring of the discourse world; the continuity of the roles assigned is regarded as a major factor contributing to discourse coherence.

The use of other-reference pronouns indicates the relationship of the speaker with other social actors and defines their distance from the deictic centre along the dimensions of space, modality and time in the discourse world of the speaker. As the brief description of the referential domains of other-reference pronouns in Table 3 below suggests, these pronouns may have specific or generic reference and the referents they point to may or may not share the deictic centre of the speaker. While first- and second-person pronouns and demonstrative pronouns are generally used deictically, the primary use of third person pronouns is typically anaphoric. However, it is primarily the non-anaphoric use of pronominal reference that gives rise to ambiguous interpretations and equivocation, defined as ‘non-straightforward communication’ (Bavelas et al. 1990), which can be used to manipulate the attitudes which people adopt in relation to one another.
Table 3: Referential domains of other-reference pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You</td>
<td>hearer or addressee (definite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>group of people including hearer or addressee (definite or indefinite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indefinite group, generic use (informal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He/She</td>
<td>male/female individual, typically not hearer or addressee (definite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indefinite individual as prototype of a class, generic use (typically he)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It</td>
<td>singular collections of people, such as institutions, organizations (definite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>indefinite individual as prototype of a class, generic use (often egocentric)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They</td>
<td>group of people excluding hearer or addressee (definite or indefinite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indefinite institution with the authority to affect the life of hearer and/or addressee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indefinite individual as prototype of a class, generic use (often informal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indefinite group, generic use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those</td>
<td>indefinite group of people distant from hearer or addressee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The basic function of third person pronouns is to refer to a third party, i.e. not the speaker or the addressee, although, as Wales (1995: 54) points out, this third party may be absent or present in the speech situation. The third party may perform several potential roles: those of listener, by-stander, accidental over-hearer or deliberate eavesdropper (Levinson 1987); these roles affect the extent to which the speaker takes the third party into account when trying to anticipate the expectations of the audience. The referential potential of they is of particular interest, as similarly to we, it has several potential meanings, some of which allow for ambiguous interpretations. For instance, the lack of precise delimitation of the boundaries of the group to which they refers is frequently used in political discourse to allow for some amount of ambiguity or vagueness when constructing the binary opposition of ‘us’ against ‘them’. Another meaning of they which is often used for political purposes is the reference to indefinite institution of authority, which is perceived as threatening and even sinister (Wales 1995: 61). In addition, other-reference pronouns can be used to express subjectivity; this typically refers to generic uses of pronouns which can be pragmatically reinterpreted to refer to the speaker (this is primarily the case of you and one) and, occasionally, to the addressee. It should be noted that according to Wilson (1990: 62), “indicating self-reference by means other than ‘I’ and ‘we’ is said to represent a distancing strategy on the part of the speaker, because the choice of pronoun indicates how close/distant the speaker is to the topic under discussion, or to the participants involved in the discussion”. As to the prototypically generic uses of other-
reference pronouns, they are available only in the case of the pronouns you, he (she), they and one. The choice of generic forms is stylistically relevant, i.e. he and one are typically associated with formal, and you and they with informal discourse.

Personal pronouns are marked for case; consequently, the subjective and the objective form of the pronouns can be used to indicate the prototypical roles of agent and patient (Wales 1995: 85) and thus to reflect power relations. The use of possessive pronouns is also open to pragmatic implications, since they indicate ‘to what extent selves and others are free agents who control or are under the control of others by virtue of inevitable or temporary bonds’ (Mühlhäusler and Harré 1990: 207). In addition, possessive pronouns can signal distance from the speaker (as in my Lord vs. your honour) and modify the level of agency and responsibility for actions (as in my belief vs. I believe) (Mühlhäusler and Harré: 225).

Since pronominal choice is an effective marker of the relative distance the speaker indicates to subjects or individuals under discussion, the pronouns used by a speaker to refer to social actors may be seen as being on a scale ranging from the most subjective proximal form I and progressively moving away from the deictic centre to distal forms such as they and those. Although pronominal scaling is often idiosyncratic and reflects the speaker’s perception of pronominal use, it is highly probable that individuals who construe the world from the point of view of a shared system of values and beliefs are likely to exhibit a similar pronominal distancing scale. It is therefore relevant to begin the discussion of the contribution of pronominal reference to the perception of coherence in opening addresses by considering the pronominal scales of distancing (Wilson 1990) used by the three Directors-General of UNESCO (see Table 2 below).

**Table 2: Pronominal scales of distancing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matsuura</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>he/she</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>those</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>he/she</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>they, you (generic)</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>those</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M'Bow</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>he/she</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>he, they (generic)</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>they</td>
<td>those</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the differences in their cultural backgrounds and individual ideological preferences, the Directors-General act in their speeches as representatives of UNESCO, i.e. in their institutional identity as speakers of their organization (Van De Mieroop 2007: 120).
1121), and therefore they construe the world in similar ways by expressing a commitment to the ideology and belief system proclaimed by UNESCO. It is thus not surprising that the three speakers share the same pronominal scaling, which can be regarded as institutional. However, as Tables 3 below suggests, there are considerable differences in the frequency of use of the pronouns by the three politicians, which reflect their idiosyncratic styles as well as functional variation in pronominal reference resulting from their political views as individuals or as members of other social groups and developments in UNESCO and the global political situation during their terms of office.

Table 3: Pronominal reference in the speeches of the three Directors—General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronouns</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>We</th>
<th>You</th>
<th>He/She</th>
<th>It</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>They</th>
<th>Those</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matsuura</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M’Bow</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The striking difference in the frequency of occurrence and choice of the self-reference pronouns _I_ and _we_ used by the three speakers, shows how language is used to reflect and construct the world in political discourse. Matsuura’s addresses display the most prominent rate of self-reference pronouns, especially of first person singular forms. (A detailed analysis of the frequency of occurrence of the first person pronoun and its most frequent collocates is provided in Dontcheva-Navratilova 2008.) This is in agreement with the well-established ideology of the organization during his term of office and may be interpreted as a strategic choice helping him to build up a strong managerial position for the carrying out of large-scale administrative reform. A very high rate of first person pronouns is also present in Mayor’s speeches; however, Mayor shows a marked preference for the inclusive _we_, often associated with the pragmatic strategy of over-inclusion. This reflects his efforts to overcome existing ideological contradictions and to reunite UNESCO by constructing an institutional identity based on shared values and beliefs through his “culture of peace” policy and a carefully contructed image of togetherness in the global context of the post-Iron Curtain world. As argued by Dontcheva-Navratilova (2009b), the very low frequency of occurrence of the plural first person pronoun _we_ in M’Bow’s
discourse (most occurrences – 14 out of 21 – are in two speeches delivered at UN headquarters, i.e. in most cases the contextually retrievable referent is the UN or UNESCO) indicates his failure to identify fully with the institutional ideology as a result of the implicit ambiguity of his position as a supporter of the interests of developing nations and leader of the organization, while the high rate of first person singular forms evidences his efforts to assert an authoritative institutional and personal identity. The strategic use of first person pronouns for the construal of the identity of the speaker is discussed in the following sub-section, 4.3.2.

There is also considerable variation in the choice of pronominal reference to others. There is a higher frequency of occurrence of the deictic pronoun you (typically with plural and occasionally with singular reference), frequently in proximity with the first person pronoun I in the salutation part of addresses, in Matsuura’s and especially in Mayor’s addresses to indicate direct appeal to the addressee and a higher level of involvement of the speaker with the audience (e.g. I am delighted to welcome you). This is in contrast with the lower frequency of use of you combined with a lower rate of first person pronouns in M’Bow’s speeches, which makes them less interactive and may be interpreted as a distancing strategy.

The rate of the typically anaphoric he/she to refer to others is statistically prominent only in the speeches of M’Bow, and this is partially affected by his tendency to use he in generic terms. It is relevant to note that in the whole corpus there are only four instances of her in the politically-correct reference to nouns expressing generic meaning his or her, him or her (three in the speeches of Mayor and one in a speech made by M’Bow), and a single instance of she and three instances of her indicating specific reference in the speeches of Matsuura. This would seem to reflect the representation of women in positions of leadership in the world of international governmental organizations. The insignificant frequencies of he and it in the speeches of Mayor and Matsuura reflect the fact that they opt to name organizations and institutions to which they refer specifically and use forms of direct address, such as name, honorific or you when addressing individuals present at the moment of the delivery of the speech. The rate of it is relatively prominent in the speeches of M’Bow, where it is used as a neutral construction to refer anaphorically to different organizations and institutions.

As for the use of the markers of the furthest distance from the deictic centre they and those, the rate is higher in the speeches of M’Bow and Mayor; both speakers often use
them to express evaluative and spatial distancing from definite or indefinite groups, represented as victims or negatively designated social actors, thus projecting the polarity of the global political arena before and immediately after the fall of the Iron Curtain and the internal problems of UNESCO on their discourse. The lower frequency of those and especially they (used in a neutral way) in the speeches of Matsuura reflects the lower ideological tension within the organization and the world in general during his term of office.

The distribution of possessive pronouns used for anaphoric reference is shown in Table 2 below. Most of the occurrences of my are associated with the salutation part of addresses (e.g. my gratitude, my thanks); the higher rate of use of my by Matsuura reflects his frequent use of the strategy of self-disclosure in which he relates his personal experience (my visit, my friend). The possessive pronoun your is used by all speakers in formulaic address forms referring to groups of individuals (in the diplomatic context typically Your Excellencies) and to reference groups of hosts and meeting participants in association with the occasion taking place (your conference), the institution they represent (your organization) or their work (your deliberations). While typically performing a phatic function at the beginning and the end of speeches, the use of your in acts of thanking or praising indicates politeness, but also distancing of the speaker from the addressee either by signalling that he is not a member of the group to which the addressee belongs or by investing him with the authority to assess the performance of the addresser.

Table 4: Possessive reference in the speeches of the three DGs of UNESCO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronouns</th>
<th>My</th>
<th>Our</th>
<th>Your</th>
<th>His/her</th>
<th>Its</th>
<th>Their</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matsuura</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M’Bow</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While considerably less frequent, most of the occurrences of the possessive pronoun his in the speeches of M’Bow and Matsuura appear in a context similar to that of your, i.e. at the beginning of speeches in the inherently polite acts of thanking or showing respect to a specific member of the audience. The form his followed by a title and the name of the person, i.e. an oblique and indirect form of address, whose function is compared by Wales (1995: 55) to the function V-forms used in many European languages (German Sie, Spanish Used, Czech Vy) to indicate the attitude of “an unworthy speaker not presuming to
address someone face to face”, is typically used in reference to heads of state (His Excellency President Hosni Moubarak) or other high officials who are thus emphasized and signalled as outstanding within the group of members of the diplomatic corps and politicians who are referred to by Your Excellencies. This function of his is not present in Mayor’s speeches; he uses this form for referring to highly praised intellectual achievements or moral behaviour of an individual (Mahatma Ghandi, with his supreme lesson of perseverance), which are thus presented as permanently associated with him/her. However, notwithstanding the above-mentioned differences, it is possible to claim that in the speeches of the three Directors-General the pronoun his indicates positive evaluation and proximity to the ideological values of the speaker.

Though showing considerable difference in the frequency of occurrence, the functional distribution of the possessive pronoun its is very similar in the three sub-corpora: it refers either to UNESCO itself (more than 50 per cent in each of the three sub-corpora) or to different specific organizations with which UNESCO works in close cooperation. The possessive relationship between the organizations and the entities controlled – officials or bodies (Executive Board), members (Member States), documents (Charter), actions (dedication to peace) – is represented as permanent. This use of its may be contrasted with the use of your and our to indicate a possessive relationship with similar entities; while the use of your is less frequent and indicates that the speaker has no relation to the entity which is controlled by or belongs to the speaker (your organization), the use of our usually signals affective treatment and often references a very large group (e.g. our age could be, and as our survival is at stake, should be the age when, for the first time in history, our hopes are translated into a language shared by all humankind), or points to a partial impermanence in actions or positions (changes are urgently required in our approach to peace-keeping); in the latter case the use of the first person possessive seems to guarantee continuity in the actions and/or positions of the agent, and thus contributes to the intertextual construction of the existential coherence of the speaker and the organization he represents.

Similarly to the distribution of they, the rate of their is higher in the speeches of M’Bow and Mayor, who use it to reference groups which are seen as distant or distinct from the one represented by the speaker (i.e. a member state, a different organization). When occurring with abstract nouns and nominalizations (addiction, aspirations, hopes, desires) the possessive pronoun expresses a reduced agency of the referenced group.
(Mühlhäusler and Harré 1990: 225); in such cases *their* may be followed by *own* which emphasizes that, although effectively or potentially this is not the case, the agency or control should be that of the group designated by *their* and no one else, as in:

(12) *This is the reason why it is so important to empower all human beings to decide for themselves, to make their own choices, to master their own destiny, to design their own future.* (Mayor, DG/95/28)

This may explain the absence of occurrences of *their* indicating negatively designated groups, which tend to be presented as agentive and are attributed full responsibility for their actions.

To conclude, the analysis of the distribution and referential domains of pronominal reference in the material has shown that there are two statistically prominent groups of pronouns – *I/me* and *we/our*, which are used to construct the identities of the speaker and which interact with *you/your* to indicate direct appeal to the addressee, and *they/their* and *those*, referencing distant and/or negatively represented groups. Therefore, these types of pronominal reference are the focus of the study of the strategic use of pronouns for a coherent representation of identities and social roles, and for the definition of a participant’s interpersonal relationships.

### 4.3.2 Reference, persuasion and the identity of the speaker

When delivering a speech, politicians use various closely interwoven persuasion strategies to change, affect or strengthen the beliefs of others by asserting the credibility of the speaker, associated with a coherent presentation of his/her institutional, professional and personal identity, and by asserting the reliability of the content conveyed by constructing a coherent argumentation legitimizing the views and actions proposed. The most frequently used strategies are: direct appeal to the addressee and the audience; self-disclosure; narrative of belonging; establishing common ground; unification of in-group as opposed to out-group perceived as victim or threat/enemy; narrative of achievements; casting the present as a natural extension of the past; appeal to authority; appeal to logic; reference to statistics; appeal to emotions and humour (e.g. Donahue and Prosser 1979, Halmari 2005). What follows aims to show how the use of reference in relation to some of these persuasion strategies contributes to the perception of coherence in discourse.

The construal of the identity of the speaker, closely related to the controlling of the level of personality, is central to successful persuasion. The presents research considers
three identities of the speaker: the institutional identity is seen as a function of the institutional role of the speaker and the authority vested in him, and is associated with a commitment to institutional opinions, attitudes and beliefs; the professional identity of the speaker is based on his professional expertise and knowledge; and the personal identity reflects the subjective views and emotions of the speaker and affects interpersonal relations with other individuals. As Ng and Bradac (1993) and Donahue and Prosser (1997: 74) have shown, self-reference is a key linguistic resource which affects the coherent build-up of the identity of the speaker, as it may indicate: judgements of certainty, the expression of authoritativeness and self-confidence, the level of commitment of the speaker when making statements and reporting on results or accepting responsibility for a policy, the expression of subjectivity in reporting personal feelings, experience or a personal state of mind, and the efforts of the speaker to guide the reader towards a coherent interpretation of the discourse. Obviously, the interpretation of the functions of self-reference devices as indicators of the speaker’s opinions, attitudes and relations to the audience, cannot be made in isolation from the linguistic context in which they occur.

The present analysis considers three main functions of self-reference devices which are associated with the three footings, i.e. principal, author, and animator (Goffman 1981), which the speaker can take when delivering a speech and which contribute to the construction of the institutional, professional and personal identity of the speaker. These are the expression of stance (e.g. Martin and White 2005), i.e. conveying judgments, opinions and commitments of the speaker, the expression of dialogicity, related to interactional aspects of the discourse (Bakhtin 1975, Bolívar 2000), and the metadiscourse function of monitoring discourse organization and indicating intratextual and intertextual reference. It is evident that these devices are instrumental in the construction of coherence on the interpersonal and textual planes of discourse.

