CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL CONCEPTS AND REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. Theoretical Concepts

In this thesis, the writer used the functional systemic theory of Halliday (see Halliday, 1994) and Eggins, 2004 to describe about interpersonal meaning theoretically.

2.1.1. Interpersonal Meaning

Language is simultaneously used as representation, exchange, and organization of experience (Halliday, 1994: 68). As social beings, human kinds cannot live isolated; they need to interact with others in order to fulfill their needs. The use of language to interact is said to perform interpersonal function (Saragih, 1999: 9).

Halliday (1994: 68) states that simultaneously with its organization as a message, the clause is also organized as an interactive event involving speaker, or writer, and audience.

Furthermore, in the act of speaking, the speaker adopts for himself a particular speech role, and in so doing assigns to the listener a complementary role which he wishes him to adopt in his turn (Halliday, 1994: 68).

Typically, therefore, an ‘act’ of speaking is something that might more appropriately be called ‘interact’: it is an exchange, in which giving implies receiving and demanding implies giving in response (Halliday, 1994: 68).
In addition, Halliday (1994) in Sinar (2002: 46) states that the interpersonal meaning of the clause can be observed on two levels. On the first level, the speaker/writer as the producer of the clause can speak/write from a position carrying the authority of a discipline or an institution. In this, the way the interpersonal meaning is delivered is determined by the knowledge or power relationship existing between the speaker/writer and the listener/reader. On the other level, the speaker/writer may choose to communicate with the listener/reader from a position as a person, with no authority of a discipline, an institution, or the like.

2.1.2. Speech Function

Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 106-111) in Eggins (2004: 144) points out that whenever we use language to interact, one of the things we are doing with it is establishing a relationship between us; between the person speaking now and the person who will probably speak next. To establish this relationship, the people involved in the interaction must take turns at speaking. When they take turns, they take on different speech roles in the exchange.

Halliday (1994: 68) states that the most fundamental types of speech role, which lie behind all the more specific types that we may eventually be able to recognize, are just two: (i) giving, and (ii) demanding.

Eggins (2004: 144) says that at the same time as choosing either to give or to demand in an exchange, we also choose the kind of commodity that we are exchanging. The choice here is between exchanging information and goods and services.
Furthermore, Martin and Rose (2007: 223) states that when negotiating information we expect a verbal response (or gesture), whereas when negotiating goods-and-services we expect action. Below is the example:

**Negotiating information:**

initiating Hendrik Everything OK?
responding Coetzee - Yes

**Negotiating goods-and-services:**

initiating Hendrik Shall we go inside?
responding Grootbooms - (family turns and proceeds to enter the hotel)

When the two dimensions of *speech roles* and *commodity* are cross-classified, four basic ‘moves’ are derived as summarized in the table 2.1 below.

**Table 2.1 Speech roles and commodities in interaction (based on Halliday, 1994: 69)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMODITY EXCHANGED</th>
<th>SPEECH ROLES</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Goods and Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giving</td>
<td>Giving</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Offer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demanding</td>
<td>Demanding</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Command</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The four speech functions are summarized as follows:

a. [giving/information] = statement
b. [demanding/information] = question
c. [giving/goods and services] = offer
d. [demanding/goods and services] = command

These four basic moves above (statement, question, offer, and command) are what Halliday refers to as *speech functions*. On the other hand, *speech functions* are the specific activities which occur from the cross-classifying of *speech roles* and *commodity exchange*. Therefore, it can be said that every starting move in dialogue
must be one or other of these *speech functions* and each *speech function* involves both a *speech role* and a *commodity choice*.

In an interaction or dialogue, typically it does not involve only one speaker. We need also to recognize that after one speaker has initiated an exchange, another speaker is very likely to respond. In other word, a speech function by an addresser is responded by an addressee. Martin (1992: 56) states that when the initiation and response as orientation of both the interlocutors are taken into account, other four speech functions are derived thus make eight speech functions. The derivation of speech functions are summarized in the following figure.

![Figure 2.1 The derivation of eight speech functions (Martin, 1992: 56)](image-url)
With reference to the figure, systemically eight speech functions are derived as follows:

1. [giving/information/initiating] = statement
2. [giving/information/responding] = acknowledgment
3. [demanding/information/initiating] = question
4. [demanding/information/responding] = answer
5. [giving/goods and services/initiating] = offer
6. [giving/goods and services/responding] = acceptance (may be non-verbal)
7. [demanding/ goods and services/initiating] = command
8. [demanding/ goods and services responding] = compliance (may be non-verbal)

Eggins (2004: 146) says that in some registers, the expected response is a supporting move, but in other registers (such as casual conversation), the confronting responses are more common. Incorporating this dimension, the *speech function pairs* can be summarized in table 2.2 below.

