CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 An overview of Discourse Analysis

2.1.1 Definitions of Discourse

Linguistics had focused its analysis on sentence until the beginning of 1950s. But in 1952, a famous linguist Z. S. Harris published an article entitled “Discourse Analysis” in *Language Magazine*. He expressed a new opinion stating that the most complete unit of language is discourse, not a sentence. This opinion had brought linguists started to analyze language base on discourse.

Discourse analysis is not only widely recognized as one of the vastest, but also the least defined areas in linguistics. One reason for this statement is that our understanding to discourse analysis is based on scholars from a number of academic disciplines that are actually very different from one to another. However, as the least defined areas in linguistics, the study of discourse analysis is supposed to be the most important study of language.

According to Schiffrin (1994: 20), there are three definitions of discourse which are influenced by different paradigms where they reflect to different assumptions between formalist, functionalist, and formalist-functionalist dichotomy.

a. The first is the classic definition of discourse as derived from formalist (in Hyme’s 1974 terms, “structural”) assumptions is that: discourse is language above the sentence or above the clause. Concerning with the definition of discourse as *language above the sentence*, many contemporary structural analysis of discourse view the sentences as the unit of which discourse is
b. The second definition to be considered replaces what is basically a formalist trust with a functionalist trust: discourse is language use. Schiffrin (1994:31) considers a functionalist view, “The study of discourse is the study of any aspect of language use.” And another statement is Brown and Yule’s (1984:1), “The analysis of discourse is necessarily, the analysis of language use. As such, it can not be restricted the description of linguistics forms independent of the purposes or functions which are designed to serve in human affairs.”

c. The third definition of discourse attempts to bridge the formalist-functionalist dichotomy: discourse is utterances. This view captures the idea that discourse is above (larger than) other units of language; however, by saying that utterance (rather than sentence) is a unit of which discourse is comprised, we can suggest that discourse arises not as a collection of decontextualized units of language structure but of inherently contextualized units of language use.

Besides those three definitions of discourse above which are influenced by the differences in paradigm, there are still some linguists who give other definitions of discourse. Few of them are as follows:

- Tarigan (1981:85) states,”Wacana adalah satuan bahasa yang terlengkap dan tertinggi atau terbesar di atas kalimat atau klausa dengan kohesi dan koherensi yang berkesinambungan yang mempunyai awal dan akhir yang nyata disampaikan secara lisan dan tulisan.”

- Linde (1981:85) in Tarigan says, “Discourse is a stretch of continuous beginning and ending, and also a number of internal structures.”
Edmonson (1981:4) in Tarigan says, "Discourse is a structural event manifested in linguistic behavior (or others) whereas a text is an arrangement of structural linguistic expressions which forms a unity."

Carlson (1983: XII-XIV) in Tarigan says, "Discourse is a stretch of continuous utterances (a sequence of individual sentences). So, it does not only consist of utterances or sentences which are grammatically well-formed."

From all definitions above, the writer sees some similarities and differences on opinions of the linguists. However, there are essentially some important points that the writer gets from all those discourse definitions:

1. linguistic unit
2. the most complete/the highest
3. above the sentence or above the clause
4. well-tied or coherent
5. sense of unity or cohesion
6. continuity
7. written and spoken
8. clear beginning and ending
2.1.2 Functions of Discourse

The study of discourse analysis leads the language users to understand thoroughly about the discourse and also is qualified to produce a well-formed discourse. It is important that the recipient gets the information correctly. For instance, when the doctor tells a nurse how to administer the medicine to the patients, a policeman gives direction to the travelers, or a salesman explains the products to the buyers and so on. In each case, it matters that he speaker or writer should make what she/he says/writes clear by. Every speaker or writer is expecting that his/her utterances or written texts be understood and appreciated by the recipients. In this situation, of course, the speaker or the writer will try to find the best way to make easily reported or uttered. So, discourse is an appropriate unit for this purpose.

Finally, it can be insisted that the function of discourse is defined to organized a larger idea of a writer or a speaker (that the sentence failed to do) and to arrange that the idea into a coherent state so that the recipients will easily comprehend what the writer or speaker means. Thus, as the sequence, the goal of language will be obtained. So, the main function of discourse is as the bet way to convey information in terms of communication. However, the participants, either the speaker/writer or hearer/reader should certainly understands thoroughly about the discourse and its structure or organization.

2.1.3 Types of Discourse

E. A. Nida (1987:42) in Tarigan says that each language has its own classification of discourse based on different criterions. Further, she classifies discourse
into narrative, conversation, exposition, exposition, and poem. According to his point of view, discourse can be classified into various ways, such as:

- Based on the medium used
- Based on the way of discourse is conveyed
- Based on thematic orientation
- Based on the form of discourse

1. **Based on the medium used**

   Based on the medium used, a discourse can be classified into:

   a. **Written discourse**

      Written discourse is a type of discourse that is conveyed in written form, through writing media. The recipients should read the discourse if she/he wants to enjoy or comprehend it. The example of written discourse can be found in newspaper, magazine, book, and others.

   b. **Spoken discourse**

      Spoken discourse is a type of discourse which is conveyed orally through speaking or spoken form. The recipients should listen to the discourse if she/he wants to enjoy or comprehend it. This includes casual conversation, speech, and others.