Explicit attribution of stance to the speaker contributes to the construal of all aspects of the orator’s identity. As the findings of the analysis of self-reference expressions show, out of the 352 occurrences of self-reference to the speaker by the first person singular pronoun I 271 are used in subject position and in most cases function as expressions of stance. The explicit attribution of stance to the speaker presents him as an active discourse participant engaged in interaction with the addressee and the audience; this enhances dialogicity and contributes to greater speaker visibility (Gosden 1993: 62-67). Moreover, “with I as a subject the utterance has all the reliability of first-hand claim”
(Hodge and Kress 1993: 92), and therefore is assigned high authority and expertise value, which matches the institutional authority vested in the Director-General as a function of his status in the organization.

The strategy of self-disclosure is associated with revealing personal feelings, emotions, attitudes, and professional and biographical experiences. Self-disclosure may be realized by matrix clauses consisting of a first person singular form supported by mental-process verbs, e.g. think, know, wish, regarded as introductory signals in indirect statements which introduce into the sentence the person presenting his/her evaluation on the proposition in the following that-clause (Poldauf 1964: 251). According to Wilson (1990: 62), these structures are typically associated with the expression of sincerity and deep personal involvement, thus projecting the personal identity of the speaker to support the institutional views conveyed by the rhetoric.

As the findings of the analysis show, the Directors-General tend to use matrix clauses to express involvement with the ideas and aims of UNESCO and to establish solidarity with their audience. In the speeches under investigation, the choice of verbs, nouns and adjectives expressing a high degree of authorial commitment and certainty (think, believe, trust, know; belief; sure, convinced) reflects the institutional role of the Director-General, who strives to create an impression of high authority, integrity and credibility in order, on the one hand, to persuade the audience to accept and support the views of the organization, and on the other, to promote his managerial policy. Thus, the use of I think to indicate a personal attribution of judgement in (13) below, which according to Brown and Levinson (1987: 164) is regarded as a hedge suggesting that the speaker is not taking full responsibility for the truth of the utterance, may be reinterpreted in an institutional context as a persuasive device putting forward a strong position which draws on the expertise and institutional authority of the Director-General and is in agreement with the shared values and views of the organization he represents. A similar interpretation of I think and I believe in political discourse is suggested by Miššíková (2007: 147), who claims that the function of these hedges is metalinguistic, since they “refer to the ‘quality’ of the language used by the speaker and thus are concerned with ‘telling the truth’”. In addition, since I think invites the listener’s judgement and thus enhances listener involvement, it also functions as a marker of dialogicity, which is stressed by the shift to the inclusive we in the following example:

(13) I think that we must explore this approach of considering drug addicts as persons who
need care and to whom such care should be provided in the same way as any other kind of medical assistance. (Mayor, DG/95/19)

By showing his personal involvement in the discourse, the speaker indicates that he is not acting only in the role of animator, but also is personally committed to the attitudes, views and opinions stated in his opening address.

When seeking to convey authoritativeness and self-confidence, the orator may refer to his professional expertise to provide support for his attitudes and beliefs. Thus in the following example (14), Mayor draws on his expertise as a biochemist and his highly successful academic career to claim authority associated with his professional identity, so enhancing the credibility of his opinion and arguments.

(14)  *As a brain biochemist, I must warn particularly against the damage produced by drug addiction.* (Mayor, DG/95/19)

The expression of coherent stance is also indicated by overt attribution of emotive assessment to the speaker, frequently realized by the matrix clauses *I hope* with *that*-clause and *I wish* with *to*-infinitive complementation. While *I hope* may also be considered to infer epistemic meaning, *I wish* is frequently used as an alternative to the modal expression *would like* to indicate tentativeness and politeness. As noted above, the use of self-reference in association with strongly positive affective adjectives (e.g. *delighted, happy*) indicates emotional intensity on the extremes of a value scale and enhances dialogicity by evaluating positively speaker-audience relations. In addition, since affective adjectives have positive connotations and signal an assumption of shared attitudes, beliefs and values, they are related to the strategy of claiming common ground.

(15)  *I am particularly happy to be speaking to you today on the occasion of the XIIth General Assembly of the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property.* (M’Bow, DG/83/16)

The use of the extraposed structure *It is a privilege for me + to*-infinitive clause achieves backgrounding of the speaker, while foregrounding the affective-stance noun, indicating the attitude expressed and achieving end-focus on the item positively evaluated:

(16)  *It is a great pleasure for me to open the first session of the Conference of Parties to the International Convention against Doping in Sport.* (Matsuura, DG/2007/009)

Matsuura provides an interesting example of the strategy of self-disclosure combining a narrative of personal experience with humour by an insert in the salutation part of his address at the opening of the *Pilgrimage Route Meeting* in Accra (Ghana) under
the form of a narrative which may be qualified as a joke (17). Jokes presuppose the existence of mutually-shared values and background knowledge for the inferring of missing links when deriving coherence from a text; therefore they can be regarded as building up common ground between the speaker and the audience. Since owing to the cross-cultural character of diplomatic communication the risk of disturbed coherence (Bublitz and Lenk 1999) is high, the Director-General uses an explicit disambiguating device “to suggest to [his] current hearers a preferred line of interpretation” (Povolná 2006: 132). Thus by the use of the contrastive topic shift marker More seriously though he indicates a return to a formal and serious mode of discourse typical of the occasion and a rhetorical move boundary.

(17)  
I made my first official visit to Ghana at the invitation of President Kufuor three years ago, in order to launch the 2004 International Year to Commemorate the Struggle Against Slavery. On that occasion, I had the privilege of making my first address as Nana Nyarko Abronoma the First, a name that was graciously bestowed upon me in Cape Coast. Yesterday, I was almost made Nana of the Ga people at the ceremony held at James Town, Accra. But they discovered at the last minute that I am already Nana of Cape Coast. They therefore decided to withdraw their offer, which I regret nonetheless. More seriously though, it is with genuine pleasure that I return to your country ...

(Matsuura, DG/2007/017)

In Matsuura’s speech this joke is integrated into a narrative of personal experience, a discourse strategy asserting the existential coherence of the speaker by stressing his close relationship with the audience. In his narrative the Director-General claims common ground with his audience in Ghana by indicating that this is not his first visit to the country; furthermore, he indicates that he has been granted the honorary title of Nana of Cape Coast, i.e. he claims to have been accepted as a member of the Cape Coast people by using an in-group identity marker. He proceeds to relate the story of how he was nearly made Nana of the Ga people, but was then refused this honour (a face-threatening act), i.e. within the joke the speaker humbles and abases himself, thus showing deference to the hearer and minimizing the imposition of his institutional rank and the fact that he is holding the floor. Deference is also indicated by the use of the personal pronoun they to indicate distancing and to present the referent as indefinite and powerful, similarly to the use of they to refer to the government, police or army (Wilson 1990: 67-9). The contrast between the two parts of the narrative indicated by the discourse marker but is enhanced by a change of the thematic element, i.e. while in the first two sentences of the narrative the speaker is established as the theme, in the last two it is the personal pronoun they referring to the Ga authorities that takes over the function of theme, thus attributing the agentive role
to them and positioning the speaker as the patient.

Direct appeal to the addressee and the audience is frequently conveyed by expressive speech acts of welcoming, thanking and congratulating, which are considered unambivalently polite by Leech (1983: 140) and mark a direct involvement with the listeners. As example (18) suggests, they usually include explicit other-reference which takes the form of vocatives and second person pronouns.

(18) It is with the greatest joy, Mr. President of the Republic, that I welcome you this evening to the Headquarters of UNESCO on the occasion of the Third International Forum on the Environment organized by the French Ministry of the Environment and the Quality of Life. (M’Bow, DG/80/36)

The expression of personal involvement is typically enhanced by boosters (greatest joy) associated with the discourse strategy of self-disclosure, which contributes to the existential coherence of the speaker by making explicit his attitude to people, facts and ideas, thus allowing him to represent these as continuous. Involvement with the audience or particular addressees is further enhanced by occurrences of the possessive pronoun my with nouns referring to the addressee (friend, colleague, mentor) or to an encounter (stay, visit), thus indicating the existence of established and continuous relationships between the participants in the interaction, and as a result enhancing the perception of coherence on the interpersonal plane of discourse.

Dialogicity is also fostered by the occurrence of comments by the speaker interrupting the flow of the argument, which are typically realized in the form of comment clauses, i.e. discourse markers conveying direct appeal to the listener, thus inviting his/her reaction. The most frequent function of these highly context-dependent structures is that of opine markers (19); according to Povolná’s (2007: 116) classification, these are speaker-oriented discourse items used to “emphasize that what is being uttered is just the current speaker’s own opinion or attitude”, thus reflecting a culture-specific preference for tentativeness, which is considered to be characteristic of spoken English (Urbanová and Oakland 2002: 17).

(19) Education – I believe – is the key to its achievement, as it is to the reduction of screen violence. (Mayor, DG/95/39)

The fact that while occurrences of the comment clause I believe are not reported by Povolná (2007), who includes in her corpus informal face-to-face and telephone conversations and radio discussions, instances of I believe as opine marker are present in the MICASE corpus of spoken academic English, supports the claim that I believe is
associated with more formal contexts and the expression of a high level of certainty, authority and expertise.

On the textual plane, self-reference expressions function as metadiscourse markers by guiding the listener through the argumentation presented in the political speech and by activating relevant intertextual connections based on the participants’ background knowledge, thus contributing to the coherent interpretation of discourse. The speaker may activate the participants’ shared knowledge by referring to values and ideas promoted by UNESCO without specifying the source document, or he may quote or refer to a specific text, typically a resolution or convention. In addition, the speaker may refer to his own ideas or speeches delivered on previous occasions, thus underlining the continuity of his views, values and actions and building up an interdiscoursal dimension of coherence, as illustrated in:

(20)  *As I recently emphasized from the rostrum of the General Conference in Sofia, this is not the first time that the United Nations has faced such challenges.* (M’Bow, DG/85/41)

Intra-textual reference is used in the material to indicate discourse organization, to emphasize an important point or idea, to guide the listener through] the discourse, or to refer to another part of the same text. In addition, most self-reference expressions function as markers of emphasis and point of view, thus helping the listener to derive a coherent interpretation of the discourse. The most frequent intra-textual reference marker used to indicate transition between discourse segments is the first person imperative *Let me*, which similarly as in academic English is “common when the speaker/writer is signalling an upcoming aspect of the text” (Carter and McCarthy 2006: 288); the sense of *allow* of the introductory signal *let me*, however, is considered to be preserved to a certain extent, thus contributing to the expression of politeness, as in:

(21)  *Let me begin with a word of tribute to our partners in the organization of this meeting.* (Mayor, DG/95/43)

While self-reference by the first person singular pronoun *I* is associated with the strategies of self-disclosure, claiming common ground, narrative of belonging, humour, claiming authority and direct appeal to the audience and addressee, self reference by the first person plural pronoun *we* is related primarily to the strategies of unification of in-group as opposed to out-group perceived as victim or threat/enemy, narrative of achievements, and casting the present as a natural extension of the past. Self-reference by *we* is also instrumental in the construction of the institutional identity of the speaker as a leader of the
organization he represents.

An analysis of the exclusive/inclusive *we* ratio (Table 5) based on the 279 occurrences of *we* in agentive subject position shows that while inclusive group reference clearly prevails, there are considerable differences in the number of tokens used by the three speakers. The use of the institutional exclusive *we*, referring to UNESCO, is the most prominent in the speeches of Matsuura, who adopts a managerial perspective, and extremely rare in M’Bow’s addresses, who, as already pointed out, seems to fail to fully identify with the institutional ideology.

**Table 5: Exclusive/inclusive *we* ratio in the speeches of the three Directors-General**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Matsuura</th>
<th>Mayor</th>
<th>M’Bow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusive <em>we</em></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive <em>we</em></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The exclusive *we* referring to UNESCO plays an important role in the construction of the institutional identity of the speaker and the organization and fosters their coherent representation discourse. It is typically used when defining commitments of UNESCO with respect to member states and other organizations. In the majority of cases the exclusive *we* has a cohesive function; by referring anaphorically to UNESCO, it fosters the establishment of this referent as thematic and contributes to discourse coherence by creating cohesive chains on the textual plane of discourse; these cohesive chains can be text-exhaustive and thus affect global coherence. In addition, in (22) the categorization of UNESCO as lead agency for promoting educational programmes and the representation of the organization as an active agent in collaborative action (*UNESCO has given priority – we have responded – we have collaborated*) enables Matsuura to use a narrative of achievements to cast the present as a natural extension of the past and thus to reaffirm the institutional identity of the organization. By relating past action to future expectations, the Director-General enhances the existential coherence of the organization, which is presented as acting consistently towards a goal shared with a partner (ECOWAS) who is the beneficiary of the joint action (*the request of the [ECOWAS] Secretariat and member states for assistance – ECOWAS member states benefit – these benefits will be shared across West Africa*). In fact, *our hope* suggests an implicit ambiguity, since it is possible to
identify the referent of *our* as UNESCO only, or as UNESCO and ECOWAS sharing joint goals and aims; further, an interactive dimension is added by the sentence initial adverbial (*as you are already aware*), which appeals directly to the audience to claim shared knowledge and activate mental models facilitating a coherent interpretation of the discourse.

(22) *As you are already aware, UNESCO has given priority to its work as lead agency for promoting Education for All (EFA) and the education-related Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). In this regard, we have responded to the request of the Secretariat and member states for assistance in the formulation of the ECOWAS Education Protocol, which now serves as the basis for collaboration between ECOWAS member states in this important area. In addition, we have collaborated with the Secretariat in designing a regime for the recognition of higher education degrees across the sub-region. ECOWAS member states benefit here not only from UNESCO interventions in response to bilateral agreements with ECOWAS, but also directly by virtue of their membership of UNESCO. Our hope and expectation is that through ECOWAS sponsored networks, these benefits will be shared across West Africa.* (Matsuura, DG/2006/092)

The inclusive uses of *we*, which are often highly ambiguous and context-dependent, can have deictic or anaphoric interpretation; deictic reference to meeting participants and UNESCO and other groups draws on the context of situation, while the referents of the rhetorical *we* (the United Nations) and the generic use of the pronoun are established by inference from the socio-cultural context. As Table 6 shows, the most frequent function of the inclusive *we* is to refer to UNESCO and others, such as other organizations, groups of states or professional groups; this integrative use of *we* may be used to delimit an ad-hoc in-group boundary, while the expressive use introduces an interactional dimension related to the claiming of solidarity, common ground and shared values.

**Table 6: Categories of inclusive *we* in the speeches of the three Directors-General**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions of inclusive <em>we</em></th>
<th>Matsuura</th>
<th>Mayor</th>
<th>M’Bow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker + other</td>
<td>No 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting participants</td>
<td>No 18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO + others</td>
<td>No 42</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 57</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>No 8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic</td>
<td>No 3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% 4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>No 74</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The integrative use of the inclusive *we* is typically determinate and refers to meeting participants or the orator and another individual. It is most prominent in Matsuura’s addresses and, as evidenced in section 4.2.1 above, typically occurs in the salutation part of the speeches to indicate the speaker’s alignment with the addressee(s). The contribution of these inclusive uses of *we* to evaluative coherence stems from their potential to establish individuals as members of an in-group whose point of view and ideology are presented in the speech. In (23) the shift from *I* to *we*, referring to the speaker and *His Excellency President Ali Abdullah Saleh*, an individual addressee present at the event and thus sharing the deictic centre of the speaker, categorizes them as belonging to an in-group delimited by the commitment to a certain idea, action or goal, and casts the present as a natural extension of the past, thus signalling existential coherence. Discourse coherence is further promoted by the use of cohesive devices including reference chains referring to the speaker (*me – me – I – my – we*) and the addressee (*His Excellency President Ali Abdullah Saleh – his Excellency – we*), and temporal and locative frame markers which are related by the cohesive relation of specification and co-specification (*several occasions: at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris – in Aden in 2002 during my last trip to Yemen – in Paris the following year – Yesterday*). The assertion of the existence of a long-term collaboration between the two institutional representatives and their institutions enhances the credibility of the speaker’s argumentation by indicating continuity of past and present actions and reliance on previous experience.

