

T.R.
SULEYMAN DEMIREL UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND LETTERS
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND
LITERATURE

THE MEANING-BASED COHERENCE IN ENGLISH AND
TURKISH: AN INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH

SUPERVISOR
Prof. Dr. Hüseyinaga RZAYEV

İLKER ÖZÇELİK
1030224186
MASTER'S THESIS

ISPARTA
2013



T.C.
SÜLEYMAN DEMİREL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZ
SAVUNMA SINAV TUTANAĞI



Tez Savunması 1

Tarih: 21/6/2013

Enstitü Yönetim Kurulunun 13/ 6/2013 tarih ve 93389805.302.14.05/ 995 sayılı kararıyla oluşturulan jürimiz Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Bilim Dalı YÜKSEK LİSANS öğrencisi İlker ÖZÇELİK'nın "The Meaning-based Coherence in English and Turkish. An Interdisciplinary Approach" başlıklı tezini incelemek ve değerlendirmek üzere 21/6/2013 tarihinde saat 13.0'da toplanmış ve adayı tez savunmasına almıştır.

Lisansüstü Yönetmeliği Madde 25 uyarınca adaya dakika süreyle teziyle ilgili Ek'te sunulan sorular yöneltilmiştir. Yapılan değerlendirmeler sonunda adayın tezinin aşağıda belirtilen sebeplerle,

Tezin kabul edilmesine
(Öğrenci, varsa jüri tarafından gerekli görülen düzeltmeleri yaparak, tezinin onaylı son şeklini bir (1) ay içinde Enstitü'ye teslim etmelidir.)

Tezde düzeltme verilmesine
(Öğrenci, tezde gerekli görülen düzeltmeleri yaptıktan sonra üç (3) ay içinde savunmasını yineleyecektir.)

Tezin reddedilmesine
(Öğrenci, yeni tez konusu belirlemelidir.)

*Tez adı değişikliği yapıldı/yapılmadı.
oy birliği/oy çokluğu ile karar verilmiştir.
Gereği için arz olunur.

Jüri	Adı Soyadı	İmza
Danışman	:Prof. Dr. Hüseyin RZAYEV	
Üye	:Prof. Dr. Ramazan GÜLENDAM	
Üye	:Doç. Dr. Ömer ŞEKERCİ	

Ek : Herbir jüriye ait tez değerlendirme jüri raporları

Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu Kararı	Tarih:	Karar No:
Bu form danışman tarafından düzenlenerek 3 gün içerisinde ilgili Anabilim Dalı aracılığı ile Enstitüye teslim edilir.		



T.C.

SÜLEYMAN DEMİREL ÜNİVERSİTESİ

Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürlüğü

YEMİN METNİ

Yüksek Lisans tezi olarak sunduğum “Meaning-based Coherence in English and Turkish” adlı çalışmanın, tezin proje safhasından sonuçlanmasına kadar ki bütün süreçlerde bilimsel ahlak ve geleneklere aykırı düşecek bir yardıma başvurulmaksızın yazıldığını ve yararlandığım eserlerin Bibliyografya’da gösterilenlerden oluştuğunu, bunlara atıf yapılarak yararlanılmış olduğunu belirtir ve onurumla beyan ederim.

İlker ÖZÇELİK
05.07.2013

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It would not have been possible to write this master thesis without the help and support of the kind people around me, to only some of whom it is possible to give particular mention here.

First and foremost, I would like to express the deepest appreciation to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Hüseyinaga RZAYEV, who has the attitude and the substance of a genius: he continually and convincingly conveyed a spirit of motivation in regard to research, and an excitement in regard to teaching. Without his guidance and persistent help this master thesis would not have been possible. I could not have imagined having a better supervisor and mentor.

We would also like to express our special thanks to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ömer ŞEKERCİ, from whom we have learned how to work and enrich our language skills and ways of thinking.

We feel obliged to cordially thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ramazan GÜLENDAM, who, making such a long journey to join the Committee, with his serious but kind attitude, is always encouraging us to work harder and in this way is contributing to all kinds of improvement of each moment of our work.

I would like to express my gratitude to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Betüre MEMMEDOVA and Assist. Prof. Dr. Mehmet UYSAL for the useful comments, remarks and engagement through the learning process of this master thesis.

My deepest appreciation goes to Research Assistant Yasemen KİRİŞ and Yeşim Sultan YAŞAR for their never-ending support.

I would like to express many thanks to Prof. Dr. Suleyman SEYDİ and to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sulhaddin YASAR for their kind attitude and on-going support.

I would like to thank my parents for their spiritual support, love and tolerance throughout my life.

Last, but by no means least, I thank my colleagues and friends at Suleyman Demirel University.

ÖZET

İngilizce ve Türkçe'de Anlama Dayalı Tutarlılık: Disiplinlerarası Bir Çalışma

İlker ÖZÇELİK

Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi

İngiliz Dili ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı

Yüksek Lisans Tezi, 82 sayfa, Haziran 2013

Danışman: Prof. Dr.Hüseyin RZAYEV

Çağdaş dilbilimin en önemli ve ihtilafli alanlarından bir tanesi de tutarlılık açısından metin düzenlenmesi ve anlamdır. Çok yönlü bir kavram olan tutarlılık (ve bağdaşıklıkla olan etkileşimi), farklı şekillerde yorumlanmıştır; bir yandan bağdaşıklıkla ve öbür yandan da bağıntı ile yakın ilişkisini göz önünde bulundururken, onun yukarıda belirtilen faktörlerle ortak hareket ettiğini ve metin bileşenlerinin bütünleşmesine "katkıda bulunduğunu", bunun sonucunda da uzlaşımsal gerçek anlamların ve toplumsal sanıların değişken ve karmaşık rollerini yansıtan ve tüm karmaşıklığı ve "zenginliğiyle" sözde "bütünün" ortaya çıktığını varsaymaktayız.

Anahtar Kelimeler: tutarlılık, bağdaşıklık, Türkçe, İngilizce, uzlaşımsal anlam, toplumsal sanı.

ABSTRACT

The Meaning-based Coherence in English and Turkish: An Interdisciplinary Approach.

İlker ÖZÇELİK

Suleyman Demirel University

Department of English Language and Literature

Master's Thesis, 82 pages, June 2013

Supervisor: Prof. Dr.Hüseynaga RZAYEV

Text organization and understanding in terms of coherence is one of the most essential and controversial problems of contemporary linguistics. Being a multi-faceted phenomenon, coherence (and its interplay with cohesion) has been interpreted in different ways; taking into account its close relatedness to cohesion on the one hand, and relevance, on the other, we assume that it functions jointly with the above mentioned factors and “contributes” to integration of textual constituents as a result of which appears the so-called “whole” with all its complexities and “wealth” reflecting varying and mingled roles of conventionalized literal meanings and common sense assumptions.

Keywords: Coherence, cohesion, Turkish, English, conventionalized meaning, common sense assumption

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ÖZET

ABSTRACT

INTRODUCTION

1.1. The aim and goals of the thesis	2
1.2. The Scope	3
1.3. The research method and Techniques and Data Collection	4
1.4. The Importance of the Study	5
1.5. Structuration of the Thesis	7

CHAPTER 1

Cohesion: Its Role in Text Organization

1. Review of the Existing Literature on	
1.1. Text/Textuality: Critical Review	8
1.2. Text and Discourse	11
1.3. Cohesion	13
1.3.1. Grammatical Cohesion	16
1.3.2. Lexical Cohesion	33

CHAPTER 2

Coherence in English (and Turkish): Its Interplay with Cohesion

2.1. Coherence	38
2.2. Models of Coherence	56
2.3. Selection of variables and sample texts	62
2.4. Interaction of coherence and cohesion	64
2.5. Coherence-cohesion interplay illustration on the level of sample translation from Turkish to English	69

CONCLUSION	75
-------------------	-----------

REFERENCES	77
-------------------	-----------

CV	83
-----------	-----------

INTRODUCTION

This paper examines the ways in which semantics, grammar and pragmatics contribute to an orderly presentation of coherence in a discourse. Because different factors impose constraints on the dominance of each contributor in creating, understanding and interpretation of textuality and the role of coherence in realizing it as a whole involving features which can hardly be found in its constituents taken separately, a language user's choice of giving preference to this or other device can signal the constituents' assumed familiarity level, which, finally, can assist the communicant in constructing a coherent discourse model.

Various individual devices (semantics, grammar, and pragmatics) serve distinct discourse functions relating to the structuring of information within the discourse, but these factors work together to create generalized coherent patterns of communication. In this sense, the study of coherence is somewhat peculiar in that it uses species of language to describe language as well as coherence in it. The source of potential problems is two-fold. First, many linguists don't make any distinction between cohesion and coherence. Second, through their linguistic pedigree discourse analysts have a long tradition of restricting themselves with only devices of cohesion and coherence, wholly neglecting their individual properties, potential, intersection and mutually relevant features in structuring and functioning of language as a means of communication as well as of constructing not only our world but also our way of thinking.

In terms of this approach and aim, the research examines the following questions (goals):

- 1) Why languages are conventional, unique and similar in utilizing both cohesive devices and coherence potential?
- 2) To what extent does textual representation of cohesive devices and coherent potential differs from language to language?
- 3) What is the role of "hidden" meanings or "conventionally patterned common sense assumptions" in discourse analysis?

4) How do literal and “social” meanings interact in “language in use” and how they contribute to the construction of textual meaning?

In accord with the aim and goals of the research, the introduction part has been structured as follows:

- 1) The aim and goals of the research (see p. 1)
- 2) The scope of the study
- 3) The method and research techniques of the study and data collection
- 4) The importance of the study
- 5) Structuration of the thesis

The Scope of the Study

Coherence here is examined in close connection with cohesion, making a strict distinction between the characteristic features and the roles of the 2 mentioned phenomena, on the one hand, and analysing their potential in terms of “text structuration”. The other important point is that; we expand the scope of coherence on account of

a) correct combining factors,

b) national-cultural-oriented standards, and

c) pragmatics to cover the study of linguistic communication, in relation to language structure and context of utterance. For this purpose, pragmatics must identify: (a) central uses of language (i.e. when pragmatic and literal meanings overlap); (b) cover and specify the conditions for coherent relations, as well as (c) to uncover general principles of coherence relations in different languages.

Finally, the format (and scope) of cohesive devices has been narrowed (in one sense), and widened in the other, on account of examining their communicative relevance, and thus we make clearer the reason: “Why the so-called cohesive devices are so widely applied in all languages and how language benefits from them” (gains compactness, avoids repetition and becomes more effective and purpose-oriented).

The method and research techniques of the study and data collection

The major theoretical instrument for us is the critical analysis (reviewing) of the existing field literature. In this sense, the use (though rarely and implicitly) of presuppositional analysis has proved to be fruitful in revealing (mis)match of the above mentioned aspects of coherence. Moreover, the elements of contrastive and comparative approaches have also been explored in the research.

Examples for analysis have been collected via traditional data collection method. The gainings of the research enabled us to generalize advantages/disadvantages of “common sense” and “culturally-oriented” coherence relations in English (and rarely in Turkish).

The Importance of the Study/Research

- 1) First of all, the study explores different possibilities (“coherence” being one of them) for greater integration of language and literature in the curriculum. Central to such an approach is a continuing investigation of the nature of literary language and an illustration of both the creativity of ordinary language users and the “wealthy” potential inherent in so-called “everyday” language use (to make it more rational, compact and effective).
- 2) The main linking argument is that language studies can be all the richer as a result of greater attention to the creative formations and logically reasonable reformations of spoken and written literary English in a wide range of contexts of use.
- 3) The other main point in this thesis is that teaching methodologies which utilise process-based approach can promote (especially in “writing” and text linguistics” as well as “speaking” classes) greater literary understanding and foster more effective language development, especially on the part of learners of English as a foreign or an additional language. Fuller integration of language-based approaches to text study is seen as a positive way of democratising access to literary text (In our education prevails a so-called restrictive and isolationist view of teaching English as an academic subject, not understanding the connection between language and literature). The thesis, therefore, explores some relevant theories and practices of language- and literature-based interpretation of texts.
- 4) We argue that refining some of the typical features of interpretation we can enlarge the scope of the interrelationship of language and literature by a consideration of both of them as discourse.
- 5) This integrated approach is also strongly supported by some scholars who even go further and emphasize that “there is no longer any reason to confine to literature alone the type of studies crystallised in poetics: We must read “as such” not only literary texts but all, not only verbal production, but all symbolism” (Todorov 1981:7)
- 6) We must be aware that privileging literature to the detriment of all other types of discourse is purely ideological and has no justification, since literature (in fact)

is in conceivable outside a typology of discourses. Implicit or explicit in the studies of romances, action adventures, as well as the rhetoric of advertising copy, newspaper editorials and political speeches is the notion that elements of literariness inhere in all constructed texts and as Carter claims, “much pedagogic benefit can be derived from comparisons and contrasts of such “constructedness”” (Carter 2002: 114).

- 7) The importance of “language-literature” relationship is that findings and principles of this approach can also be fruitfully extended to and applied in stylistics classes and ideological use of language. In this sense, Fowler’s claim “linguistic meaning is inseparable from ideology and both depend on social structures” (Fowler et al 1979: 2) is rather reasonable which has been emphasized by Carter (2002: 114) as follows: It is naïve to suppose that literature is any different from other language use... and linguistic criticism can be harnessed to unmask ideologies and to analyse critically the ways in which reality is socially constructed and politically reproduced in all texts.

The Structure of the Research

To fulfil these “missions”, the “Labour Division” has been distributed in the following way:

Chapter 1 deals with “cohesion” and cohesive devices. It examines the capacity of each cohesive device in various interpretations. Diversity of opinions reveals multifaceted nature of cohesive devices both from the angle of structuration and communicative relevance. In terms of this approach, ellipsis and substitution get enriched and more communicatively oriented values.

The main concern of Chapter 2 is “coherence”, in its full complexity and “wealth”, the latter being specified both semantically and pragmatically. The characteristic features of “coherence” (in comparison with those of “cohesion”) are, in all cases, revealed in terms of “language in use” during which the majority of the Gricean maxims get violated without leading to any misunderstanding.

The maxim of “relevance” is an exception in this sense; it “collaborates” with coherence allowing it to function as “a contextual” or “situational” variety of language; the only “trace” of a modified structure helps reveal the “hidden” meaning with the contribution of “common sense assumptions” or other devices of coherence. Inseparability of language and culture is also considered in interpreting coherence in English and Turkish dialogic texts and proverbs.

Conclusion generalizes the findings of the research and works out definite pedagogic implications which can be fruitfully applied in teaching and learning a foreign language.

“References” part involves the actively used literature consisting of books, articles in various journals, dissertations and other scientific sources.

Chapter 1

Cohesion: Its Role in Text Organization

1.1. Text/Textuality: Critical Review

This thesis examines the ways in which coherence (in joint efforts with cohesion) contributes to an orderly presentation of information in a text. Ever since the early contributions of the Prague School (e.g. Firbas 1966) and Halliday (e.g. Halliday 1967, Halliday and Hassan 1976), it has been a linguistic truism that human languages tend to structure a text on the basis of an interrelationship of ‘given-/new information parts’- that is, in any particular sentence (which is a constituent of a text level), information that is assumed to be familiar, or given, tends to be incredible for and usually is placed before the new information. One way of ensuring that this flow of information is preserved is through the use of coherence (and cohesion) which, in turn, plays an essential role in the organization of textual information. Chafe in (1976) uses the term “packaging” to refer to this use of syntactic and semantic as well as presuppositional structuring of a text to serve pragmatic functions, noting that by choosing to package one information using one cohesive or coherent device than another, a speaker accomodates his/her speech to various “states of the addressee’s mind”.