2. **Based on the way of discourse is conveyed**

   Based on the way of discourse is conveyed, a discourse can be classified into:
a. **Direct discourse**

Direct discourse is a type of discourse which is limited in its conveyance by intonation or punctuation. Kridaklasana (1984: 208) in Tarigan says. “*Wacana langsung adalah kutipan yang sebenarnya dibatasi oleh intonasi atau pungtuasi.*”

b. **Indirect discourse**

Indirect discourse is a type of discourse which is conveyed by using a certain grammatical construction of word, instead of quoting the words used by the speaker directly. Kridaklasana (1984:208) in Tarigan says, “*Wacana tidak langsung adalah pengungkapan kembali wacana tanpa mengutip harfiah kata-kata yang dipakai pembicara dengan menggunakan konstruksi grammatical atau kata tertentu, antara lain dengan klausa subordinatif, kata bahwa, dan sebagainya.*”

3. **Based on thematic orientation**

Based on the thematic orientation, a discourse can be classified into:

a. **Expository discourse**

Expository discourse is oriented in the subject and parts that tied logically which ignore the time and the expositor.

b. **Narrative discourse**

Narrative discourse is oriented in the action and the entire parts tied chronologically. It needs ordered time.

4. **Based on the form of discourse**

Based on the form, discourse can be classified into:
a. **Prose**

Prose is free composition. It is not ruled by stanza and rhythm. Prose can be spoken or written, direct or indirect, and expository or narrative. This type of discourse includes novel, short story, articles, and so on.

b. **Play**

Play is the type of discourse conveyed in the form of dialog, either spoken or written.

c. **Poem**

Poem is a type of discourse which ruled in stanza, line, rhythm, and rhyme. It can be spoken or written.

### 2.1.4 Structure of Discourse

Every genre has its own discourse structure. It might seem as if informal, spontaneous conversation had no structure of its own over and above the internal organization of each sentence and the cohesion between the sentences. Conversation is very highly structured. There are definite principles regulating the taking of turns in conversation, and one of the functions of some of the items operating cohesively as conjunctives is that of marking and holding turns. There are several types of “adjacency pairs” ordered sequences of two elements in a conversation that are related to each other and mutually presupposing, like greetings, invitations, or question-answer sequences. The discourse structure of a conversation is in turn reinforced by the cohesion, which explicitly ties together the related parts, bonding them more closely to each other than to the others that are not so related; hence Halliday’s and Hasan’s observation that ‘there
tends to be a less meaningful relationship between two sequential interchanges than between two sequential speeches (i.e. turns) in an interchange’.

Other forms of discourse are more obviously structured than conversation; and some, notably narrative, have been studied in considerable detail in a variety of different languages. There is no need here to labor the point that the presence of certain elements, in a certain order, is essential to our concept of narrative; a narrative has, as a text, a typical organization, or one of a number of typical organizations, and it acquires texture by virtue of adhering to these forms. Literary forms, including the ‘strict’ verse forms—culturally established and highly-valued norms such as those of metre and rhyme scheme, defining complex notions such as the sonnet, iambic pentameter blank verse, and the like—all fall within the general category of discourse structures. They are aspects of texture, and combine with intrasentence structure and intersentence cohesion to provide the total text-forming resources of the culture.

2.2 Concept of Cohesion

Halliday and Hasan (1976: 4) state that, “The concepts of cohesion is semantic one, it refers to relations of meaning that exist within the text, and that define it as a text.” It means that the key to the concepts of cohesion is based on meaning, that is, something which exists in the language, not something which exists in people.

A relatively neglected aspect of the linguistic system is its resources for text construction, the range of meanings that are specifically related to something which being said or written to its semantic environment. The essential component of these resources is cohesion. Furthermore, cohesive relations are relations between two or more elements in a text that are independent of the structure. For example, between a
personal pronoun and antecedent proper name such as Tommy...he, Elizabeth...she, and so on. A semantic relation of this kind may set up either within a sentence or between sentences. Concerning with that, when it crosses a sentence boundary, it has been outlined by Halliday in his writings on stylistic, and the concept was developed by his partner, Hasan, in her University of Edinburgh doctoral thesis. Halliday and Hasan said that there are four concepts of cohesion. They are text, texture, ties, and cohesion and coherence.

2.2.1 Text

A text is not just a string of sentences. In other words it is not simply a larger grammatical unit, something of the same kind as a sentence but differing from it in size—a sort of super sentence. A text is best thought of not as a grammatical unit at all, but rather as a unit of a different kind: a semantic unit. The unity that it has is a unity of meaning in context, a texture that expresses the fact it relates as a whole to the environment in which it is placed.

Being a semantic unit, a text is realizes in the form of sentences, and this is how the relation of text to sentence can best be interpreted. A set of related sentences, with a single sentence as the limiting case, is the embodiment or realization of a text. So the expression of the semantic unity of the text lies in the cohesion among the sentences of which it is composed. Any piece of language that is operational, functioning as a unity in some context of situation, constitutes a text. It may be spoken or written, in any style or genre, and involving any number of active participants.

