CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Theoretical Framework

These related theories are the basic in collecting and analyzing any information related to cohesive devices in the Qur'anic translation text of *Surah Yasin*. These steps are important before discussing further about the research problem. In this part the writer would like to review the theories related to the topic of the study. These theories include the concept of discourse competence, cohesion, cohesive device, and reference. All of the theories are given explanations and examples which are able to support them.

2.1.1 Discourse Competence

Discourse refers to the set of norms, preferences, and expectations relating language to context, which language users draw on and modify in producing and making sense out of language context. Discourse knowledge allows language users to produce and interpret discourse structures such us verbal act (e.g. request, offers), conversational sequence (such us question-answer), activities (such us storytelling, and arguing), and communicative style (such us woman's speech) (Ochs & Bambi. 1979:1). It means that discourse relate to speech or piece of writing which makes the language user produces discourse through verbal act, conversation or communication. Blakemore (1987) describes

7

discourse as the linguistic form of the utterance, contextual assumptions and the assumption that the speaker is being relevant (Blakemore. 1987:44)

Discourse competence is the ability to create and maintain social identities and relationships through language. Discourse competence involves the ability to built context through linguistic structures. Children and other acquires come to understand that a single structure or a set of structures may, in the same moment of use, build a multitude of context, a type of affect, a social act and a social identity. Acquirers also come to understand that context are built sequentially and develop the competence to create and interpret language activities through ordered acts and expressed stances. (Ochs & Bambi. 1979:6)

Martin, Perez has the view that the communicative competence is defined as the knowledge which enables us to use language as a communication device in a give social context, it is a dynamic concept based on the negotiation of meanings among interlocutors, which can be applied either to written or spoken modes of communication (Martin, Perez. 1996:316). Canale and Swain took up this notion of communicative competence and distinguished four aspects of communicative competence:

8

a. *Grammatical/linguistic* competence, which includes knowledge of the lexicon, syntax and semantics (mastery of language codes).

b. *Sociolinguistic* competence, concerned with the appropriateness of communication depending on the context including the participants and the rules for interaction.

c. *Strategic* competence, a set of strategies devised for effective communication and put into use when communication breaks down (grammatical and sociolinguistic strategies).

d. *Discourse* competence, which is concerned with the cohesion and coherence of utterances/sentences (Canale& Swain. 1980:10).

Discourse Competence can be seen as the ability to understand, create and develop forms of the language that are longer than sentences (stories, conversations, letters, and others) with the appropriate cohesion, coherence and rhetorical organization to combine ideas.

2.1.2 Text

Text is the verbal record of the communicative event. (Brown & Yule. 1983:190) It means that text is relating to words to keep a permanent account which obtained from speaking. Actually, text not only speaking but also it can be writing. According to Halliday&Hasan, the word text is used in linguistic to refer to any passage, spoken, or written, of whatever length, that does form a unified whole. A text may

9

be spoken or written, prose or verse, dialogue or monologue. It may be anything from single proverb to whole play, from a momentary cry for help to an all-day discussion on a committee. A text is unit of language in use (Halliday&Hasan, 1976:1)

The word "text" refers to any instance of languages, and someone can produce a text through spoken or written. Text, whether spoken or written, is a semantic and pragmatic unit, but sentence is considered a grammatical unit (Quirk, 1985: 142). So, it means that text is unit of language in use, it is not lexico-grammatical unit like clause or sentence and it is not defined by size. Actually, we can't count that a text has two or three sentences. A text does not consist of sentence, it is realized by, or encoded in sentences.

All text have texture, and this is distinguishes them from what is not text. Crane (2000: 1) stated that texture is the basis for unity and semantic interdependence within text and a text without texture would just be a group of isolated sentences with no relationship to one another.

2.1.3 Cohesion

Cohesive is one of criteria in making a sequence of sentence which constitute in a text.The concept of "cohesion" was introduced by Halliday and Hasan (1976), whose major concern is to investigate how sentences are linked in a text. A text has texture, and this is what distinguishes it from something that is not a text. If a passage of English

10

containing more than one sentence is perceived as a text, there will be certain linguistic features present in that passage which can be identified as contributing to its total unity and giving it texture (Halliday&Hasan. 1976:2).

The concept of cohesion is a semantic one; it refers to relation of meaning that exist within the text, and that define it as a text. Cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another (Halliday&Hasan. 1976:4). It means that cohesion is connection of whole meaning within text. Cohesion also includes comprehend meaning which compose a relation with a text to make it understanding. Halliday and Hasan (1976) explicitly state that cohesion does not concern what a text means; it concerns how the text is constructed as a semantic edifice (Halliday&Hasan. 1976:21) That is, although cohesion usually plays a role in a paragraph, it does not lead to the global flow of a text across paragraphs.