Because different cohesive devices (or constructions) impose constraints on the familiarity of their content planes (references, substitution, reiteration/repetition, ellipsis, etc.), a speaker’s choice of cohesive or coherent device can signal the constituent’s assumed familiarity level, which, in turn, can assist the hearer/reader in constructing a coherent text model. In this way, the constraints on the information status of the constituents within a cohesive (or coherent) construction are directly tied to that device’s textual function. Various cohesive/coherent devices/structures serve distinct textual functions relating to the structuring of information within a text, and these functions work together to create generalized patterns of information structure.

But to analyse any information structure as a functional aspect of a text, we are to answer one question which is central to understand the problem: What is a text or textuality?

Since the 1970s, the study of textuality has been given new impulses by scholars who feel the need for a theoretical synthesis of the available data (Meeuwis 1991: 481). In this framework, the “pragmatic perspective” is not restricted to language use of coherence in microsituations of face-to-face communication. Coherence-induced language orientation being our primary concern, we want to investigate how this matter can be approached “pragmatically”. The adequacy of the “coherent frame of reference” proposed by H. Rzayev will be experimented in view of communicatively-induced information status change. This perspective is also functional in the sense that it approaches coherence in the light of language in use. This concentration on use implies that reference has to be made to non-linguistic factors as well as linguistic ones. An essential concept in this pragmatic-functional model of a text is: Language use is a constant which directly affects choices in order to comply with varying communicative needs. The process is otherwise called linguistic adaptation while the range of possible choices constitutes the variability of language, a second central notion. Thirdly, there is negotiability: i.e., linguistic choices do not have fixed function correlates, in the sense that a particular communicative need may be fulfilled by a diversity of linguistic devices, and vice versa.

Therefore this part of the research outlines the kinds of opinions (concerning “What is a text?”) that might be available/useful for critical treatment. This sets the discipline of text analysis a very difficult task. We suggest that to investigate whether this is a realistic undertaking, it is necessary to establish how texts actually construct meaning and what this constructed meaning looks like. In other words, how and why is it constructed? And how are purposive and meaning constituents are constructed over text? The central claim of our departure point is that the concept of text is in itself not a straightforward matter.

Rather than attempting an exclusive definition of text, we think it reasonable to dwell briefly on the various metaphors for text available to discourse analysts. Hoey (1991) identified the prevailing metaphor of text in linguistics as viewing text as a sentence (ibid:13). This leads researchers to looking for structure in text that they are used to finding in sentence: lexical-like units, syntactic structural relations, finite set of

generative rules, grammaticality, completeness, etc. This view of text is typical of early text linguistics (Sanchez-Garcia 2006: 186). However, even a brief examination of this metaphor reveals that text is unlike a sentence in more ways than it may resemble it. There are other analogies that may help us elucidate how text is dealt with in various analytic contexts. E.g. for Huddleston (1984: 18), a text does not consist of a random juxtaposition of sentences. The connections between them being not the same kind, their study falls under a different field, not syntax but “discourse analysis” or “text linguistics”. Within the sentence, as he claims, we have a much sharper distinction between permissible and impermissible combinations (the compensation of which-in the latter case-, unlike the textual level is impossible), which enables us to formulate rules distinguishing what is grammatical from what is not. Parallel to text as sentence is the metaphor of text as a dialogue. In this case, we will look for patterns of interactivity with the intended audience, other texts, evidence of turn-taking, etc. This perspective can be found in literary criticism as well as many postmodern approaches to text. Hoey argues that “text has some organization but that organization does not have the status of structure, a structural description being one that permits one to make predictive statements about the data under examination. Thus, according to this view (which is shared by Dressler as well in 1981 reformatted 2002:22), it is not possible to make predictive statements about text organization (Hoey 1991:13). Dressler even goes further, claiming that probabilistic models are more adequate and realistic than deterministic ones.

Investigating the conceptual underpinning of discourse, Lukeš also chooses to talk of patterns rather than structures as Werth, Hoey and others do. He proves his decision claiming that “the concept of structure carries with it certain assumptions of stability, connectivity, and hierarchy that may prejudice the outcome of an inquiry in a way that the idea of a pattern will not” (Lukeš2006: 189)

The third view of viewing text organization is that text does permit of full structural description and this is perhaps the most common view and is held by such linguists as van Dijk (1972), Longacre (1983), Pike and Pike (1977), Graustein and Thiele (1987), and Grimes (1975). A rather different version of this 3rd view (preceding from the relationship between cohesion and text organization) focuses on structure from the

perspective of genre (Halliday and Hassan 1985; Martin 1985; Ventola 1987, etc.). A final metaphor of text is that of a mental or discourse space. This metaphor is most closely associated with cognitive approaches to text but it has multiple incarnations and sources. In its one incarnation, it can be traced to psychological concerns with memory and attention scopes. This can be found in literature as topic-focus articulation in generative functional grammar (Hajicova 1993), anaphoric coreference (Ariel 1990) or psychology of text comprehension (Sanford and Garrod 1981).

For Meeuwis (1991: 484), the ultimate truth in interpreting or organizing a text is to be found in a combination of internal (linguistic) and external (sociolinguistic) information. Thomason and Kaufman, in turn, formulate this combination as “the principle of multiple causation” (1988: 57), a principle that allows them to move away from the unicausal approaches to text organization. For Jackendoff (1972: 230), “... it makes sense to speak of a discourse as “natural” if successive sentences share presuppositions”, i.e., “the information...that is assumed by the speaker to be shared by him and the hearer” (ibid: 16). Prince’s notion of an open proposition (=OP), corresponding to Chomsky’s and Jackendoff’s notion of presupposition, serves to make presumed shared knowledge in discourse and contains one or more variables to represent what the speaker assumes to be salient or inferrable in the discourse at the time of utterance (1986).

Our aim in outlining the different metaphors of text in the research literature was neither to provide a definitive classification,, nor to declare an allegiance to one or the other approach. Rather, our intention is to demonstrate the complexity of text and often due to the complex nature of the factors such as cohesion and coherence.

1.2. “Text” and “Discourse”

Before moving on, let me briefly clarify the definition of “text” with regard to “discourse”. The interchangeable use of “text” and “discourse” seems to be an acceptable terminological compromise that is adopted by many researchers. However, the indeterminacy of the term “discourse” makes it both very versatile and potentially misleading. In the field literature, we find “discourse” referring either to a single conversation or text, to a collection of texts or conversations, or to a shared way of

talking or creating texts (equivalent to linguistic or non-linguistic code). The last of these frequently leads to plural use of “discourses”. Yet another use is the instantiation or use of text in interaction (similar to the “langue/parole” distinction) which views discourse essentially as a process rather than product. We use the term referring to all of these possible uses, only specifying in which cases and when confusion could arise. This allows us to benefit from the power and versatility of indeterminacy while avoiding the pitfalls of terminological confusion.

Text, for some scholars (especially those from the field of Critical Discourse Analysis), is a social action or process and corresponds to a variety of other concepts outside linguistics proper, in particular, “model” in psychology and “frame” in social sciences. The most detailed elaboration of this idea was provided by Werth (1999) in his concept of “text world” (he had borrowed the term from van Dijk). The “text world”, for Werth, is a result of the process of “discourse” which he defines as:

A deliberate and joint effort on the part of a producer and recipients to build up a “world” within which the propositions advanced are coherent and make complete sense (1999:51).

By viewing discourse as the process of constructing text worlds, Werth makes it possible for cognitive linguists (and we among them!) to study discourse outside the confines of the text as a sentence metaphor.

However, Werth’s approach also demonstrates a number of weaknesses of a straightforward application of a theory of Grammar e.g. His examples of analysis focus mostly on the construction of propositional text worlds dealing with issues of counterfactuals and deictics (similarly to Fauconnier 1985, 1997). In the process, some of the key achievements of cognitive and construction grammar have been left unexplored. Accordingly such questions as “What is the nature of the “complexity” of these structures and how is this complexity represented in text?” remain unanswered.

1.3. Cohesion

Do not forget! Most “footprints in a jungle” are ambiguous. To identify them is important, but to properly understand, interpret and take appropriate measures in “not getting trapped” by them can be much more important. (H. Rzayev)

In what follows, some possible applications and explanations of the proposed role of cohesion in creating coherence will be briefly pointed out. In fact, we experience varying cohesive devices in every part of coherent events/structures. That is natural and understandable: up to this point we have focused our attention on considerations of textuality but in accord with the basic assumption “cohesion is a well-defined multifaceted linguistic event” deserves further comment. The first point to be made concerns the fact that textual information floatings have some “local” as well as “global” properties. As Schlesinger (1974: 109-110) pointed out the notion of a discussion cannot be reduced to the sum total of the utterances that make it up. There is more to a verbal interchange than the sum-total of its individual units just as there is more to a sentence (i.e. textuality has some traces inherited from the sentential level, what, in fact, is in consonant with the assumption: textuality is not a “vacuumly packed structure “emptied from everything of the sentential level” (Rzayev unpublished paper: 2-3) than the sum-total of its constituent words. And such (usually negative evaluative) judgements obviously do not apply to any single statement made by a discussant but the structure of the relationships between these statements. What is, hence, needed, is to explicate more fully various concepts by which discussions are characterized in “local” or “global” capacity of cohesion. The fact that we characterize verbal interchanges in either “local” or “global” manner is hardly surprising: in fact, these distinctions are lexically (or grammatically) encoded in many languages e.g. the notion of “topic” figures prominently in many of these distinctions and in fact, this notion plays a central role in the characterization of both literal and metaphorical speech events: “textuality speaks” when discussions at the level of “intersentential” exchange is perceived by participants to have a well-defined topic: In cases when “wholeness” seems to be neutral with respect to topic definiteness, verbal interchanges not only have non-

reducible properties. These more “global” aspects of verbal interchanges (i.e. the coherence level) rely heavily on the sequential concatenation of utterances in discourse. The central concept horizon for our analysis of the roles of cohesive devices in textuality is that of an episode (a paragraph, a story or an essay of a definite type). Its structure is defined by four “imperatives”, namely: (1) the initiation imperative, which establishes the mutual “availability” of actors for interaction; (2) the definition imperative, in which the general type of interaction to be enacted is consensually established; (3) the rule-confirmation imperative, in which the encounter rules are confirmed, qualified, etc. (4) the strategic development imperative (e.g. cause-effect relationship’s role in coherence), in which “actors make communicative choices which are guided by the collective emergent goal(s) of each episode, and the previous imperative is either accomplished, abandoned, or redefined” (Dascal 2003: 236). In terms of this approach we are trying to clarify the “potential” of cohesion in textuality.

Here it would be a good to start with the work of Halliday and Hasan, *Cohesion in English*, the first systematic description of cohesion in English.

Halliday and Hasan (1976: p.1) defines text as “a unit of language in use”. The main difference that lies between a text and non-text is its ‘texture’. The texture is provided by the cohesive relations that exist between certain linguistic features that are present in the passage and can be identified as contributing to its total unity (p.2.). In other words, cohesive ties give the text its texture.

Cohesion occurs “where the interpretation of some element in the text is dependent on that of another. The one presupposes the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it.” (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 4)

Cohesion is the grammatical and lexical links within a text or sentence that (in cooperation with “coherence”) holds a text together and gives it meaning. Ulla Connor (1996) defines cohesion as "the use of explicit linguistic devices to signal relations between sentences and parts of texts.”

For Halliday and Hasan (1976), cohesion is a semantic relation the basis of which is on the central notion of presupposition- such as anaphora, cataphora and exophora. The

three levels presupposition is realized are: the semantic level (as in the case of reference) which has the semantic property of definiteness and specificity, the lexicogrammatical level (as in the case of substitution and ellipsis) and the grammatical level as in the case of conjunctions. The three types of reference (personal, demonstrative and comparative) are made to specific information items in the text whose retrieval from elsewhere is crucial for interpretation (ibid: 31-87). Personal reference subsumes personal and possessive pronouns. Demonstratives “this” and “that” mostly make reference to extended text. Particular comparison is also referential in the sense that reference is made to a certain standard by which one thing is said to be superior, inferior or equal. Both ellipsis and substitution (ibid: 88-225) presuppose the existence of certain textual elements. Nominal ellipsis presupposes the head noun, verbal ellipsis may presuppose either the lexical verb or the operator and clausal ellipsis presupposes the entire preceding clause. Nominal substitutes “one” and “thing” presuppose a countable noun and function as heads of the nominal group; the lexical item “same” presupposes the entire nominal group. Verbal substitute “do” presupposes the lexical verb and functions as the substitute of the verbal group. Substitutes “so” and “not” presuppose an entire clause. The conjunctives which are classified into additives, adversatives, causals and temporals also involve presupposition since they make reference to what precedes and less frequently to what follows and “establish linkage as in the case of the cohesive temporal ties “previously”, ”afterwards” ,and “meanwhile.”

Lexical cohesion, the fifth resource of textual cohesion in Halliday and Hasan`s model, is defined as the cohesion achieved by the selection of vocabulary (ibid: 274). It is classified into two major subcategories: reiteration and collocation, both of which also involve presupposition. Reiteration covers repetition- the lexical recurrence of an item- and the use of synonymy or near synonymy, a super-ordinate or a general term. Collocation is lexical cohesion achieved through the association of lexical items that regularly co-occur within and across the sentence boundaries (ibid: 284), it is a more open category which includes lexical items that are interpreted in relation to the existence of other lexical items because of: a) their belonging to an ordered series, b) their relevance to the topic or c) their oppositeness.

M.A. Halliday and R. Hasan identify the following five general categories of cohesive devices in text:

1. reference
2. ellipsis
3. substitution
4. conjunction
5. lexical cohesion

Types of Cohesion

Halliday and Hasan (1976) divide cohesion into two types: grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion. The previous refers to a combination of terms of sentences that form grammatical aspect. The latter refers to a combination of terms between sentences that form lexical component.

1.3.1. Grammatical Cohesion

Grammatical cohesion can be divided into four types: *reference*, *substitution*, *ellipsis*, and *conjunction*.

Grammatical Cohesion				
Reference		Substitution	Ellipsis	Conjunction
Personals		Nominal	Nominal	Additive
Existential	Possessive	one/ones,		and, and also,

I, you, we, he, she, it, they, one	my/mine, your/yours, our/ours, his, her/hers, its, their/theirs, one's	the same, So		nor, or, or else, furthermore, by the way, in other words, likewise, on the other hand, thus
Demonstratives	Verbal	Verbal	Adversative	
this/that, these/those, here/there	do, be, have, do the same, likewise, do so, be so, do it/that, be it/that		yet, though, only, but, however, at least, in fact, rather, on the contrary, I mean, in any case	
Definite article	Clausal	Clausal	Clausal	
The	so, not		so, then, therefore, because, otherwise,	
Comparatives			Temporal	
same, identical, similar(ly), such, different, other, else			then, next, before that, first ... then, at first, formerly ... final, at once, soon, to sum up, in conclusion	

Interpretation of Types of Grammatical Cohesion

i) Reference

Reference is a grammatical cohesive device in a text that can only be interpreted with reference to some other parts of the text.

Referencing cohesion functions to retrieve presupposed information in text and must be identifiable for it to be considered as cohesive. In written discourse, referencing identifies the writer's way of introducing participants and tracing them all through the text (Eggins 1994: 95). There are two general types of reference: endophoric referencing, which refers to information that can be "retrieved" from within the text, and exophoric referencing, which refers to information from the immediate context of situation.

Endophoric referencing can be divided into two types: one being anaphoric and the other being cataphoric. *Anaphoric* refers to any reference that "points backwards" to previously mentioned information in text, when the information needed for the interpretation is in the preceding portion of the text. *Cataphoric* refers to any reference that "points forward" to information that will be presented later in the text, when the information needed for the interpretation is to be found in the part of the text that follows.

(a) Look at the moon. It's waning. (It refers back to the sun.)

(b) It's waning, the moon. (It refers forwards to the sun.)

In the sentence (a), we are directed to look backwards to what is previously mentioned (the moon). However, in the sentence (b) we look forward to identify the element (the moon) the reference item "it" refers to. The sentence (a) is an example of anaphoric reference, while the sentence (b) is a cataphoric sentence.