Text may be of any length. Many familiar texts in fact come out as less than one sentence in that grammatical structure. Since it is not of the grammatical rank scale and
does not consist of sentences; a text is not tied to the sentence as its lower limit. In fact, many familiar texts such as warning, titles, announcements, inscription, and advertisement come out as less than one sentence in grammatical structure, and often consist of verbal, nominal, adverbial or prepositional group only, for example [2.1]:

a. No smoking.
b. Stop!
c. For sale.
d. Do not feed!
e. Wonders never cease!

Equally, there is no upper limit on the length of the text. An entire book may and in many genres such as fiction typically does comprise a single text; this is implied in the term ‘novel’. The same is true of a play, a sermon, a lecture, or a committee meeting.

2.2.2 Texture

The concept of texture is entirely appropriate to express the property of ‘being a text’. A text has texture, and this is what distinguishes it from something that is not a text. It derives this texture from the fact it functions as a unity with respect to its environment. This also means that every discourse has a texture, which is signed by cohesion between the sentences in the discourse itself and which makes the sentences coherent (logically related).

When a passage of English containing more than one sentence is perceived as a text, there will be certain linguistic features in that passage which can be identified as contributing to its total units and giving it texture. For example:
[2. 2] Andy and I went to Medan Mall. We bought our needs.

[2. 3] Lea and her mother are shopping. I am sleeping in my bedroom.

The sentences in example [2:2] above are related one another that make the reader or hearer easy to understand what they are about. It is clear that we in the example [2. 2] refers back (is anaphoric to) Andy and I. This anaphoric function of we gives cohesion to the two sentences, so that we interpret them as a whole; the two sentences together constitute a text. The texture is provided by the cohesive relation that exists between Andy and I with we. But, the cohesive relation does not occur in example [2. 3].

2.2.3 Ties

A tie refers to a single instance of cohesion, a term for one occurrence of a pair of cohesively related items. The concept of tie makes it possible to analyze a text in terms of its cohesive properties, and gives a systemic account of its pattern of texture. A tie is a complex notion, because it includes not only the cohesive elements itself, but also that is presupposed by it. A tie is best interpreted as a relation between those two elements. For example:

[2. 4] Lea goes to Medan Mall. She buys pens, books, and cassettes.

[2. 5] Come and get two apples. Put the apples into the box.

In the example [2. 4], the two sentences related one another, in which there is a cohesive relation between Lea and she, which constitutes a tie. The particular kind which we can find in this example is called ‘reference’. And in example [2. 5], here the item functioning cohesively is the apples, which works by repetition of the word apples accompanied by the as an anaphoric.
2.2.4 Cohesion and Coherence

The general meaning of cohesion is embodied in the concept of text. By its role in providing ‘texture’, cohesion helps to create text. The concept of cohesion is semantic one; it refers to relations of meaning that exists within text, and that define it as a text. Cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some elements in the discourse is depend on that of another, the one presupposes the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded expect by resource to it. When this happens, a relation of cohesion is set up, and the two elements, the presupposing and the presupposed are there by at least potentially integrated into a text. Cohesion makes texts hang together. In short, cohesion is defined as the set of possibilities that exits in the language for making text hang together.

However, by itself, cohesion would not be sufficient to enable us to make sense of what we read or hear. There must be another factor which leads us to distinguish connected texts which make sense from those which do not. This factor is usually described as coherence.

Coherence can be defined as when sentences, ideas, and details fit together clearly, readers can follow along easily, and the writing is coherent. The key to the concept of coherence is not something which exists in the language, but something which exists in people. This means that it is people who make sense of what they read or hear, they try to arrive at an interpretation which is in line with their experience of the way the world is. For example [2. 6]:

A: That’s the telephone
B: I’m in the bathroom
A: Okay
There are certainly no cohesive ties within this fragment of discourse. By using the information contained in the sentences expressed, people can manage to make sense of what the other says. From the fragment above, we can characterize that brief conversation in the following ways:

A request to perform action.
B states reason why he can not comply with request.
A undertakes to perform action.

However, there must be something else involved in the interpretation. Language-users must have a lot of knowledge to understand how the conversational interaction works which is not simply ‘linguistic’ knowledge, but something in them.

In short, coherence has connection with the aspect of speech, while cohesion has connection with the aspects of form and formal language.

2.3 Kinds of Cohesive Devices

There are five of kinds of cohesive devices which are outlined by Halliday and Hasan. Those five kinds of cohesive devices are reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion.

2.3.1 Reference

According to Halliday, reference is the relationship between an element of the text and something else by reference to which is interpreted in the given instance. Reference is a potentially cohesive relation because the thing that serves as the source of the interpretation may itself be an element of text.