(23) *Let me extend my gratitude to His Excellency President Ali Abdullah Saleh for inviting me to make this second official visit to his country. I have been privileged to meet his Excellency on several occasions, first at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris, then in Aden in 2002 during my last trip to Yemen, and then once again in Paris the following year. Yesterday, we met for the fourth time to discuss our bilateral cooperation in many areas. We noted with great pleasure the progress that has been made in recent years, in particular in education and culture, and addressed plans for further reinforcing our collaboration.* (Matsuura, DG/2006/180)

While attributing in-group membership, reference to meeting participants by the integrative inclusive *we*, anaphorically or deictically related to mental representations of groups and individuals available in the previous discourse or the situational context, posits them and the occasion at the deictic centre of the orator. This is explicitly stressed by the adverbial sequence *here today* in example (24), thus achieving coherence by establishing the interactants and their ideology as continuously present and proximal in terms of the
space, time and modality dimensions of discourse. The personal intrusion of the speaker (I look forward to) and the direct address to the addressees (your experience and vision of the future) foregrounds the interpersonal dimension of coherence.

(24) UNESCO is also assisting African universities in developing scientific and technological capacity specifically targeted to addressing regional challenges. In this regard, we are privileged to have present here today the Commissioner of the African Union for Human Resources, Science and Technology, and the Honorable Minister of Science and Technology of Nigeria – I look forward to learning of your experience and vision for the future. (Matsuura, DG/2006/113)

The expressive use of the inclusive we enhancing the perception of in-group togetherness is also determinate; its reference is occasionally indicated by disambiguating devices, as in (25), where the referents of we are listed to avoid a potential misinterpretation of the in-group boundaries outlined by the speaker.

(25) As we work together on the whole of the EFA agenda, it is important that all of us – governments, aid agencies, civil society organizations, multilateral partners and the private sector – re-examine our priorities. (Matsuura, DG/2006/157)

Since the interpretation of the deictic first person plural pronoun is context-dependent, the referent of we may change on each occasion of its use, thus allowing the speaker to indicate alignment with different groups while assuming shared values and beliefs. Thus in (26) the referent of the inclusive we in the first sentence is all organizations of the UN system and all people involved in the Decade on Education for Sustainable Development. However, the occurrences of we in the rest of the paragraph are exclusive, i.e. they refer to UNESCO as the lead agency for promoting the Decade, which is a part of a larger in-group committed to a common goal. The active involvement of UNESCO in achieving this goal, categorized as a tremendous challenge, is positively evaluated by the choice of expressive lexical means (welcome – delighted – do our utmost – with all energy), which qualify the attitude of the speaker towards accepting the responsibility to accomplish this goal successfully. The use of I am sure is another example of personal intrusion by the speaker to show epistemic certainty and indicate a high level of commitment to the common set of values and beliefs; this fosters the credibility of the speaker and the persuasive force of the discourse.

(26) Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) is clearly a tremendous challenge but it is one that we must all welcome and one that we must address together. For its part, UNESCO is delighted to have been designated by the United Nations General Assembly as the lead agency for promoting the Decade and for its international coordination. We shall do our utmost to fulfil this responsibility with all the energy, commitment and expertise it deserves. In this task, I am sure we can count on the broad ESD partnership to work
The different functions of *we*, though, need not be strictly delimited; in fact, it “has a shifting signifier, since it is used with many potential scopes of reference even within a single discourse” (Wales 1996:62). As the extract taken from Matsuura’s speech at the opening of the *First Session of the Conference of Parties to the International Convention against Doping in Sport* suggests (27), while the situational context indicates the states parties of the Convention as the most likely referent of *we* (the in-group boundary is defined by membership and the ideology stated in the Convention), additional potential referents are UNESCO and the international community in general.

(27) *The fight against doping in sport will be at its strongest if we have a network of capable governments throughout the world. [...] The entry into force of the Convention marks a major advance in efforts to create an honest and equitable environment for all athletes. And yet, we cannot afford to be complacent. We must continue to strongly encourage those Member States who have not ratified the Convention to take the necessary measures to do so. All governments have a duty to complete this task, and to ensure that future generations are able to enjoy and excel in doping-free sport.* (Matsuura DG/2007/009)

By allowing for multiple inference the orator assumes that he is not speaking only on behalf of the states parties of the convention and the organization he represents, but also on behalf of the audience (including potential members of the Convention and the general public). The rhetorical implication is that all interactants and the audience are assumed to share the orator’s ideology, which is posited as ‘right’. It is therefore evident that the rhetorical power of the shifting specific/generic reference to very large groups resides in its potential to impose the orator’s ideology as shared by all interactants, the audience and even mankind.

The ambiguous reference of inclusive *we*, deictically and occasionally anaphorically retrievable from the socio-cultural context or the previous discourse as the United Nations or extended to imply the generic *we*, the “collective voice of universal conscience” (Wales 1996: 62), is often combined with intertextual linking to achieve interdiscoursal coherence, thus enhancing the existential coherence of the orators and the organization they represent. This strategy, most prominent in the speeches of Mayor, who uses it in order to reclaim shared ideology and common goals for all member states, is illustrated by (28). Here an explicit reference to the United Nations Charter, further enhanced by a paraphrase of Archibald MacLeish’s idea embedded in the preamble of the Constitution of UNESCO – “it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed” – creates continuity of institutional ideology and reinforces institutional identity. Coherence on the
local and interdiscoursal levels is further promoted by the contrast of war against peace, and lack of sharing, poverty and injustice against family cohesion and responsibility, which sets up the evaluative stance of the speaker. The use of parallelism based on the negative comparator lack emphatically states that the speaker assesses the situation as departing from the norm, i.e. what is ‘right’, in ‘our’ society. By conceptualizing reality in terms of oppositions of ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ the orator claims legitimization for his institutional ideology, and by presenting the threat to the ‘right’ social order as proximal (implied by today and the implication that screen violence affects our children in our homes) he motivates intervention against what is considered as ‘wrong’ (Chilton 2004, Cap 2007), i.e. coherence is enhanced by the activation of the cause-effect coherence relation.

(28) The United Nations Charter promised our children life, not suffering and war. It was thought that the best tribute we could pay those killed during the Second World War was to spare the lives of their children, to save them from the ultimate form of violence. We made it our task to prevent war by constructing the defences of peace in the minds of men, in the well-known phrase of Archibald MacLeish. Today we too often foster violence through injustice, lack of sharing, poverty and exclusion; through lack of family cohesion and responsibility; through lack of the necessary rigour by national parliaments; through lack of good sense and taste in the media – particularly public media of whom we have a right to expect a greater sense of responsibility; through violence on the screen. We owe it to our children to honour the promises made to them in the UN Charter and the Convention on the Rights of the Child. (Mayor, DG/95/39)

Building up a coherent representation of a discourse world in terms of ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ along a cline of distancing on spatial, temporal and ideological axes from a deictic centre is further promoted by the categorization of the agents of social action as ‘us’, the in-group situated at the decitic centre, and ‘them’, distant outsiders (e.g. Chilton 2004, Wodak 2007, Van Dijk 1997). In terms of its semiotic and semantic potential, the specific/generalized inclusive we functions as a value-laden antonym of they and those, which indicate social actors represented as distant, out-group members contrasted to the in-group of the speaker. Since the meanings of these deictic pronouns are not necessarily fixed or stable, in different contexts they have the potential to produce different contrastive oppositions, which results in the pragmatic power to delimit and oppose groups for political expediency (Wales 1996: 61), thus allowing speakers to achieve different goals.

The treatment of the we – they opposition in M’Bow’s speeches reflects his conceptualization of the global political space as made up of two antagonistic worlds. The implied dichotomy of the international community (‘them’) vs. the developing countries (‘us’) in M’Bow’s discourse reflects the internal controversy of his position as a Director-
General of UNESCO and a partisan of the interests of developing countries. In his 1980 speech at UN headquarters in New York (29), M’Bow represents the global political space as divided into two opposing worlds (*demarcation line is gradually separating two worlds whose chances of survival are fundamentally unequal*), in which developing countries are assigned the role of victims excluded from the in-group to which they have the right to belong; the spatial metaphor *a long way from* presents the situation as distal (i.e. undesirable, not ‘right’) from the deictic centre of the speaker. This opposition is encapsulated in the pronoun *we* (used in the first and last paragraphs of the extract), which though referring to the United Nations and by over-generalization to mankind, cannot override by its inclusive force the tension expressed by such items as *dialogue of the deaf, to accept or to refuse, disorder and war as opposed to peaceful manner, our destinies are now irreversibly linked*. Thus while the deictic interpretation of *we* by its internal controversy sustains the ideological position of the speaker, the anaphorical function of the pronoun creates superficial cohesive chains contributing to discourse connectivity.

(29) *We are still a long way from the prospects outlined in the texts adopted in 1974 and 1975 with a view to the establishment of a new international economic order. And yet, it is vital to move away from this dialogue of the deaf which takes place at so many international gatherings, when many societies are at present on the verge of serious breakdown. [...] An indivisible demarcation line is gradually separating two worlds whose chances of survival are fundamentally unequal. This division is an offence against the moral conscience of mankind even before it represents a threat to its future. [...] The inevitable result is that the international community cannot see the wood for the trees and prescribes palliatives where surgery is necessary. Failure to trace this misery to its source involves a danger of reducing the concept of international co-operation to that of aid, which increasingly resembles humiliating charity. [...] In fact, co-operation, in the form in which it has been undertaken up to now, has led to the increased dependence of many Third World countries, rather than the strengthening of their endogenous capacity for development. Even if a few have brought off the occasional victory, several have found themselves weakened at the time of reckoning, and sometimes even worse off in some respects than at the outset. Those countries which have thrown themselves wide open to foreign investments, adopting the logic of the market system, have often suffered the dislocation of their economy. Others have been tempted to try the exact opposite: withdrawal behind their frontiers and isolation. Deprived of most of the advances in knowledge and know-how acquired by the rest of the world, they have spent their force in the attempt. [...] The choice which we are offered, at the anguished close of this millennium, is not whether to accept real changes or to refuse them. It hinges only on the question of whether these changes will come about through violent upheavals, in disorder and war, or whether they will take place in a concerted and peaceful manner. Let us agree to see in this meeting a sign of hope. It is in fact in this forum that mankind has tried, for the first time in its history, to plan out its future on a basis of solidarity, by entrusting representatives of the States of the whole world with a mandate to reflect together on their common problems. For better or worse, our destinies are now irreversibly linked. Let us accept them in this*
way, transcending our individual interests, in the name of collective aspirations for a form of progress that is synonymous with shared dignity. (M’Bow, UN General Assembly, September 1980)

In the speeches of M’Bow and Mayor, the markers of distance they and those are used to designate two distinct types of group. On the one hand, they and those may refer to prevailingy definite groups of people with the role of passive patients, who are threatened by something or deprived of something and thus seen as not fully integrated into the in-group society, members of which they should potentially be. On the other hand, they and those may reference typically indefinite groups represented as active agents threatening the in-group society as a whole or some of its members.

Returning to the analysis of (29) above, the anaphoric reference constructed by means of lexical reiteration and pronominal reference creates cohesive chains enforcing an ideological view which posits the international community (identified with developed countries) as a threat to the Third World countries (they, their, themselves, those), who are seen as excluded from the global society and deprived of their lawful rights; this is indicated by their role of affected participant subjects in passive voice structures (e.g. Others have been tempted to try the exact opposite). This idea is further highlighted by the redefinition of the positive value concept international co-operation, which presupposes relationships between partners, as the negative value concept aid, which increasingly resembles humiliating charity, reflecting a rearrangement of power relations between the participants casting developed countries as patronizing in their behaviour to dependent developing countries. The representation of two conflicting ideological axes is coherently sustained throughout the speech and is emblematic of M’Bow’s discourse as a whole (Dontcheva-Navratilova 2010). The legitimization of the claims of the excluded group stems from a negative moral evaluation of the position of international society, which is seen as an offence against the moral conscience of mankind, a threat to its future and humiliating charity, and the simultaneous construction of a sympathetic and supportive stance towards the Third World countries, who are presented as illegitimately deprived of equal opportunities and fair treatment (increased dependence of many Third World countries, rather than the strengthening of their endogenous capacity for development – weakened – worse off) and viciously trapped in a disadvantageous situation (suffered the dislocation of their economy – withdrawal behind their frontiers and isolation – deprived of most of the advances in knowledge and know-how). It should be mentioned that in the last but one paragraph of (29), where the group of Third World countries is further
subdivided into two groups which have chosen a different path of political action, the
speaker uses equivocation (Bavelas et al. 1988) based on the indefinite reference of those
countries and others and obscures the precise identities of the countries, thus avoiding the
creating of explicit ideological tensions within his in-group.

The presence of two ideological axes is also traceable in Mayor’s speeches; however, he aligns himself with the UN system and the international community, which are seen as active social actors empowered to intervene and protect victims against those who threaten them. In his address to the 58th session of the United Nations International Narcotics Control Board, Mayor uses the first paragraph of example 30 as an opening which precedes the salutation part of the speech. It is interesting to note that Mayor is the only one of the three orators included in my research who uses this strategy. This foregrounding strategy is used to highlight the threat that the metonymically related products, effects and agents – drugs, cars, cancer, drug addiction and drug traffickers – represent to the established social order. The binary opposition between drug traffickers and international society, which is called upon to stop them, is introduced by the forceful parallelism of the three sentences opening the speech, in which drugs, drunk drivers and cancer are presented as equal in their killing potential to war; thus the pronoun they, used to refer to the agents performing the killing, acquires a strong negative connotation. The referent of the inclusive pronoun we is the organizations of the United Nations system and the international community as a whole, which are seen as active social agents empowered to intervene and protect victims against those who threaten them. As the second paragraph in the same example indicates (this passage appears later in the speech) the same opposition is coherently constructed throughout the whole discourse.

A careful analysis of (30) shows that Mayor uses a sequence of persuasion strategies to legitimate his appeal for immediate action against the threat of drug addiction. First of all, he draws on his expertise as a biochemist, which positions him as a source competent to judge the validity of the threat and invests him with the authority of a person who knows what is inevitably going to happen (Fowler 1991: 211). The repeated use of evaluative structures including the personal pronoun I/my (I must warn, I think, my concern) shows a strong personal involvement with the issue; in addition, the ethical dimension of the problem and the urgent nature of the situation are used as arguments requiring international society to acknowledge the system of values of the United Nations, to take action against the threat and protect the victims. Most importantly though, Mayor
activates the context of war and constructs the image of a ‘faceless’ and therefore sinister enemy who threatens to kill the most vulnerable members of society – children who deserve care and protection. The referent of the pronoun they in the third paragraph of the extract is the victims (in danger of injury, murder, violence, rape, sexual exploitation, AIDS and other diseases, hunger, solitude, contempt – and drug abuse) – the street children who are given the passive role of a disadvantaged group acted upon by a negative agent, and who, although not yet part of ‘us’, live in ‘our’ society, and thus are closer on the spatial and ideological axes to the deictic centre (indicated by the use of proximal these and the possessive relation our young people), and who should be helped, supported and thus integrated into the in-group (educated to become responsible citizens). The personal pronoun we, referring to a wide international community, is opposed to those, which typically indicates a distant indeterminate group bearing strong negative connotations (manipulating them in order to make huge and heinous financial gains). The pronoun those is postmodified by a relative clause which specifies the negative actions and intentions of the referent without making explicit its identity; drawing on Cornish (2008: 1000), this use of those may be seen as anadeictic, since the post-modifying clause is supposed to trigger in the addressee’s memory a shared representation of the referenced qualities, actions and entities. The final paragraph places the referents we/our, they and those in direct contrast, while further legitimating intervention against drug traffic by intertextual reference to the texts of the Constitution of UNESCO (construct the defences of peace in the minds of men and women) and the Charter of the United Nations (saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war). Thus Mayor constructs a coherent tripartite discourse world in which ‘we’ lead a war in order to protect ‘them’ (the victims) against ‘those’ who threaten ‘them’ and ‘us’.

