Artículos

Reseñas

BABEL
19
2010

AFIAL

UNIVERSIDADE DE VIGO

XUNTA DE GALICIA
CONSELLERÍA DE ECONOMÍA E INDUSTRIA

BABEL
A.F.I.A.L

Aspectos de
Filoloxía Inglesa e Alemá

Nº 19 - Ano 2010

19

SERVIZO DE PUBLICACIÓNS   UNIVERSIDADE DE VIGO

Índice

THE NOTION OF DISCOURSE COHERENCE FROM THE RELEVANCE THEORY FRAMEWORK: AN ANALYSIS OF A COMMENT ARTICLE*

Ramiro Durán Martínez
Universidad de Salamanca
rduran@usal.es

The main aim of our paper is the study of the notion of discourse coherence from the Relevance Theory framework (Sperber and Wilson 1995). We will examine how relevance theory works in the analysis of connectivity in an authentic text: a comment article published by a British newspaper. There we will prove that discourse coherence is determined by the relation between the explicit information existing in the text and its contextual assumptions, together with the cognitive effects or conceptual connectivity derived from the interaction between both factors.

In our research we have found two opposing perspectives concerning the relationship between coherence and relevance: the first one considers coherence and relevance as independent notions (Giora 1997, 1998, Alonso 1999, 2005) and the second one sees coherence as a category deriving from relevance: Blakemore (1992, 2001, 2002), Blass (1986, 1990), Sperber and Wilson (1995). We consider that the view of discourse coherence as a pragmatic rather than a semantic factor is responsible for that distinction.

Keywords: *relevance theory, discourse coherence, conceptual connectivity, contextual assumptions, comment article.*

El principal objetivo de este artículo reside en el análisis de la noción de coherencia discursiva desde el marco de la teoría de la relevancia (Sperber and Wilson 1995). Examinaremos cómo la Teoría de la Relevancia

estudia el análisis de la conectividad en un texto
auténtico: un artículo de opinión publicado por un diario
británico. Aquí mostraremos que la coherencia discursiva
se determina por la relación entre la información
explícita que existe en el texto y sus supuestos
contextuales, así como los efectos cognitivos o
conectividad conceptual que se derivan de la interacción
entre ambos factores.

En nuestra investigación hemos encontrado dos
planteamientos opuestos en el análisis de la relación
entre coherencia y relevancia: el primero de ellos las
considera como nociones independientes (Giora 1997,
1998, Alonso 1999, 2005) mientras que el segundo
plantea que la coherencia se deriva de la relevancia:
Blakemore (1992, 2001, 2002), Blass (1986, 1990),
Sperber and Wilson (1995). Consideramos que la visión
de la coherencia discursiva como un factor de naturaleza
más pragmática que semántica es responsable de esta
distinción.

Palabras clave: *Teoría de la relevancia, coherencia
discursiva, conectividad, supuestos contextuales, artículo de
opinión.*

1. A BRIEF OUTLINE OF RELEVANCE THEORY

Relevance Theory (Sperber and Wilson 1995) offers a general
theory of human cognition and communication starting from the
following fundamental assumption: the addressee will make the
needed effort to process a piece of information if he/she deems it
relevant in a specific situation. A piece of information is considered
relevant when, being processed in the particular cognitive
environment of a specific hearer, it causes a certain number of
contextual effects. The relationship between contextual effects and
processing effort is of crucial importance in Relevance Theory and it
leads to the key notion of optimal relevance, explained by Sperber and
Wilson (1995: 16) with the following maxims:

A - Other things being equal, the greater the contextual effects, the greater the relevance.

B - Other things being equal, the smaller the processing effort needed to achieve those effects, the greater the relevance.

Just like many other theories dealing with discourse analysis from different perspectives (i. e. cognitive, semantic, pragmatic), Relevance Theory emphasises that the starting point of communication is not zero. Thus, when the addressee is involved in any kind of communicative act, he or she will have to select the interpretation which gives greater contextual effects in each particular situation because this is the easiest way to adjust to both the immediate context and the encyclopaedic knowledge of the addressee.