Concerning with the cohesion within a text, it can be provided by relationship called co-reference. Brown and Yule (1976: 31) cite, ‘Co-reference forms are forms
which instead of being interpreted semantically in their own right make reference to
something else for their interpretation.” So, through co-referential relation, we may
interpret a text. If the interpretation lies outside the text in the context of situation, the
relationship is said to be an ‘exophoric’ relation which plays no part in textual cohesion.
And if the interpretation lies within the text, the relationship is said as ‘endophoric’
relation. Endophoric is divided in two relations. They are anaphora and cataphora.
Anaphora is the form of presupposition, pointing back to some previous item and
cataphora is the form of presupposition with the presupposed element following:

Reference:

```
  | [situational]   | [textual] |
  | exphora         | endophora |
  | [to preceding text] | [to following text] |
  | anaphora        | cataphora  |
```

There are three types of reference. They are personal reference, demonstrative
reference, and comparative reference.

2.3.1.1 Personal Reference

Personal reference is sentence by means of function in the speech situation,
through the category of person. The category of personal includes the three classes of
personal pronouns, possessive determiners (usually called ‘possessive adjectives’), and
possessive pronoun. See the table of the personal reference below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic category</th>
<th>Existentia</th>
<th>Possessive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical function</td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>Modifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Noun (pronoun)</td>
<td>Determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person: speaker (only)</td>
<td>I me</td>
<td>mine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>addressee(s), with/without other person(s)</td>
<td>you</td>
<td>yours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaker &amp; other person(s)</td>
<td>us</td>
<td>ours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other person, male</td>
<td>he him</td>
<td>his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other person, female</td>
<td>she her</td>
<td>hers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other person, object</td>
<td>they them</td>
<td>theirs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>object; passage of text</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>[its]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generalized person</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>one’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personals referring to the speech roles (speaker and addressee) are typically exophoric; this includes *I* and *you*, and *we* meaning ‘you and I’. They become anaphoric, however, in speech; and so are normally anaphoric in many varieties of written language, such as narrative fiction. For example:

[2. 7] My husband and I are leaving. We have seen quite enough of this unpleasantness.

*We* refer to my husband and *I*. So in this case, it is anaphoric relation.

Personals referring to other roles (persons or objects other than the speaker or addressee) are typically anaphoric; this includes *he*, *she*, *it* and *they*, and also the ‘third person’ component of *we* when present. For example:

[2. 8] Lea drove a new car. She bought it last week.
It is clear that *she* refers back to (is anaphoric to) Lea. This anaphoric function of *she* gives cohesion to the two sentences, so that we interpret them as a whole; the two sentences together constitute a text. The texture is provided by the cohesive relation that exists between *Lea* and *she*.

Only the anaphoric type of reference that is relevant to cohesion, since it provides a link with a preceding portion of the text. When we talk of the cohesive function of personal reference, therefore, it is particularly the third person forms that we have in mind.
2.3.1.2 Demonstrative Reference

Demonstrative reference is essentially a form of a verbal pointing. The speaker identifies the referent by locating it on a scale of proximity. The system is as follows:

neutral the

selective

near

far (no near)

participant

place:

time:

near : far :

singular: this that

plural: these those

place: here there

time: now then

The adverbial demonstratives here, there, now, and then refer to the location of a process in space or time, and they normally do so directly, not via the location of some person or object that is participating in the process; hence they typically function as Adjuncts in the clause, not as elements within the nominal group. The remaining (nominal) demonstratives this, these, that, those, and the refer to the location of something, typically some entity-person or object that is participating in the process; they therefore occur as elements within the nominal group.

The demonstratives regularly refer to exophorically to something within the context of situation. This is the primary form of verbal pointing; and it may be accompanies by demonstrative action, in the form of a gesture indicating the object referred to. For example:

[2. 9] Pick these up!

[2. 10] How would you like a cruise in that yacht?
Similarly with the demonstrative adverbs:

[2.11] Leave that there and come here!

In general, this, these, and here imply proximity to the speaker; that, those, and there imply distance from the speaker, which may or may not involved proximity to the addressee-the meaning is ‘near you, or not near either of us, but at any rate not near me’.

2.3.1.3 Comparative Reference

Comparative reference is indirect reference by means of identity or similarity.

The table of comparative reference items was given as follows:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>identity</th>
<th>same equal identical, identically</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>general (deitic)</td>
<td>similarity</td>
<td>such similar, so similarly likewise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>difference</td>
<td>other different else, differently otherwise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comparison</td>
<td>numerative</td>
<td>more fewer less further additional;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>so- as- equally- + quantifier, eg:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>so many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>particular (non-deitic)</td>
<td>epithet</td>
<td>comparative adjectives and adverbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eq: better; so- as- more- less- equally- +comparative adjectives and adverbs, eg: equally good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

General comparison is comparison that is simply in forms of likeness and unlikeness, without respect to any particular property: two things may be the same, similar or different (where ‘different’ includes both ‘not the same’ and ‘not similar’). General comparison is expressed by a certain class of adjectives and adverbs. For example [2.12]
a. It’s the same car as the one we saw yesterday.

b. It’s a similar car to the one we saw yesterday.

c. It’s a different car from the one we saw yesterday.

All the examples in [2. 12] are cataphoric in the structural sense. In each case the referent was *the one we saw yesterday* and the comparatives *same, similar, and different* were pointing forward.