For cohesion purposes, anaphoric referencing is the most relevant as it "provides a link with a preceding portion of the text" (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 51)

There are three sub-types of reference: *personal*, *demonstrative*, and *comparative*.

a) *Personal reference*

Personal reference functions in the speech situation, through the category of person.

The category of reference includes the three classes of personal pronouns, possessive determiners (usually called possessive adjectives) and possessive pronouns.

Personal reference is used to identify individuals and things or objects that are nominally stated at some other point in the text.

For example;

- (a) **Tad Williams** is one of the most prominent writers of modern times. In addition to *Memory, Sorrow and Thorn* **he** has written the acclaimed *Otherland* series. (The third person singular pronoun **he** refers back to Ted Williams.)

- (b) **Ahmet Necip Fazıl Kısakürek** (May 26, 1904 – May 25, 1983) was a Turkish poet, novelist, playwright, philosopher and activist. **He** is also known simply by **his** initials *NFK*. **He** was noticed by the French philosopher Henri Bergson, who later became **his** teacher. (The third person singular pronoun **he** and the possessive pronoun **his** refer back to Ahmet Necip Fazıl Kısakürek.)

- (c) After **he** had received the order, **the soldier** left the barracks and ran shouting “Freedom”.

b) Demonstrative Reference

While personal reference items refer to their referents by specifying them in the speech situation, demonstrative reference items refer to their referents by specifying their location on a scale of proximity. What is meant by proximity is nearness/remoteness/interval in place, time, occurrence or relation

Halliday and Hasan recognize two types of demonstratives: the adverbial demonstratives and the selective nominal demonstratives. The adverbial demonstratives ‘here’, ‘there’, ‘now’, and ‘then’, according to Halliday and Hasan, refer to the location of a process in space or time. They normally do so directly regardless of the location of person or object that is participating in the process. Adverbial demonstratives usually function as adjuncts in the clause. They never act as elements within the nominal group. They have a secondary function as qualifier (e.g. ‘that man there’).

For example;

- (a) Humans have many needs, both physical and intangible. It is easy to see ***the*** physical needs such as food and shelter. (The situation makes it clear what referent is intended.)
- (b) Leave that there and come here! (“That” and “there” imply distance, whereas “here” refers to something that is near the speaker.)

The selective nominal demonstratives ‘this’, ‘these’, ‘that’, and ‘those’ also refer to the location of a person or an object participating in the process.

For example;

- (c) Be careful of wasp, bees and hornets. ***These*** are dangerous pests.

c) Comparative Reference

The third type of referential cohesion is comparative. “Comparative reference is expressed through adjectives and adverbs and serves to compare items within a text in terms of identity or similarity” (Nunan 1993: 24). Halliday and Hasan divide this category into two: general comparison and particular comparison.

Comparative reference	
General	Particular

Identity	We have received exactly the same report as was submitted two months ago	quantity/numeral	There were twice as many people there as last time.
Similarity	The applicants gave five similar responses.	quality/epithet	We are demanding higher living standards.
Difference	A: Would you like these seats? B: No, I'd like the other seats.		

i) General Comparison

Halliday and Hasan define general comparison as a comparison in terms of likeness' and 'unlikeness' where two things, for example, are said to be the 'same/similar' or 'different'.

Halliday and Hasan identify that the likeness between things expressed by the general comparison may take one of the three forms as follows:

1. Identity, where 'two things' are the same thing, as in:
 - (a) It's the same car as the one we bought last month.
2. Similarity, where 'two things' are like each other, as in:
 - (b) It's a similar car to the one we bought last month.
1. Difference (non-likeness), which is a combination of the two previous forms, as in:
 - (c) It's a different car from the one we bought last month.

ii) Particular Comparison

Unlike the ‘general comparison’; particular comparison means “comparison that is in respect of quantity and quality” (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 77). It is also expressed by means of ordinary adjectives or adverbs. The adjectives function in the nominal group either as numerative (e.g. ‘more’ as in ‘more papers’) or as epithet (e.g. ‘better’ as in ‘better papers’).

For example;

(a) There were twice as many people there as last time. (as the people...)

(b) We are demanding higher living standards. (than the present ones).

According to Halliday and Hasan in particular comparison there must be a standard of reference by which one thing is said to be ‘superior’, ‘equal’, or ‘inferior’ in quality or quantity.

In such cases ellipsis is widely used in the 2nd part of the sentence/comparison collaborating with and enhancing the effectiveness of particular comparison.

ii) Substitution

Whereas reference functions to link semantic meanings within text, substitution differs in that it operates as a linguistic link at the lexicogrammatical level. In Bloor and Bloor (1995: 96), substitution and ellipsis are used when “a speaker or writer wishes to avoid the repetition of a lexical item and is able to draw on one of the grammatical resources of the language to replace the item.”

Unlike reference, substitution is a relation between linguistic items such as words or phrases. Reference is a semantic phenomenon; substitution, including ellipsis, is grammatical.

Halliday and Hasan (1976: 90) argue that “since substitution is a grammatical relation, [...] the substitute may function as a noun, as a verb, or as a clause”. Hence they distinguish three types of substitution: nominal, verbal, and clausal.

These three types of substitution identified by Halliday and Hasan (nominal, verbal and clausal) reflect grammatical function. When something in text is being substituted, it follows that the substituted item maintains the same structural function as the presupposed item. In nominal substitution, the most typical substitution words are “one and ones” and they substitute nouns. In verbal substitution, the most common substitute is the verb “do” and is sometimes used in conjunction with “so” as in “do so” and substitute verbs. Halliday and Hasan (ibid:125–126) point out that “do” often operates with the reference items “it” and “that” but still have the main function as a verbal substitute because of its grammatical role. In clausal substitution, an entire clause is substituted and though it may seem to be similar to either nominal or verbal substitution, the difference is the presupposed anaphoric reference.

Nominal substitution	Verbal substitution	Clausal substitution
There are some new tennis balls in the bag. These ones have lost their bounce.	A: Annie says you drink too much. B: So do you!	A: Is it going to rain? B: I think so.

a) Nominal Substitution

According to Halliday and Hasan the substitute ‘one’, including its plural form ones’, always functions as head in the nominal group, and can substitute only for an item which is itself head of a nominal group, as in:

(a) My axe is too blunt. I must get a sharper *one*.

The substitute ‘one’ in the second sentence substitutes for the noun ‘axe’ in the first sentence. It would be possible to repeat the noun ‘axe’ in the second sentence to read ‘I must get a sharper axe’. Moreover, the substitute ‘one’ assumes the function of the presupposed item.

(b) A: I’ll have a glass of apple juice, please.

B: I'll have the same.

b) Verbal Substitution

The verbal substitution operates on the verbal group. It functions as the head of the verbal group, instead of the lexical verb; and its position is always final in the group.

It is often realized by the verb *do* as in the following example given by Halliday and Hasan (:114):

(a) A: Does Granny look after you every day?

B: She can't do at weekends, because she has to go to her own house.

Here the verb *do* substitutes for *look after me* but *every day* is negated by *at weekends*.

Moreover, the verbal substitute 'do' can also substitute for a verb plus certain other elements in the clause, as in:

(b) He never really succeeded in his ambitions. He might have *done*, one felt, had it not been for the restlessness of his nature.

The verbal substitute 'done' in the second sentence substitutes not only for the verb 'succeeded' in the first sentence but also all the other elements accompanying the verb in the clause 'succeeded in his ambitions'.

c) Clausal Substitution

Unlike the two preceding substitution types, nominal substitute 'one'- operating on the nominal group, and verbal substitute 'do'- operating on the verbal group, clausal substitute 'so' and the negative form 'not' operate on the entire clause, i.e. they do not presuppose a noun or a verb but the entire clause, as in:

(a) A: Is there going to be an earthquake?

B: It says so.

(b) A: Has everyone gone home?

B: I hope not.

In the above examples, the clausal substitute ‘so’ in example (a) presupposes the whole of the clause ‘there’s going to be an earthquake’, and in (b) the negative form ‘not’ in the second example presupposes the whole of the clause ‘everyone gone home’. But what differs clausal substitution from the 2 previous ones is that it reflects the reality at a higher i.e. pragmatic level involving the attitudinal conclusion of the respondent.

iii) Ellipsis

Many scholars base their descriptions of ellipsis on the study of Halliday and Hasan (1976) who define it as substitution by zero. The basic difference between the two types of cohesion is that in ellipsis there is nothing to be inserted into the structural slot of the missing information (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 143).

For example;

(a) A: Whose is this hat?

B: (It’s) mine.

In (a), a deictic element “mine” presupposes an item expressing a thing – hat.

Like substitution, ellipsis is a grammatical rather than semantic relationship, i.e. it expresses the grammatical relation between words, phrases or clauses in a text. Ellipsis is said to be a special case of ‘substitution’, in which an item (or items) is substituted by zero.

Hoey (1983: 110) treats ellipsis as deletion that occurs “when the structure of one sentence is incomplete and the missing element(s) can be recovered from a previous sentence unambiguously”. Thompson (2004: 180) defines ellipsis as “the set of resources by which full repetition of a clause or clause element can be avoided”. He distinguishes between substitution and ellipsis proper, where the latter one is an element missed out. This element occurs in an incomplete sentence, and the gap is to be filled by elements from a previous message.

For example;

(b) The thieves have stolen our TV and drunk all my whisky.

(The thieves have stolen our TV and **they have** drunk all my whisky.)

In (b), **they** and **have** are ellipted from the second clause.

(c) She is going to Istanbul not to Ankara.

(She is going to Istanbul and she is not going to Ankara.)

(d) A: Where did you study?

B: At Suleyman Demirel University.

In the opinion of Kosheyava (1982: 159), the category of limitation (“ellipsis” being one of its varieties) is the second universal category which serves to reflect the restrictive relations of reality in language. Language development, as she claims, is to a considerable degree a result of refracting the limitative factor due to which the reality of being is cognized and expressed. Therefore the predominant feature of the expression of this universal principle can be revealed at all levels of language abstraction (ibid:159-160).

For Rzayev et al (2007: 205-206), ellipsis enables us to avoid repetition not only by ellipting of the word or any other structure but also by the use of a pro-form:

He might be late, but I don’t think he will do so.

They also claim that communicatively reasoned use of ellipsis is that omitting shared items attention is focused on new information:

A- Have you told him of the meeting?

B- (I have) not yet (told him of the meeting).

“Not yet”, the only element from the answer functions as the rhematic section and unlike the thematic section elements (I have... told him of the meeting) cannot be

omitted. Quite often it is normal to omit whole phrases and clauses/sentential parts to draw attention to the most important part of the structured content:

A-Ahmet has argued with Kemal.

B- (But) Why (has he argued with Kemal)?

A- I don't know (why he has acted so). He's always arguing with his friends and (he is always) justifying himself.

For them, there are however grammatical and semantic constraints as to what can be omitted (ibid: 206)

Halliday and Hasan distinguish three types of ellipsis: nominal, verbal, and clausal.

Nominal ellipsis	Verbal ellipsis	Clausal ellipsis
My kids play an awful lot of sport. Both (x) are incredibly energetic.	A: Have you been studying? B: Yes, I have (x).	A: Why'd you only book three seats? B: John is coming with us, isn't he? A: Is he? He didn't tell me (x).

a) Nominal Ellipsis

Halliday and Hasan define nominal ellipsis as the one which operates within the nominal group. The structure of the nominal group consists of a head with optional modifier. The modifying elements include some which precede the head, known as 'premodifiers', and some which follow it, known as 'postmodifiers'. The former usually consist of a deictic, numerative, epithet, or a classifier, whereas the latter consist of only a qualifier, as in:

(a) Those three fast hybrid cars with sunroofs...

The head of the nominal group is the noun 'cars'. Within the modifier, 'those' has the function of deictic, 'three' numerative, 'fast' epithet, and 'hybrid' classifier, while 'with sunroofs' is a postmodifier functioning as qualifier.

(b) A: Which last longer, the curved rods or the straight rods?

B: The straight (x) are less likely to break

Proper nouns, capable of further specification, designate individuals; therefore they are not subject to ellipsis. Common nouns, on the other hand, under certain circumstances may be omitted (e.g. seven other students joined the group, and soon another three) (Rzayev et al 2007:207)

b) Verbal Ellipsis

Unlike nominal ellipsis, verbal ellipsis, as the name suggests, operates on the verbal group.

Halliday and Hasan believe that an elliptical verbal group is one whose structure does not fully express its systemic features; they have to be recovered by presupposition, as in :

(a) A: What have you been doing?

B: Studying.

(A: What have you been doing? B: I have been studying.)

In (a), what is omitted is **I have been studying**. It is only the lexical verb *study* that is found in the elliptical verbal group. The elliptical form *studying* has various systemic features that are not found in the verbal structure. Among these features are finite, indicative, non-modal; positive; active; present perfect progressive, all of them capable of being reformulated due to the context of the previous sentence/clause or question.

c) Clausal Ellipsis

Clausal ellipsis is a very complicated relation; there is no clear-cut distinction between verbal ellipsis and clausal ellipsis. The former involves the omission of other elements in the structure of the clause besides verbal ones.

iv) Conjunction

The main cohesive category ‘conjunction’ involves the use of formal markers to connect sentences, clauses and paragraphs to each other. Conjunction signals the way the writer or speaker wants the reader or hearer to relate what is going to be said to what has already been said.

Conjunction differs from reference, substitution and ellipsis in that it is not an anaphoric relation. However, Halliday and Hasan (1976), Martin and Rose (2007), Nunan (1993) treat conjunction and conjunctive elements as cohesive devices. These scholars note that conjunction expresses cohesive relations indirectly, through certain meanings. These meanings presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 226). Therefore, the relationships signalled by conjunction can be fully understood through reference to other parts of the text (Nunan 1993: 26).

Conjunction, as described by Bloor and Bloor (1995: 98) acts as a “cohesive tie between clauses or sections of text in such a way as to demonstrate a meaningful pattern between them”, though Halliday and Hasan (1976: 227) indicate that “conjunctive relations are not tied to any particular sequence in the expression.”

Therefore, amongst the cohesion forming devices within text, conjunction is the least directly identifiable relation. Conjunction is divided into four sub-categories:

- 1) additive
- 2) adversative
- 3) causal
- 4) temporal

Types of conjunction			
additive	Adversative	causal	Temporal
simple: and, nor, or	proper: yet, but, however	general: so, because of, thus	simple: then, next, afterwards
complex: moreover, in addition, besides	contrastive: but, on the other hand,	specific: for this reason, as a	complex: at once, this time, the

that, additionally	actually, in fact,	result, for this purpose	last time, meanwhile, at this moment, until then
comparative: likewise, similarly, on the other hand	corrective: instead, on the contrary, at least	conditional: then, under the circumstances	sequential/ conclusive: at first, in the end; finally, at last
appositive: I mean, in other words, for example, thus	dismissive: in any case, anyhow, at any rate	respective: in this respect, with regard to this, otherwise	here and now?/ summarizing: up to now, up to this point; to sum up, briefly
From a marketing viewpoint, the popular tabloid encourages the reader to read the whole page instead of choosing stories. And isn't that what any publisher wants?	The eldest son works on the farm, the second son worked in the blacksmith's shop, but the youngest son left home to go overseas.	Chinese tea is becoming increasingly popular in restaurants, and even in coffee shops. This is because of the growing belief that it has several health-giving properties.	The weather cleared just as the party approached the summit. Until then they had seen nothing of the panorama around them.

a) Additive Conjunction

Under the heading ‘additive’, Halliday and Hasan group the words ‘and’, ‘or’ and ‘nor’. They believe that these words are all used cohesively, as conjunctions; and all of them are classified as additive.

All the three, (‘and’, ‘or’, and ‘nor’), may express either the external or the internal type of conjunctive relation. In the additive context there may be no clear difference between the two; but when ‘and’ is used alone as a cohesive item, as distinct from ‘and then’, etc., it often seems to have the sense of ‘there is something more to be said’, Halliday and Hasan (1976: 235) believe that the typical context for the conjunctive ‘and’ is one in which there is a total or almost total shift in the participants from one sentence to the next, and yet the two sentences are very definitely part of a text.