**Table 2.2 Speech function pairs (adapted from Halliday, 1994: 69)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiating speech function</th>
<th>Responding speech function</th>
<th>SUPPORTING</th>
<th>CONFRONTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>acknowledgment</td>
<td>contradiction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>answer</td>
<td>disclaimer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer</td>
<td>acceptance (may be non-verbal)</td>
<td>rejection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command</td>
<td>compliance (may be non-verbal)</td>
<td>refusal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In doing the interaction, people do exchanging experience (conversation), in order to recognize a correlation between the semantic choice of speech function and the grammatical structure typically chosen to encode it. In a statement, a particular structure of a clause is typically a declarative clause. For a question, it is used an interrogative clause, whereas in an offer one can use a ‘modulated interrogative’. For a command, an imperative is likely used such as the following examples:

- *It’s written by Shakespeare.* (Statement: a declarative)
- *Have you ever read ‘Romeo and Juliet’?* (Question: an interrogative)
- *Would you like to borrow my copy?* (Offer: a modulated interrogative)
- *Here, take it!* (Command: an imperative)

Egging (2004: 147) says that there is also a correlation between the different structure of an initiating move and the structure of a responding move. Most initiating moves are long, while most responding moves are short. Responding moves are short because they typically involve some kind of abbreviation or *ellipsis* or are what we call *minor clause*.

**Table 2.3 Speech functions and typical mood of clause (Egging, 2004: 147)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPEECH FUNCTION</th>
<th>Typical Mood in Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Declarative Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Interrogative Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer</td>
<td>Modulated Interrogative Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command</td>
<td>Imperative Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement</td>
<td>Elliptical Declarative Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>Elliptical Declarative Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Minor Clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>Minor Clause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1.3. MOOD and RESIDUE

The interpersonal meaning which relates to the exchange of experience represents the speech role relationship. The speech role itself is realized by the mood system of the clause which comprises two major elements: (1) MOOD, and (2) RESIDUE. And as an exchange of experience, a clause divides into five structural elements namely Subject, Finite, Predicator, Complement, and Adjunct. The MOOD consists of two parts: (1) the Subject, which is a nomional group, and (2) the Finite element, which is part of a verbal group (Halliday, 1994: 72). The RESIDUE consists of functional elements of three kinds: Predicator, Complement and Adjunct. There can be only one Predicator, one or two Complements, and an indefinite number of Adjuncts (Halliday, 1994: 78).

2.1.3.1. Constituents of MOOD

The two essential functional constituents of MOOD are Subject and Finite.

a. Subject

The definition of the Subject offered by Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 117) in Eggins (2004: 151) is that it realizes the thing by reference to which the proposition can be affirmed or denied. It provides the person or thing in whom is vested the success or failure of the preposition, what is ‘held responsible’.

For examples, in the clause She does her job well, the Subject is She. And in the clause They bought a new house, the Subject is They.
b. Finite

The second essential constituent of MOOD element is the Finite. Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 115) in Eggins (2004: 152) point out the Finite in terms of its function in the clause to make the proposition definite, to anchor the proposition in a way that we can argue about it. While Eggins (2004: 148) says that when the clause is used to exchange information, Halliday refers to it as proposition.

Furthermore, Halliday (1994) states that the finite element is one of a small number of verbal operators expressing tense (e.g. *is*, *has*) or modality (e.g. *can*, *must*).

Martin and Rose (2007: 228) say that finite is that part of a verbal group that realizes tense (past, present, and future), modality (probability, usuality, obligation, inclination, ability) and polarity (positive, negative).

For examples, in the clause *She does her job well*, the Finite is *does*. And in the clause *They bought a new house*, the Finite is *did*. Specifically, the split of Finite from verb or verb phrase is shown in the following, where the Finite is italicized.

- Does = *does* + do
- Bought = *did* + buy
- Have gone = *have* + gone
- Study = *do* + study
- Can run = *can* + run
- Am listening = *am* + listening
2.1.3.2. Constituents of RESIDUE

Just as the MOOD component contains the two constituents of Subject and Finite, so the RESIDUE components contain a number of functional elements: a predicator, one or more complements, and any number of different types of Adjuncts.

a. Predicator

Eggins (2004: 155) states that the definition of the predicator, then, is that it fills the role of specifying the actual event, action or process being discussed. Moreover, Eggins (2004: 155) states that the Predicator is identified as being all the verbal elements of the clause after the single Finite element.