(30) Drugs kill: they kill like war. Cars driven by drunks kill: they kill as in war. Lung cancer kills: it kills like war. As a brain biochemist, I must warn particularly against the damage produced by drug addiction. Irreversibility is the supreme criterion for action. It is a matter of the ethics of time. Courageous, firm, innovative measures must be adopted at international and national level alike if we really want to end this shame of many people, too often young, being trapped by an addiction harmful both for them and for their social entourage. […]

We must prosecute the drug traffickers just as we must care for the health of the addicted. Both supply and demand must be reduced. This means adopting radical measures for preventing the laundering of money of unknown provenance. The adoption of international measures to this effect is absolutely indispensable if we wish to address the real problems and not merely the symptoms. […]

I think that close collaboration is necessary to put an end to what has been going on for too long: an endless war against a faceless enemy. One of my greatest concerns in this respect
is the problem of street children. Today, over 100 million children throughout the world are struggling for survival in destitution and distress. They are the street and working children who are in danger of injury, murder, violence, rape, sexual exploitation, AIDS and other diseases, hunger, solitude, contempt – and drug abuse. We see these children standing around street corners and under bridges intoxicating themselves by inhaling solvents. Their numbers are increasing daily, in the South and in the North. These children need to be taught how to live in society, they must be integrated into society, and they need to be educated to become responsible citizens and to defend themselves against those intent on manipulating them in order to make huge and heinous financial gains. [...] (Mayor, DG/95/19)

The use of they/those in Matsuura’s speeches is not marked for the projecting of negative connotations. Thus the following extract taken from his address to the Freedom of Expression and Media Development conference (31) exemplifies a different treatment of distance. The social actors referred to by they/their and the determiner those are carriers of positive values (brave individuals) and part of the in-group, who are represented as distant on the temporal and spatial axes only, since they have died or are risking their lives in Iraq for the securing of values asserted by the in-group (expressing an opinion, disseminating information, encouraging open dialogue and debate, freedom of expression).

(31) The vast majority of victims in Iraq have been local journalists and media staff. Most are attacked because of their work. They are targeted for expressing an opinion, for disseminating information, and for encouraging open dialogue and debate.

I would like to ask for a minute of silence to commemorate the women and men who have lost their lives for freedom of expression, and to honour those brave individuals who every day continue to risk their lives in order to provide vital information about the situation in their country. (Matsuura, DG/2007/001)

It is obvious from the discussion above that reference is a key element of numerous persuasion strategies aimed at asserting the credibility of the speaker, associated with a coherent presentation of his/her institutional, professional and personal identity, and aimed at asserting the reliability of the content conveyed by constructing a coherent argumentation legitimizing the views and actions proposed. Of particular importance is the use of self-reference devices for identity construction, for opening a dialogic space for the negotiation of meaning with the addressee(s) and the audience, and for representing discourse participants as sharing a common ideology. Other reference devices outline the scale of distancing used by the orator and indicate social actors as proximal or distal, thus structuring the discourse space from the perspective of deictic centre of the speaker. The potential of pronominal reference and related nominal reference to build up the institutional identity of the speaker in relation to his personal and professional identities, and to present his attitudes, opinions and beliefs as continuous, predetermines its key role in enhancing the perception of global and local coherence on all planes of discourse.
4.4 Modality markers and point of view

This section of the investigation considers the role of modality in constructing interpersonal coherence in opening addresses. It should be noted that within the study of interpersonal meanings in political discourse, modality expressed by various lexical and grammatical forms (e.g. modal auxiliaries and adverbs, lexical verbs, nouns, evaluative adjectives, degree words, mood etc.) has received considerable attention (e.g. Hodge and Kress 1993, Chilton 2004, Simon-Vandenbergen 1997); however the contribution of modal markers to discourse coherence has not been studied in detail. The present research considers the semantic and pragmatic functions of some deontic and epistemic modality markers in the opening addresses of the Directors-General, while taking into consideration ideological and context-motivated reasons for the modal selections made by the three speakers. The main aim of the following discussion is to argue that the interplay of deontic and epistemic modal meanings may enhance evaluative coherence by constructing a consistent subjective representation of the discourse world in the speeches of the orators. Thus the Directors-General can represent their attitudes, beliefs and commitments as continuous and improve their chances of not only helping the addressee(s) and the audience to understand their message, but also to make them believe it.

Modality is a semantic category which can be realized in language by different grammatical, lexical and phonological means. Despite variation in the classifications of modal meaning and in the set of criteria proposed for its definition, it is now generally agreed that modality is the semantic domain pertaining to “the addition of a supplement or overlay of meaning to the most neutral semantic value of the proposition of an utterance” (Bybee and Fleischman 1995: 2), expressing the speaker’s “opinion or attitude towards the proposition that the sentence expresses or the situation that the proposition describes” (Lyons 1977: 452) and covering the domain of essentially subjective and non-factual meanings (Palmer 1986: 14-18). This investigation adopts Palmer’s categorization of modal meanings in terms of the speaker’s commitment to propositional content (Palmer 1986, 2003), which differentiates between three types of modality, namely epistemic, deontic and dynamic. According to this approach, epistemic modality (related to values on the probability/possibility scale) expresses the speaker’s attitude to the status of the proposition in terms of judgement of truth-value, while deontic meanings (associated with the expression of wants and desires and the imposition of one’s value system and will on others) and dynamic meaning (associated with yielding control over events and
circumstances to the subject of the sentence) express the potentiality of the events. Since in English the same modal verbs can be used to express both deontic and epistemic meanings, the polysemy of these modal markers is resolved pragmatically in the process of utterance comprehension (Papafragou 2000: 521).

The distinction between subjective and objective meanings is another dimension of modality affected by pragmatic considerations. Epistemic and deontic modality are speaker-related and therefore prototypically subjective (in contrast to the objective character of dynamic modality); they clearly encode the position of the speaker with respect to the propositional content of the clause, either in terms of epistemic commitment to possibility or probability, or in terms of deontic commitment to obligation or permission. However, while most researchers agree that deontic modality allows for some cases of objective use, some authors question the existence of objective epistemic meanings (e.g. Halliday 1970, Verstraete 2001). Since all epistemic markers in the material express subjectivity, drawing on Langacker (1990) and (Verstraete 2001), this investigation takes into consideration an additional dimension of subjectivity which reflects the presence or absence of explicit speaker-presence. Explicit speaker-presence is associated with the personal intrusion of the speaker into the text (indicated typically by the use of first-person pronouns) and a high degree of commitment to the attitude expressed. In political discourse its role may be to disambiguate the nature of authority claimed by the speaker, i.e. objective knowledge, associated primarily with the professional identity of the speaker, or position of power, related to institutional and social status (Hodge and Kress 1993: 123). However, the use of third-person subject structures, i.e. depersonalized, impersonal constructions expressing intentional illocutionary opacity resulting in semantic indeterminacy (Urbanová 2003: 49), can also be strategically exploited to suppress the source of authority, thus making it difficult to challenge (Hodge and Kress 1993: 124).

4.4.1 **Deontic modality: the ‘right’ vs. ‘wrong’ opposition**

Deontic modality is connected with the necessity or desirability of acts performed by morally responsible agents (Lyons 1977: 823); it reflects the efforts of the speaker to impose a state of affairs on individuals by restricting possible states of affairs to a single choice (Chung and Timberlake 1985) or “with the modality as deixis, the imposition of a convergence of the expressed world and the reference world” (Frawley 1992: 420). Within
political discourse, the morality and legality of this state of affairs is inevitably related to a culture-dependent ideological point of view which correlates with institutional beliefs and norms of conduct and a biased representation of a constructed discourse world in terms of ‘right’ and ‘wrong’. However, in agreement with Hodge and Kress (1993: 157), it can be argued that an ideology is not “a single consistent but biased representation of reality [which] normally comes complete with its own negation, in a deeply contradictory set of versions of reality whose contradictions are intrinsic to their function”. Such a set, called an ‘ideological complex’, includes two components: the first is the representation of solidarity (solidarity function) and the other is the representation of conflict and imposition of power (power function).

A useful framework for the analysis of ideological complexes is provided by Chilton’s legitimization theory (2004) and further developed by Cap’s concept of proximization (2007). As noted above, within this approach the ideologically-biased discourse world of the speaker is seen as constructed along three dimensions of deixis – space, time and modality – which position the speaker as the deictic centre, associated with “not only the origin of here and now, but also of epistemic true and deontic right” (Chilton 2004: 59); the intrusion of the ‘wrong’ – physical or in the form of an ideological clash – in the deictic centre shared by the speaker and addressee is considered an immediate threat which legitimizes intervention (moral, legal and physical, if necessary) to restore the integrity of the ‘right’ values and social norms (Cap 2007). It can therefore be argued that deontic modality is associated with exhorting behaviour and views that conform to the culture-specific moral norms and value system and condemn as morally and/or legally wrong those views and acts which oppose these norms and this value system; this potential of deontic modality makes it a particularly useful device in epideictic oratory which is associated with an evaluative treatment of people, actions and events by emphasizing praise or blame. The evaluative treatment of people, actions and events is supported by the conceptualization of social and political relations in terms of space metaphors (Lakoff and Johnson 1980) – insiders close to the speaker are presented as sharing the ideological values of the group he represents, while outsiders are suspected of doing the opposite and are distanced from the speaker.

The fact that the Directors-General of UNESCO, as well as political speakers in general, are aware of the power of language to promote ideology and to intervene to resolve conflicts and change states of affairs is evidenced by the following quote, taken
from Mayor’s speech at the opening of the *International Conference on Screen Violence and the Rights of the Child* in Lund, Sweden, in which he uses the modal verb *must* with deontic meaning to stress the modal obligation of the UN to prevent conflicts of war and to promote a diplomatic solution of international conflicts (32). The persuasive force of Mayor’s argument is further fostered by intertextual reference to the Bible and to the ‘Let Us Beat Swords into Ploughshares’ statue and inscription outside the UN building in New York which reinterprets the biblical quote in the light of the current political context, thus assigning it a symbolic value.

(32) A stone wall outside the UN Building in New York carries a quotation from the prophet Isaiah: “They shall beat their swords into ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks. Nation shall not lift up sword against nation. Neither shall they learn war any more”. Our goal must be to eliminate the “s” from “sword”, to substitute the word for the sword. Words must be our force, as they are the principal force of the United Nations. (Mayor, DG/95/39)

Since the institutional intergovernmental organizations within the United Nations system have to synchronize the competitive interests of the parties involved, the Directors-General of UNESCO have to persuade all members to support the ideology and policy of the organization in undertaking common action. This may not necessarily be in everyone’s interest; consequently, they have to motivate and impose views which are in agreement with the institutional ideology and to criticize and blame views which contradict or threaten it. Thus the persuasive force of the discourse of their rhetoric can be seen as a result of the interplay of claiming solidarity and imposition of power; i.e. it is therefore not surprising that the modal auxiliaries *must*, *should* and *have to* expressing deontic meanings are among the most prominent devices the orators use in constructing their discourse world. It is important to note that in the speeches of the three Directors-General of UNESCO the modal auxiliaries *must*, *should* and *have to* are used to express exclusively deontic modality enforcing the institutional position of the speaker, defined in terms of moral values and norms of behaviour and actions which should be undertaken to achieve stated goals. (The 19 cases of ‘I should like to’, which are used in the opening part of the speeches to indicate formality and politeness when addressing state representatives and executives present at the event, are not taken into consideration.) It is presented as ‘right’ to conform to the moral norms and values supported by UNESCO; whatever is against them is ‘wrong’.

An analysis of the frequency of occurrence of the three modal auxiliaries in the
speeches of the Directors-General (Table 7) shows that strong deontic modality expressed by *must* and *have to* predominates (76.6%), indicating a high commitment to the institutional ideology and the implication of a sufficient power and consensus to support it; the frequency of use of *have to*, indicating obligation and compulsion imposed by external forces is, however, considerably lower than the frequency of *must*, which establishes the speaker and the institutional ideology he represents as the deontic source. The speeches of Mayor are characterized by the highest overall rate of deontic modals (56.9%); this, together with his tendency to use frequently the plural first-person *we* as subject, reflects his continuous effort to build up an image of togetherness based on ideological consensus and to promote his ‘culture of peace’ policy. The low rate of modal auxiliaries in the speeches of Matsuura (15.8%) can be explained by his role of manager rather than ideologist, which reduces the necessity of confronting ‘right’ with ‘wrong’, as well as by his personal preference for the expression of modal meanings by more explicit lexical means.

Table 7 – Distribution of the modals *must*, *should* and *have to* in the material

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modal verb</th>
<th>M’Bow</th>
<th>Mayor</th>
<th>Matsuura</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Must</em></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Should</em></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Have to</em></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As regards the subjective-objective dimension, all occurrences of the modal auxiliaries *must*, *should* and *have to* can be interpreted as expressing subjective modal meanings, since they bring into existence a particular position of commitment on the part of the speaker with respect to the propositional content of the utterance (e.g. qualifying the action as desirable or undesirable), which Verstraete (2001: 1517) calls ‘modal performativity’. Explicit subjectivity is used in 31.6 per cent of the cases; except for two instances of *I* in Mayor’s speeches, speaker presence is indicated by the speaker-inclusive plural first-person pronoun *we*, which most frequently co-occurs with the strong modality auxiliary *must* to indicate speaker authority. As argued in section 4.3 above, the use of the inclusive *we* signals the institutional identity of the speaker and, typically claims common ground and shared common values with the audience, thus creating a sense of togetherness;
when used within the strategy of over-generalization it imposes the moral values of the speaker as accepted by the larger audience of mankind as a whole.

The analysis has revealed considerable variation in explicit speaker presence in the three sub-corpora (Table 8). While both Mayor and Matsuura frequently take a personal stance, in the sub-corpus of M’Bow’s speeches there are only two occurrences of *we* referring to people in general, one of which is part of a quote. In agreement with Dontcheva-Navratilova (2009c), this can be interpreted, on the one hand, as a conscious ambiguity strategy blurring the source of authority to reduce the possibility of challenging this authority, and on the other hand, as a signal of a lower degree of commitment on the part of the speaker to the ideology of the organization; since M’Bow frequently represents the position of the developing countries, he chooses to background the deontic source when he feels he may not receive full support for the actions and attitudes expressed (either when he has to impose the policy of the organization to the detriment of the interests of the developing nations, or vice versa).

**Table 8 – Distribution of explicit and implicit speaker presence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modal verb</th>
<th>M’Bow</th>
<th>Mayor</th>
<th>Matsuura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Implicit</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Must</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Should</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Have to</em></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Matsuura’s discourse shows the highest proportion of explicit speaker presence (48.5%), which nearly equals the rate of modals marked by implicit subjectivity (51.5%). This reflects a high level of managerial authority on the part of the speaker within a context of relative stability in the organization at a time when it has managed to overcome the ideological tension that defined the era of M’Bow and slowly dissipated during Mayor’s term of office. A high commitment to the ideology of the organization is also present in the speeches of Mayor, who uses the highest number of modals marked by explicit speaker presence (49 tokens); explicit subjectivity is typically associated with duties and obligations which are to be fulfilled by the organization, while implicit subjectivity is used primarily in cases where obligations are imposed on third parties. As already pointed out, the originality of Mayor’s rhetorical style resides in the fact that he is the only Director-
General to construct an expert identity as a scientist (signalled by the use of the personal pronoun *I* with the strong modal *must*) in addition to the institutional identity shared by all three Directors-General.

An additional variation in the function of the deontic modal auxiliaries *must, should* and *have to* in the speeches of the three Directors-General concerns their use to impose the institutional ideology defined in terms of moral values and norms of behaviour, labelled here ‘attitudinal’ function, as opposed to their use to enforce a course of action which should be undertaken to achieve stated goals, termed ‘directive’ function. As Table 9 below shows, the attitudinal function is slightly more prominent than the directive one (the overall ratio is 55% to 45%), which reflects the advisory character of UNESCO. While there is practically no difference in the ratio of evaluative and directive deontic modality in the speeches of Mayor and M’Bow, Matsuura uses a higher percentage of modals with directive function; this may be explained, on the one hand, by the higher level of solidarity between the member states during his term of office, and on the other, by the fact that he devotes more attention to administrative issues in his speeches and in this respect his institutional authority as Director-General seems to be indisputable.