For example;

- (a) Breaking the boundaries of the syllabic meter, Nazım Hikmet changed his form *and* preferred writing in free verse which harmonized with the rich vocal properties of the Turkish language.

Here we observe that the conjunction ‘and’ combines the two sentences and functions as a cohesive element.

The additive conjunction *or* has the basic meaning of alternation, and it often occurs in questions, requests, permissions, predictions, opinions (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 246) (4):

- (b) Perhaps, she missed her train. Or else she’s changed her mind and isn’t coming.

b) Adversative Conjunction

Halliday and Hasan believe that the basic meaning of the adversative relation is ‘contrary to expectation’. The source of expectation is either the content of what is being said, or the communication process, the speaker-hearer situation. If it is the former, the cohesion is on the external plane; and if it is on the latter, the cohesion is on the internal plane.

For example;

(a) He's a shy **but** extrovert little boy.

Here, the phrase *but extrovert* creates a contrast to what is expected from the adjective *shy*.

(b) It is a living part of my spiritual life, **yet** I don't know if one would call me a religious artist.

In (b), the independent clause introduced by **yet** adds information contrasting with what was expressed in the main clause.

(c) This technology, **although** not a fool proof way to monitor abusers, might give victims warning that danger is approaching.

And in (c), the conjunction **although** introduces information contrasting with the main clause.

c) Causal Conjunction

According to Halliday and Hasan, the simple form of causal relation is expressed by the words 'so', 'thus', 'hence', 'therefore', 'consequently', and a number of expressions like 'as a result (of that)', 'because of that', 'in consequence (of that)'.

Under the heading of causal relations, Halliday and Hasan include the specific ones of result, reason and purpose. These are not distinguished in the simplest form of expression ;'so', for example, means 'as a result of this', 'for this reason', and 'for this purpose'. When expressed as prepositional phrases, on the other hand, they tend to be distinct.

For example;

(a) I did not understand my English homework, so I got a poor grade.

(b) I'm not feeling well; hence, I'm unable to work.

d) Temporal Conjunction

According to Halliday and Hasan, the relation between the two successive sentences may be simply one of sequence in time: the one is subsequent to the other. This temporal relation is expressed by words such as 'then', 'and then', 'next', 'afterwards', 'after that', 'sequentially' and a number of other expressions.

Halliday and Hasan believe that the temporal relation may be made more specific by the presence of an additional component in the meaning, as well as that of succession in time.

So, for example, we may have 'then + immediately' (at once, thereupon, on which); 'then + after an interval' (soon, presently, later, after a time); 'then + repetition' (next time, on other occasion); 'then + a specific time interval' (next day, five minutes later) and so on.

The following example can be regarded as a typical example of temporal conjunction:

- (a) **First**, he took a piece of string and tied it carefully round the neck of the bottle.
Next, he passed the other end over a branch and weighted it down with a stone.
(Halliday and Hasan 1976: 13)

1.3.2. Lexical Cohesion

The last category of cohesion is lexical cohesion, made up of ties based on lexical items. Lexical cohesion refers to the semantic relations between the lexical items in the text. Hence it gives us information on the organization of cohesion in the text. Lexical cohesion differs from the other cohesive elements in text in that it is non-grammatical. Lexical cohesion refers to the "cohesive effect achieved by the selection of vocabulary" (Halliday 1994: 274). In other words, lexical cohesion is created by the selection of lexical items that are in one way or another connected to each other.

For example;

- (a) The combination of *TwinPower Turbo engine* and the *athletic charisma of a coupé* is what makes *BMW X6* so special among other *SUVs*. The new *BMW X6* is as outstanding in performance as it is impressive in appearance.

Here, lexical cohesive relations are present among the lexical items (*TwinPower Turbo engine, athletic charisma of a coupé, BMW X6* and *SUV*.)

Paltridge states that (2006:133), “Lexical cohesion refers to relationships in meaning between lexical items in a text and, in particular, content words and the relationship between them”. In the words of Halliday and Hasan (1976: 274), lexical cohesion is the cohesive effect achieved by the selection of vocabulary.”

The two major types of lexical cohesion are: reiteration and collocation.

i) Reiteration

Reiteration can be defined as the the repetition of the same lexical item or the occurrence of a related term. For Halliday and Hasan (1976: 318-319), reiteration is “the repetition of a lexical item, or the occurrence of a synonym of some kind, in the context of reference; that is, where the two occurrences have the same referent”.

Halliday & Hasan (1976) classify reiteration into four types: the same word, a synonym/near-synonym, a superordinate, and a general word.

For example;

- (a) “How smart I am”, said the student. However, his teacher did not find him intelligent.

We could clearly observe an example of synonymy in (a) with the words *smart* and *intelligent*.

- (b) I have a *dream* that my four children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character. I have a *dream* today.

Another type of reiteration is the use of the same lexical item. As shown in the sentence (b), the same item, *dream*, is repeated.

(c) ...we will be able to speed up that day when all of God's children, black men and white men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual, "Free at last! free at last! thank God Almighty, we are free at last!"

(d) The mobile lifestyle we know today would not be possible without vehicles such as automobiles, buses, trams, and aircraft.

In (c), *God's children* is, in this case, a superordinate term for *black men* and *white men*.

In sentence (d), *vehicles* is a superordinate term for *automobiles*, *buses*, *trams* and *aircraft*.

(e) Some babies, particularly when ignored for a long time, begin crying to *call attention* and *feel better*. Some never do such *things*, but instead keep smiling and enjoying.

Things is a general term. Here *things* is used to refer anaphorically to two behaviors, "*call attention* and *feel better*."

For a better understanding of this type of cohesion, it will be helpful to refer to Halliday and Hasan. Halliday and Hasan(1976) give the following examples:

“There is a boy climbing the tree”

(a) The *boy's* going to fall if he does not take care.

(b) The *lad's* going to fall if he does not take care.

(c) The *child's* going to fall if he does not take care.

(d) The *idiot*'s going to fall if he does not take care.

In example (a), there is a repetition of the same lexical item: 'boy', in (b), the reiteration takes the form of a synonym or near synonym 'lad'; in (c), of the superordinate term 'child'; and in (d), of a general word 'idiot'.

In sentence (a), we see that the same lexical item the *boy* is repeated, namely there is repetition. In sentence (b), the *boy* is substituted by the *lad*, a synonym or near synonym. In (c), there is a superordinate form. And in (d), the boy is replaced by a general word, idiot.

ii) Collocation

Collocation is the use of "a word that is in some way associated with another word in the preceding text, because it is a direct repetition of it, or is in some sense synonymous with it, or tends to occur in the same lexical environment" (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 319). In this subcategory of lexical cohesion, the lexical items in a text share the same lexical environments.

Collocation, in the words of McCarthy et al. (2005: 4), is defined as "[...] a natural combination of words; it refers to the way English words are closely associated with each other." Combining the ideas of Halliday and Hasan and McCarthy et al., two lexical items are associated with each other and they tend to co-occur frequently, particularly within the similar environment.

The presence of collocation(s) in a text or discourse helps to the formation of consistency and unity, which, in turn leads to the providing of texture. If we, once again, refer to Halliday and Hasan's (1976: 333) definition of collocation, it is "one of the factors on which we build our expectations of what is to come next".

For Rzayev (unpublished paper: 5), if we consider the meaning of "get" in "to get a letter", "to get the sack" and "to get much rain", in each instance its meaning is slightly /to a considerable extent different. "to get a letter" means "to receive a letter" while "to get the sack" and "to get much rain" mean "to be dismissed" and

“to experience much rain”, respectively. Therefore we find it hard to say that in all the three cases “get” expresses one and the same meaning if to lay aside such combinations as “to get flu” (= to catch an illness) or “to get to Ankara” (=to arrive at or reach a place) and many other combinations with “get”. The differences in the meaning of “get” come from the words it is put with or it collocates, i.e., goes with. Examples such as these throw light on the ways by which we get to the meaning of a word. Examining the collocational possibilities which exist within the language we could say that in order to specify the meaning of a word in the language we need to know all the linguistic and non-linguistic contexts in which it can occur e.g. the Turkish “dil” (tongue/language) in can collocate with different words in different ways in varying contexts with different meanings. In “Dilini göster” it means “Show your tongue”, i.e. it gives its denotational meaning, while in combinations such as “Dilin kemiği yok”, “Dilim varmıyor” or “Dilini eşek arısı soksun!”, it expresses essentially different meanings which cannot be imagined without the context (linguistic or extralinguistic) which it is used in. “Dilin kemiği yok”, through the attribute of “kemiksiz”, i.e. “flexible”, it means “one can say anything s/he likes/wants”, while in “Dilim varmıyor”, it, under the influence of the verb “varmıyor”, expresses “I can’t bring/make myself (to) say it”. “Dilini eşek arısı soksun”, which is an odd collocation, acquires its meaning not only under the impression of its companion words; it is also due to the common sense assumptions of the Turkish people which are not typical for the English way of thinking (from general to specific). When translating it (unlike the Turkish “from specific to general way of thinking”), the whole meaning is generalised and then made specific as “Curse you for saying that!”

Chapter 2: Coherence

2.1. Coherence

Caution! Our body is composed of integration of various parts, each having its visible shape. But the functioning and capacity of each of them can be revealed not in isolation, due to what they look like but only via their relationship with each other, which enables us to “create wonders” in this controversial world. (H.Rzayev)

A great deal of attention has recently been paid by researchers to the study of various facets of (conversational) coherence. The centrality of this concern to the understanding of natural discourse has been underlined by W. Labov (1973. 252-53):

“The fundamental problem of discourse analysis is to show how one utterance follows another in a rational, rule-governed manner- in other words, how we understand coherent discourse. We rely upon our intuitions to distinguish coherent from incoherent discourse.” For example:

A: What is your name?

B: Well, let’s say you might have thought you had something from before, but you haven’t got it anymore.

A: I’m going to call you Dean.”

As Labov claims, our first data in dealing with an excerpt from a conversation between a doctor and a (schizophrenic) patient will be our intuitive reactions to it, and the 1st challenge in discourse analysis is to account for our intuitions (as confirmed by the response of participants).

In their attempt to meet the “first challenge in discourse analysis” and to account for intuitions concerning the coherence or incoherence of discourse, researchers have generally recognized that they have to go beyond syntactic and semantic considerations, and incorporate a variety of pragmatic factors into their analysis (Dascal 2003: 213).

One approach seeks to study the way consecutive utterances in discourse constrain the utterances that follow them, whether in terms of possible continuations or possible responses. Mohan (1974) takes up Austin's notion of a speech act sequel and studies the constraints placed by an utterance on the ones following it on the level of illocutionary force, defining the notion of an "illocutionary domain" of connected utterances. Dascal (2003: Ch.2) employs the broader notions of "conversational demand" and "conversational reaction" which integrate constraints on the semantic and pragmatic levels. Keenan and Schifflin (1976) studied topical relations on the discourse level, using the notion of "discourse topic" in defining discourse organization. They identify two major types of discourse "continuous discourse" and "discontinuous discourse". The first type is further divided into discourse containing a "collaborating discourse topic" (a topic that exactly matches that of the immediately preceding utterance) and discourse containing an "incorporating discourse topic" (a topic that takes up an utterance from the "presupposition pool" of the preceding discourse). The 2nd type is divided into discourse containing a "reintroducing discourse topic" which introduces a claim and/or discourse topic that has appeared in the discourse history, and discourse containing an "introducing discourse topic" that is in no way related to either the preceding utterance or to any earlier utterances in the discourse history.

Another approach accounts for the connectedness of utterances in discourse by formulating the rules which enable conversationalists to perceive and respond to utterances as connected, in spite of the fact that, on the face of it, they seem to violate semantic and pragmatic requirements of relevance. Grice's (1975) conversational maxims, which enable conversationalists to infer "connecting propositions" from the apparently disconnected discourse and the context of utterance, are an example of this approach. So is Searle's conception (1975 b) of indirect speech acts which enables us to interpret an utterance as carrying an illocutionary force different from the one standardly associated with it.

A third body of research, represented by Schegloff (1968: 1972), Schegloff and Sacks (1973) and Jefferson (1972), focuses on ritual, interactionally oriented speech devices and their sequential organization in conversation, which is characterized by the "conditional relevance", and specifies the conversationally obligatory occurrence, of

one form after the other, in such sequences as conversational openings and closings or corrective sequences.

The assumption that underlies these various approaches is that if each utterance within a conversational sequence is either semantically, topically, pragmatically or conditionally relevant to the utterance directly following or preceding it, the conversational sequence as a whole will be both perceived and judged to be coherent.

We do not contest this assumption; however, we do not accept the frequently made complementary assumption (which is also implicit in the example given by Labov, as quoted above) that if no such relevance relation holds for each utterance of a conversational sequence and the one adjoining it, the conversation will be experienced and judged to be incoherent (Rzayev unpublished paper:3). Van Dijk (1977) goes further in systematically exploring the two levels of discourse coherence: Sequential coherence and global coherence. He points out that sequences may be connected without being coherent, suggesting that “connection may be a necessary but not a sufficient condition for the acceptability of discourse. Connectedness seems to be a condition on pairs of sentences, but it may be the case that the whole sequence of connections must satisfy specific conditions of “coherence”. It will be assumed that these conditions are of two types, viz. linear and global”. (in Dascal 2003: 215). For van Dijk, a discourse is “about” something and this “aboutness” finds its reflection in summaries, titles, conclusions or announcements of any form.

Van Dijk equates the notions of “topic of discourse” and “topic of conversation” thus making a simplifying assumption; for Dascal (2003: 216), the topic of a written discourse is usually viewed as a “textual given”, while conversational topics must be viewed as “socially constructed” and the assumption that “conversational coherence is experienced by the discourse participants (rather than as analysed by the researcher) leads us to include in our analysis interaction—based digressions, which, by definition, fall outside and topic-based definition of discourse.”

Being studied in a wide range of disciplines such as linguistics, philology, sociology, psychology and computer science, coherence in discourse covers a wide area. Linguists identify and analyze inventories of the linguistic markers of coherence that are available

in a language. What sociologists do with coherence is that they explore the production and comprehension of coherent discourse in naturalistic conversations that involve different groups and cultures. Psychologists collect data in experiments that test hypotheses about the effect of coherence on cognitive processing and representations. Computer scientists design and test computer models that attempt to produce and test coherent text. In conclusion, the term coherence has been defined in various ways within various disciplines. Coherence in linguistics is what makes a text semantically meaningful.

Here we present a sampling of definitions of coherence:

1. Coherence is defined as a “continuity of senses” and “the mutual access and relevance within a configuration of concepts and relations”. Thereby a textual world is created that does not have to comply to the real world. But within this textual world the arguments also have to be connected logically so that the reader/hearer can produce coherence

(De Beaugrande and Dressler 1996: 84-112)

2. Coherence in its up-to-date sense is the capacity of a text to be consistent and interpretable. Any text that is perceived as meaningful is presupposed to be a coherent one... Since the coherence of a text emerges after revealing the network of connections, both syntactic and semantic, it could be exposed by the explication of the connections between the parts of the text.

(Langleben 1981: 285)

3. Coherence of a communicative unit may...be conceived of as the property which points to a semantic unity so that the unit is coherent if it is proved to be semantically homogeneous and uncontradictory.

(Langleben 1981: 285)

4. Coherence thus emerges as a superordinate term to which cohesion, collocation, and connection are subordinate.

(Werth 1984: 72)

5. All the chapters... contribute to an understanding of the devices used to establish COHESION... and COHERENCE, which I use to mean underlying organizing structure making the words and sentences into a unified discourse that has cultural significance for those who create or comprehend it.

(Tannen 1984. Xiv)

6. The concept of COHESION can therefore be usefully supplemented by that of REGISTER, since the two together effectively define a TEXT. A text is a passage of discourse which is coherent in these two regards: it is coherent with respect to itself, and therefore cohesive. Neither of these two conditions is sufficient without the other, nor does the one by necessity entail the other.