While particular comparison expresses comparability between things in the respect of a particular property. The property in question may be a matter of quantity or quality. If the comparison in terms of quantity, it is expressed in the Numerative element in the structure of the nominal group; either (a) by a comparative quantifier, e.g.: *more* in *more mistakes*, or (b) by an adverb of comparison submodifying a quantifier, e.g.: *as* in *as many mistakes*.

If the comparison in terms of quality is expressed in two ways: (i) in the Epithet element in the nominal group, either (a) by a comparative adjective, e.g.: *easier, more difficult* in *easier tasks, more difficult tasks*, or (b) by an adverb of comparison submodifying an adjective, e.g.: *so* in *so difficult a task*; (ii) as Adjunct in the clause, either (a) by a comparative adverb, e.g.: *faster* in *Cambridge rowed faster*, or (b) by an adverb of comparison submodifying an adverb, e.g.: *as* in *she sang as sweetly*. 
2.3.2 Substitution

Substitution is a relation within a text as the replacement of one item by another. It is a relation in the wording rather than in the meaning. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 88-89) give the difference between substitution and reference: Substitution is a relation in the wording rather that in the meaning. Substitution is also a relation between linguistic items, such as words and phrases; whereas reference is a relation between meanings. In terms of the linguistic system, reference is a relation on the semantic level, the level of grammar and vocabulary or linguistic form.

In English, the substitute may function as a noun, a verb, or as a clause. Concerning with it, there are three different types of substitution, namely, nominal substitution, verbal substitution, and clausal substitution.

The short list of the items that occurs as substitutes are

- Nominal: one, ones, same
- Verbal: do
- Clausal: so, not

2.3.2.1 Nominal Substitution

Nominal substitution is the replacement of a part or the entire of nominal group by a word. The words include to this type of substitution are one/ones, and same. The substitute one/ones always function as Head of nominal group and can substitute only for an item which is itself Head of nominal group. While same which is accompanied by the substitutes the entire nominal group. For example:

[2. 13] I don’t want an old car. I want a new one.

[2. 14] I’ll have hamburger for lunch. My friends will have the same.
In the example [2. 13] the word one substitutes car, which is the Head of the nominal group an old car. While in [2.14] the word the same substitutes the entire nominal group hamburger for lunch.

The substitute one/ones presupposes some noun that is to function as Head in the nominal group. It is a substitution counter put in to fill the “Head” slot. The meaning is ‘the noun to fill this slot will be found in the preceding text’.

2.3.2.2 Verbal Substitution

Verbal substitution is a substitution of a verbal group. In English the verbal substitution is do which operates as Head of a verbal group, in the place that is occupied by the lexical verb; and the position is always final in the group. For example [2. 15]:

Mother: Have you eaten the pizza kept in the cupboard?

Andy: No, I haven’t done yet, but I will do.

Here do substitutes for eat the pizza kept in the cupboard, and serves to link the two sentences by anaphora, exactly in the same way as the nominal substitute one.

2.3.2.3 Clausal Substitution

Clausal substitution is a substitution in which what is presupposed is not only an element within the clause, but the entire clause itself. The words used as the substitution are so and not.

There are three environments in which clausal substitution takes place. They are:

a. Substitution of reported clause

The reported clause that is substitute by so or not is always declarative, whatever the mood of the presupposed clause. So as a report substitute occurs in initial position in
expressions such as so it seems, so he said, so I believe, so we were led to understand.

For example:

[2. 16] ‘You’ve seen them so often, of course you know what they’re like’.

‘I believe so,’ Alice replied thoughtfully.

Here so substitutes for I know what they’re like.

b. Substitution of conditional clause

A second context for clausal substitution is that of conditional structure. Conditional clauses are frequently substituted by so and not, especially following if but also in other forms such as assuming so and suppose not. For example:

[2. 17] Everyone seems to think he’s guilty. If so, no doubt he’ll offer to resign.

Here so substitutes for he is guilty.

c. Substitution of modality clause

So and not occurs as substitutes for clauses expressing modality. Modality is the soaker’s assessment of the probabilities inherent in the situation. These may be expressed either by modal forms of the verb (will, would, can, could, may, might, must, should, and ought to), or by modal adverbs such as perhaps, possibly, certainly, sure.

For example:

[2.18] Can he lift the box? I guess not.

Here not presupposes the whole clause he can not lift the box.

[2. 19] Ben: would you like cats if you were me?

Tom: Certainly not.

Here not substitutes for I would not like cats if I were you.
2.3.3 Ellipsis

Ellipsis is a process within the text as the omission of an item. In other words, we can take as general guide the notion that ellipsis occurs when something that is structurally necessary is left unsaid; there is a sense of incompleteness associated with it. But it is useful to recognize that this is an over-simplification, and that the essential characteristic of ellipsis is that something which is present in the selection of underlying (‘systemic’) options is omitted in the structure—whether or not the resulting structure is in itself ‘incomplete’. For example:

[2. 20] Mother is looking for some salt and the father some sugar.

In the example, the predicate of the second clause father some sugar is omits, but we still understand it. The omission of the predicate in the second clause is supplied in the preceding clause.