Table 9 – Distribution of modals imposing an attitude and modals imposing a course of action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modal verb</th>
<th>M’Bow</th>
<th>Mayor</th>
<th>Matsuura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Must</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have to</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Must</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The potential of deontic modals to contribute to the perception of coherence in the discourse of the Directors-General stems from their role in the construction of a consistent ideological viewpoint: they are instrumental in imposing institutional beliefs and norms of conduct within a discourse world defined in terms of ‘right’ and ‘wrong’. The conflict between ‘right’ (*peace, collective responsibility for the fate of mankind, human solidarity*) and ‘wrong’ (*war, threat to everyone, selfish interests*) in the extract from M’Bow’s address to the eleventh *Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament* (33) is presented from the perspective of an obligation imposed on the addressee to take a course of action in favour of the institutional beliefs and norms of
conduct. The variation in the choice of deontic modals (all of which background speaker-presence by the choice of third-person subjects) implies an ambiguity of the power position of the speaker and an avoidance of speaker-commitment when negative connotations are involved. The use of the medium-strength modal *should* with the force of advice stresses the conflict between the negatively-assessed current state of affairs and the desirable state of affairs and reflects the lack of power of the institution to enforce its views. However, when advocating a course of action which is in conformity with the institutional ideology and which presupposes the active participation of UNESCO, M’Bow uses the strong modal *must* to imply high commitment and high level of solidarity and support for the suggested course of action. Finally, in a direct appeal to the audience, the choice of *have to* implies that objective facts impose the conclusion that there is a huge gap between reality and what the institutional ideology would define as a desirable state of affairs, thus imposing the necessity of intervention. This is reinforced by the explicit marking of the coherence relation of contrast, indicated by the emphatic conjunctive *nevertheless*.

(33) *Henceforth war should cease to be regarded as a means of settling particular disputes between nations; it should be confronted as a common scourge which threatens to turn upon everyone indiscriminately, even those who think they can win it for a while, and against which it is time for us all to unite. [...] A peace movement unprecedented in history must now develop everywhere, a movement which insists on collective responsibility for the fate of mankind, a responsibility which must transcend the frontiers of selfish interest and narrow calculations and scale the heights of human solidarity. [...] Nevertheless, ladies and gentlemen, it has to be acknowledged that the results achieved by the efforts that have so far been made in various quarters throughout the world are less than satisfactory, if one looks at the present situation. (M’Bow, DG/82/16)*

As the analysis of (30) above (the first paragraph of example 30 is reproduced for clarity in example 34 below) has shown, in his address to the 58th *Session of the United Nations International Narcotics Control Board* Mayor uses the opposition between ‘us’ and ‘them’ to construct a coherent tripartite discourse world in which ‘we’ are represented as active agents protecting ‘them’ (the victims) against ‘those’, the enemies who threaten ‘them’ and ‘us’. The representation of the ideological tensions in this discourse world (34) is empowered by the use of war metaphor enhanced by triple parallelism to stress the contrast between the negatively-assessed reality (*drugs, drunks, cancer, kills like war, addiction, shame*) and the desirable state of affairs (*personal and social security, health*); the aim is to persuade the addressee of the necessity of undertaking action (*severe judicial sanctions, courageous, firm, innovative measures, radical measures, international*)
measures) to stop wrongdoing and to protect victims. The presupposed high degree of consensus and solidarity on the issue of drug addiction is reflected in the directive function of most modal meanings, which give the whole speech a coherent frame. The authority of Mayor’s expert knowledge as a biochemist is used to support his institutional authority as Director-General of UNESCO to impose obligations on the addressee, expressed by the strong modal must. The high degree of personal involvement on the part of the speaker is indicated by the use of first-person pronouns (I must warn, if we really want to end, we must prosecute, we must care, if we wish to address), which in the case of we have ambiguous meaning, as most instances may be interpreted as referring to the members of the International Narcotics Control Board and/or all institutions and individuals sharing the view that negative-effect drugs should be eradicated. However, when referring to measures at international and national level, i.e. presupposing competences which are outside the scope of UNESCO, the speaker chooses implicit subjectivity, since he lacks the power to impose such measures.

(34) Drugs kill: they kill like war. Cars driven by drunks kill: they kill as in war. Lung cancer kills: it kills like war. As a brain biochemist, I must warn particularly against the damage produced by drug addiction. Irreversibility is the supreme criterion for action. It is a matter of the ethics of time. Courageous, firm, innovative measures must be adopted at international and national level alike if we really want to end this shame of many people, too often young, being trapped by an addiction harmful both for them and for their social entourage. […] There is a need to publicize and issue stern warnings concerning the effects of drugs on health, behaviour, and personal and social security. Swift and severe judicial sanctions are also necessary. We must prosecute the drug traffickers just as we must care for the health of the addicted. Both supply and demand must be reduced. This means adopting radical measures for preventing the laundering of money of unknown provenance. The adoption of international measures to this effect is absolutely indispensable if we wish to address the real problems and not merely the symptoms. […] (Mayor, DG/95/19)

Matsuura’s discourse is not marked by such a strong contrast between ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ as is conceptualized in terms of war in the discourse of Mayor and M’Bow; it typically conceptualizes social and political relations in terms of a container metaphor, i.e. society is conceptualized as a bound space associated with the ‘right’ values and norms of behaviour and the aim of political intervention is to move those who are on the periphery and not yet fully integrated into society closer to its normative centre. In the extract below, discourse coherence is fostered by a kind of macro-obligation, which is stated in the first sentence and which by its generalizing character refers to past, present and future – the necessity of guaranteeing access to education for all. In the rest of the extract, modals are
used to express specific obligations related to this macro-obligation which are imposed on different agents.

(34) In a globalized and inter-connected world, education must be FOR ALL. [...] In this forum, we must also address the question of resources for EFA. This is a recurrent item on our agenda because we still have a long way to go before resource needs are fully met. This is not to deny that real progress has been made in boosting external aid to EFA. The allocation of resources is an expression of priorities, and education, in particular basic education, has been moving up the development agenda as indeed it should. However, even if new aid commitments are met, the expected increase will still leave half of the estimated annual gap of 11 billion US dollars unfulfilled. Consequently, donors will need to double their efforts. At the same time, developing countries themselves must increase and sustain their investment in education. [...] In conclusion, it is evident that we meet at a time of great change, great challenge and great possibility. We must work together to shape this environment in ways that enable us all to devote our best efforts to the task at hand, opening up new and real opportunities for quality basic education to those who are still without them. As the EFA High-Level Group, we have a particular responsibility to make that happen. (Matsuura, DG/2006/157)

The strong commitment of the speaker and his power to influence the state of affairs by allocating financial aid from UNESCO funds is indicated by the use of explicit speaker presence (we must) combined with the establishment of a high degree of solidarity with the audience, signalled by together and us all. When addressing the issue of external aid, the modality is changed to the weaker advisory should, while need to used instead of have to after will with future time reference, though indicating a lesser degree of imposition by referring to the force of circumstances and attributing the control over the action to the agent in subject position (donors), may be interpreted as pragmatically strengthened to express obligation (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 166).

4.4.2 Epistemic modality: (un)certainty and truth commitment

Epistemic modality concerns the expression of truth relativized to a speaker; it involves knowledge and beliefs (Lyons 1977: 793) and is connected with conveying meanings on the certainty/uncertainty scale, though, as Halliday (1985: 358) points out, the mere presence of modality markers indicates an element of doubt. Since epistemic meanings are prototypically subjective, they frame the discourse in the personal opinion of the speaker by showing his/her feelings, beliefs and critical thought (Van de Mieroop 2007). The importance of epistemic modality in political discourse stems from the fact that “the speaker’s expression of (lack) of commitment to the truth value of propositions is not only (and not even primarily) a reflection of knowledge (how certain they are), but also of their ideology and their position in the discourse” (Simon-Vandenbergen 1997: 342). In
addition, politicians can exploit the scalar properties of epistemic modality, which allows them to select from low, median and high degrees of modality (Givón 1982).

Owing to the constitutive-of-reality potential of discourse, political speakers can use epistemic modal markers to indicate the degree of convergence of the expressed world and the reference world as assessed from the viewpoint of “the epistemic centre, the source of knowledge or the principal deictic point” (Frawley 1992: 412); in the case of judgements and beliefs, the self is the centre of epistemic stance, but in the case of hearsay, the centre is located with the other(s). Since within the framework adopted for the analysis of political discourse, which approaches the ideologically-biased discourse world of the speaker as constructed along the three dimensions of deixis, modality – similarly to spatial, temporal and social relations – is conceptualized in terms of remoteness; the epistemic scale may be claimed to represent the speaker’s commitment to the proposition, ranging from confident prediction to near impossibility, and from true (assertion), located near to or co-located with the self, to untrue/false, located with the other(s).

Within the rhetorical genre of addresses, which presupposes an evaluative treatment of people, actions and events, the Directors-General speaking on behalf of UNESCO express institutional beliefs ascribed to an institutional identity, which is positioned as the deictic centre of the discourse world constructed in the speech. This ideologically-biased representation of the world posits the views of the speaker and the institution he/she represents as always true, real, right, and shared by the audience, while the views of those opposing the institutional ideology are presented as false, unreal and wrong. Since institutional intergovernmental organizations have to synchronize the competitive interests of the parties involved, their officials have to create an image of themselves and the organization as knowledgeable and reliable political actors confident in their ability to impose the right views and necessary actions, to mitigate internal disagreements and tension within the organization and to denounce views and prevent actions which contradict or threaten the institutional ideology. It is therefore not surprising that on the interpersonal plane of discourse it is the expression of ‘modal certainty’ (Simon-Vandenbergen 1997: 344) that enables the Directors-General of UNESCO to convey a high degree of commitment to the validity of their propositions, thus constructing a coherent subjective representation of their discourse worlds. However, a lesser degree of certainty may be used in contrastive rhetorical structures to juxtapose contrastive views or when dealing with issues on which the member states seem to have diverging opinions.
The following analysis of the functions of epistemic modal markers for the expression of different degrees of (un)certainty in the material focuses primarily on modal auxiliaries (will, can, could, may, might, cannot), modal adjectives and adverbs (e.g. sure, certain, clear, certainly, undoubtedly, surely, truly, probably, perhaps) and lexical verbs (know, think, believe, take it, hope), which can be part of congruent or metaphorical realizations of interpersonal meanings (Halliday 1985: 331). Metaphorical realizations of modality are typically thematic and thus, by consistently making the subjective point of view of the speaker the point of departure of the message, contribute directly to discourse coherence. The continuity of the subjective attitude of the speakers is further enhanced by the occurrence of modal markers in adjacent sentences and clauses to form parallelism or contrastive structures.

A quantitative analysis of the epistemic modality markers under investigation shows that the most frequent markers of epistemic meaning are modal verbs, while the least frequent are lexical verbs (Table 10). The only speaker using a higher rate of lexical verbs is Mayor, who is also the only one to construct an expert identity as a scientist and writer in addition to the institutional identity shared by all three Directors-General. The variety of modal means used by the Directors-General reflects their speaking styles; thus the elaborate rhetorical style of Mayor motivates the widest range of epistemic expressions in the speeches. The variation in the total number of modal expressions reflects the ideology of the speakers as affected by the institutional and global context – the higher level of tension in the general political climate and within the organization during M’Bow’s and Mayor’s terms of office explains the considerably higher number of modal markers used to express certainty and tentativeness in their speeches.

Table 10: Frequency of use of modal markers by the Directors-General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modal marker</th>
<th>M’Bow</th>
<th>Mayor</th>
<th>Matsuura</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal verbs</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbials/adjectives</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical verbs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the occurrences of epistemic modal markers in the material can be interpreted as subjective modality. Explicit subjectivity is not very frequent; it is typically conveyed by
clauses including mental verbs (think, believe) and epistemic adjectives (sure, certain) using as subject I referring to the personal identity of the Director-General, but we and UNESCO also occur, indicating an institutional point of view and thus claiming common ground and solidarity. The choices of the three speakers reflecting the degree of certainty cline (Table 11) indicate that while the speeches of Matsuura and Mayor show an approximately equal distribution of high and low degree modality, in the speeches of M’Bow low certainty modality predominates, motivated by the lesser solidarity and agreement within the organization during his term of office.

Table 11: Degree of modality in the speeches of the Directors-General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of modality</th>
<th>M’Bow</th>
<th>Mayor</th>
<th>Matsuura</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most frequent function of epistemic modal markers in the speeches of all three Directors-General is to express a high degree of commitment to the truth of the proposition. While conveying judgments which provide legitimization for the views and actions of UNESCO, the speakers assert their right to impose an ideologically-biased discourse world based on solidarity, i.e. they assume that all member states and the audience support and approve of the institutional ideology, which is presented as right, real and desirable.

The high degree of certainty conveyed by Matsuura in his speech at the launch of the United Nations Decade on Education for Sustainable Development (35) is indicated by a sequence of lexical (clearly, sure) and implicit (shall, will) epistemic markers which are combined with deontic modals (must) to imply high commitment and solidarity. While expressing confidence in the ability of the organization and its partners to deal with the challenge at hand, the speaker states intentions concerning the course of action to be taken and asserts the power of the institution to assure their realization.

(35) Education for Sustainable Development is a clearly tremendous challenge but it is one that we must all welcome and one that we must address together. [...] We shall do our utmost to fulfill this responsibility with all the energy, commitment and expertise it deserves. In this task, I am sure we can count on the broad ESD partnership to work closely with us. In addition, UNESCO will be making its own programmatic contributions to ESD and the
Decade, drawing not only upon its Education sector but also upon its other sectors [...] (Matsuura, DG/2005/036)

Similarly, the persuasive force of Mayor’s address to the International Consultative Forum on Education for All (36) stems from the consistent use of epistemic modal markers emphasizing a high level of certainty (adverbials: clearly, no doubt, of course; modal verbs: cannot), which express a coherent subjective point of view, despite his acknowledging of the complexity of the issue and the difficulties involved in reaching an agreement on a joint course of action. The dialogic character of the speech is indicated by the emphatic use of yes and of course in sentence initial thematic position, which typically implies that the audience already knows or will readily accept the information presented by the writer (Biber et al. 1999: 870), and by the clausal marker I hope intensified by the emphatic do.

(36) Current events demonstrate all too clearly that basic education for the human race must also include those elements that foster tolerance, democratic behaviour, respect for human rights and dignity. Yes, it must include values. These are essentials that cannot be postponed to higher education, nor even to secondary education. No doubt, the quality of basic education content is a sensitive area with significant socio-cultural, political and economic overtones. Of course this meeting is not expected to agree on some ideal basic education curriculum or general norms to be applied worldwide. But I do hope that your deliberations will inspire educators, governments and organizations to give more attention to this crucial aspect of Education for All. (Mayor, DG/93/37)

The personal intrusion of the speaker through structures marked by explicit subjectivity shows personal insights, critical thought, and frames the discourse in personal opinion. In his speech at the launching of the United Nations Year for Tolerance (37), Mayor echoes a view that is presented as generally accepted but not explicitly attributed, in which he clearly denies using strategic simulation of affect by an emphatic No! and a subjective median modality marker (I believe), which rephrases the negated view by post-modification, specifying the period which is to come to an end (the end of a history dominated by the recourse to war), and thus reinterprets it in a positive way. In the last sentence of the extract, the deontic modal must, used with the inclusive we subject to stress an appeal for solidarity, asserts the obligation of UNESCO, the UN and, by overgeneralization, mankind to deal with the problem and also the ability to impose the ideologically-biased institutional view.

(37) It is said that a clash of cultures and religions is inevitable. It is said that we are at the end of history. No! We are, I believe, coming to the end of a history dominated by the recourse to war. We must now learn the ways of tolerance and build a new history – a future history of peace. (Mayor, DG/95/8)
A combination of modal markers with varying degrees of certainty may be used in contrastive rhetorical structures to stress that the speaker and the institution he represents are in control of the situation and are certain of their power and ability to bring into existence the desired state of affairs. When addressing the Conference on Globalization and Science and Technology (38), Matsuura uses the indicative mood (is) and will, conveying a confident prediction in order to present globalization as a fact; this fact is initially qualified as relatively desirable, irreversible and probably unstoppable, i.e. as a kind of a threat. The explicit marker of contrastive coherence relation however, empowered by the concessive clause (while) introducing the epistemic meaning of may appear inevitable, implies a doubt concerning the problematic character of globalization; it reduces the inevitability of the threat by indicating contrary expectations and interacts with deontic modality markers imposing the obligation to deal with the problem and to bring it under control.