(Halliday and Hasan 1976: 23)

7. Davies (2005) explains the idea of a text when she says, “not all sequences of sentences form texts- they have to be coherent sequences”. Thus, she marks coherence as an identity of a text.

8. Coherence is increased when the materials in the paragraph are arranged according to a definite method. The methods available are the same as those for the essay as a whole...They include the inherent orders of time, space, and process; and the logical orders such as general to specific, least to most important, cause and effect and climax.

(Hardison 1966:46)

9. A work is considered coherent when the sequence of its parts... is controlled by some principle which is meaningful to the reader...Coherence is the quality

attributed to the presentation of material in a sequence which is intelligible to its reader.

(Hughes and Duhamel 1962. 19-20 (in Kaplan 1972:10))

10. Teun A. van Dijk (1977: 93) argues convincingly that coherence is a semantic property of discourse formed through the interpretation of each individual sentence relative to the interpretation of other sentences, with "interpretation" implying interaction between the text and the reader.

Among the others, the two concepts dominant here are “unity” and “meaningfulness”. However, unity and meaningfulness entail much more than the presence or absence of connecting devices on the surface of the discourse. That this is so can be demonstrated with the following examples:

- (a) I am a teacher. The teacher was late for class. Class rhymes with grass. The grass is always greener on the other side of the fence. But it wasn't.

Here, each sentence is notionally linked to the one that precedes it, using both lexical and grammatical means, but the text is ultimately senseless. In short, a text is cohesive if its elements are linked together, and coherent if it makes sense. These are not necessarily the same thing. That is, a text may be cohesive, (i.e. linked together), but incoherent (i.e. meaningless).

- (b) "Yesterday I met an old friend in London. In London, there are numerous public libraries. These libraries were visited by boys and girls. The boys are handsome, and they often go to public swimming pools. These swimming pools were closed for several weeks last year. A week has seven days. Seven days ago I visited my grandparents in San José ..." (example based on Brinker 2005: 41, slightly modified)

The sentences above seem connected to each other superficially; however, it is not possible to call them as a coherent and unified. Due to the fact that an overall theme underlying a whole structure is missing, the text is incoherent and lacks unity, consistency and thus coherence

It is also possible to create a coherent text with an impoverished set of surface signals (van Dijk, 1981: 177-193; Widdowson, 1979: 96-97), as in the following example:

A man bought a dog.

The child wanted the animal.

The father drove to his house.

The cottage stood near the park.

The boy was delighted with the gift.

The twosome went exploring along the path into the woods.

from Dillon 1981: 95-96

With the aim of creating a coherent text, readers or hearers of this text will try to attribute relevance as long as they can do so. As stated by Brown and Yule (1983: 66-67), hearers and readers will attribute relevance and coherence to a text until they are unable to do so. First, they will construct the minimum context necessary to permit an interpretation, and then they will rely on past experience and knowledge to construct relevant, normal interpretations to fit the context.

Although the mentioned studies of conversational structure have gone a long way towards explaining the notion of discourse coherence, their treatment of conversational (or any other type) “incoherence” is rarely discussed and much less adequate.

This paper will focus on only some features of discourse coherence which is viewed as the product of relevance relations between sequential utterances. In our approach the so-called digressions (i.e. lack of explicit semantic or grammatical connectedness) cannot be considered as disruptive to discourse coherence. What marks a digression is the fact that it is not directly related, syntactically, semantically and “pragmatically”, to the main conversational contribution of its adjacent utterances. In short, digression does not fit in the “mainstream of conversation”. It breaks the patterns that consists in each utterance adequately, “responding” to the preceding one, a pattern that seems to characterize any non-digressive stretch of conversation. If we consider conversations

containing digression as incoherent, no revision would be needed to justify the absence/presence of conversational coherence and incoherence. Nevertheless, our intuitions, on which we must rely to distinguish coherent from incoherent discourse, refuse to accept such a judgement. As the interpretation of the following examples proves conversations containing digressions of various types (which is a problem to be examined independently) are experienced by conversational partners as coherent events, not as verbal pathworks. Still some remarks should be made on digressions: they are not conversations. They have definite rules to play both in regulating and sustaining the conversation and in contributing substantively to it. In other words, digressions may be a puzzle if considered from a purely textual or even from an actional (illocutionary) perspective, but they make a great deal of sense if considered from a broader, interactional point of view.

Consider the following conversation between two students, which is not a rarely used style:

Ali: How is going, Kemale?

Kemale: Tell me what you want to know, and I'll tell you.

Ali: Have you come this morning?

Kemale: Whether I have come this morning?.. Don't worry, the lecture was a bullshit.

As the example shows, participating in a conversation requires being constantly in the lookout for reasons that might justify less obvious interpretative alternatives. But this only means that one must make constant use of the full set of pragmatic interpretation tools. One such tool is the expectation that each utterance meet the conversational demand to which it reacts. Openness of conversational discourse to contextual reinterpretation and its defeasibility imply that the structure it imposes on conversations cannot be described in terms of conditions of "well-formedness". Another assumption is that although the conversational demand is related to the illocutionary (speaker's) point of the utterance, it is not determined by it, for it is much more specific.

One important factor in terms of which the above-mentioned conversation has been structured is Ali's "conversational demand": She wants him "to get to the point". In her second reply, she pauses to infer what demand lies behind Ali's question: She understands that Ali's question "Have you come this morning?" can hardly be satisfied with "Yes, I have" or "No, I haven't". Therefore she answers accordingly, i.e. in accord with the intentional demand of Ali's question. In both cases, in Ali's utterances, Kemale does not make the "phatic" opening of a causal chat and "request of information about Kemale's matinal presence somewhere" which, in fact, is the actual conversational demand. Consequently, her reactions do not enact any of the "possible countermoves" corresponding to those ostensive points. Nevertheless, they are pragmatically understandable (both the interlocutor and Kemale are well aware of the "hidden" or "implicit" conventions of the education system and what not attending lecture classes can lead to) because they concatenate with what she perceives to be the actual conversational demand to which she is supposed to respond. In terms of this approach, it is by reference to the conversational demand (which can be introduced in different ways) that "relevance to purpose" (mainly of the interlocutor) comes to play a role in structuring conversation. Searle also points out that in many cases there is an uncomfortable "circularity" in the relationship between relevance and purpose "because the criteria of relevance are not independent of the criteria of identity of the particular conversation", which, in turn, "...would put no constraints on the structure of actual talk exchanges" (Searle 1992: 14).

In what follows, a description and interpretation of discourse coherence status in CDA (Critical Discourse Analysis) is proposed, in which both the distinction and interaction of the textual coherence and interactional levels of its analysis is put to use.

For Norman Fairclough (2001) "The familiar common sense world of everyday life" is built entirely upon assumptions and expectations which control both the actions of members of a society and their interpretation of the actions of others. Such assumptions and expectations are implicitly backgrounded, taken for granted, not things that people are consciously aware of, rarely explicitly formulated or examined or questioned.

We preview the content of this paper/presentation by answering the following questions, approximate order of appearance:

- (1) What is “common sense” in discourse, how does it relate to the coherence of discourse and to processes of discourse interpretation?
- (2) What is the relationship of common sense, coherence and ideology?, and
- (3) What must you do to make sense of a whole text, to arrive at a coherent interpretation of it, assuming you already know the meanings of its constituent parts?

You must do two things:

- A) You need to work out how the parts of the text link to each other, and
- B) You need to figure out how the text fits in with your previous experience of the world: What aspects of the world it relates to, or indeed what conception of the world it presupposes. In short, you need to establish a “fit” between text and world (of yours!).

As seen from these imperatives, Fairclough uses the term “coherence” in a way which brings in the following types of connection: (i) between the sequential parts of a text; and (ii) between (parts of) a text and “the world”. These are connections which we make as interpreters of texts; they are not made by the text itself. But in order to make them, we have to draw upon those background “assumptions and expectations”. The sense of coherence of a whole text is generated in a sort of chemical reaction which you get when you put together what’s in the text and what’s already “in” the interpreter—that is, the common-sense assumptions and expectations of the interpreter.

Let’s begin with the second type of connection (between text and world) interpreting just one sentence:

- (a) For many centuries, the opal was reputed to be an unfortunate stone, bringing the wearer bad luck.

What conception of the world do we need to make sense of this sentence? We presumably need a world in which objects such as stones are capable of affecting human lives and human fortunes!

Texts of this sort are interesting in presupposing a view of the world that is “common-sense” for some people, but strikes others as somewhat odd. Implicit assumptions can be more easily recognized in such cases than they are elsewhere.

Paradoxical, as it may see, both the production of a text and the interpretation of a text have an interpretative character. The producer of the text constructs the text as an interpretation of the world or of the facets of the world which are then in focus; formal features of the text are traces of that interpretation. The traces constitute cues for the text interpreter who draws upon her assumptions and expectations (incorporated in frames) to construct her interpretation of the text. Thus text interpretation is the interpretation of an interpretation. For neither the world nor the text does interpret what is “there” to impose itself; both the production and interpretation of texts are creative, constructive interpretative processes.

If to turn to the first of the two aspects of coherence (i.e. coherence between the sequential parts of a text), we claim that implicit assumptions chain together successive parts of texts by supplying “missing links” between explicit propositions, which the hearer/reader either supplies automatically, or works out through a process of inferencing. Look for example at the following alternative interpretations of S. Maugham’s “The man with the scar”:

(A.) A man with a scar now lives a life of misery; when facing an execution, he killed the woman he loved and was pardoned;

(B). A political exile from Nicaragua ensures his own survival by murdering his wife in a sufficiently “noble” way. He impresses his executioners but becomes emotionally scarred.

This story is a relatively open story, sufficiently inexplicit in its meanings to allow such kind of opposing propositions.

These interpretations generate questions which are not immediately answered by the text. There is coherent connection between them only if you can assume a world in which a man (who loved his wife so much and was devoted to her) knew “their life

could not be lived alone” and thought “they should both die together” (killing his wife first and then to be killed himself) is likely to be the only way to escape separation.”

Such kind of inferencing typical for the world/culture making or allowing the general to kill his dear wife can hardly be obligatory, even permissible for the worlds with different moral values. But what is the world of his life (not to escape death penalty, of course!) is part of the frames for loving relationships and it would occur unnatural to any member of that world if the sequential coherence of the sentences was against the logic or common sense of that society. Therefore, we (being a representative of that world or at least knowing its “rules”) supply the linking (not verbally expressed) assumption automatically, by a process of automatic gap-filling.

Fairclough assumes that the text below would probably not require any inferential work from regular/local readers of that magazine, but it might from other people.

**B
L
E
M
S**

Need someone to talk to? We're always willing to listen. You can write to us, Dave and Lesley, at: Blue Jeans, P.O. Box No. 305, London NW1 1TX. Please enclose a stamped, addressed envelope if you'd like a personal reply.

Embarrassed By Boys

Please help me. I'm 13 and whenever there's a boy on TV, and my mum's in the room I get really embarrassed. I've never been out with anyone even though Mum says I'm quite pretty. How can I get over this problem?
Worried BJ fan, Chester.

Most people — girls as well as boys — go through a phase of feeling nervous with the opposite sex. It happens because all of a sudden boys aren't just friends any more — they're people you fancy and think about going out with. The secret is to relax and try to still look on the boys you know as friends. You'll find you get on much better with boys if you're not always worrying about how you look — it's much more important to have fun. Don't worry that you haven't been out with anyone yet — you've got plenty of time!
Lesley.

For Fairclough, the factors giving coherence to the heading “problems” are common-sense assumptions which, in turn, consist of the two relevant causes: (1) it is a generally acknowledged rule that to deal with “problems” means to find someone cleverer to talk to (if, of course, you can’t overcome the difficulty yourself- “Two heads are better than one” holds good for such cases), and (2) to solve your problem that someone is to know it which is possible only if you put him in the know (either by listening to you or getting written information).

In accord with the economic principle (which usually provides balance in the economy of the country) “demand” (“request for help” in this situation) and “supply” (“giving expected help”) coherently link these two “attitudes” without which this problem can hardly be solved. Another coherent factor in the letter is the semantic polarity of the clauses in sentence 3 which is also strengthened by “though” (playing the role of the cue for this assumptive interpretation): Her mother’s words “a quite pretty girl” contrast with “I’ve never been out with anyone”. This shyness reflected in sentence 2 (I... get embarrassed) has become “a real problem” for her and she addresses the newspaper to help her in getting over “this problem”.

Fairclough argues that the answer is coherently linked to the request part due to the assumption that though the solution of the problem is not so easy and has its own secrets, its remedy can be “revealed” and “solved” by more experienced and wiser people, what, in turn, means that “it is the reader)here “the addressee”-i.ch.)who is responsible for bringing all these contentious assumptions into the process of interpretation, not the text” (Fairclough 2001: 69). If an interpreter (either the writer or the reader) is to make sense of a literary text, he has to entertain all these assumptions. This is also typical for persuasive discourse and political propaganda – for instance, when an article begins with “30 million Azeri Turks in Iran Islamic Republic have been deprived of elementary human rights”, a journalist presupposes that “Iran Islamic Republic is a tough dictatorial regime”. Such kind of implicit assumptions are widely used for various ideological purposes reflecting itself in ways of constructing texts, which, in turn, constantly and cumulatively “impose assumptions” upon text interpreters and text producers, typically without either being aware of it (Fairclough 2001: 69).

Assumed to be a cooperative endeavour, communication succeeds if the participants contribute to its success, by performing proper communicative acts that provide a rational means-ends relationship between them. Such kind of “Labour division means that the ethics of communication consists at least of two “duties”: the (speaker’s) duty of making herself understood and the (addressee’s) duty of making the necessary effort to understand.

Though useful, none of the analysed opinions can pretend to be the only possible model of interpretation of discourse coherence. The notion of “coherence” has been so problematic and its fate has not been different from that of so many other notions presumed to be “fundamental”, and it has been severely challenged.

Rzayev also shares the viewpoint that the study of conversational/discourse coherence has to take into consideration all possible factors, particularly purely interactional and implicitly expressed culture-oriented and national-way patterned common sense assumptions”, rather than rely(ing) only on the sequential relations of utterances and the implications which can be conventionally derived from them.

Investigating “coherence-cohesion” relationship, he works out the following “division of Labor” between them:

A. Cohesion

- 1) Makes surface structure compact and more efficient;
- 2) Is based on identical or similar meaning;
- 3) Realizes simplification by means of “reference” in any way
- 4) Its (semantic) referents are external units (words, phrases, sentences) due to what they can be easily manipulated, while the subcontent is an immovable given;
- 5) Is a functional-stylistic device (allowing to avoid repetition)-referential relations are used to encode highly differentiated internal structures (perception, subcontext);
- 6) Is context-dependent;
- 7) The “syntax” (function) of “references” is a “two-dimensional geometry” in that their meanings are isomorphic with the surface (referent);

- 8) Functioning-the case of “mentioning”, i.e. the use of the “surface substitute” of a symbol rather than the symbol it refers to;
- 9) The hearer’s search for alternative referents is based on a well-defined (and limited) subject matter.

(Rzayev unpublished paper: 5)

What the present approach claims is that the following aspects/ features of coherence are sure to play the crucial role (either separately or in a conjoint for/ either implicitly or explicitly) in constructing a comprehensive and interpretable text:

- 1) implicit or explicit semantic signals with either literal or literary meaning-based configuration);
- 2) inferencing/judgement by means of presupposed information/knowledge or “activation of well-defined contextual substructure”, containing one’s memories/life experience of the world;
- 3) functioning as constraints and being “immovable” i.e. stable for a definite language society (at least for a definite period of time);
- 4) carriers of cultural (sub)context-based meaning/value;

Number 1 is closely connected with the assumption claiming that language is conventional in the sense that “worked out by and inherited from our ancient generations, it and its working mechanism cannot be changed by the members of the language society at will and whenever they want (though language is always open to various changes caused by both external and internal factors)”.