Like substitution, ellipsis is a relation within the text, and in the great majority of instances the presupposed item is present in the preceding text. That is to say, ellipsis is normally an anaphoric relation. The difference between substitution and ellipsis is that in the former a substitution counter occurs in the slot, and this must therefore be deleted if the presupposed item is replaced, whereas in the latter the slot is empty—there has been substitution by zero. Halliday and Hasan discuss ellipsis under three headings, namely, nominal ellipsis, verbal ellipsis, clausal ellipsis.

2.3.3.1 Nominal Ellipsis

By nominal ellipsis, we mean ellipsis within the nominal group. The structure is that of a Head with optional modification; the modifying elements include some which
precede the Head and some which follow it, referred to here as Premodifier and Postmodifier respectively. Thus in these *two fast electric trains with pantographs* the head is *trains*, the Premodifier is formed by *those two fast electric* and the Postmodifi er by *with pantographs*.

There are two ways to fill out an elliptical nominal group. The first is simply to push down the element functioning as Head, making it a Modifier, and add the ‘missing’ head in its place.

[2.21] How did you enjoy the movie? - A lot (of the movie) was very good, though not all.

[2.22] How did you enjoy the exhibition? A lot (of the exhibition) was very good, though not all.

The second one is to keep the elliptical group as it is and add a partitive qualifier that is possible only under the certain conditions. For example:

[2.23] Which hat will you wear? This is:

a. the best
b. the best hat
c. the best of the hats
d. the best of the three
e. the best you have

In all cases *the* is Deictic, *three* is Numerative, *best* is Epithet and *hat* is the common noun representing the thing. Then:

(a) is elliptical; *the* is modifier, best is *Head*.

(b) is non-elliptical; *the best* is Modifier, *hat* is Head.
(c)) is non-elliptical; the is Modifier, best is Head, of the hats is partitive Qualifier, non elliptical.

(d) is elliptical; structure as (c), except that the partitive Qualifier of the three is itself elliptical.

(e) is elliptical; structure a (c). Except that the qualifier you have is not partitive

2.3.3.2 Verbal Ellipsis

By verbal ellipsis, we mean ellipsis within the verbal group. For example:

[2. 24] Have you been swimming? – Yes, I have.

[2. 25] What you have been doing? – swimming.

The two verbal groups in the answers, have (in yes, I have) in [2. 24] and swimming in [2.25] are both instances of verbal ellipsis. Both can be said to stand for have been swimming and there is no possibility of ‘filling out’ with any other items. So, from the examples, swimming in [2. 25] could not be interpreted as I will be swimming or they are swimming. It could be interpreted only as I have been swimming.

2.3.3.3 Clausal Ellipsis

Clausal ellipsis is an ellipsis within the clause, taking the clause as the point of departure. The clause in English, considered as the expression of the various speech functions, such as statement, question, response and so on, has a two-part structure consisting of modal element plus propositional element. Typically, modal ellipsis occurs in response to a WH- questions asking ‘what’ (did, was, does, etc.) For example:

[2. 26] What were they doing? – Holding hands.

[2. 27] Who was going to punish the students? - The teacher was.
On the other hand, prepositional ellipsis is response to statement yes/no questions where the subject is presupposed by a reference item. For example:

[2. 28] The train has arrived. - Has it?

[2. 29] Has the train arrived? - Yes, it has.

2.3.4 Conjunction

Conjunction is rather different from the other kind of cohesive devices. It is not simply an anaphoric relation. According to Hartley who said that conjunction is a salient cohesive device because of its function of specifying the semantic connection of a clause with the preceding text. Conjunctive element are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly, by virtue of specific meanings; they are not primarily devices for reaching out into the preceding (or following) text, but they express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in discourse.

In describing conjunction as cohesive device, we are focusing attention not on the semantic relation, but on one particular aspect of them, namely the function they have of relating to each other linguistic elements that occur in succession but are not by other structural means.

There are four categories of conjunction. They are additive, adversative, clausal, and temporal. Here is an example of each:

[2. 30] For the whole day he climbed up the steep mountainside, almost without stopping.

a. And in all this time he met no one. (additive)

b. Yet he was hardly aware of being tired. (adversative)

c. So, by the night time the valley far below him. (clausal)
d. Then, as dust fall, ha sat down to rest. (temporal)

The words and, yet, and, then can be taken as typifying these four general very general conjunctive relations, which they expressed in their simplest form.

Conjunctive relation may occur in either an external or an internal context. The conjunction may be located in the phenomena that constitute the content of what is being said (external), or in the interaction itself, the social process that constitutes the speech event (internal).

2.3.4.1 Additive

The additive relation is somewhat different from coordination proper, although it is no doubt from it, for example:

[2. 31] They gave him food and clothing. And they looked after him till he was better.

Here and does links two different facts which makes it external, but at the same time it mat to serve to convey the speaker’s intention that they should be regarded as connected in some way.