(38) The complex phenomenon of “globalization” is – and for the foreseeable future will continue to be – a major trend, affecting all spheres and levels of society. The early, often passionate, debates about the relative desirability of globalization, have now given way to the growing recognition that this process is not just irreversible, but also probably unstoppable. However, while globalization may now appear inevitable, the direction and form it takes is something we can – and must – work to shape. (Matsuura)

The commitment of the speaker is affected by the level of solidarity and support for the institutional ideology from the member states and the audience. Thus the discourse world constructed in the speech delivered by M’Bow to the United Nations General Assembly in New York (39) reflects ideological conflict. The variation in the degree of epistemic modality is used to enhance persuasion by asserting the speaker’s ideological view as right and that of his opponents as wrong. At the opening of an extract which presents the view that the hypothetical outbreak of a nuclear conflict would be fatal as right, unquestionable and shared by all discourse participants, this is achieved by the use of an impersonal high certainty marker (it is certain). However, the use of the modal may to express possibility in the subsequent sentences implies the existence of proponents of the opposite view and puts the blame for the hypothetical disaster (those mad enough to start a nuclear war would then have the wisdom to limit it) on ‘others’ who oppose the institutional ideology (referred to by the distal deictic pronoun those), and whose views are presented as false, unreal and wrong.

(39) It is certain that if a nuclear conflagration were to break out nothing could then stop it. It is at the very least misguided and dangerous to think that those mad enough to start a
nuclear war would then have the wisdom to limit it [...] Under these circumstances, war may not only be beyond the control of those who start it; it may be beyond all control and plunge the whole world headlong into an irreversible situation. (M’Bow, DG/82/16)

It is obvious from the discussion above that modality has a key role in building up a subjective point of view in political discourse. Deontic modality is instrumental in the construction of an ideologically-biased discourse world in terms of ‘right’ and ‘wrong’, while epistemic modality typically emphasizes certainty by expressing strong commitment on the part of the speaker to the truth of the proposition and to the (un)desirability of events and actions from the point of view of the institutional ideology. The interplay of epistemic and deontic modal meanings implies a correlation between the imposition of compliance with the institutional ideology and the expression of certainty based on authority and knowledge. By constructing a consistent ideological viewpoint indicating a continuous high level of commitment towards the topic under discussion and by imposing behaviour and views which conform to the culture-specific moral norms and value system of the organization, the speaker enhances his existential coherence and contributes to the construction of evaluative and interactional coherence on the interpersonal plane of discourse. The perception of discourse coherence is furthered by lexical and pronominal choices co-occurring with the modal markers.
5 CONCLUSIONS

This study has dealt with the analysis of coherence in the genre of diplomatic opening addresses in an attempt to explain how ideational, interpersonal and textual meanings interact in the construction of a coherent discourse interpretation in the highly specific context of institutional interaction practiced by the UNESCO discourse community. In the final section of this volume, I will reflect on the theoretical framework applied, summarize the results of the practical analysis and consider some directions for further research.

Considering that there is still no consensus in the international linguistic community on how coherence should be understood, an important objective of my research on the theoretical plane was to conceptualize coherence as a constitutive component of human communication. Adopting a dynamic approach to discourse interpretation, this study has defined coherence as the context-dependent subjective perception of meaningfulness and purposefulness of discourse which comes into existence as a result of the collaborative efforts in an interaction of the participants, who project their background knowledge, personal opinions, attitudes, feelings and experience in discourse processing onto their understanding of the discourse. Coherence is therefore regarded here as a constitutive property of purposeful discourse derived intentionally from a text by an interpreter who assumes that all participants in the communication adhere to Grice’s cooperative principle and impose coherence on the text to make sense of the interaction. It is this inherent subjectivity of coherence that predetermines its scalar nature; since the perception of coherence depends on the intentions and background knowledge of interactants, agreement in their discourse interpretations is considered a matter of degree ranging from almost complete overlap to greater or lesser misunderstandings or breaks in communication. The awareness of this scalar nature of coherence is interpreted as an incentive for the use of various strategies for preventing misunderstandings or repairing divergence in coherence.

Since when deriving coherence from a text the participants in an interaction interpret and negotiate meanings on all planes of discourse, the main objective of my research was to explore the complementarity of ideational, interpersonal and textual meanings in constructing discourse coherence, while arguing that the overall perception of coherence in discourse is based on relatively independent but interrelated aspects of
coherence comprising conceptual connectedness, evaluative and dialogical consistency, and textual relatedness.

The analytical approach adopted in this research, which is rooted in the discourse analysis tradition, has endeavoured to provide a functional interpretation of language phenomena. In the analysis of aspects of coherence on the ideational, interpersonal and textual planes of discourse, I have relied on several analytical frameworks for describing how coherence is constructed. While assuming that on the ideational plane the perception of continuity is derived from mental representations in the mind of the participants used as a basis for inferencing (Van Dijk and Kintsch 1983), this investigation has drawn on Daneš’s (1974, 1995) patterns of thematic progression, Givón’s (1995, 2001) referential coherence and Kehler’s (2002, 2004) coherence relations to analyze the interdependence of experiential and logical meanings and their association with cohesive devices guiding the listener towards an intended discourse interpretation. The implementation of Tanskanen’s (2006) classification of lexical cohesion relations in consonance with Hoey’s (1991) understanding of the complementarity of lexical and grammatical cohesion and Cornish’s (2008) cognitive approach to reference interpretation has enabled me to explore the role of cohesive chains at local and global levels of discourse as explicit markers of coherence. Most importantly, the adoption of Hunston and Thompson’s (2000) approach to evaluation as a general framework for the analysis of interpersonal meanings has allowed the present study to highlight the centrality of evaluation to the perception of discourse coherence. Since the functions of evaluation, namely the expression of opinion reflecting the value system of the speaker, the construction and maintenance of interpersonal relations and discourse organization correlate with the ideational, interactional and textual aspects of meaning, evaluation can be seen as enhancing coherence on all planes of discourse. Finally, the analysis of dialogical consistency has drawn on Hoey’s (2001) framework for the study of interactive aspects in monologic discourse, which associates global coherence with genre or text-type structure, and local coherence with clause relations. In addition, the insights of Bolivar’s (2001) evaluative triad have influenced my approach to the analysis of topic change and rhetorical move boundaries and to the exploration of the intertextual dimensions of coherence. An important theoretical implication which has emerged in this research is that although an investigation focusing on one aspect of discourse coherence has the potential to provide valuable insights into discourse construction and interpretation,
only a holistic approach to the study of coherence on all planes of discourse can reveal the full interpretative potential of a text.

Since this research was carried out on a corpus of speeches representing one genre, the genre of diplomatic opening addresses, I have relied on the genre analysis framework (Swales (1990, 2004), Bhatia (1993, 2002); this was slightly modified by Dontcheva-Navratilova (2009) to account for both functional constituents and rhetorical moves in the analysis of generic structure) for the describing of the impact of situational context and discourse processing conventions on the perception of coherence and for the explaining of related rhetorical, formal and functional choices. The choice of the genre under investigation, an instance of prepared monologue intended for oral performance, was motivated by its potential to display most, if not all, facets of discourse coherence. In addition, as specimens of political persuasive discourse, diplomatic addresses allow the analyst to explore the strategies orators use to make their addressees and audiences understand and believe their ideologically-biased representation of a reality while guiding them towards an intended coherent discourse interpretation. The material under investigation comprised 30 speeches delivered by three consecutive Directors-General of UNECO over a thirty-year period; however, this research cannot be regarded as essentially diachronic, since the differences in rhetorical style and discourse strategies used by the three speakers are interpreted as primarily reflecting the ideological backgrounds of the orators, the policy of the organization and the global political situation in the period of the term of office of each of them, rather than changes in the characteristics of the genre.

Turning to the practical analysis of aspects of coherence in opening addresses, it is important to stress that this research has focused primarily on the analysis of speaker meaning, while exploring the resources used by the orators to impose on the audience an interpretative perception of the semantic unity and purposefulness of their discourse which reflects their communicative intentions with regard to the situational, socio-cultural and pragmatic context in which the interaction takes place. In addition, I have also considered the impact of the anticipated audience reaction on speaker choices and potential interpretations which listeners might derive when making sense of the interaction.

The key assumption taken as a starting point for this investigation into coherence in opening addresses was that when delivering their speeches the Directors-General try to achieve their communicative goals, and if necessary get past the epistemic vigilance of the addressees and the audience, by enhancing speaker credibility through the establishment of
a dialogic framework for the negotiation of a coherent representation of identities, social roles, shared value systems and relationships with the audience, and by constructing a coherent logical argumentation to support their claims and actions. Thus, while considering the persuasion strategies used by the orators, the analysis of discourse coherence has focused on features which convey meanings pertaining simultaneously to the ideational, interpersonal and textual planes of discourse, thus evidencing the interplay of different aspects of coherence; these features comprise the management of discourse topic in relation to the rhetorical structure of the genre, the use of reference for constructing the identity of the speaker and representing his attitude towards other social actors, and the role of modality for evaluative treatment of people, actions and events, and for expressing the truth commitment of the speaker.

The results of the analysis of the management of discourse topic highlight the correlation existing between linguistic features, rhetorical moves and persuasive strategies used by the orators. My findings have evidenced that the hierarchy of discourse topics, based on the relation of generalization holding between all discourse-segment topics and the Global theme which coincides with the topic of the conference or meeting at which the speech is delivered, is one of the main factors contributing to the perception of global coherence on the ideational plane of discourse. Topic continuity based on a selected pattern of thematic progression, temporal and referential coherence, and coherent topic shifts at discourse-segment and rhetorical-move boundaries are instrumental in enhancing local coherence on the ideational and textual planes of discourse. In addition, this research has proved that the essentially interpersonal vocative address forms have gradually developed a discourse structuring function related to the marking of topic shift and rhetorical-move boundary, which can now be considered as a distinctive feature of the genre.

The communicative functions of the structural components and related rhetorical moves making up the generic structure of opening addresses motivate the use of specific persuasion and coherence strategies. As this investigation has demonstrated, the introductory part of the speech, the salutation, is associated with the establishment of the authority, competence and existential coherence of the speaker together with the construction of his relationship with the audience. The (re)construction of the identities of referents and the continuity of the spatio-temporal setting (the here-and-now of the event) contributes to the perception of coherence on the ideational plane of discourse, which is enhanced by cohesion relations pertaining to the textual plane of discourse. The
negotiation of interpersonal relations by the use of contextually-sensitive vocative address forms and personal pronouns for structuring the audience and establishing speaker credibility can be interpreted as laying the foundations for the construction of coherence on the interpersonal plane. In the argumentative part of opening addresses the perception of coherence is fostered by cohesive chains signalling the availability of mental representations of actors and their actions in the discourse world, and coherence relations implied or explicitly marked by the speakers which not only highlight the logical connections in the speech, but also indicate the point of view of the orator. As the analysis has shown, interpersonal coherence is closely related to the persuasion strategies used by speakers, since the persuasive force of the argumentation is enhanced by the high personal involvement of the speaker indicated by markers of subjectivity and expressive and evaluative lexical items which convey a consistent contrastive presentation of actions or events and emphatic evaluation of aspects of the issue under consideration. It follows that the expression of ideational meanings cannot be sharply delimited from the expression of attitudes, opinions and feelings of the participants towards entities and processes in the discourse world that is constructed. The interplay of ideational, interactional and textual aspects of coherence has also been evidenced in the closure of opening addresses; it is related to the reintroduction of the discourse topic, the marking of continuous alignment of the speaker with the audience, and a consistent expression of evaluative judgements and attitudes from the point of view of the institutional ideology.

In its consideration of the strategic use of reference, this analysis has demonstrated that consistent self- and other-reference by the use of personal pronouns with anaphoric and deictic interpretation and related nominal categorization contributes to the perception of coherence on the ideational and textual planes of discourse; by creating cohesive chains reference devices make continuous the availability of mental representations of actors and their actions in the discourse world. On the interpersonal plane, pronominal reference conveys dialogicity and marks social actors and their actions as proximal or distal from the point of view of the deictic centre of the speaker, thus assigning them in-group or out-group status. The function of nominal reference is essentially evaluative as it indicates the value assigned to actors, actions and events from the point of view of the in-group institutional ideology. The continuity of social roles and relationships between participants reflected in the perception of referential and evaluative coherence in the speeches of all the orators has an interdiscoursal dimension which helps them project an existentially coherent
image of themselves and the organization they represent. It is therefore not surprising that this investigation has also evidenced that reference partakes in numerous persuasion strategies related to the asserting of the credibility of the speaker by contributing to coherent identity construction and to presenting the discourse world as conceptualized in terms of binary oppositions, thus legitimizing the ideologically-biased views and actions proposed. Of particular interest is the use of the pronoun we, which owing to its inherent ambiguity can be used within the strategy of over-generalization to impose the moral values of the speaker as accepted by a larger audience, including mankind as a whole. The representation of the ‘us’ against ‘them’ opposition is often evaluated emphatically by conceptualizing social and political relations in terms of ‘war’ or ‘container’ metaphors. It should be noted that the results of the investigation have demonstrated that the Directors-General differ in the values they assign to pronominal expressions and especially in their treatment of the ‘us’ against ‘them’ opposition; this is due to differences in their ideological backgrounds and in the political situation during their terms of office.

Modality plays a key role in building up a subjective point of view in political discourse and therefore is associated primarily with the construal of coherence on the interpersonal plane of discourse. While deontic modality is associated with an ideologically-biased representation of the discourse world of the speaker in terms of ‘right’ and ‘wrong’, epistemic modality is used to emphasize his certainty by expressing strong commitment to the truth of the proposition and to the (un)desirability of events and actions from the point of view of the institutional ideology. As the findings of my investigation demonstrate, the interplay of deontic and epistemic modal meanings enhances evaluative coherence by constructing a consistent subjective representation of the discourse world in the speeches of the orators which implies a correlation between the imposition of compliance with the institutional ideology and the expression of certainty based on authority and knowledge. The establishment of the institutional ideological viewpoint as continuous by indicating a consistently high level of commitment towards the topic under discussion and by imposing behaviour and views which comply to the culture-specific moral norms and value system of the organization, helps the speaker to enhance his existential coherence while contributing to the perception of evaluative and interactional coherence on the interpersonal plane of discourse, which is furthered by lexical and pronominal choices co-occurring with the modal markers.

The findings of my analysis have demonstrated that the interpretative perception of
coherence in discourse comprising conceptual connectedness, evaluative and dialogical consistency, and textual relatedness is affected by the interplay of meanings pertaining to all planes of discourse. This study has also evidenced that differences in the cultural background of the participants in intergovernmental institutional interaction motivate a higher level of explicitness and the use of disambiguation devices to reduce the risk of disturbed coherence. It should be noted that the discussion of coherence in opening addresses with focus on speaker meaning provided in this study has attempted to outline the interpretative potential of the speeches under investigation; it is highly improbable, however, that it has managed to shed light on all possible interpretations that could be derived from the texts.

To conclude this final section of my study, I would like to consider some possible directions for further research. Regarding the analytical framework, it is evident that the creation of a unified framework for the analysis of all interrelated aspects of coherence is a task for the future. However, the application of the various existing frameworks for the study of coherence in different genres and text types can refine the existing methodologies and reveal new insights into the ways coherence is constructed in different kinds of discourse. As for diplomatic opening addresses, which seem to be one of the few underexplored genres of political discourse, they offer challenging opportunities for investigating how coherence is derived in intercultural communication, a context which provides numerous opportunities for misunderstanding stemming from divergences in the background knowledge on which interactants rely when interpreting discourse.
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Mr President of the United Nations General Assembly,
Mr Secretary-General of the United Nations,
Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a great honour for me to be taking part in the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and I am grateful to your Preparatory Committee for the opportunity which it has thus given me to address you. I offer my greetings to the distinguished representatives of Member States who are endeavouring to give substance to that hope which men have cherished as a dream but which is now inseparable from their chances of survival: disarmament.