Halliday (1994: 78) states that the predicator is present in all non-elliptical major clauses, apart from certain clauses with verbs be and have. It is realized by a verbal group minus the temporal or modal operator.

For examples, in the clause She does her job well, the Predicator is do. In the clause They bought a new house, the Predicator is buy. Specifically, the split of verb or verb phrase from the Finite is shown in the following, where the Predicator is italicized.

- Does = does + do
- Bought = did + buy
- Have gone = have + gone
- Study = do + study
- Can run = can + run
- Am listening = am + listening
b. Complement

A second component of the RESIDUE is the Complement. Eggins (2004:157) states that a Complement is defined as a non-essential participant in the clause, a participant somehow affected by the main argument of the proposition. It is identified as an element within the RESIDUE that has the potential of being Subject. A complement can get to be Subject through the process of making the clause passive.

For examples, in the clause *She does her job well*, the Complement is *her job*. In the clause *They bought a new house*, the Complement is *a new house*. *her job* and *a new house* are the Complements in those clauses and have potential to become the Subjects like in the following clauses: *Her job is done well by her* and *A new house was bought by them*. And in the clause *Mr. Jones is a farmer*, *a farmer* functions as the Complement in systemic functional grammar, but does not have potential to become the subject.

c. Adjunct

The final constituents of the RESIDUE are Adjuncts. Eggins (2004: 158) states that Adjuncts can be defined as clause elements which contribute some additional (but non-essential) information to the clause. They can be identified as elements which do not have the potential to become Subject – i.e. they are not nominal elements, but are adverbial, or prepositional.

Halliday (1994: 79) says that an adjunct is an element that has not got the potential of being Subject. It is typically realized by an adverbial group or a prepositional phrase.
For examples, in the clause *She does her job well*, the Adjunct is *well*. And in the clause *They bought a new house last month*, the Adjunct is *last month*. In the clause *Actually, I can’t stand it*, the Adjunct is *Actually*.

In Eggins (2004:159) it is stated that we can differentiate between three broad classes of Adjuncts, according to whether their contribution to the clause is principally ideational, interpersonal, or textual. The different classes of Adjuncts are accorded different positions in the MOOD/RESIDUE analysis of the clause.

1) Adding ideational meaning: Circumstantial Adjuncts

Eggins (2004: 159) states that Circumstantial Adjuncts add ideational content to the clause, by expressing some circumstance relating to the process represented in the clause. Circumstantial meaning may refer to time (probed with *when*), place (*where*), cause (*why, what for*), matter (*about what*), accompaniment (*with whom*), beneficiary (*to whom*), agent (*by whom*). Here are some examples

- *They can’t do that these days*. The Adjunct is *these days*. (Time: when)
- *You read books for fun*. The Adjunct is *for fun*. (Cause: what for)
- *Henry James writes about women*. The Adjunct is *about women*. (Matter: of what, about what)
- *George was read the story by Simon*. The Adjunct is *by Simon* (Agent: by whom)

2) Adding interpersonal meaning: Modal Adjuncts

Eggins (2004: 159) states thatModal Adjuncts are clause constituents which add interpersonal meaning to the clause. That is, they add meanings which are somehow connected to the creation and maintenance of the dialogue.
They can do this either by impacting directly on the MOOD element (by adding some qualification to the Subject/Finite), or indirectly, by merely adding an expression of attitude by making an attempt to direct interaction itself. There are four main types of Modal Adjuncts:

a) Mood Adjuncts
b) Polarity Adjuncts
c) Comment Adjuncts
d) Vocative Adjuncts

While the first two act directly on the MOOD constituent, and therefore are shown as being MOOD elements, the second two act affect the clause as a whole and are therefore not included in either the MOOD or RESIDUE boxes. Each sub-class of Modal adjuncts will be considered briefly.

a) Mood Adjuncts

Based on Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 126-9) in Eggins (2004: 160), the following categories of items can be classified as Mood Adjuncts:

i) Expression of probability: e.g. perhaps, maybe, probably.
ii) Expression of usuality: e.g. sometimes, usually, always.
iii) Expression of intensification or minimization: e.g. really, absolutely, just, somewhat.
iv) Expression of presumption: e.g. evidently, presumably, obviously.
v) Expression of inclination: e.g. happily, willingly.
b) Polarity Adjuncts: Yes and No