When dealing with written texts such as comment articles, the main aim of Relevance Theory is to contribute to the explanation of how texts are interpreted, how they are processed by the reader and what effects are achieved. From the Relevance Theory perspective, the relevance of a particular proposition is not determined by the text itself but by the context in which it is processed. We shall thus show how this notion of relevance confronts the idea of coherence as a possible explanation of how texts are processed and understood. Let us now examine some different approaches which have been made to the concept of discourse coherence taking into account its relationship with the notion of relevance.

2. DISCOURSE COHERENCE AND RELEVANCE THEORY

2. 1. Is coherence a notion independent from relevance?

From a general perspective, Grabe and Kaplan (1996) point out an evident dichotomy in the research about coherence: on the one hand, it can be considered as a phenomenon directly associated with the receiver/reader or, on the other hand, it can be perceived as a responsibility of the producer/writer. This distinction entails two different approaches: the latter considering coherence as a linguistic-textual phenomenon responsible for concepts such as acceptability,

appropriateness or text well-formedness and the former considering coherence as a cognitive phenomenon: "coherence is the result of conventionalised knowledge and sequences which a hearer (reader) will be able to call upon to impose a coherent frame onto a message." (Grabe and Kaplan 1996: 68)

The discussion between Giora (1997) (1998) and Wilson (1998) through different papers published in the *Journal of Pragmatics* clearly shows both the difference between the linguistic and the cognitive approach to the notion of coherence and consequently their different perception of the relationship between coherence and relevance. Giora's account of discourse coherence is based on the requirements that all the propositions in a text should be related to a discourse-topic proposition (i.e. Giora's relevance requirement) and that each proposition in a text should be more informative than the one that precedes it in relation to the discourse topic (i.e. Giora's Graded Informative Condition). She argues that relevance cannot be the only principle that governs human communication and it can by no means replace current accounts of discourse coherence since it is neither necessary nor sufficient for text well-formedness. After examining different *ad hoc* examples, she claims that coherence is not a derivative notion from relevance, as Sperber and Wilson suggest, because "although a discourse may be Sperber and Wilson relevant to an individual interacting with her/his set of assumptions at a small cost, this discourse may nevertheless be judged as incoherent by the same individual. And vice versa: A discourse may be judged as coherent by an individual and yet be Sperber and Wilson irrelevant to her/him." (1997: 31)

In "Discourse, Coherence and Relevance: a Reply to Rachel Giora", Deirdre Wilson begins her rebuttal of Giora's review of Relevance Theory by emphasizing that it is exclusively interested in the cognitive aspect of discourse coherence:

> What is a theory of text or discourse coherence designed to do? Many coherence theorists set themselves two related goals: (a) to provide a theory of comprehension, explaining how discourses are understood; (b) to provide a theory of evaluation,

explaining intuitions of discourse well-formedness, acceptability or appropriateness. Goal (a) is shared with relevance theory, which aims to provide a theory of comprehension. However, relevance theory has no explicit goal equivalent to (b). (Wilson 1998: 57)

Wilson points out that Giora's interest is in goal (b): to account for intuitions of coherence and degrees of coherence as intuitions about the "well-formedness" of texts. Nevertheless, she also suggests that, as a by-product, the criterion of consistency with the principle of relevance can shed more light on intuitions of acceptability and "well-formedness" than her appeals to local and global coherence, something that Giora refutes in a later paper (1998).

In "Recent approaches to bridging: truth, coherence, relevance", Wilson and Matsui (2000), using questionnaire results, compare the predictions of the Relevance Theory approach with different coherence-based approaches to bridging references and they show how the intuitions of the addressee are best explained following the Relevance Theory framework. They particularly pay attention to two of the main problems that the coherence-based approach poses: the first one is that the accessibility of coherence relations does not depend exclusively on intrinsic discursive features because whatever relation is most accessible in one situation does not necessarily have to be the most accessible in all others. The second problem for coherence-based approaches is that "an utterance may have two alternative interpretations, both of which satisfy the same coherence relation." (Wilson and Matsui 2000: 117)

In an attempt to summarise these two positions, we will show that some researchers, represented here by Giora (1997, 1998) consider coherence as a notion independent of relevance, while authors such as Blakemore (1992, 2001, 2002), Blass (1986, 1990), Sperber and Wilson (1995) and Wilson and Matsui (2000) see coherence as a mere superficial symptom of relevance relations in discourse. The view of discourse coherence as a pragmatic rather than a semantic factor is responsible for that distinction: relevance theorists consider that connectivity in discourse results from relevance relations between text and context rather than from relations linguistically

encoded in the text and they are exclusively interested in the cognitive and pragmatic aspects of discourse coherence.