Four years ago, in this same forum, I already spoke of the main lines of the mission that UNESCO fulfils in this field, by virtue of its Constitution, which declares its purpose to be that of advancing, through the educational and scientific and cultural relations of the peoples of the world, the objectives of international peace and of the common welfare of mankind for which the United Nations Organization was established and which its Charter proclaims.

In the Final Document adopted at the close of its proceedings, the first special session assigned to UNESCO, directly or indirectly, certain responsibilities in four main fields: information, studies and research, co-operation with nongovernmental organizations and, lastly, disarmament education.

The written report that I have submitted to this special session will show you how UNESCO has discharged those responsibilities, taking account of the instructions given by its Executive Board and its General Conference.

UNESCO has constantly concerned itself with the questions that are the subject of your deliberations, and its Member States have thus attached the greatest importance to your work. Hence, at its twenty-first session held in Belgrade in 1980, the General Conference invited me ‘to make an appropriate contribution, within UNESCO’s spheres of competence, to the preparation of the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to be devoted to disarmament in 1982’, whilst the Executive Board, at its 114th session, which has just ended, asked me ‘to make appropriate provision in the current programme and budget and in the second Medium-Term Plan for the undertaking of any special responsibilities the General Assembly may wish to entrust to the Organization in the document(s) it adopts at its second special session devoted to disarmament’.

UNESCO indeed considers that its prime responsibility is to take, within its fields of competence, whatever action may help to reduce international tensions and may be conducive to the maintenance of peace and to disarmament. Standing at the crossroads of
all activities of the mind, receptive to all works that express the sensitivities of the peoples, it is constantly attentive to the world, endeavouring to feel its every heartbeat. It is therefore well aware that we live in a world increasingly overshadowed by anxiety: anxiety among the rich at the extent of a rising unemployment which may become the source of grave social tensions, of fear, selfishness and, alas, even of chauvinism; anxiety among the poor, who see more and more doors closed to them and whom relationships of inequality condemn to remain in apparently inescapable situations; and the anxiety felt in many countries at the worsening of tensions, the proliferation of conflicts and the rise of perils that may lead towards a nuclear war.

We have been hearing echoes of these concerns and of the dangers inherent in the situation which gives rise to those concerns from an increasing variety of sources, from prominent persons belonging to all backgrounds, from non-governmental organizations and from institutions that co-operate with UNESCO, as well as from the most highly respected authorities of our age. In the Vatican, last January, His Holiness Pope John Paul II solemnly handed me a statement issued by a group of eminent scientists convened by the Pontifical Academy of Sciences in which these men of science acknowledge the inability of the medical community to provide the survivors of a nuclear attack with the necessary care, and concluded that ‘prevention is our only recourse’.

Here we find refuted the various scenarios, worked out in comfortable offices, which would have us believe that the effects of a nuclear war on mankind could be contained. The International Council of Scientific Unions, an organization which brings together all the world’s scientists, whether they come from the countries of the West, the East or the Third World, has asked me, through its Executive Board, to act as its spokesman at this session, since it is not in a position to address you directly. The scientists, researchers and professors, who are better informed than anyone else of the dangers currently threatening mankind, beseech you and all Member States to take immediate action to put a stop to the arms race.

The Academies of Sciences of the socialist countries, for their part have issued an appeal in which they suggest the establishment of an international committee of scientists on the danger of nuclear war.

The Secretary of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States recently handed me a document expressing the alarm of American scientists, which he authorized me to bring to the notice of this Assembly.

The concern and alarm being felt by intellectuals and scientists are unquestionably a reflection of a wider movement which is beginning or developing in other circles, in many countries, particularly among young people, and which unites them all in a single hope, that of stopping the machinery which threatens to bring irreversible catastrophe upon all mankind. It is only too clear that the nature of war has changed. The destructive power of modern nuclear weapons is such that any conflict in which such weapons were used might well result in the annihilation of the whole human race. That, in my view, is what distinguishes our age so radically from all previous ages: the ability which mankind now possesses to wipe itself off the face of the earth.

It is certain that if a nuclear conflagration were to break out nothing could then stop it. It is at the very least misguided and dangerous to think that those mad enough to start a nuclear war would then have the wisdom to limit it; and existing stocks are already capable of wiping out all human life on earth several times over.

Chemical and biological weapons, although they have less spectacular effects, none the less present another and exceptional danger, alas unsuspected by the public at large:
prohibited though they are, it is well known that they continue nevertheless to be produced, tested, improved and stockpiled, no doubt for future use.

Vast resources are thus squandered to no purpose: they do not even improve the security of those who foot the bill, since the balance of military power tends simply to establish itself at an ever higher level. The arms race, originating from a will to dominate or a sense of insecurity, thus escalates under its own momentum. Owing to the growing interdependence of the destinies of the various nations and the overlapping of conflicting interests, there is an ever closer link between international tensions and internal conflicts, between national disputes and ideological cleavages, between regional interests and worldwide issues. Under these circumstances, war may not only be beyond the control of those who start it; it may be beyond all control and plunge the whole world headlong into an irreversible situation.

Henceforth war should cease to be regarded as a means of settling particular disputes between nations; it should be confronted as a common scourge which threatens to turn upon everyone indiscriminately, even those who think they can win it for a while, and against which it is time for us all to unite.

A peace movement unprecedented in history must now develop everywhere, a movement which insists on collective responsibility for the fate of mankind, a responsibility which must transcend the frontiers of selfish interest and narrow calculations and scale the heights of human solidarity.

It is true that a great deal of effort has been made to avert war within the United Nations system. Among the activities undertaken by UNESCO, recounted in the document to which I have already referred, I would emphasize only the very recent ones relating to certain important meetings such as the World Congress on Disarmament Education, held in June 1980; the training seminar for university teachers in the field of disarmament in the Latin American and Caribbean Region, held in Caracas in October 1981; the symposium organized, in collaboration with the Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs, in Ajaccio in February of this year, on the theme ‘Scientists, the arms race and disarmament’, which adopted a number of recommendations, some of them addressed to your session; and lastly, the Intergovernmental Conference which is to be held next December on the implementation of the Recommendation concerning Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

Nevertheless, ladies and gentlemen, it has to be acknowledged that the results achieved by the efforts that have so far been made in various quarters throughout the world are less than satisfactory, if one looks at the present situation.

The outlook from this conference is, indeed, extremely sombre. At this very moment, hundreds of aircraft and tanks are breathing fire and destruction in the Middle East, Africa and Latin America. At this very moment, men, women and children – innocent civilians especially – are dying, in Lebanon and elsewhere, while those who could put an end to that slaughter, those who are alone capable of doing so, confine themselves to making verbal statements very often couched in the most ambiguous terms.

Have we, then, forgotten the words which President Harry Truman spoke on 25th April 1945, shortly before the adoption of the Charter of the United Nations at San Francisco: ‘We can no longer permit any nation, or group of nations, to attempt to settle their arguments with bombs and bayonets’, adding: ‘If we do not want to die together in war, we must learn to live together in peace’.
But although bloodshed has not ceased since 1945, when the United Nations system was established, blood has not been shed everywhere. The industrialized countries, as a whole, have known peace at home. Meanwhile, they have supplied arms to the rest of the world, arms with which it has continued to lacerate itself. While the industrial powers have avoided confrontation amongst themselves, they have often contributed elsewhere to aggravate, when they have not themselves incited, conflicts in which the weapons they have produced are tested by, and on, the peoples of the Third World, as if the blood of the latter were of less value. The developing countries, too, often spend on armament funds that would have been better spent on improving the circumstances of their peoples. Perhaps I am now overstepping the bounds of that discretion to which I am held, but I cannot silence the voice of my conscience at so crucial a moment as this.

If the world situation has deteriorated so seriously, if the main causes of conflict are intensifying instead of abating, and if the threats that they hold are multiplying instead of diminishing, it is not because we lack the material means or the appropriate institutional machinery, but because, at a time when we finally have them, we lack an undivided faith in the unity of our destiny, a reason for living that links our diversities by means of values shared by all.

Time is already running out, but there is still time to forge – together – that common reason for living. For despite all their differences, people share similar anxieties, confront similar dilemmas and cherish common hopes, which are expressed in a thousand ways, but which all converge in the moral foundations of our being.

Because we have the intellectual and technical means required, our age can be – and because our survival is at stake it must be – the age when, for the first time in history, our common hopes are translated into a language shared by all humankind. Only then will the voice of collective wisdom prevail over that of individual ambition and greed for power; only then can there be universal respect for the same rights and duties and the same standards of measurement for all. Your session could afford a unique opportunity to make that voice heard. May it take full account of the fears that assail the world today!
Drugs kill: they kill like war. Cars driven by drunks kill: they kill as in war. Lung cancer kills: it kills like war. As a brain biochemist, I must warn particularly against the damage produced by drug addiction. Irreversibility is the supreme criterion for action. It is a matter of the ethics of time. Courageous, firm, innovative measures must be adopted at international and national level alike if we really want to end this shame of many people, too often young, being trapped by an addiction harmful both for them and for their social entourage. There is a need to publicize and issue stern warnings concerning the effects of drugs on health, behaviour, and personal and social security. Swift and severe judicial sanctions are also necessary. We must prosecute the drug traffickers just as we must care for the health of the addicted. Both supply and demand must be reduced. This means adopting radical measures for preventing the laundering of money of unknown provenance. The adoption of international measures to this effect is absolutely indispensable if we wish to address the real problems and not merely the symptoms. Tackling the real problems also means recognizing and dealing with the causes of social marginalization and exclusion. It means investing in the welfare of young people, in sports activities, in training, in immediate assistance mechanisms where urgently required. It means – and the rest is no more than the rhetoric of a society unable to cope with present challenges diverting a substantial part of investments in the traditional defence sector to new “defence” actions; converting external debt into measures to improve the living conditions of many people in the developing countries; and infusing in all countries developing and developed alike – the values consistent with a common destiny and a new deal.

Mr President of the International Narcotics Control Board,
Mr Executive Director of UNDCP,
Distinguished members of INCB,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am very honoured by your invitation to address this 58th session of the International Narcotics Control Board and to discuss with you global issues of drug abuse and control and UNESCO’s aim of reducing the demand for drugs through a preventive education programme. To Professor Hamid Ghodse, President of INCB, I offer my personal thanks for inviting me to speak, and I should like to thank you all for being here around this table.

I hope to spend this morning with you finding ways and means of tackling what I consider to be one of the most serious global threats to society, to health and to the economy – the threat of drug abuse and drug trafficking.

Strategies drawn up by your Board within the international drug control system to ensure an adequate supply of drugs for scientific and medical purposes have been, on the whole, remarkably successful in reducing to negligible proportions the quantities of narcotics diverted from the licit supply. This success proves that it is possible, to a
significant extent at least, to manage the international trade in substances whose special nature would make their integration in a free market economy dangerous.

On the other hand, INTERPOL has announced that, of all narcotic drugs in circulation, only between 5 and 15 per cent are seized. This means that at least 85 per cent of these substances circulate in a market controlled by criminals. Drugs are thus an area of the economy largely beyond the reach of any legal control, offering to the criminal elements in society the “superprofits” deriving from a form of “unrestrained capitalism”. My role as Director-General of UNESCO is to encourage international co-operation in education, science and culture. Most important among these is education. Education is a vital and pervasive force in all aspects of our existence. It shapes us as individuals and as societies, and determines what we are and what we aspire to become. Education empowers us to take our destiny in our own hands and to lead a prosperous and happy life. We can, through education, and especially preventive education, contribute to a lasting reduction in the demand for drugs. As you are all aware, the problem is to help to prevent drug addiction as well as to solve the problems associated with abuse of drugs, both licit and illicit, and in this way to improve the quality of life for all people.

To reduce the demand for drugs and ultimately to eradicate drug abuse, education must be directed towards fostering positive and constructive attitudes and behaviour in all spheres of society. It must go beyond the traditional, formal style of teaching and make use of community participation, without imposing any particular ethic and respecting socio-cultural specificities. Individuals and local communities must make efforts and take initiatives to tackle the problem of drug abuse as they perceive it. Drug abuse must be divested of its myths, and its effects on health, both among individuals and in the community, as well as its economic aspects must be strongly emphasized.

I said before, I know very well as a brain biochemist and also as a perinatal biochemist what are the impacts of drug addiction on brain receptors, the irreversible damage produced when a certain level of intake is reached. And this must be emphasized and made known – not least to those who only talk about the economic aspects of drug trafficking and drug addiction. We need to bring a great deal more scientific rigour to our discussions on illicit drugs as well as on alcohol and tobacco. We must make very clear what is the real harm biological and behavioural - produced by drugs, the degree of dependency they induce, how far their effects are reversible. We must highlight the harm done to self and to society. In the case of tobacco, for example, the damage to the individual's health must be emphasized. And all the measures adopted must be based essentially “personal warnings”. In the case of alcohol abuse, there is a need for permanent warnings about health effects and very firm collective measures, particularly related to driving or other activities carried out under the influence of alcohol.

On previous occasions in its annual reports for 1991-1992, the INCB Board has extensively discussed the arguments of those who support the legalization of illicit drugs. Most of these advocates, like the American economist Milton Friedman, or the British weekly “The Economist”, have asserted that “control” over drugs by the legal market economy would reduce the undesirable effects caused by the illegal drug economy. In brief, they have proposed replacing a liberal illegal economy by a liberal legal one, making drugs available in the same way as any other merchandise. The arguments which your Board has used to reply to them seem to me very valid, and justify taking a firm stand against the legalization of the non-medical use of drugs. Like weapons and medicines, drugs are not substances to trifle with. We cannot abandon them to “market forces”, legal or illegal. A question of equity is also involved here. We must not forget that it is the poor
countries which are considered to be responsible if they purchase weapons, but guilty if they sell drugs. We thus always blame the same people. In the case of armaments, we sanction the buyers, not the suppliers. In the case of drugs, we invert the responsibility and make the sellers responsible.

Drug trafficking and drug abuse are corroding the foundations of our societies. To succeed in reducing the demand for drugs, action must also be taken to reduce their supply. We can do this by developing replacement crops and markets for them. We must therefore encourage the active participation of growers and farmers. But, at the same time, intensified action must be taken against illegal trafficking at all levels. The sanctions against drug trafficking must be proportional to the harm they produce. In the case of those who encourage consumption in the schools at a very early age, who induce addiction in teenagers, justice must be rapid and very firm. But – let me repeat – the best way of stamping out drug trafficking is, in the end, to take effect measures at the international level to prevent the laundering of money.

Drug demand reduction, in order to be significant and sustainable, calls for multiple, diversified but concerted measures, accompanied by patient, systematic educational efforts. And we must seek common, effective measures, both at the national level and within the sphere of international co-operation, as regards the allocation of the human and material resources needed to reduce the supply of drugs. In developing countries, drug production, trafficking and abuse have increased. If peasants can legally earn enough to sustain a decent standard of living, without having recourse to drug-plant production, they will, in all likelihood, be able and willing to avoid illicit crops. But the issue must not be presented, as I have done right now, as a purely economic one. It is also – and crucially – an ethical one. The authorities – national, municipal and at the level of each village – must be ethically guided. The issue – which also concerns the individual citizen – is one of responsibility. There is no excuse for violence, and drug trafficking is a very severe form of social violence.

When talking about crop eradication campaigns we must warn about the possible use of herbicides, what are known as “defoliants”, which are so harmful and damaging to the environment. We must not forget the effects of the so-called Agent Orange in the Viet Nam war. We must be very clear about the long-term toxic effect on humans of all these potential toxic agents.

The INCB debate to which I have just referred did not consider the views of those who argue for a so-called “alternative regulation” of a number of drugs. This would not cover all substances or be done in an uncontrolled way but would be subject to the discretion and medical supervision of each UN Member State and to the scrutiny of their crime-prevention authorities.