Eggins (2004: 161) states that Yes and No, and their common conversational alternatives (yea, yep, na, nope, etc.) may function in two different ways:

i) As Polarity Adjuncts: when Yes or No are standing in for an ellipsed clause, they should be analyzed as Polarity Adjunct. Since in this role they are taking the place of an ellipsed MOOD constituent, polarity Adjuncts are classified as part of the MOOD constituent of the clause.

ii) As Textual Adjuncts: when Yes or No (or more typically yea or na’, occur in unstressed initial position, introducing a clause, they should be treated as continuity items and classified as Textual Adjuncts.

c) Comment Adjuncts

Eggins (2004: 161) states that While Mood and Polarity Adjuncts express meanings which are directly related to the arguable nub of the proposition (i.e. to the MOOD constituent), Comment Adjuncts function to express an assessment about the clause as a whole. (Or on the other hand, Comment Adjuncts do not belong to either MOOD constituent or RESIDUE constituent).

Comment Adjuncts typically occur in clause in initial position, or directly after the Subject, and are realized by adverbs. Halliday (1994: 49) identifies the following meanings as expressed by Comment Adjuncts:

- Admission:  
  \textit{frankly}

- Assertion:  
  \textit{honestly, really}
• How desirable: *luckily, hopefully*
• How constant: *tentatively, hopefully*
• How valid: *broadly speaking, generally*
• How sensible: *understandably, wisely*
• How expected: *as expected, amazingly*

d) Vocative Adjuncts

Eggins (2004: 162) states that Vocative Adjuncts function to control the discourse by designating a likely ‘next speaker’. They are identifiable as names, where the names are not functioning as Subjects or Complements, but are used to directly address the person named.

Like Comment Adjuncts, Vocative Adjuncts do not belong to either MOOD constituent or RESIDUE constituent, but affect the clause as a whole. They typically occur initially or finally.

3) Adding textual meaning: Textual Adjuncts

Eggins (2004: 162) says that textual meanings are meanings to do with the organization of the message itself. There are two main types of Textual Adjuncts: *Conjunctive Adjuncts, and Continuity Adjuncts.*

a) Conjunctive Adjuncts

Eggins (2004: 162) states that the Conjunctive type expressed by *cohesive conjunction*, function to provide linking relations between one sentence and another. They typically occur at the beginning of the sentence, but they can occur at other points. They express the logical meanings of elaboration, extension and enhancement. In written texts, Conjunctive
Adjuncts are words like *however, moreover, nevertheless,* and *in other words.* In conversation, the speakers often use more informal conjunctions, such as *so, like,* and *I mean.* Conjunctive Adjuncts belong neither in the MOOD constituent or RESIDUE constituent.

b) Continuity Adjuncts

The second category of Textual Adjuncts is Continuity Adjuncts. Eggins (2004: 164) states that this category includes the continuative and continuity items, particularly frequent in casual talk, such as *well, yea,* and *oh,* where these items occur to introduce a clause, and signal that a response to prior talk is about to be provided. Unlike the Conjunctive Adjuncts, no specific logical relation (i.e. of elaboration, extension, or enhancement) is expressed by a Continuity Adjunct. They merely signal that the speaker will be saying more. Again these Continuity Adjuncts do not belong either MOOD constituent or RESIDUE constituent.

Moreover Eggins (2004: 165) states that when *yes* or *no* (or more typically *yea* or *na*) occur in unstressed initial (or near-initial) position, introducing a clause, they should be treated as textual items and classified as Continuity Adjuncts. The function of *yes* or *no* in these situations is not primarily to express Polarity (which is expressed in the Finite) but to signal that the speaker has taken a turn and is about to declare his/her position, as in example: *Yea, I know.*
Of all the explanation about Adjuncts above, below is the summary of Adjuncts in the following table.