2.2. Is Coherence a Pragmatic Matter?

It seems surprising that in the book where Sperber and Wilson formulate their Relevance Theory, the only reference to the notion of *coherence* appears in a footnote where the following statement is made: "It can be shown that cohesion and coherence are derivating categories, ultimately derivable from relevance (1995: 289)" and they refer to Blass (1986, 1990) for a detailed argument for this position. As there is no analysis of the relationship between coherence and relevance in Sperber and Wilson's presentation of their general theory of human communication and cognition, we will base our analysis on Blass (1986, 1990).

In *Relevance Relations in Discourse* (1990) Blass tries to prove, using Sperber and Wilson's Relevance Theory, that connectivity in discourse is a pragmatic rather than a semantic matter, arguing that connectivity results from relevance relations between text and context rather than from relations linguistically encoded in the text. She considers that the existence of coherence relations is neither necessary nor sufficient for comprehension and she disagrees with the position of researchers such as Lundquist who try to integrate the notions of coherence and relevance:

> Between the two extremes which characterise the study of coherence at the moment, on the one hand the syntactic perspective of anaphoric cohesion between two sentences, and on the other hand the concept of coherence, not as a linguistic fact, but as a general principle of relevance we adopt a position in between; for us, the (re)construction of coherence is based on the linguistic markers which a speaker employs in order to facilitate the work for the addressee, who himself seeks to (re)establish this intended coherence due to a general principle of relevance. (Lundquist 1985: 154)

Lundquist's perception of coherence, based exclusively on the linguistic markers employed by a speaker to ease the work for the addressee, who is, at the same time, geared to the maximisation of relevance, is just one part of the complex notion of discourse coherence. As Alonso points out, there are more than just linguistic markers in the analysis of a communicative act:

> Coherence makes a dynamic use of the different meanings contributed by all elements involved in communication: participants, linguistic selection and context. Coherence determines how the information contained in the discourse is organised to suit the goals governing the process of production. It is decisive in the process of interpretation by text receivers, and interacts with other types of meaning (presupposed, inferential, experiential, socio-cultural, etc.) at all stages of the communicative process. (Alonso 2005: 112)

Blass (1986, 1990) adopts Sperber and Wilson's suggestion that what is crucial to discourse comprehension is the recognition of relevance relations, which are relations between the content of an utterance and its context. Coherence and cohesion relations are considered as just a superficial symptom of something deeper, i.e. relevance relations in discourse. By choosing an exotic language (Sissala) to do her research, Blass tries to prove that the principles by which hearers use contextual information in interpreting utterances in discourse are universally the same.

The idea of considering coherence as a superficial symptom (Blass 1986, 1990, Sperber and Wilson 1995) goes against the perspectives of some of the most qualified researchers on discourse (Halliday and Hassan 1976, Van Dijk 1977, 1980, Van Dijk and Kintsch 1983, De Beaugrande 1980, 1997). Although they show discrepancies when cohesion and coherence are assigned "a place and a function in the reality of discourse meaning" (Alonso 2005: 115), they all agree on the distinctive nature of both notions. Let us mention here, as an example, De Beaugrande's separate treatment of cohesion and coherence as elements of the textual unit, where cohesion deals with sequential connectivity, while coherence is regarded as the expression

of conceptual connectivity. Contrary to the position defended by Blass (1986, 1990), cohesion relations are considered superficial while coherence is generally perceived as a deeper notion: "A coherent discourse is not just a set of successive sentences more or less related to each other at surface level; it is a network of meaning that goes beyond the propositional content individually represented in each of the sentences." (Alonso 2005: 112)

Like Lunquist (1985) there are some other researchers who have tried to link Relevance Theory with coherence. In "The Role of Cohesive Devices as Textual Constraints on Relevance: A Discourse-as-process View" (2003), Moreno also tries to bind the notion of coherence to the cognitive framework established by Relevance Theory, paying particular attention to the role of cohesive devices in written texts. Following Sinclair´s model of written text structure (1993), she is particularly interested in examining cohesive devices as elements of the interactive apparatus of the language in the process of text interpretation and not as the traditional view of cohesive devices (Halliday and Hassan 1976) as elements in a text analyzed as a finished product. With this aim in mind she studies the coherence pattern of a comment article from the *Guardian Unlimited* perceived by a discourse community of 25 subjects. Moreno's model is concerned with the analysis of textual cohesive devices in the perception of relevance and coherence in the process of discourse interpretation:

> Its ultimate purpose is to determine which textual features of a given text are more likely to help potential readers to make sense as a discourse-as-process. That is, the present study will try to identify those textual elements that help readers to achieve optimal relevance (cf. Sperber and Wilson, 1986) at each successive *text of the moment* in relation to the growing meaning derived from processing previous text. They will then be accounted for as textual constraints on relevance, that is, as text pointers that help readers to select relevant contextual assumptions brought to bear on the interpretation of current discourse. A sentence will be said to be relevant if it conveys relevant

information and relevance will be defined, following Blakemore (1987: 111), in terms of a relationship between propositions. (Moreno 2003: 114)

However, the framework proposed here by Moreno does not agree with Blass's perception of the relationship between coherence and relevance (1986, 1990). As the previous quotation shows, Moreno focuses on the study of relevance through the analysis of cohesive connections between propositions in a text while Blass considers that the ultimate goal of Sperber and Wilson's Relevance Theory is the analysis of the relationships between utterances and assumptions:

One fundamental difference between relevance-based and coherence-based approaches is that, while coherence is a relation between linguistic units (utterances, elements of a text), relevance is a relation which is defined not only for utterances but also for assumptions, i. e. units of information or thought. (Blass 1990: 72)

After all the considerations examined in this article, it becomes clear that there are opposing perspectives about issues such as the relationship between coherence and relevance, the notions of coherence and cohesion or the role of coherence as an essential or superficial component of the overall meaning of the discourse. Nevertheless, when examining coherence (Blakemore 1992, 2001, 2002, Blass 1986, 1990, Sperber and Wilson 1995), we perceive in some Relevance Theorists a tendency to drift from the notion of coherence to the notion of cohesion, going from the conceptual aspects determined by coherence to the segmental elements of cohesion. Like most of the schools dealing with discourse analysis, Relevance Theorists also tend to ignore interdisciplinarity and tend to forget the valuable contributions which are made by different linguistic theories to various aspects of the analysis of communicative processes. This is the case with the analysis of the relation between information content and context where valid classical approaches to the notions of *conceptual connectivity* or *cognitive effects* such as those of Van Dijk (1976) or Van Dijk and Kintsch (1983) are neglected. Nevertheless, we consider that the analysis of the relationships between utterances and assumptions

is a crucial element for the correct interpretation of the notion of discourse coherence.

3. THE STUDY OF COHERENCE FROM THE RELEVANCE THEORY PERSPECTIVE: CONCEPTUAL CONNECTIVITY ANALYSIS IN "I'LL ALWAYS BE DADDY'S GIRL AT HEART"

The main aim of the following text analysis is to show how the phenomenon of conceptual connectivity works in a discourse. We will follow the principles of Relevance Theory as these theorists claim to be the only researchers truly concerned with the relation between information content and context while coherence approaches are regarded by the same school as mainly focusing on textual connectivity:

> Relevance theory thus accounts for the interpretation of utterances which coherence theory cannot account for and shows why even when there is a co-text, interpretation almost invariably involves the use of background assumptions not derived from the co-text. In this sense, relevance theory is clearly a more adequate theory of how utterances are understood. (Blass 1990: 74)

In this paper, we will stress the importance of focusing on conceptual connectivity (not necessarily structural cohesive connectivity) as a major factor in yielding cognitive effects. In order to do our research we have chosen an authentic and unabridged comment article published by *The Observer* on the 19th of June 2005. In this article we will examine the crucial role of context in the way utterances are processed, and we will show how the context is actively constructed by the reader in the course of the comprehension process rather than established beforehand. We will also analyse how a text may be processed and interpreted by a prospective reader following the criteria established by Blass (1990), where connectivity in discourse is determined by the relation between the explicit information existing in the text and its contextual assumptions. Blass (1990: 74) argues that, according to Sperber and Wilson, the notion of topic is also derivative in Relevance Theory, merely giving access to

"an encyclopaedic entry which plays a relatively central role in comprehension."