My feeling is that these proposals for an alternative form of regulation are worth considering, because they are quite distinct from the arguments of those who advocate schemes for free and total deregulation. Such proposals, however, should not be misinterpreted, as they often are. Their proponents give assurances that, and I quote, “legalizing drugs does not mean that society is advocating the use of drugs”. I think it would be worth while considering an international agreement to allow, under medical control, a limited supply of drugs to drug addicts who need them and are unable to break with their habit. They should simultaneously benefit from social and medical care, and be helped in the same way as patients suffering from a curable disease. I think that we must explore this approach of considering drug addicts as persons who need care and to whom such care should be provided in the same way as any other kind of medical assistance. We
could thereby contribute to the curing process while ensuring that the drug will be made
available to those concerned without the need for recourse to the means they are presently
forced to adopt. Such an approach could have a very big impact on the black market in
drugs.

Let us seriously consider and discuss the adoption of so-called “harm reduction”
policies implemented in various countries as part of a global drug control policy and
programme. In recent years, in view of the AIDS epidemic among intravenous drug users,
the health authorities in many countries have developed a “harm reduction model”. Many
experts arguing in favour of such a model assert that its consistent development implies
two kinds of control over drugs: control over international trade similar to that already
existing and implemented by INCB concerning the licit supply of and demand for drugs for
medical purposes; and national control of the availability of drugs, suitably adapted to the
nature of the substances (for instance, legal control of cannabis by products in specific
places where access is forbidden to the under-aged, and the concurrent availability of
opiates in pharmacies and on medical prescription). I repeat that the issue before you is
very complex and that all such initiatives must be judged in terms of the results they
produce. At the same time, we must not only consider the possibility of influencing supply
and demand; we must also take into account those who are addicted, the reasons for their
addiction, and in this way go to the very roots of the problem.

Concerning the development of a harm reduction model, the choice lies not
between two alternatives – prohibition or liberalization – but perhaps between three
possibilities: maintaining the prohibition of the non-medical use of drugs (but with a
medically controlled supply to the drug addicts so as to sharply reduce the incentive to
drug trafficking); the liberalization of narcotics, i.e. their integration within the legal
market economy; and the extension of national and international control over the trade in
and availability of drugs.

Mr President,

UNESCO is keen on bringing its specific expertise to bear in the field of drug abuse
prevention, within the United Nations international drug control system. It wishes and is
able to do so – I repeat – particularly through education.

At the last meeting of the Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC), held
here in Vienna on 27 and 28 February last, I placed special emphasis on the need to combat
drug abuse through education and public information, notably by means of media
campaigns, while at the same time addressing the root causes of such abuse. I repeat that
we need the help of the media – together with that of the municipal and local authorities -
to create the necessary awareness, commitment and involvement. The ACC,
acknowledging the co-ordinating role of UNDCP, also stressed country-level initiatives by
United Nations Residents Coordinators in the various countries and requested its
Subcommittee on Drug Control to enhance inter-agency coordination by developing joint
multisectoral plans of action. I think that this was a very important outcome of this
meeting, inasmuch as we must be guided by your Programme, making use of your specific
knowledge and advisory mechanisms and systems in order to act in a co-ordinated way at
the national level. We touch here on the more general issue of the need for someone to
conduct the orchestra at the national level – guided by those programmes or institutions
with a specific mandate and competence in the field concerned.
I think that close collaboration is necessary to put an end to what has been going on for too long: an endless war against a faceless enemy. One of my greatest concerns in this respect is the problem of street children. Today, over 100 million children throughout the world are struggling for survival in destitution and distress. They are the street and working children who are in danger of injury, murder, violence, rape, sexual exploitation, AIDS and other diseases, hunger, solitude, contempt – and drug abuse. We see these children standing around street corners and under bridges intoxicating themselves by inhaling solvents. Their numbers are increasing daily, in the South and in the North. These children need to be taught how to live in society, they must be integrated into society, and they need to be educated to become responsible citizens and to defend themselves against those, intent on manipulating them in order to make huge and heinous financial gains.

In the name of all those people suffering from economic, social and health problems related to their own addiction, to that of their next-of-kin or to that of their friends, let me reiterate that UNESCO is ready to co-operate directly with the International Narcotics Control Board, and through the United Nations Drugs Control Programme, to promote drug abuse prevention through education.

Of particular importance to me at this meeting is the extent to which UNESCO considers co-operation with INCB – and, more generally, with UNDCP – to be vital in giving impetus to our joint efforts to reduce drug demand. Let us debate the different opinions about the drug demand issue, its links with the supply side and the related policies. Let us pool our experience and exchange information in this field so as to see more deeply into the real nature of the drug abuse phenomenon and decide on adequate ways and means to combat it.

But I cannot end these remarks without underlining that this issue, as with all transnational ones, must be addressed on the basis of an international strategy and commitment, employing an integral approach encompassing the problem in all its complexity and taking into account not only the economic but also the social and ethical aspects. These transnational issues cannot be tackled effectively through a “business-as-usual” approach. No. The threats are new. So the strategy to address them must be new. The budgets devoted to previous threats must now be redirected. We must invest in youth because youth is our future and our hope; we must firmly punish those who harm our young people because they are destroying our future and our hope; and we must care for those who need help, particularly the youngest ones, because our mission is that of saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war – all kinds of war. UNESCO in particular must devote itself to this cause because, as you know, its role is to construct the defences of peace in the minds of men and women, and peace-building means above all empowering every person to act and behave in accordance with his or her own choices and not under the constraint of social and of economic conditions that pre-empt choice and usurp the will of the individual. This is the solution, this must be our common aim – getting to the roots of the drug abuse problem, which lie in exclusion, marginalization and extreme poverty.

Thank you, Mr President and Board Members, for giving me the opportunity to address your meeting.
Honourable Deputy Prime Minister of the United Kingdom,  
Honourable Ministers of Ghana and the ECOWAS countries,  
Distinguished Participants,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is an honour to be among you today, together with the Deputy Prime Minister, for the opening of the Pilgrimage Route Meeting. This meeting marks the 2007 bicentenary of the abolition of the North Atlantic slave trade by the UK Parliament.

I made my first official visit to Ghana at the invitation of President Kufuor three years ago, in order to launch the 2004 International Year to Commemorate the Struggle Against Slavery. On that occasion, I had the privilege of making my first address as Nana Nyarko Abronoma the First, a name that was graciously bestowed upon me in Cape Coast. Yesterday, I was almost made Nana of the Ga people at the ceremony held at James Town, Accra. But they discovered at the last minute that I am already Nana of Cape Coast. They therefore decided to withdraw their offer, which I regret nonetheless.

More seriously though, it is with genuine pleasure that I return to your country on this occasion, invited again by President Kufuor. I have been privileged to meet the President on many occasions. Most recently was just two weeks ago at the African Union Summit in Addis Ababa, when President Kufuor was elected Chairman of the Union. I had the privilege to make a speech at the Summit, chaired by him, addressing the theme of “Science and Technology in Africa”. The next African Union Summit will take place in Accra in July of this year. It is indeed a great achievement for Ghana.

I totally agree with the statement made by President Kufuor at the Africa-France Summit held in Cannes, France, that “Africa is a land of beauty and hospitality”. Vice President Mahama has been extending Ghanaian hospitality to me since yesterday.

Ghana is a very special place for me. I made my first official visit in 2004. But this was not my first visit to Ghana. My discovery of this marvellous country began much earlier, in the early 1960s. It was here, in Accra, that I undertook my first overseas posting within the Japanese diplomatic service, covering ten West African countries that is almost all ECOWAS countries. It was here that I began to learn about Africa, and that the foundations were laid of my deep personal commitment to the continent’s development. It is an enormous pleasure to be back in West Africa again, and in particular in Ghana.

Today’s meeting is especially significant, as it takes place with the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of Ghana’s independence. This is an historic moment to celebrate the force of freedom and its triumph over injustice. I pay special tribute to the Minister of Tourism and the Diaspora for taking the initiative to organize today’s event.

Therefore, I am most delighted to assist at the launch of the Joseph Project of the Akwaaba Anyemi Programme, which the Minister has initiated. This ambitious and inspiring project endeavours to reinstate a sense of pride among all peoples of Africa by celebrating the continent’s tremendous heritage. The programme of activities seminars,
international conferences, publications, arts festivals, and cultural visits that will take place throughout the year reflects the leading role played by the Government of Ghana in Pan-African development in the new millennium.

Together, the commemoration of the 2007 bicentenary and the Joseph Project offer a great opportunity for African countries to share their knowledge and experience, and to help forge, on the basis of their common past, new paths for the future. UNESCO is ready to help promote the project with the Ghanaian government and other ECOWAS countries, in cooperation with the African Diaspora and European governments. I am happy to hear a very positive reaction from Deputy Prime Minister Prescott.

Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

Ghana, like many African countries, played a significant and complex role in the history of slavery and the slave trade. From the sixteenth century on, European nations fought each other for the right to exploit the human resources of the Gold Coast, a struggle that pitted Ghanaian against Ghanaian, ethnic group against ethnic group.

Such tragedies have left a legacy that continues to haunt and frustrate the development of Africa today. We cannot begin to comprehend present-day Africa without reference to the systematic human, intellectual and cultural persecution to which this great continent was subjected through the centuries of trans-Saharan and transatlantic slave trading.

We cannot possibly understand the racial prejudice that continues to affect people of African descent today without taking into account the theories of racial hierarchy generated to justify the slave trade.

And we will never understand the exclusion and poverty experienced by black populations in the Americas, the Caribbean, the Indian Ocean and elsewhere without taking into account the system of exploitation and inequality inherited from slavery, which has long persisted after the abolitions.

However, beyond the extreme suffering caused by this shameful institution, it is also necessary to acknowledge that the slave trade led to new and fertile interactions between the peoples of Africa, Europe, the Americas and the Indian Ocean. While decrying its tragic character, we must recognize that this meeting of peoples has had unexpected remarkable consequences for the cultures of the regions concerned, particularly through the spread of African customs, beliefs and creativity, at first in the so-called “New World”, and then subsequently across the entire globe.

Moreover, the legacy of the slave trade is not only evident in countries to which slaves were transported. It is also present in many African countries, especially in the fortified trading posts located along the coast of Ghana between Keta and Beyin. These trading posts were inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1979, and constitute an important foundation for the collective memory of the slave trade.

Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

UNESCO is very pleased to note that the themes of today’s Pilgrimage Route Meeting
draw strongly on the Organization’s own Slave Route Project. Launched in the 1990s, this initiative was conceived to “break the silence” surrounding the slave trade and slavery through the historical study of their causes and dynamics. It sought to explore the consequences and interactions that resulted from the slave trade, with the aim of establishing a culture of tolerance and peaceful coexistence among different races and peoples.

Under the Slave Route Project, UNESCO created the Cultural Tourism Programme of Memory for Africa, devoted to identifying, rehabilitating, and promoting sites, buildings and places of slave trade remembrance. This holistic approach embracing economy, history and ethics fully reflects our common duty to remember, while providing potential opportunities for tourism development.

In particular, the programme links the ethical aspect of the memory of the slave trade with the need for sustainable development. It recommends that concerned UNESCO Member States, tour operators, tourists and local populations take an active role in the promotion of cultural tourism, seeking to raise awareness of the slave trade heritage, while respecting the natural environment.

Through the inventory of sites of memory, tourist routes can be created and implemented at the national, regional, and international levels. Indeed, since the slave trade extended well beyond national boundaries, tourist routes should be progressively developed among those countries with historical links, in particular ECOWAS Member States. Cultural tourism related to the Slave Route Project can in this way become a factor for regional and interregional integration. It can also contribute to reinforcing the relations with the African Diaspora, for whom such sites of memory constitute important emotional and historical links with their lands of origin. Underlying such action is UNESCO’s firm conviction that sustainable development can only be achieved by taking full account of cultural issues. Therefore it is essential that the slave trade, its abolition and memory are integrated into school curriculum.

Along with the cultural tourism of memory, the Slave Route Project calls also for the creation of slavery museums, involving both the tangible and intangible heritage of African peoples and those of the Diaspora communities. The creation of these museums will serve to increase public knowledge of the slave trade and slavery both within and between societies and continents. The goal is ultimately to create places where questions regarding the slave trade and slavery can be examined in a constructive and relevant manner by a wide public.

Potentially, slavery museums can be set up in every African country, many of which already possess public or private museums. However, one of the main obstacles is the current diffusion of artefacts and documents. As you are all too well aware, many museums are nearly empty. Given this situation, how can the traces of the slave trade dispersed around the world be inventoried? How can researchers, pilgrims, young people and the general public access this information? How can the concerned institutions and scholars of the sub-region collaborate and share their material, their experience and expertise on the issues in a more effective manner? These are some of the questions that I hope will be examined in the sub-regional seminar on slavery in West Africa in the light of the opportunities offered today by the technologies of information.

I would like to emphasize that the role of these museums must not be limited to the conservation, restoration and dissemination of artefacts and documents. The situation calls for an active collaboration between museums, communities and researchers on the slave trade. In their capacity as forums for exchange and dialogue between different generations,
museums on slavery can play a major role in educating young people and adults, students and researchers, as well as pilgrims and tourists. To avoid becoming a traditional site for the display of objects, the emphasis should be placed on transforming these museums into interactive centres, taking full advantage of the latest innovations in museology.

I am certain that within the framework of the commemoration of this Bicentenary and the Joseph Project, many other challenges related to the management of the memory of slavery and the slave trade will be addressed in Ghana as well in the other ECOWAS countries.

Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is my sincere hope that this sub-regional seminar will also contribute to essential issues such as the mapping of slave sites in West Africa, the establishment of a network of West African Museums specialized in the slave trade and slavery, and the development of remembrance tourism in the sub-region. We are confident that the numerous initiatives undertaken in follow-up to this meeting will contribute to “breaking the silence” surrounding the slave trade, and strengthening our common memory. This constitutes an essential step towards enabling the great African continent to realize its full potential in the contemporary world.

I thank you for your attention and wish you much success in your deliberations.
8 Shrnutí

Habilitační práce zkoumá vytváření koherence v politickém diskurzu na základě analýzy úvodních projevů přednášených generálními řediteli UNESCO na mezinárodních konferencích. Výzkum prostředků a strategií, jež přispívají k vytváření koherence v žánru úvodních projevů, je proveden především z hlediska analýzy diskurzu, pragmatiky a kritické analýzy diskurzu. Analýza jazykového materiálu, která využívá jak kvalitativních, tak kvantitativních metod, vychází z žánrové analýzy a relevantních analytických postupů pro výzkum různých aspektů koherence na ideáční, interpersonální a textové úrovni diskurzu.

Přestože je koherence jedním z ústředních konceptů v oblasti analýzy diskurzu, není vzhledem ke své složitosti dosud lingvisty chápána zcela jednotně. Svědčí o tom množství přístupů ke zkoumání tohoto jazykového jevu, které autorka kriticky hodnotí a srovnává. Ve své práci autorka koncipuje koherencí jako dynamickou vlastnost diskurzu, která je potenciálně variabilním výsledkem spolupráce mezi účastníky interakce, které promítají do interpretace psaného nebo mluveného textu své všeobecné znalosti a předchozí zkušenosti v interpretaci diskurzu. Výzkum vychází z předpokladu, že jak výstavba, tak vnímání koherence jsou výsledkem souhrny ideáčních, interpersonálních a textových významů v diskurzu. Na základě analýzy úvodních projevů autorka prokazuje, že pojíícím koherentním prvky v politickém diskurzu jsou významy interpersonální, které jsou vytvářeny pomocí modálních sloves, osobních zájmen, evaluačních lexikálních jednotek a signálů dialogičnosti. Tyto interpersonální prvky jsou provázány s výstavbou koherence na úrovni ideáční, jež je založena na tématické posloupnosti, ustálených identitách referentů, časovém zakotvení diskurzu v momentě promluvy a logických vazbách mezi jednotlivými částmi promluvy. V mezinárodním prostředí diplomatické komunikace je vnímání koherence často usnadněno použitím četných kohezních signálů. Autorka dále poukazuje na to, že v žánru úvodních projevů je volba strategií pro výstavbu koherence úzce provázána s přesvědčovacími strategiemi, které politikové používají v souvislosti se svými komunikativními záměry a rétorickou strukturou žánru úvodních projevů.