The other, the most observable evidence of this rule is “regular and correct combination making” capacity of language units of various levels. This is the main reason why collocation should be treated as a coherence relation marker. Otherwise, “strong” in “a strong man” and “a strong language” should have expressed the identical denotative meaning. “Making an appropriate literal or literary meaning-based choice” is the concern of semantics while substitution is a functional identity-based category and each type of substitution is interchangeable with its referent, while “strong” in the above

mentioned collocations are not interchangeable without causing changes in meaning. On the other hand, “strong” in “strong language” is not synonymous with “powerful language” and to feel this difference leads us to extend the scope of “coherence” on the basis of its “relevant combining capacity”.

Perhaps some clarification is needed concerning Number 2 as well. The central claim in this respect is: all discourse depends on context first of all: some texts or their parts can be understood with reference to something external to the text (or to another text) while other texts are self-contained and create their internally relevant context. The former are also known as low dependency discourses (e.g. fictional work and poetry recital) while the latter are typical for scientific genre and instruction containing discourses (instruction leaflets, oral directions, sciences).

For Carter et al (2001: 167), “the attraction of referring outside a text is that this can leave plenty of manoeuvre...” holds true for how writers introduce themselves to their readers or how they address them using “I” (e.g. at the end of Ch. Bronte’s “Jane Eyre”, the narrator, Jane, talking of her relationship with Mr. Rochester, says: “Reader, I married him”), “You” and “We”, which, in some cases can cause unclarity. But such “outside text” sources as “inferencing” or “presupposed information” or “life experience-based knowledge/judgement usually refer and are restricted to something real and concrete in life. These sources with their internal structures give a precise characterization of the combinational properties of linguistic expressions which have such kind of capacity. For example, in the dialogic text below the underlined sentence 1 can combine only with the argument expression (Sentence 2) with higher functor rules consisting of a “judgement” schemata which, in turn interprets the structure of “why” category:

Mother: You are late today, Naile.

Naile: It was because of stubbornness of our mathematics teacher. He made us stay longer.

Mother: But he must have had some reason for that.

Naile: Yok, anne. Sadece, o istediği gibi at koşturmaktan zevk alan birisi.

The second part of the conversational text distinguishes “terminal” and “nonterminal symbols/judgements”. Mother’s judgement is concrete and categorical embracing only the past tense activities of the teacher caused by his dissatisfaction from the students’ irrelevant performance. As for the answer to this judgement, Naile assumes that the teacher is (generally) a person who acts as he thinks proper, without any regard to the others. This comprehension can be arrived at only by a Turkish person who understands what “o istediği gibi at koşturmaktan zevk alan birisi” means just in this context. Unlike the cohesive devices (which are based on the notion of interchangeability or substitutions), coherence relations here construct “ a bridge” between the semantic structure of the concrete judgement of the mother and the “common sense assumptions” of the national character knowing no time restriction, hence always relevant for those two people. Naile’s answer, thus avoids enormous number of ambiguities by encoding only valency and agreement into the coherence relations. Number 3 distinguishes what a sentence means what someone means by uttering that sentence. The respondent’s choice is due to his restricting the whole meaning of the sentence to what he thinks relevant at the time. His indirect approach, however, does in no way change the direct nature of his attitude. It remains “immovable” and stable, (though in implicit form) with regard to the semantic structure of the question. Hence in the following dialogue:

A: Did you enjoy the play?

B: Well, I thought the ice-creams they sold in the interval were good (The example is from M. Short 2005: 147)

It is quite apparent that B is saying in an indirect and therefore relatively polite way that he did not enjoy the play, even though he does not actually say so. If to transform B’s answer to ordinary language terms we might say that he implied that he didn’t like the play even though he did not say so. Unlike the conventional (or traditional) implicature, the conversational implicature limits its scope with its problem, rarely exploring some peripheral idea associated with the central idea for different purposes (for politeness, exaggerating his dislike not to offend the people who liked the play, etc.). It is in terms of these features that 3 (roughly “conversational” implicatures) differs from 2 (“conventional” implicatures).

Culture-based meanings are one of the most important and most widely used coherence devices. Native speakers, being well-aware of these “hidden meanings”, enjoy using them to make their speech more effective and compact. e.g. a foreigner can hardly understand the meanings and purposes of the proverbs “Gezen kurt aç kalmaz” and “Altın yerde paslanmaz, taş yağmurdan ıslanmaz”. But a native Turkish (if properly used) understands them at once. A literal translation of the former will be “A wolf that roams does not go hungry” while the latter will sound still more confusing for a foreigner “Gold does not rust in the ground and rocks don’t get soaked in the rain”. It is only the literary (metaphorical) level that makes both proverbs of high value and with two-fold purposes.

The meaning of the former proverb will be “a person will make an effort if s/he is to be successful”. Side by side with its wisdom, the one who utters it gives advice to make every effort which by all means will bring a success.

As for the latter one, its literary meaning is “people and things of high quality do not change with adversity.” It has a great educational value.

These multi-faceted proverbs and sayings are “labelled” with culturally-oriented hidden meanings which take us to that wonderful world that allows us to interpret them in accord with our life experience and national values. Therefore, interrelationship of a discourse and “common assumptions” of different cultures give different interpretations to the same text, hence coherence relations are so important.

Being studied in a wide range of disciplines such as linguistics, stylistics, logic, psychology, literature, sociology and computer science, coherence in discourse covers a wide area. Linguists identify and analyze inventories of the linguistic markers of coherence that are available in a language. What sociologists do with coherence is that they explore the production and comprehension of coherent discourse in naturalistic conversations that involve different groups and cultures. Psychologists collect data in experiments that test hypotheses about the effect of coherence on cognitive processing and representations. Computer scientists design and test computer models that attempt to produce and test coherent text. In conclusion, the term coherence has been defined in

various ways within various disciplines. Coherence in linguistics is what makes a text meaningful and understandable.

1.4. Models of Coherence

For such linguists as Beaugrande & Dressler (1981), Bednarek (2005) and Enkvist (1990); coherence is the semantic, logical, or cognitive links holds a text as a unified whole and gives it the texture.

In the review of the existing literature, coherence has been dealt at two levels of discourse.

The first set of studies identifies coherence as the particular format of meanings and notions classified in sequential clauses. The key assumption is that the meanings of the sections of a discourse are what construct the meaning of the whole discourse and the meaning of the whole discourse is much greater than the sum of the meanings of its sections.

Consider the following sentences:

1. a. Bill was about to be impeached. He called his lawyer. (Result)
 - b. Bill was about to be impeached. He bought six pounds of zucchini.
- (Kehler, 2000; p. 539)

In (1a), a cause-effect relationship is established. The reason why Bill called his lawyer is because he is about to be impeached. The two utterances depend on each other via a causal result relation. The presupposition why an impending impeachment would require a politician to ask for advice from his lawyer is generated via the cause-effect relationship. However, it is almost impossible to arrive at an interpretation in (1b). There seems to be no reason for a politician who is on the verge of being impeached to buy six pounds of zucchini. For that reason, (1b) lacks coherence.

Kehler (2000) proposes an elaborate and in-depth model under which he classifies coherence relations between sequential utterances. On the basis of Hume's (1955) classification of "connection among ideas", the discourse model by Kehler also propose other types of connection that can be established between propositions in establishing

coherence. These connections can be subsumed under three main sets: “cause-effect” relations, “parallel relations and “narration” relations.

The following examples are based on Kehler (2000):

Cause-effect relationship

1. (a) Bill called his lawyer. He was about to be impeached.

Parallel relationship

2. (a) Bill likes to play golf. Al enjoys surfing the net. (Parallel)
(b) Bill likes to play golf. George hates broccoli.

The passage (3a), by the agency of parallel relation, is coherent, licensed by the fact that parallel recreational activities are attributed to parallel entities Bill and Al. On the other hand, the lack of a similar degree of parallelism in passage (3b) results in a less coherent passage. However, if it is assumed that Bill is attributed to Bill Clinton and that George is attributed to George Bush, then the passage, talking of the two presidents, becomes more coherent.

3. (a) Margaret Thatcher adored Ronald Reagan and Tony Blair admires Bill Clinton.

(b) Margaret Thatcher adored Ronald Reagan and Bill Clinton is admired by Tony Blair.

The PARALLEL relation is evident in (4a) in the syntactic structure. However, in (4b) the degree of syntactic parallelism is reduced and diminishes coherence, as well. The only structural difference between (4a) and (4b) is that the second clause has passive structure. Although passivization makes the text more colourful (in accord with the principle of “variety”), the coherence in (4b) is not as tight as it is in (4a) because it changes semantic as well as communicative value of arguments in (4b). As a result,

processing the text demands more effort from the text receiver, especially from the angle of (purpose of) “topic-focus” division of the information.

Contiguity relationship

The third class of relation in Kehler’s categorization is Contiguity, in which the only relation is Narration.

Narration relationship can be especially encountered in recounting of everyday situations, in newspaper articles, in narratives etc.; the entities in a narrative are usually ordered in accord with the linear order of the events described.

According to the past studies on coherence relations (e.g., Halliday and Hasan, 1976; Longacre, 1983) Narration has been equalized with temporal continuity.

5. (a). Ken Starr convened his grand jury this morning. Vernon Jordan was subsequently called to testify.

(b) Ken Starr convened his grand jury this morning. Vernon Jordan subsequently scheduled a press conference.

Loosely speaking, a Narration requires that one infer a connectable sequence of states characterizing a common system of entities. In regard to the coherence of (5a), the reader/hearer of the passage tends to conclude that Jordan bears a testimony to Ken Starr’s grand jury. On the other hand, in (5b) the coherence is quite difficult to identify. It might be assumed, perhaps incorrectly, that Jordan bore a testimony to Ken Starr’s grand jury which, in turn, led him to organize a press conference.

Another line of coherence analysis deals with global patterns in a text on the macro level. The focus in these analyses is beyond isolated sentence groups, because as it is stated by van Dijk (1980), the local relationships between subsequent propositions are

also determined by the organization at macro level. That is to say, in coherent discourse, there is no clause totally independent of its local and its global context.

In accordance with van Dijk's view, Beaugrande & Dressler (1981) studied coherence in different types of texts such as nursery rhymes, poems, and scientific texts. They analysed mutually accessible concepts and relations that underlie the surface of a text (p. 4) as coherence.

In order to handle the coherence in global patterns, Beaugrande & Dressler (1981) introduced the "chunks of knowledge" For example, a text producer may describe the conditions of "clothes" and "furniture" to depict "poverty" without any common grammatical items continuing in successive clauses. According to Beaugrande & Dressler (1981), in this example, "poverty" is built up by using "the knowledge that *actually* is conveyed by expressions occurring in a text". Rather than grammatical items, such a configuration of concepts and meanings produces a kind of continuity that makes a text coherent.

Beaugrande & Dressler (1981) call FRAME, SCHEMA, PLAN and SCRIPT as four complete chunks of the macrostructure of a text. FRAMEs include concepts that belong together semantically. For instance, "bride", "groom", and "wedding ring" belong to the frame of "wedding". On the other hand, SCHEMAs contain events related by temporal and causal ties to the global level. So, SCHEMAs arrange the events sequentially in a textual world. PLANs outline the ways through which the text producer advances toward the goal. Lastly, SCRIPTs consist of pre-established routines of the events. A script specifying actions and participants of these actions have also pre-established roles in a script. For example, in the SCRIPT of a wedding the groom and bride enter the wedding hall, and sit in front of the officer to perform their wedding vows.

Consequently, Beaugrande & Dressler (1981) argue that using global patterns enables a text producer to lessen the complexity on the local patterns since global patterns make it possible to retain more items active in the textual world during text production and text reception processes.

In addition, coherence also includes the concept of “global theme” introduced by van Dijk (1980). In accordance with the Enkvist’s “world-picture” model of coherence (cf. examples 1 & 2), “global theme” indicates the macro propositions that the overall discourse is about. A text is considered as incoherent in the lack of a global theme as illustrated in the following passage taken from Tomlin et al. (1997; p. 90):

6. (a) This morning I had a toothache. I went to the dentist. The dentist has a big car. The car was bought in New York. New York has had serious financial problems.

Here each sentence is connected with the following one via a common referent in each of them above. Yet, due to the lack of a global theme the text is considered as incoherent. The failure in the example (6a) is related with the macro structure of discourse formulated by van Dijk (1980) as the global semantic structure of a discourse. According to van Dijk (1980) macrostructures indicate higher level conceptual units that establish global organization such as the title, headline or summarizing sentences in a text.

The sentences of a text are rather interlinked by what Kehler (2002: 3), Hobbs (1985: 2) and Sander et al. (1992: 1pp.) call various “coherence relations.” These sense relations, which are also called "propositional relations" by Mann & Thompson (1986: 58pp.), are encoded in the text and identified by the reader who tries to make sense of the text and its constituents. They are simply put, "types of reasons why speakers or writers have added this particular sentence" (Meyer et al. 2005: 151). Coherence relations are sometimes called 'types of thematic development'.

What is proposed here is a taxonomy of theme relations blending categories used by Meyer et al. (2005: 151-153), and Kehler (2002: 15-23). They are, however, only the most important types, and it should be noted that there are more, as, for example, pointed out by Mann & Thompson (1986: 60-67):

- **parallel,**

"Dick Gephardt organized rallies for Gore, and Tom Daschle distributed pamphlets for him."(Kehler 2002: 16)

- **description**, a theme is split up into its components; it is specified and situated in space and time. The descriptive theme development either refers to a unique historical event (i.e. in news and reports), a process that is generalized or repeated (i.e. found in recipes, encyclopaedia entries, manuals etc.), or the description of either a living creature or an object (as found, for instance, in dictionary articles)
- **narration**, especially found in recounting of everyday situations, in newspaper articles, in narratives etc.; the elements in a narrative are usually ordered according to the linear order of the events described (compare: temporal relation)

- **clarification**,

- **contrast**,

"The U.S. Geological Survey says eight Haitian cities and towns - including this capital of 3 million - suffered "violent" to "extreme" shaking in last month's 7-magnitude quake (...). In Chile, no urban area suffered more than "severe" shaking - the third most serious level - Saturday in its 8.8-magnitude disaster, by USGS measure."

(taken from Yahoo.com on 4 March, 2010, 2.45 p.m.)

- **explication**,

"The Atlantic bluefin tuna is considered a delicacy from Osaka to Omaha. In Tokyo's venerable Tsukiji fish market, a single giant blue tuna can fetch up to \$100,000 in auction."

(taken from Time.com)

- **temporal relation**,

"The Caterpillar and Alice looked at each other for some time in silence: at last the Caterpillar took the hookah out of its mouth, and addressed her in a languid, sleepy voice. 'Who are you?' said the Caterpillar [...]. "

(taken from Carroll (1993).)

- **cause-effect-relation,**

"George is a politician. Therefore, he's dishonest. (result)
George is dishonest. He's a politician. (explanation)

(from Kehler 2002: 20-21)"

- **argumentation,** the speaker or writer introduces an argument and backs it up by supporting facts or other pieces of evidence:

"The introduction of genetically modified (GM) food and crops has been a disaster. The science of taking genes from one species and inserting them into another poses a serious threat to biodiversity and our own health. In addition, the real reason for their development has not been to end world hunger but to increase the stranglehold multinational biotech companies already have on food production[...]"

(taken from Greenpeace.org, 4 March 2010, 2:49 p.m.)

a. Selection of variables and sample texts

By now researchers in linguistics psychology, rhetoric and artificial intelligence widely agree on the various components which create coherence.

As coherence stands as a central notion for the understanding and comprehension of text, various studies (works) have researched (explored) the process used by readers to preserve and keep coherence and to model the readers' representation of both the textual information and their previous knowledge (e.g., Lorch& O'Brien, 1995).