The distinctive element of our analysis lies in considering that the cognitive effects derived from the interaction of explicit information and contextual assumptions should not only involve surface cohesive connectivity, as Blass (1986, 1990) and Moreno (2003) claim, it should also concern conceptual connectivity. Following discourse analysts - van Dijk (1977, 1980, 1983) or de Beaugrande (1980, 1997) - we believe that conceptual connectivity, which emerges from the interaction between pre-existing and discourse acquired information, contextual assumptions and cognitive effects, helps in the construction of coherence.

According to Relevance Theory, the relevance of an utterance in a text is usually determined by its relation with the explicit information displayed in the text and the contextual assumptions derived from it. There are three ways in which new information interacts with existing contextual assumptions to yield cognitive effects: new information may achieve relevance by strengthening an existing assumption in the mind of the reader, by contradicting and eliminating an existing assumption or by combining with an existing assumption to yield a contextual implication. The interaction between utterances and assumptions, explicit and implicit information, and the different cognitive effects will be analysed in the following comment article. We will contend that this interaction and the search of the addressee for adequate contextual effects helps to determine the coherent structure of the text. We will also claim that the resulting cognitive effects are crucial in the construction of conceptual connectivity.

I'll always be Daddy's girl at heart

The Observer 19/06/2005

(1a) There is something rather odd about the fact that the relationship between fathers and daughters is never celebrated – or even rarely mentioned. (1b) Even on the dark side of things, the Electra complex is less well known than its Oedipal equivalent. (1c)The only well-known paean to the father-daughter relationship is Marilyn Monroe's rather creepy and breathy 'My Heart Belongs

*to Daddy'. **(1d)** The da-da-da in question, as she calls him, is something more of a father figure or sugar daddy than a flesh-and-blood paterfamilias - and that's putting it politely.*

THE TOPICALISED ELEMENT in (1a) "the relationship between fathers and daughters" makes the encyclopaedic entries of "family relations" in general and "father-daughter relation" in particular available to the reader and, together with the title of the article, provides the main context where the next stretch of discourse should be processed.

CONTEXTUAL ASSUMPTION (as a result of the encyclopaedic knowledge of the reader): Family relations are celebrated/examined.

EXPLICIT INFORMATION: (1b-1d) The relationship between father and daughter is never celebrated and it has been superficially examined.

COGNITIVE EFFECT: CONTRADICTING AN EXISTING ASSUMPTION. Not every kind of family relationship is celebrated/examined.

(2a) *The mother-daughter relationship quite rightly comes under regular scrutiny as incredibly complex and often infuriating. **(2b)** After all, what woman has not hated their mother at one time or another? **(2c)** The dynamic between fathers and sons is also often in the news for different reasons - as political capital to make single mothers feel bad. **(2d)** Fathers are often urged to spend more time with their sons and lectured about the importance of male role models. **(2e)** So where do fathers and daughters fit in?*

TWO NEW SUB-TOPICS ARE INTRODUCED IN 2A – 2B (mother – daughter relationship) and 2C – 2D (father-son relationship). Both of them also belong to the encyclopaedic entry of "family relations".

NEW CONTEXTUAL ASSUMPTION (as a result of the cognitive effect in paragraph 1): (2) Not every family relationship is examined.

EXPLICIT INFORMATION: Mother-daughter relations (2A-2B) and father-son relations (2C-2D) have been examined in different ways.

COGNITIVE EFFECT: CONTRADICTING AN EXISTING ASSUMPTION (as in paragraph 1) (2E) The father-daughter relationship has not been properly examined.

(3a)The relationship between a male parent and a girl child is special and different. (3b) Elizabeth Gaskell wrote beautifully about the tension between a widowed father and his grown-up little girl in Wives and Daughters. (3c) Papa Gibson wants to remarry for the good of daughter, Molly. (3d) Disaster ensues when she hates the prospective new wife.
(4a) But the relationship between daddy and daughter is never really strained; they love each other too much and there is enough distance between them to live and let live.(4b) This is the biggest obstacle for mothers and daughters to overcome.(4c) They are often too alike to let anything go.

THE MAIN TOPICALISED ELEMENT IN THIS ARTICLE (father-daughter relationship) opens the third (3a) and fourth paragraph (4a).