Here are the conjunctive relations of additive type, with example of each:

Simple additive relation (external and internal)

- Additive: and, and also, and…too.
- Negative: nor, and…not, not either, neither
- Alternative: or; or else

Complex additive relation (internal): emphatic

- Additive: further (more), moreover, additionally, besides that, add to this, in addition, and other thing.
• Alternative: alternatively

Complex additive relations (internal): de-emphatic
• Afterthought: incidentally, by the way

Comparative relations (internal)
• Similar: likewise, similarly, in the same way, in (just) this way
• Dissimilar: on the other hand, by contrast, conversely

Appositive relations (internal)
• Expository: that is, I mean, in other words, to put it another way
• Exemplificatory: for instance, for example, thus
2.3.4.2 Adversative

The basic meaning of the adversative relation is contrary to expectation. The expectation may be derived from the content of what is being said, or from the communication process, the speaker-hearer situation as in the additive we find cohesion on both the external and the internal planes.

An external adversative relation is expressed in its simple form by the word yet occurring initially in the sentence

[2. 32] They looked after him well. Yet he got no better.

The adversative relation also has its internal aspect. Here the underlying meaning is still contrary expectation; but the source of the expectation is to be found not in what the presupposed sentence is about but the current speaker-hearer configuration, the point reached in the communication process, as we expressed it earlier. For example:

[2. 33] That must be Harry. Yet it can’t be; Harry’s in London.

Here is the summary of conjunctive relations of the Adversative type:

Adversative relations ‘proper’ (in spite of) (external and internal)

- Simple: yet, through, only
- Containing: but
- Emphatic: however, nevertheless, despite this, all the same.

Contrastive relations (‘as against’) (external)

- Simple: but, and
- Emphatic: however, on the other hand, at the same time

Contrastive relations (‘as against’) (internal)
• Avowal: in fact, as matter of fact, to tell the truth, actually, in point of fact

Correcting relations (‘not…but’) (internal)

• Correction of meaning: instead, rather, on the contrary
• Correction of wording: at least, rather, I mean

Dismissive (generalizes adversative) relations (no matter…, still’) (external and internal)

• Dismissal, closed: in, any/either case/event, any/either way, whichever
• dismissal open-ended: anyhow, at any rate, in any case, however that, may be

2.3.4.3 Causal

The simple form of causal relation is expressed by so, thus, hence, therefore, consequently, accordingly, and a number of expression like as a result (of that), in consequence (of that), because of that. Under the heading of causal relations are included the specific ones of result, reason, and purpose.

The distinction between external and internal types of cohesion tends to be a little less clear cut in the contexts of causal relations than it is in the other contexts, probably because the notion of cause already involves some degree of interpretation by the speaker. The simple forms thus, hence, and therefore all occur regularly in an external sense, implying some kind of reasoning or argument from a premise. For example:

[2. 34] He drove into the harbour one night. So they took his license away.
In a sense internal relation the meaning is if we have now reached this point in the discourse. For example:

[2. 35] We’re having guests tonight. So don’t be late.

The following is a summary of the conjunctive relations of the causal type:

Clausal relation, general (‘because…so’) (external and internal)
- Simple: so, thus, hence, therefore
- Emphatic: consequently, accordingly, because of this

Clausal relation, specific
- Reason: (mainly external) for this reason, on account of this (internal) it follows (from this), on this basis
- Result: (mainly external) as result (of this), in consequence (internal) arising out this
- Purpose: (mainly external) for this purpose, with this in mind/view (internal) to this end

Reserved clausal relations, general
- Simple: for, because

Conditional relations (‘if…then’) (external and internal)
- Simple: then
- Emphatic: in that case, that being the case, in such an event
- Generalized: under the circumstances
- Reserved popularity: otherwise, under the circumstances

Respective relations (‘with respect to’) (internal)
- Direct: in this respect/connection, with regard to this, here
• Reversed popularity: otherwise, in the other respects, aside/apart from this.

2.3.4.4 Temporal

The relation between the two sentences – that is, their relation in internal terms, as content- maybe simply one of sequence in time: the one is subsequent to the other. The temporal relation is expressed in its simplest form by *then*. One important type of internal temporal conjunction which is linked to the one just discussed is the relating of what is being said to the particular stage which the communication process has reached: to here and now of the discourse, as it were. For example:

[2. 36] He stayed there for three years. Then he went on to Jakarta.

External temporal conjunction is being said to the present situation, the ‘here and now’ of reality; they do not therefore presupposed anything in the preceding text. If on the other hand, ‘here and now’ means ‘here and now in the text, then such forms will have a cohesive effect. For example:

[2. 37] He found his way eventually. Then he’d left his papers behind

Here is the summary of relations of the temporal type:

Simple temporal relations (external)

• Sequential: (and then, next, afterwards, after that, subsequently

• Simultaneously: just (then), at the same time, simultaneously

• Preceding: earlier, before, then/that, previously

Complex temporal relations (external)

• Immediate: at once, there upon, on which, just before

• Interrupted: soon, presently, later, after a time, sometime, earlier
• Repetitive: next time, on other occasion, this time, the last time
• Specific: next day, five minutes later, five minutes earlier
• Durative: meanwhile, all this time
• Terminal: by this time, up till that time, until then
• Punctiliar: next month, at this point/moment, previous moment