Table 2.4 Summary of Adjuncts (Eggins, 2004: 165)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Sub-type</th>
<th>Meanings</th>
<th>Class of item</th>
<th>Location in analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ideational</td>
<td>Circumstantial</td>
<td>time, manner, location, etc.</td>
<td>prepositional, phrase adverb</td>
<td>In RESIDUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood</td>
<td></td>
<td>intensity, probability, usuality, presumption</td>
<td>Adverb</td>
<td>In MOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarity</td>
<td></td>
<td>positive or negative speaker’s</td>
<td>yes/no (elliptical)</td>
<td>In MOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td>assessment of whole message</td>
<td>adverbial, prepositional, phrase</td>
<td>not in MOOD or RESIDUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocative</td>
<td></td>
<td>nominating next speaker</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>not in MOOD or RESIDUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual</td>
<td>Conjunctive</td>
<td>logical linking of messages</td>
<td>cohesive, conjunction</td>
<td>not in MOOD or RESIDUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity</td>
<td></td>
<td>messaging coming</td>
<td>minor clauses adverbs (yeah/nah)</td>
<td>not in MOOD or RESIDUE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.4. Major Clause and Minor Clause

Eggins (2004: 166) states that a major clause is a clause which has a MOOD component, even though that MOOD component may sometimes be ellipsed. Here are the examples of major clause:

- *Shakespeare writes ‘Romeo and Juliet’* (non-elliptical major clause)
- *Yes, he did* (elliptical major clause). Or in answer to question: *Did Shakespeaker write ‘Romeo and Juliet’?*
In addition, Eggins (2004: 166) states that minor clause are clauses which have never had a MOOD constituent, for example, *Oh dear!, Well!, Eh?,* and *OK.* Minor clauses are typically brief, but their brevity is not the result of ellipsis.

### 2.1.5. Polarity and Modality

Halliday (1994: 85) states that polarity is the choice between positive and negative, as in *is / isn’t, do / don’t.* Typically in English, polarity is expressed in the Finite element; each Finite verbal operator has two forms, one positive *is, was, has, can,* etc., the other negative *isn’t, wasn’t, hasn’t, can’t* (or *is not, cannot …*) etc.

Furhuremore Halliday (1994:85) says that the Finite element is inherently either positive or negative; its polarity does not figure as a separate constituent. It is true that the negative is realized as a distinct morpheme *n’t or not;* but this is an element in the structure of the verbal group, not in the structure of the clause.

However, the possibilities are not limited to a choice between *yes* and *no.* There are intermediate degrees: various kinds of indeterminacy that fall in between, like ‘sometimes’ or ‘maybe’. These intermediate degrees, between the positive and negative poles, are known collectively as Modality (Halliday, 1994: 86).

The structure of polar interrogatives involves the positioning of the Finite before the Subject. Therefore, the words which are used to make polar interrogatives are *be (am, is, are, was, were), do, does, did, have, has, had, can, could, will, would, shall, should, may, might, must,* and *ought to.* Below are the examples:

- *Are you coming?*
- *Does he live in Mexico?*
- *Shall we go now?*
- *Have you got a dictionary?
In those clauses above, the entire polar interrogative will function as the Finite and belong to the MOOD constituent.

2.1.5.1. Modalization

Eggins (2004: 174) states that modalization is the expression of the speaker’s attitude towards what s/he’s saying. It is the way the speaker gets into the text, expressing a judgment about the certainty, likelihood of frequency of something happening or being.

Moreover Eggins (2004:174) adds that speakers can make it (modalization) quite obvious that it is their judgment that is being expressed. Halliday points out that this can be done by using a particular type of Mood Adjunct: I reckon, I suppose, I’m sure, I think, It is possible that, It is probable that, It is certain that, It is stated that, It is found that, etc.

Mood adjunct like this are example of what Halliday calls ‘grammatical metaphor’, in this case ‘metaphors of modality’ (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2004: 626-630). We can see that this clause is in fact functioning metaphorically as Adjunct by applying tag test. When we tag I think she’s gonna be late again, we do not pick up don’t I (which would indicate that the Subject of the clause is I), but instead isn’t she, indicating that the grammatical Subject is in fact she, and the I of I think is functioning as an Adjunct to the clause: I think she’s gonna be late again, isn’t she? (not don’t I).
2.1.6. WH-interrogatives

Eggsins (2004:168) says that, in a WH-interrogative, we need to recognize the presence of a WH element. WH element is always conflated or fused with another element of clause structure. It may be conflated with the Subject, the Complement, or a Circumstantial Adjunct, and is shown as a constituent of the MOOD or RESIDUE according to the status the element with which is conflated.

a. WH element conflated with Subject (part of MOOD)
   • e.g. *Who* wrote ‘Romeo and Juliet’? (*Who* functions as Subject)

b. WH element conflated with Complement (part of RESIDUE)
   • e.g. *What* do you mean? (*What* functions as Complement)

c. WH element conflated with Circumstantial Adjunct (part of RESIDUE)
   • e.g. *When* did he buy a new car? (*When* functions as WH/Adjunct Circumstantial)