CONTEXTUAL ASSUMPTION (as a result of the explicit information in paragraph 2): (3) Mother – daughter and father-son relationships are somehow predictable.

EXPLICIT INFORMATION: (3a) Father – daughter relationship is special and different.

IMPLICIT INFORMATION: (3b- 3d) Mother – daughter relationship is often strained.

CONTEXTUAL ASSUMPTION (as a result of the implicit information in paragraph 3): (4) Mother – daughter relationship is too close and this causes problems.

EXPLICIT INFORMATION: (4a) The relationship between father and daughter is never strained because they love each other but there is some distance between them.

COGNITIVE EFFECT: STRENGHTENING OF AN
EXISTING ASSUMPTION: Closeness and similarity of characters
causes problems in the mother-daughter relationship.

*(5a) My father and I were never similar enough to drive each other mad,
yet we were close enough in character to have a silent understanding. (5b) I am
getting a bit old to be a daddy's girl now but I suspect I will always be one, even
when I'm an old crone.*

While paragraphs 1-4 have dealt with the topic of family
relations in a general way, paying particular attention to the father-
daughter relationship, paragraphs 5-9 are devoted to personalizing the
topicalized element of the article, as shown in (5a) "My father and I
...". Paragraphs 4 and 5 share the same contextual effects, explicit
information and cognitive effects with the only difference that
paragraph 4 speaks in general terms while paragraph 5 refers to the
particular relationship between the writer and her father. In this way,
a smooth transition is ensured from the writer's general ideas to her
personal experience.

CONTEXTUAL ASSUMPTION (as a result of the cognitive
effect in paragraph 4): (5) My mother and I had a very close
relationship and this has occasionally caused problems.

EXPLICIT INFORMATION: (5a) The fact that my father and
I loved each other but there was some distance between us made our
relationship really successful in the past.

EXPLICIT INFORMATION: (5b together with the title of
the article): In the future, I'll also always be Daddy's girl.

COGNITIVE EFFECT: STRENGHTENING OF AN
EXISTING ASSUMPTION: (as in 5) Closeness and similarity of
characters causes problems in the mother-daughter relationship.

In paragraphs 6 - 8, the writer describes different aspects of her
relationship with her father that will not be analysed here for the sake
of brevity. We will just point out the main explicit information in them:

EXPLICIT INFORMATION: Even in difficult circumstances (being part of an all-women family, when I was a teenager and I disappointed him, …), my father has always been an ally and a confidant.

(9a) *Now that I am in my thirties and my father is in his fifties, for the first time our lives are similar: we both have children, too many responsibilities and we feel quite tired.* **(9b)** *And I have finally managed to give him the one thing I suspect he has always wanted - a living, breathing potential Gunner in Will, his one-year-old grandson.* **(9c)** *The best father's day present for him is the potential that two size six baby feet represent.* **(9d)** *He's kicking a ball in the garden right now, Dad, I promise.*

CONTEXTUAL ASSUMPTION (as a result of the explicit information in paragraph 6-8): In the past, I sometimes disappointed my father due to the fact that our lives were quite different.

EXPLICIT INFORMATION: (9a) At present, our lives are quite similar: children, responsibilities and tiredness.

EXPLICIT INFORMATION: (9b) She has had a baby boy.

IMPLICIT INFORMATION (CONCLUSION): In an all-women family, where her father might have felt quite isolated (not found many common grounds/interests) his daughter is proud of having given him the opportunity to share, in the future, his interests with his grandson. This might compensate previous disappointments.

4. CONCLUSION OF OUR ANALYSIS

In this paper we have studied how Relevance Theory works in the analysis of coherence in a comment article published in a British newspaper, highlighting the main distinctive element between the Relevance Theory approach and more traditional conceptions of the notion of coherence: i.e. the importance given by Relevance Theory to the utterance-assumption relation in the explanation of discourse coherence. With this analysis we have proved how context is actively constructed by the reader during the course of the comprehension

process through the relations between the explicit information displayed in the text and the contextual assumptions and cognitive effects derived from it.