Conclusive relations (external)
• Simple: finally, at last, in the end, eventually

Sequential and conclusive relations (external): correlative forms
• Sequential: first…then, first…next, first…second
• Conclusive: at first…finally, at first…in the end

Temporal relations (internal)
• Sequential: then, next, secondly
• Conclusive: finally, as a final point, in conclusion

Temporal relations (internal): correlative forms
• Sequential: first…next, first…then, first…secondly
• Conclusive: …finally, …to conclude with

Here and now relations (internal)
• Past: up to now, up to this point, here to fore
• Present: at this point, here
• Future: from now on, hence forward

2.3.5 Lexical Cohesion

Lexical cohesion is the cohesion effect achieved by the selection of the vocabulary. On the borderline between grammatical and lexical cohesion is the cohesive
function of the class of general noun. Lexical cohesion has two types, namely, reiteration and collocation.

2.3.5.1 Reiteration

Reiteration is a form of lexical cohesion which involves the repetition of a lexical items, or the occurrence of a related item which may be anything from a synonym or near synonym of the original to a general word dominating the entire class in the context of referent; that is, where the two occurrences have the same referent. Let us categorize these as above:

The instance of reiteration may be: (a) same word, (b) synonym or near synonym, (c) super ordinate or (d) general word. For example:

[2. 38] There is a boy climbing that high tree.

a. The boy’s going to fall if he doesn’t take care.
b. The lad’s going to fall if he doesn’t take care.
c. The child’s going to fall if he doesn’t take care.
d. The idiot’s going to fall if he doesn’t take care

From the example, it can be concluded that:

In (a) the word boy is repeated. There is a repetition.
In (b) the reiteration takes the form of synonym lad.
In (c) of the super ordinate term of boy is child.
In (d) of a general word idiot.

2.3.5.2 Collocation

Collocation is achieved through the association of lexical items that regularly co–occur. Collocation takes place through occurrence of a different lexical items that is
systematically relate to the first one, as a synonym or super ordinate of it. We can therefore extend the basis of the lexical relationship that features as a cohesive force and say that there is cohesion between any pair of lexical items which stand to each other in same recognizable lexicosemantic (word meaning) relation. This would include not only synonyms or near synonyms such as sick...ill, climb...ascent, and superordinates such as rose...flower, elm...tree, but also pairs of opposites such as dead...alive, boy...girl, stand up...sit, antonyms such as high...low, wet...dry. For example:

[2.39] Why does this little boy wriggle all the time? Girls don’t wriggle

There is obviously a systematic relationship between a pair of words boy and girl; they are related by a particular type of oppositeness, called complementarity.

2.3.6 Relevance study

In designing this thesis which deals with cohesive analysis, the writer consults and refers to some relevant text book, research, and thesis to support the idea of the analysis. Some of them can be mentioned here as follows:

Halliday and Hasan in Cohesion in English (1976:298-299) say, “The concept of cohesion refers to relations of meaning that exist within text, and it is that define it as a text. Cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some elements in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The potential for cohesion lies in the systematic resources of reference, ellipsis, and so on that is built into the language itself.” The sentence of a text, however, are related to each other both substantively and by cohesion, and it is a characteristic of a text that the sequence of the sentence cannot be disturbed without destroying or radically altering the meaning. Within a text, the meaning of each
sentence depends on its environment, including its cohesive relations with other sentences.


Lubis (2005: 158) in her journal *Penggunaan Kohesi dalam Translasi* concerns with the usage of English cohesive devices, such as reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion as suggested on Halliday and Hasan in translation. The aim of using cohesive devices is to build cohesive clauses in a text. She concludes that these cohesive devices are used differently in some languages since they have their own preferences and patterns.

Laurie (1991: 75)) in her thesis *An analysis of Cohesive Devices and Cohesive Ties in Robert Forst’s Poems* presents about cohesive devices and ties that she found in Robert Forst’s poems: “The Pasture”, “Stopping by Woods in a Snowy Evening”, and “Neither Out Far, nor in Deep”. Based on her analysis, the findings are as follows: (a) in other types of discourse, cohesion is an intersentence relation. But in poems, cohesion is an interline relation; (b) only endophoric reference can be classified as cohesive devices, whereas exophoric reference does not give cohesive effect to the text; (c) the relation of co-referential is typically realized by the devices of reference and sometimes by substitution, lexical, and by ellipsis. The relation of co-extension is normally realized by the devices of lexical.
Irawan (1994: 58) in *An Analysis of Cohesive Devices in Articles of Reader Digest* concludes that the study of cohesion shows how one sentence or one paragraph is related to another. Thus, it helps us to understand the unity of text easier. Irawan also finds the fifth cohesive devices: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion in his data. In terms of the distribution reference, the personal reference is the most dominant in the data.

Rosa (1997: 75)) in *Cohesive devices in TV Interview: An Analysis of Cohesive Devices as Found in RCTI'S Aneka Dialog* sums up that study of cohesion can be applied not only in English texts, but also in other language, including Indonesian language. She also finds that demonstrative reference is the most dominant in her data.