While a model to measure the readers' level of understanding and comprehension of a text can be provided, this analysis would be costly since it is time consuming and requires professional training. Therefore, most of the models proposed have focused on relatively short (one paragraph) texts, typically from 10 to 100 words, and few theories

have attempted to account for coherence in longer texts. Therefore, our analysis, due to the considerable effort and time it requires, is limited to some short texts.

As stated by Ricento (2004), the following components are considered to play a role in textual coherence by scholars working in this area:

(1) Textual Level

- a. Syntactic component
- b. Semantic component
 1. Presupposition
 2. Entailment
 3. Inference
- c. Cohesion
 1. Local (micropropositional)
 2. Global (macropropositional)
 3. Types
 - a. Lexical
 - b. Reference
 - c. Conjunction
 - d. Ellipsis
 - e. Substitution
- d. Thematic component
 1. Theme/rheme
 2. Topic/comment
 3. Old/new information
- e. Rhetorical component
 1. Rhetorical predicates
 2. Hierarchical relations
 3. Local and global rhetorical patterns/groupings
 - a. Cause/effect
 - b. Process
 - c. Collection
 - d. Description

- e. Comparison
- f. Response
- g. Analogy
- Etc.

(2) Cognitive Level

- a. Memory (long-term, short-term)
- b. Perception
- c. Emotion
- d. World knowledge
- e. Pragmatic knowledge
 - 1. Physical laws
 - 2. Commonsense logic
 - 3. Inference
- f. Schema
- g. General processing models

(3) Cultural level

- a. Literary conventions
- b. Reader/writer responsibility and relationship
- c. Cultural values and attitudes

This categorization is not meant to be all-inclusive, but rather, its goal is to present the major topics which have been addressed in the literature and which have been incorporated, to varying degrees, in a number of proposed models of coherence.

b. Interaction of coherence and cohesion

We assume that however controversial the definitions and opinions are concerning interrelationship of cohesion and coherence, they are: (1) closely related and (2) in many and different ways depend on each other.

Halliday and Hasan (1994, 308-309) defines coherence as "the internal [resource] for structuring the clause as a message", including the notions of 'theme' and 'information',

and cohesion refers to the external relationship between clauses and clause complexes, which are independent of grammatical structure.

For de Beaugrande and Dressler, cohesion and coherence represent two of their seven standards of textuality. In their model, cohesion

subsumes the procedures whereby the surface elements appear as progressive occurrences such that their sequential connectivity is maintained and made recoverable. (deBeaugrande 1980:17–21, 1984:37–40, 1997:13–15; de Beaugrande& Dressler 1981:3–10)

Coherence, on the other hand,

subsumes the procedures whereby elements of knowledge are activated such that their conceptual connectivity is maintained. (deBeaugrande 1980:17–21, 1984:37–40, 1997:13–15; de Beaugrande& Dressler 1981:3–10)

Thus, de Beaugrande and Dressler treat cohesion and coherence as two clearly separate phenomena, without one having an influence on the other.

Some texts may be coherent and meaningful to some receivers but uninterpretable to others. This has led some researchers to postulate that it is really background knowledge that is the predominant factor in the receiver's ability to perceive coherence. In other words, coherence can be perceived and communication is more likely to be successful if the receiver's background knowledge is sufficient for making an interpretation. Successful interpretation thus involves both the text itself and the knowledge the receiver brings into it (Enkvist 1985 b; Lundquist 1989; Shiro 1994; van de Velde 1985, 1989). To illustrate this point, let us consider the following examples, taken from Blakemore (1992: 35–36):

1. (a) The river had been dry for a long time. Everyone attended the funeral.

(b) If a river has been dry for a long time, then a river spirit has died. Whenever a spirit dies there is a funeral. The river had been dry for a long time. Everyone attended the funeral.

For most Western listeners, with their background knowledge, (1a) would probably not be coherent nor understandable, whereas (1b) is more likely to be interpretable. By contrast, speakers of Sissala, a Niger-Congo language of Burkina Faso and Ghana, with their culture-oriented and common sense assumptions, would find (1a) (or rather the Sissala version of it) perfectly coherent and understandable, whereas (1b) would convey excessive information (Blakemore 1992: 36, 173).

2. (a) I waited for ten minutes to talk to my father. He was performing Salat (Namaz).
- (b) I waited for ten minutes to talk to my father. He was performing Salat (Namaz). In Islam, it is strictly forbidden to speak while performing Salat (Namaz).

For most non-Muslim hearers/readers, with their culture-oriented and national-way patterned common sense assumptions, the utterances in (2a) would be totally incoherent, while (2b) is more likely to be understood. However, people in a Muslim-majority country, with their background knowledge, culture-oriented and patterned common sense assumptions, would find (2a) perfectly coherent and interpretable, while (2b) would convey more information than needed.

Like cohesion, coherence is a network of relations which organize and create a text: cohesion is the network of surface relations which link words and expressions to other words and expressions in a text, and coherence is the network of conceptual relations which underlie the surface text. Both concern the way stretches of language are connected to each other. In the case of cohesion, stretches of language are connected to each other by virtue of lexical and grammatical dependencies. In the case of coherence, they are connected by virtue of conceptual or meaning dependencies as perceived by language users. Hoey (1991: 12) sums up the difference between cohesion and coherence as follows:

We will assume that cohesion is a property of the text and that coherence is a facet of the reader's evaluation of a text. In other words, cohesion is objective, capable in

principle of automatic recognition, while coherence is subjective and judgements concerning it may vary from reader to reader.

We could say that cohesion is the surface expression of coherence relations, that it is a device for making conceptual relations explicit. For instance, a conjunction such as “therefore” may express a conceptual notion of reason or consequence. However, if the reader cannot perceive an underlying semantic relation of reason or consequence between the propositions connected by “therefore”, s/he will not be able to make sense of the text in question; in other words, the text will not ‘cohere’ for this particular reader. Generally speaking, the mere presence of cohesive markers cannot create a coherent text; cohesive markers have to reflect conceptual relations which make sense. Enkvist (1978b: 110–11) gives an example of a highly cohesive text which is nevertheless incoherent:

3. I bought a Ford. The car in which President Wilson rode down the Champs Elysees was black. Black English has been widely discussed. The discussions between the presidents ended last week. A week has seven days. Every day I feed my cat. Cats have four legs. The cat is on the mat. Mat has three letters.

Examples such as (3) demonstrate that a set of sentences, despite abundant cohesive ties, does not form a unified whole if coherence between the propositions is non-existent; in Enkvist’s words the text is pseudo-coherent. By contrast, we can consider example (2), presented by Widdowson (1978: 29), which has been used to demonstrate that coherence can be created without cohesion:

4. A: That’s the telephone.
B: I’m in the bath.
A: O.K.

There is no surface textual cohesion in this short text, but the three utterances still form a plausible whole, because a situation can easily be imagined in which their propositional content would make sense together, i.e. cohere. Consequently, it was concluded that overt markers of cohesion are only of secondary importance in the

creation of unity in text, compared to the covert aboutness created by coherence (Enkvist 1978, 1990; Widdowson 1978: 28–29).

There seem to be, however, apparent difficulties in finding data that would show coherence without cohesion. As a result, the same examples have been used in several studies to illustrate the lack of surface cohesive elements in a coherent text. For instance, Brown and Yule (1983: 196) and Lautamatti (1990) make use of Widdowson's constructed example quoted above. It would therefore appear that although coherence without cohesion is a perfectly possible phenomenon, it may actually be quite uncommon, at least in real language data. Short texts such as example (2), whether constructed for the sake of an argument or extracted from a real conversation, may well make sense without textual cohesion, but the longer the text, the more likely it is that it will also show cohesion.

The importance of cohesion, if compared with coherence, may have been subjected to criticism, but the validity of the concept of cohesion and its contribution to the unity of discourse have not usually been challenged. Even the critics tend to agree that cohesion plays a role, although a minor one, in creating unity in discourse. However, there are researchers who are ready to dispute the whole concept of cohesion. Morgan and Sellner (1980) claim that examples such as (3) and (4) above prove that cohesion actually has little if any importance or explanatory value in text studies. Carrell (1982) agrees with Morgan and Sellner and further maintains that cohesion is only an illusion; an illusion created by a text's coherence.

2.5. Coherence-cohesion interplay illustration on the level of sample translation from Turkish to English

The Turkish Text

Hasan çok ağırbaşlı bir çocuktur. Babası orta halli bir adamdır. Oğlunu en iyi okullarda okutabilmek için elinden gelen herşeyi yaptı. Herşeyi göze aldı. Annesi ev hanımıydı. Elinden her iş gelirdi. Yemek yapmakta üzerine yoktu. Yaptığı gözlemelerin tadından parmaklarınızı yersiniz. Bu kadın oğluna saçını süpürge etmişti. Hasan hastalandığında iki gözü iki çeşme ağlardı. Hasan liseyi bitirdiğinde diş doktoru olmak istiyordu, üniversite sınavına girdi ve Dişçilik Okulu'nu kazandı. Okulda Jale'yle tanıştı. Hasan Jale'ye ilk bakışta vurulmuştu fakat Jale Hasan'a ilk bakışta vurulmamıştı. Bununla birlikte kanı ona kaynamıştı. Jale'nin babası para babasıydı. Yıllar önce hayali ihracat yaparak köşeyi dönmüştü. Fakat Jale babasına benzemiyordu. Çok alçakgönüllü bir kızdı. Babası onu askerlik arkadaşının oğlu Abdurrahim'le evlendirmek istiyordu. Abdurrahim ilkokulu bitirmişti ve sonra okumamıştı. Kabadayı olmuştu. Delikanlıyken kirli işler çevirmeye başlamıştı. Anasının gözüydü. Hık demiş babasının burnundan düşmüştü. Yani üç aşağı, beş yukarı babası gibiydi. Jale'yi gördüğünde ona göz koydu. İçi gitti. Gözleri fal taşı gibi açıldı. Jale'yi görebilmek için Hasan'ın içi içini yiyordu. En sonunda birlikte parka gittiler. Abdurrahim onları parkta kırıştırlarken gördü. Önce derin bir iç çekti. Ve sonra gözleri döndü. Kendini kontrol edemedi. Onları Tahtalıköye göndermek istedi fakat sonra kendini topladı. Onları baş başa bırakmaya karar verdi. O anda şeytan onu dürttü. Şeytana uydu, tabancasını çekti ve ateşledi. Ancak geçen bir adam kurşun yağmuru altında kaldı ve zavallı adam kim vurduya gitti. Nalları dikti. Sonra aynasızlar geldi. Hepsini gözaltına aldılar. Jale'nin içi kan ağlıyordu. Adam göz göre göre ölmüştü. Ve böylece bu iş karakolda bitti.

The English Translation

Hasan was a very heavy headed boy. His father was a middle situated man. To make his son read in good schools he did everything coming from his hand. He took everything to eye. His mother was a house woman. Every Job used to come from her hand. In making food there was no one on top of her. The taste of the observations (gözleme) she made you eat your fingers. This woman made her hair a brush for her son. When Hasan became sick, she cried her two eyes two fountains. When Hasan finishedlycee he wanted to be a tooth doctor, and he entered the university exams and won Tootherness School, In the school he met Jale. Hasan was hit to Jale in first look but Jale was not hit to him in the first look. However her blood boiled to him. A few weekslater they cooked the job. Jale's father was a money-father. He turned the corner many years ago by making dreamy export. But Jale was not like her father. She was a very low hearted girl. Her father was wanting to make her marry to his soldierness friend's son Abdurrahim. Abdurrahim finished first school and didn't read later. He became a rough uncle. He started to turn dirty jobs when he was a crazy blooded man. He was his mother's eye. He said, "HIK" and he fell from his father's nose. So three under, five up he was like his father. When he saw Jale, he put eye to her. His inside went. His mouth got watered. His eyes opened like a fortune stone. To be able to see Jale, Hasan's inside was eating his inside. Finally, together they went to a park. When they were wrinkling in the park, Abdurrahim saw them. First he pulled a deep inside. And then his eyes turned. He couldn't control himself. He decided to leave them head to head. At that moment the devil poked him. He fit to the devil, pulled his gun and fired. However, a man passing stayed under lead rain and poor man went to who hit. He planted the horseshoes. Then the mirrorless' came. They took all of them under eye Jale's inside was blood crying. The man died eye seeingseeing. And so, this job finished in the black arm.

The Analysis

This analysis focuses on interplay of cohesion and coherence, specifying cohesive devices first and then clarifying the cases when cohesion is “powerless” in providing coherence. Our next step is to reveal the coherence factors (in Turkish version) and how and why they have been violated in the English translation according to the following rubrics:

Grammatical Cohesion. DACLTEPP:

Demonstratives – this, that, these, those.

Articles – a, an, the.

Comparatives – er, more ...than

Linkers – conjunctions and conjunctive phrases

Tense consistency

Ellipsis – substitution by zero.

Parallel sentence forms

Pronouns and determiners (possessives, quantifiers).

Lexical Cohesion. RRSSALLLTW:

Repetition – the same or nearly so.

Rhetorical – asking a question which is then answered.

Substitution – “once, do, so, not” or close variants.

Lexical sets – networks of commonly associated words

Lists

Lexical chains – a sequence of related words in a particular text

Theming – fronting the same subject throughout

Synonyms and antonyms.

Word families (words with the sam

e root but different affixes).

Not all of the above will necessarily be present in any particular piece of writing, and this does not necessarily decrease the degree of cohesion.

Lexical Cohesion

Repetition: Hasan, son, hand, father, Jale, mother, school, look, Abdurrahim, inside, devil, eye, head.

Rhetorical: none.

Substitution: none.

Lexical set: father/mother; university/exams/school/lycee; gun/fired/lead.

Lists: none.

Lexical chain: none.

Theming: none.

Synonyms: none.

Antonyms: none.

Word families: tooth/tootherness (note that “tootherness” is not an English word): none.

Grammatical Cohesion

Demonstrativeness: this,

Articles: mostly “a” with some “the.”

Comparatives: none.

Linkers: and, but, however, finally, first, then, at that moment, however, and so.

Tense consistency: all past simple, which is appropriate and correct.

Ellipsis: none.

Parallel sentences: none.

Pronouns and determiners: his, her, he, him, them, himself.

Commentary

The main contributors to cohesion are repetition, articles, linkers, tense consistency and pronouns and determiners. However, while the amount of cohesion is satisfactory, it cannot compensate for other shortcomings in this piece of writing. The reader finds the writing tiresome and would like to see more of the following:

- Fewer simple sentences and more compound and complex sentences, especially in the first half of the writing.
- A much wider range of appropriate English vocabulary, including better use of appropriate English idioms instead of translations of Turkish ones. This is the writing's major fault.

A Turkish speaker of English, with his/her conventionally patterned common sense assumptions, would find this piece of text perfectly meaningful and understandable. This text creates a plausible whole for a Turkish person knowing English. On the other hand, a native speaker of English would never be able to understand the every single item in the text. Because, the text is full of Turkish collocations, reflected meanings and even idioms translated literally into English. The use of English literal idiomatic language puts the reader/hearer into a difficult situation in terms of understanding the text.

Interpretation by a Native Speaker of English

Hasan was a very difficult boy. His father was from the middle class. He did everything what he could to pay for his son education and he watched on his son closely. Hasan's mother was a housewife. She was able of doing everything especially she was very good at cooking. She was a sharp-eyed woman and she took care of her son with love. When Hasan became sick, she cried her heart out. Hasan wanted to become a dentist, thus after finishing high-school he passed the university exams and started the School of Dentistry. He met Jale in the school. Hasan fell in love with Jale from the first sight, unfortunately, she didn't feel the same. However, she has some feelings for him, but a few weeks later their feelings changed. Jale's father went into a profitable business, got rich and money became a dominant value to him. Jane was different though. She was a very genuine girl. Her father wanted her to marry his business partner's son Abdurrahim. Abdurrahim finished high school and didn't continue his studies. He became a bad person. He started doing dirty jobs because he was insane. He has his mother's eyes and he resembled his father a lot. When he saw Jale, he fell for her deeply. He felt that he must see her again. Finally, they went to a park together. While they were walking in the park, Abdurrahim saw them. At first, he felt something inside

and then he opened his eyes. He couldn't control himself. He wanted to get rid of them but he collected his thoughts. He decided to leave them one for one. At that moment the devil whispered in his ear. He listened to the devil, loaded his gun and fired. However, the man passing by got lucky and avoided the shot and the other poor man was injured. Then the picture changed. They saw all of them. Jale was crying inside. The man died in front of her. And so, this led to the tragic ending.