The distinctive element of our analysis lies in considering that the cognitive effects derived from the interaction of explicit information and contextual assumptions should not only involve surface cohesive connectivity, as Blass (1986, 1990) and Moreno (2003) claim, but also conceptual connectivity, which emerges from the interaction between pre-existing and discourse acquired information, contextual assumptions and cognitive effects. Our analysis thus confirms that there are three ways in which new information interacts with existing contextual assumptions to yield cognitive effects: new information may achieve relevance by strengthening an existing assumption in the mind of the reader, by contradicting and eliminating an existing assumption or by combining with an existing assumption to yield a contextual implication.

The interaction between utterances and assumptions, explicit and implicit information, and the different cognitive effects have been analysed in the previous comment article. We have also shown how this interaction and the search on the part of the addressee for those adequate contextual effects is a crucial element to determine conceptual connectivity, which is considered a key issue in the creation and maintenance of discourse coherence - see van Dijk (1977, 1980), de Beaugrande (1980, 1997) - and it is not necessarily structural cohesive connectivity.

WORKS CITED

Alonso, P. 1999. "Claves para la comprensión y aprendizaje del concepto de coherencia discursiva". *Cuadernos de Investigación Filológica* 25: 39-52.

Alonso, P. 2005. *Semantics. A Discourse Perspective*. Oviedo: Septem.

Beaugrande, R. de 1980. *Text, Discourse and Process*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex. 1997. *New Foundations for a Science of Texts and Discourse*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Blakemore, D. 1992. *Understanding Utterances*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Blakemore, D. 2001. "Discourse and Relevance Theory". *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Eds. D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen and H. Hamilton Oxford: Blackwell, 100-118.

Blakemore, D. 2002. *Relevance and Linguistic Meaning. The Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blass, R. 1986. "Cohesion, Coherence and Discourse". *Notes on Linguistics* 34: 41-64.

Blass, R. 1990. *Relevance Relations in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Garrido, J. 2003. "Relevance versus Connection: Discourse and Text as Units of Analysis." *Clac* 13.

Giora, R. 1997. "Discourse Coherence and Theory of Relevance: Stumbling Blocks in Search of a Unified Theory". *Journal of Pragmatics* 27: 17-34.

Giora, R. 1998. "Discourse Coherence is an Independent Notion: A Reply to Deirdre Wilson". *Journal of Pragmatics* 29: 75-86.

Grabe, W. and Kaplan, R. B. 1996. *Theory and Practice of Writing*. London and New York: Longman.

Halliday, M. A. K. and Hassan, R. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Kolaiti, P. 2005. "Pragmatics and the Phantasm Called Text: A Relevance-Theoretic Approach to Cohesion." *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 17: 335-352.

Lundquist, L. 1985. "Coherence: from Structures to Processes". *Text Connexity, Text Coherence. Aspect, Methods, Results*. Ed. E. Sözer. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag, 151-175.

Miao, X. 1999. "The Explanatory Power of Relevance Theory to Discourse Coherence". *Foreign Language Teaching and Research* 3 (119): 9-14.

Moreno, A. I. 2003. "The Role of Cohesive Devices as Textual Constraints on Relevance: A Discourse-as-Process View". *International Journal of English Studies* 3 (1): 111-165.

Sinclair, J. M. 1993. "Written Discourse Structure". *Techniques of description: Spoken and Written Discourse, a Festschrift for Malcolm Coulthard*. Eds. J. M. Sinclair, M. Hoey and G. Fox. London: Routledge.

Sperber, D. and D. Wilson 1995 (1986). *Relevance. Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Van Dijk, T. A. 1977. *Text and Context. Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse*. London: Longman.

Van Dijk, T. A. 1980. *Macrostructures: An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse, Interaction and Cognition*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Van Dijk, T. A. and Kintsch, W. 1983. *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension*. London: Academic Press.

Wilson, D. 1998. "Discourse, Coherence and Relevance: A Reply to Rachel Giora". *Journal of Pragmatics* 29: 57-74.

Wilson, D. 2005. "New Directions for Research on Pragmatics and Modularity". *Lingua* 115: 1129-1146.

Wilson, D. and T. Matsui 2000. "Recent Approaches to Bridging: Truth, Coherence, Relevance." *Lengua, Discurso, Texto*. Eds. J. J. de Bustos, P. Charadeau, J. L. Girón, S. Iglesias and C. López Alonso. Madrid: Visor Libros, 103-131.