2.1.7. Exclamatives

Exclamative structures, which are used in interaction to express emotions such as surprise, disgust, worry, etc., are a blend of interrogative and declarative patterns (Eggsins, 2004: 171). Like the WH-interrogatives, they require the presence of a WH element, conflated with either a Complement or an Adjunct.

a. WH conflated with a Complement (part of RESIDUE)
   • *What a great writer* Shakespeare was! (*What a great writer* function as WH/Complement)
b. WH conflated with Attributive Complement (part of RESIDUE)
   • *How amazing he was!* (*How amazing* function as WH/Attributive)

c. WH conflated with an Adjunct (part of RESIDUE)
   • *How fantastically Shakespeare wrote!* (*How fantastically* function as
     WH/Adjunct: Circumstantial)

2.2. Review of Related Literature

In this part, the writer took some scientific researches which relate to this
study and give some contribution to this study.

1. Rosmery Salinovita Munthe (1995) with the thesis title ‘An Analysis of
   Circumstantial Element in ‘The Three Fat Women of Antibes by W.S. Maugham’.

   The writer of the thesis above formulated the main problems as follows:
   (1) What is Systemic Linguistic in particular circumstantial element as one of the
       three components in the process? (2) What is the experiential meaning of
       circumstantial element in a text? and (3) What is the identification of the
       circumstantial element in a text? The theory used in that thesis is Halliday’s
       theory. The method of research is the library research (qualitative method). The
       result of the thesis is that the analysis of the circumstantial element is found more
       in written text than spoken one. This is because written text tends to be longer
       and more various than the spoken one.

   The contribution from this thesis to the writer’s is that this thesis helps
   the writer to find some theories dealing with Systemic Functional Linguistic, it is
   Halliday’s theory. The difference of the thesis to the writer’s is that this thesis
contains the analysis of the circumstantial element (ideational meaning), while the writer’s contains the analysis of the interpersonal meaning.


The writer of the thesis above formulated the main problems as follows: (1) What type of cohesion is used in Female magazine advertisement? (2) What cohesion subtype is used in Female magazine advertisement? and (3) What is the function of cohesion in Female magazine advertisement? The theory used in the thesis is Schiffrin’s theory, and Halliday and Hasan’s theory. The method of research is descriptive qualitative method. The result of the thesis is that from ten cosmetic text advertisements in Female magazine, it is found that there are some cohesive devices, they are reference: personal, demonstrative, and comparative; ellipsis: nominal ellipsis; conjunction: additive conjunction; and lexical cohesion: reiteration and collocation.

The contribution from this thesis to the writer’s is that this thesis helps the writer especially in analyzing the data. The difference of the thesis to the writer’s is that this thesis contains the analysis of cohesion, while the writer’s contains the analysis of the interpersonal meaning.


The theory used in the thesis is Halliday and Hasan’s theory, and Firth’s theory. The method of research is the library research (qualitative method). The result of the thesis is that the writer of the thesis tried to analyze whether the five kinds of cohesion: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical
cohesion are existed in the discourse (a short story by Anton P. “Hello” in a magazine).

The contribution from this thesis to the writer’s is that this thesis helps the writer to find some theories dealing with Systemic Functional Linguistic, it is Halliday’s theory. The difference of the thesis to the writer’s is that this thesis contains the analysis of cohesion, while the writer’s contains the analysis of the interpersonal meaning.


The writer of the thesis above formulated the main problems as follows: (1) What experiential functions are in Reader’s Digest Magazine’s Selected Articles? and (2) Which function is the most frequent in Reader’s Digest Magazine’s Selected Articles? The theory used in the thesis is Halliday and Hasan’s theory and Kress’s and Stillar’s theory. The method of research is the library research (qualitative method). The result of the thesis is the writer found six function of experiential in the monthly American magazine, Reader’s Digest edition 2007. She found that material function is the most existed in the analysis and dominates with percentage 57.04%, the relational function follows with percentage 16.55%, then other functions with the same percentage 11.97%, they are verbal function and mental function.

The contribution from this thesis to the writer’s is that this thesis helps the writer to find some theories dealing with Systemic Functional Linguistic, it is Halliday’s theory. The difference of the thesis to the writer’s is that this thesis contains the analysis of experiential functions, while the writer’s contains the analysis of the interpersonal meaning.
The writer found that those scientific researches above study about the discourse analysis generally and that they helped the writer in supporting the research either in theory concepts or the method of research and those researches also give the writer more understanding to complete this study.