Commentary:

“It was very hard to understand the text since I do not speak Turkish. I suppose that the text is full of figurative language typical of Turkish culture, unfortunately, I am not familiar with it. However, I tried to paraphrase the text and as I understood it, there were three main characters: Hasan, Jale, and Abdurrahim. Hasan was in love with Jane but it was not mutual and the feelings between them disappeared. Jane's father wanted her to marry his friend's son Abdurrahim and she met him in the park. Abdurrahim is presented as a negative character while Jale is depicted as a positive character. While a couple is in the park, something terrible happens. Abdurrahim tries to shot a man but he injures the other man instead. It is not said who that man is. Jale is shocked because she sees how the man dies. The story ends tragically.

“I could not understand the story clearly because of the language and I believe that when I paraphrased it, it lost its figurative language and the main sense.”

Conclusion

The examining of the specific field literature and analysis of various written and dialogic/conversational texts in terms of the coherence relations (with “the interplay of cohesion and coherence” occupying an essential part of the thesis), the following conclusions reflect the essence of the major results of our efforts:

- 1) Discourse as a practical realization of language can be shaped in different ways for different purposes in different situations;
- 2) In all its organizational and interpretative aspects any text or discourse is sensitive to and depends on a definite context (linguistic or extra-linguistic)
- 3) Coherence and cohesion interplay in different ways. Contribution of cohesion in making a text coherent is activated to varying extents from situation to situation under the influence of distinct factors.
- 4) Our findings prove the opinion that all reference-based cohesive relations are of semantic-identity nature and what they are united by is their interchangeability with the elements they refer to, i.e. their referents
- 5) We share the opinion according to which collocation, unlike reiteration, is not a cohesive device, since its value completely depends on the meaning of the word it collocates with and in this sense its denotative meaning functions as the innermost basis contributing to the utilization of this or that literary meaning which is created, in fact, under the “pressure” of the word it goes with.
- 6) Coherence can vanish even where the text is rich in cohesive relations and can appear where cohesive devices are missing or rather weak. Coherence’s crucial role reflects itself in the following ways:
 - a) By means of implicit or explicit semantic signals with either literal or literary- meaning-based configurations;
 - b) Inferencing/judgement – by means of presupposed information or activation of well-defined contextual substructure, containing one’s memories/life experience of the world;

- c) Functioning as constraints and being “immovable”, i.e. stable for a definite language society, and
 - d) Carriers of cultural (sub)context-based meaning value
- 7) The coherence on semantic level is consonant with the assumption claiming that language is conventional in the sense that “worked out by and inherited from our ancient generations; it and its working mechanism cannot be changed by any language society members at will and whenever they want.
Regular and correct combination making capacity of language units of various levels also fall under the umbrella of the semantic level;
- 8) “Texts or their parts can be understood only with reference to something external” is a most essential feature of “coherence”. But no coherence can be purely “external” or “internal”. They, functioning jointly, and sharing the burden of “wholeness” or “integration” of the texture, contribute less or more in making the whole coherent and understandable;
- 9) Politeness is also one of the missions of coherence, but reflecting itself in different ways and extents in different cultures
- 10) The analysis of the Turkish text and its translation into English strikingly shows the importance of culture- and common assumptions-based coherence in proper rendering the content of the Turkish version in English though cohesive relations can be easily identified and specified in accord with its “simplifying” power by means of “reference” in different ways.
- 11) Being a functional –stylistic device and context-dependent, the syntax of cohesive reference is a “two-dimensional geometry” in that their meanings are isomorphic with the surface (referent).
- 12) The hearer’s/reader’s search for alternative referents is based on a well-defined (and limited) subject matter.

REFERENCES

I. References (Actively Cited Literature)

- BLOOR, T. & Bloor, M. (1995). *The functional analysis of English: a Hallidayan approach*. London: Arnold
- BRINKER, K. (2005). *Linguistische Textanalyse. Eine Einführung in Grundbegriffe und Methoden. 6th ed.* Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag.
- BROWN, G. and Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CARROLL, L. (1993). *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*. London: Wordsworth.
- CARTER, R.A. (2002). *Stylistics' and 'Text Linguistics*. In: MALMKJAER, ed., *The Routledge Linguistics Encyclopaedia* Routledge.
- CHAFE, W. (1976). *Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics and Point of View. Subject and Topic*, ed. Charles Li. New York: Academic Press.
- CONNOR, U. (1996). *Contrastive Rhetoric: Cross-Cultural Aspects of Second-Language Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DASCAL (2003). *Interpretation and Understanding*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- DAVIES, A. (2005). *A Glossary of Applied Linguistics*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- de BEAUGRANDE, A., Dressler, W. U. (1996). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. New York.
- de BEAUGRANDE, A. (1980). *Text, Discourse, and Process: Toward a Multidisciplinary Science of Texts*. London: Longman.
- DENISON, D., Keizer, E. and Popova, G. (2004). *Fuzzy Grammar*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- DIJK, Teun A. Van (1977). *Text and context. Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse*. London: Longman.
- DIJK, Teun A. Van (1981). *Studies in the pragmatics of discourse*, The Hague ; New York : Mouton.

- EGGINS, S. (1994). *Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. Continuum International Publishing Group.
- ENKVIST, N.E. (1990). Seven Problems in the Study of Coherence and Interpretability. In U. Connor and A.M. Johns, (eds.) *Coherence in Writing: Research and Pedagogical Perspectives*. Alexandria, Virginia: TESOL.
- FAIRCLOUGH, N.(2001). *Language and Power* (2nd edition). London: Longman.
- FOWLER, R., Hodge, R., Kress, G. and Trew, T. (1979). *Language and Control*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- GRICE, H.P. (1975). Logic and Conversation, *Syntax and Semantics*, vol.3 edited by P. Cole and J. Morgan, Academic Press.
- HALLIDAY, M. (1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 2nd ed. London et al.: Edward Arnold.
- HALLIDAY, M. A. K., and Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- HOEY, M. (1983). *On the Surface of Discourse*, London: George Allen &Unwin.
- HOEY, M.P. (1991). *Patterns of Lexis in Text*, Oxford University Press.
- HOPPER, Paul J., and Thompson, S. A. (1984). *The Discourse Basis for Lexical Categories in Universal Grammar*, *Language* 60.4: 703-752. Reprinted in *Bas Arts*.
- HUME, D. (1955). *An inquiry concerning human understanding : with a supplement. An abstract of a treatise of human nature* , Indianapolis : Bobbs-Merrill Co.
- JACKENDOFF, R. (1972). *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- KAPLAN R. B. (1972). *The Anatomy of Rhetoric : Prolegomena to a functional Theory of Rhetoric*. Philadelphia : The Center for Curriculum Development .
- KEENAN (Ochs), E. & Schieffelin, B. (1976). Foregrounding referents: A reconsideration of left-dislocation in discourse, *Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, vol. 2.
- KEHLER, A. (2000). Coherence And The Resolution Of Ellipsis, *Linguistics and Philosophy* 23. Kluwer Academic Publisher: Netherlands.
- KOSHEYAVA, I. G. (1982). *The Theory of English Grammar*. Moskva "Prosvešeniye".

- LABOV, W. (1973). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press
- LANGLEBEN, M. (1981). *Latent coherence, contextual meanings, and the interpretation of text*, Text,1.
- LUKEŠ D. (2006). “What does it mean when texts “really” mean something?: Types of Evidence for conceptual patterns in Discourse”. In. *Cognitive Linguistics in Critical Discourse Analysis: Application and Theory* (Eds. H. Christopher and D. Lukeš). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- MARTIN, J. R. & Rose D. (2003). *Working with Discourse: meaning beyond the clause*. London: Continuum.
- MCCARTHY, M. J., & O'Dell, F. (2005). *English Collocations in Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MEEUWIS, M. (1991). A pragmatic perspective on contact-induced language change: Dynamics in interlinguistics. *PRAGMATICS*, 1(4), 481–516.
- NUNAN, D. (1993). *Introducing discourse analysis*. London: Penguin English.
- PALTRIDGE, B. (2006). *Discourse analysis*. London, New York: Continuum.
- RICENTO, T. K., (1992). *Aspects of Coherence in Japanese and English Expository Prose*. University Microfilms.
- RZAYEV et al (2007). *A Communicative Syntax of English Grammar*. Ankara: PelikanYayincılık.
- RZAYEV, H. (2004). Once more on the interplay of cohesion and coherence. (Contrastive approach).
- SCHLESINGER, I. M. (1974). *Relational concepts underlying language*. In R. L. Schiefelbusch& L. L. Lloyd (Eds.), *Language perspectives-Acquisition, retardation and intervention* (pp. 129-151). Baltimore: University Park Press.
- SHORT, M. H. (2005). *Language and Style*.
- SEARLE, J. R. (1992). *The Rediscovery of the Mind*, MIT Press.
- SEARLE, J.R., (1975). A Classification of Illocutionary Acts, *Language in Society*, Vol.5, (1976), pp. 1–24).
- TANNEN, D. (1984). Introduction. *Coherence in Spoken and Written Discourse*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex

- THOMASON, S. G. & Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- TODOROV, T. (1981). *Introduction to Poetics*. University of Minnesota Press.
- WERTH, P. (1984). "Focus, coherence and emphasis". London: *Croom Helm. Journal of Linguistics* / Volume 22 / Issue 01 / March 1986, pp 208-213
- WERTH, P. (1999). *Text Worlds: Representing conceptual space in discourse*. New York: Longman
- WIDDOWSON, H. G. (1979). *Explorations in Applied Linguistics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- WIDDOWSON, H. G. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

II. References (of General Use)

- BEDNAREK, M 2005. Frames revisited: the coherence-inducing function of frames, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37(5), 685-705
- BLAKEMORE, D. (1992). *Understanding Utterances*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- CARRELL, P. L. (1982). "Cohesion is not coherence." *Tesol Quarterly*, 16(4), 479–488.
- CHOMSKY, N. (1986). *Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin, and Use*. New York: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- de BEAUGRANDE, A., Dressler, W. U. (1981). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*, Longman, London, (digitally reformatted 2002).
- DIJK, Teun A. Van (1972). *Some aspects of text grammars. A Study in theoretical poetics and linguistics*. The Hague: Mouton.
- ENKVIST, N. E. (1985b). "Introduction: coherence, composition, and text linguistics." In N. E. Enkvist (Ed.), *Coherence and Composition: A Symposium* (pp. 11–26). Åbo: Meddelanden Från Stiftelsen För Åbo Akademi Forskningsinstitut.
- ENKVIST, N.E. (1978). 'Coherence, Pseudo-coherence, and Non-coherence.' *Cohesion and Semantics*. J.O. Östman. Åbo, Finland, Åbo Akademi Foundation.
- FAUCONNIER, G. (1985). *Mental Spaces*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

- FIRBAS, J. (1966). 'Non-Thematic Subject in Contemporary English', *Travauxlinguistiques de Prague 2*.
- GRAUSTEIN, Gottfried & Thiele, Wolfgang (1987). *Properties of English texts* (1. Aufl). VEB Verlag Enzyklopadie Leipzig, [Leipzig, Germany]
- GRIMES, Joseph E. (1975). *The thread of discourse*. The Hague: Mouton.
- HAIČOV, E. (1993). *Issues of sentence structure and discourse patterns*. Prague: Charles University.
- HALLIDAY, M. A. K., and Hasan, R. (1985). *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-semiotic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- HALLIDAY, M.A.K. (1967). Notes on transitivity and theme in English: Part 2. *Journal of Linguistics*, 3.
- HOBBS, J. R. (1985). On the Coherence and Structure of Discourse", Report No. CSLI-85-37, *Center for the Study of Language and Information*, Stanford University.
- JEFFERSON, G. (1972). Side sequences. In D. Sudnow (Ed.), *Studies in social interaction* (pp. 294–338). New York: Free Press.
- LAUTAMATTI, L. (1990). "Coherence in spoken and written discourse." In U. Connor & A. M. Johns (Eds.), *Coherence in Writing: Research and Pedagogical Perspectives* (pp. 29–40). Alexandria, VA: TESOL
- LONGACRE, R. E. (1983). *The Grammar of Discourse*, New York: Basic Books.
- LORCH, R.F., Jr., & Lorch, E.P. (1995). Effects of organizational signals on text processing strategies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87, 537-544.
- LUNDQUIST, L. (1989). "Coherence in scientific texts." In W. Heydrich, F. Neubauer, J. S.Petöfi, & E. Sözer (Eds.), *Connexity and Coherence: Analysis of Text and Discourse* (pp.122–149). Berlin & New York:Walter de Gruyter.
- MANN, W. C. & Thompson, S. A. (1986). "Relational Propositions in Discourse." *Discourse Processes* 9: 57-90.
- MARTIN, J. R. (1985). *Factual Writing: exploring and challenging social reality*. Geelong, Vic.: Deakin University Press.
- MEYER, P.G. et al. (2005). *Synchronic English Linguistics: An Introduction*. 3rd ed. Tübingen: Narr Verlag.
- MIRA, A. (1990). *Accessing Noun Phrase antecedents*. London: Routledge.

- MOHAN, B. A. (1974). "Do sequencing rules exist?" *Semiotica*. ((Volume 12, Issue 1.
- MORGAN, J. L. & Sellner, M. B. (1980). "Discourse and linguistic theory." In R. J. Spiro, BRUCE, B. C., & W. F. Brewer (Eds.), *Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension: Perspectives from Cognitive Psychology, Linguistics, Artificial Intelligence, and Education*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- PIKE, K. L., & Pike, E. G. (1977). *Grammatical Analysis, Summer Institute of Linguistics Publications in Linguistics*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington.
- SANDERS, T. J. M. et al. (1992). "Toward a Taxonomy of Coherence Relations." *Discourse Processes* 15: 1-35.
- SANFORD, A. J. & Garrod, S. C. (1981). *Understanding Written Language: Explorations of Comprehension Beyond the Sentence*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- SCHEGLOFF, E. A. (1968). "Sequencing in Conversational Openings," *American Anthropologist*, 70, 6 1075-1095.
- SCHEGLOFF, E. A. and Sacks, H. (1973). "Opening Up Closings," *Semiotica*, VIII, 4 289-327.
- SHIRO, M. (1994). "Inferences in text production." In M. Coulthard (Ed.), *Advances in Written Text Analysis* (pp. 167–178). London: Routledge.
- VENTOLA, E. (1987). *Discourse analysis; Semiotics; Social interaction*. Pinter: London.

CV

Kişisel Bilgiler :

Adı ve Soyadı : İlker ÖZÇELİK
Doğum Yeri ve Yılı : İSTANBUL 10/07/1988
Medeni Hali : Bekar

Eğitim Durumu :

Lisans Öğrenimi : Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi
Yüksek Lisans Öğrenimi : Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi

Yabancı Dil(ler) ve Düzeyi :

- 1) İngilizce (C2)
- 2) Almanca (B1)

İş Deneyimi :

- 1) Araştırma Görevlisi, SDÜ (10.09.2010- Devam ediyor)

Bilimsel Yayınlar ve Çalışmalar :

- 1) İngilizce Öğretmenliği Formasyon Belgesi, 2009, Selçuk Üniversitesi, Konya, TÜRKİYE.
- 2) 14. Uluslararası INGED ELT KONFERANSI, 22-23 Ekim,2010,Isparta, TÜRKİYE.
- 3) Comparativism, Identity, Communication, 19-20 Ekim 2011, Craiova, ROMANYA.
- 4) Haftalık Akademik İngilizce Çalıştayları, 2011-2012, Isparta, TÜRKİYE.