2.1.4 Cohesive Device

Millward in Muslimah's thesis (2007:13) says that cohesive devices are certain words or phrases and their location within the discourse will activate a set of assumptions to the meaning of what has gone beforehand or will generate a set of expectations to what may follow. Halliday and Hasan (1976:5) have divided cohesive devices into five:

11

a) Reference, Halliday and Hasan (1976:31) state that reference is the specific nature of the information that is signaled for retrieval.

b) Subtitution, Renkema (2004:101) explains that substitution is the replacement of a word (group) or sentence segment by a "dummy" word. Dummy word here is another word that still has the same meaning. This means there is no omitted within the text but the writer change it with another word which has relation to the previously.

c) Ellipsis, according to Halliday and Hasan (1976:142), ellipsis is something left unsaid. The word "unsaid" here means that the omission a word or phrase in the text.

d) Conjunction, Halliday and Hasan (1976: 320) state that there are a number of possible ways in which the systems allow for the parts of a text to be connected to one another in meaning.

e) Lexical cohesion, Halliday and Hasan (1976: 274) state that Lexical cohesion refers to the cohesive effect achieved by the selection of vocabulary.

2.1.5 Reference

Lyons (1968: 404) says that the relationship which holds between words and thing is the relationship of reference: word refer to thing. Brown, Gillian and George Yule (1983: 28) reference is treated as an action to the part of the speaker/written. In the following conversational

12

fragment, we shall say, for example, that speaker A uses the expressions *my uncle* and *he* to refer to one individual and *my mother's sister* and *she* to refer to another. We will not, for example, say that *he* 'refers to' *my uncle.*

A: my uncle's coming home from Canada on Sunday +

He's due in +

B: how long has he been away for or has just been away?

A: Oh no they lived in Canada eh he was married to my mother's sister ++ well she's been dead for a number of years now.

There are three main types of cohesive references: personal, demonstrative, and comparative.

- Personal Reference

Personal reference is reference by means of function in the speech situation, through the category of person (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 37). The personal category includes the three classes of personal pronouns, possessive determiners usually called possessive adjectives and possessive pronouns (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 43). The items of the reference are as follows:

Table 2.1 Personal Reference

Function Class		Determinative	Possessive	
Singular	Masculine	He/ him	His	His
	Feminine	She/ her	Hers	Her

13

	Neuter	It	Its	Its
Plural		They/ them	Theirs	Their

(Halliday, 1985: 295)

The following example is Alice's conversation with the flowers:

- *"Aren't you sometimes frightened at being planted out here, with nobody to take care of you?"*

- *"There's the tree in the middle," said the Rose. "What else is <u>it</u> good for?"*

- *"But what could <u>**it**</u> do, if danger came?" Alice asked.*

- *"<u>**It**</u> could bark," said the Rose.*

- *"It says 'Bough-wough!'" cried a Daisy: "that's why <u>**its**</u> branches are called boughs!"* (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 48).

- Demonstrative Reference

    Demonstrative reference is reference by means of location, on a scale of proximity (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 37). Demonstrative reference is essentially a form of verbal pointing. The speaker identifies the referent by locating it on a scale of proximity.

Table 2.2 Demonstrative Reference

Specific	Near	This/ these	This/ these	Here (now)
	Remote	That/ those	That/ those	There (then)
Non-		it	The	

14

specific				

(Halliday, 1985: 295)

The circumstantial (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. The nominal demonstrative *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 (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 57-58). Look at the example below:

- "I like the lions, and I like the polar bears. ***These***are my favorites."

- "***Those*** are my favorites too." (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 60).

These and *Those* in the example above are the demonstrative references of the lions and the bears.

- Comparative Reference

Comparative reference is indirect reference by means of identity or similarity (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 37).

Table 2.3 ComparativeReference

Function	Deictic/	Ephitet	Adjunct/

15

Class		numerative		submodifier
General	Identity	Same, equal, identical, etc.		Identically, (just) as etc.
	Similarity	Similar, additional, etc.	Such	So, likewise, similarly etc.
	Difference	Other, different, etc.		Otherwise, else, differently etc.
Particular		More, fewer, less, further, etc; so, as, etc; + numeral	Bigger etc.; so, as, more less etc. + adjective	Better etc.; so, as, more less etc. + adverb

(Halliday and Hasan, 1985: 295)

General comparison is a comparison that is simplified in terms of likeness and unlikeness, without respect to any particular property: two things may be the same, similar or different ('different' includes both 'not the same' and; not similar'). Meanwhile particular comparison means comparison in respect to quantity or quality. For example:

- *There were twice **as many people there as** last time.*

- *He's a **better** man than I am.*

- *There are **more** things in heaven and earth, Horatio, **than** are dreamt of in your philosophy.* (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 82)

16

First example is comparison of quantity, with numeral as comparison and (the people who were there) *last time* as referent. Second example is quality, with an epithet as the comparison and *I* as referent. In third example, the referent is (the things that) *are dreamt of in your philosophy;* the comparison is again quantity.

Reference also divided into three parts:

a) Homophoric reference: the identity of a presuming item can be retrieved from the general context of culture.

   For example:

   - How hot **the sun** is today!

     (We all know which sun we are talking about, the specific sun of our solar system)

b) Exophoric reference: the identity of a presuming item can be retrieved from the immediate context of situation.

   For example:

   - Put **it** down next to **her**, please.

     (If you are in the same place and in the same time, you are able to decode the *it* and the *her*)

c) Endophoric reference: the identity of a presuming item can be retrieved from elsewhere within the text itself. The identity of the participant has been given at an earlier point in the text:

   For example:

17

She was called Mary by her parents

(the identity of the female participant identified as *she* has been revealed somewhere before in the text)

In Endophoric also divided into:

- Anaphoric reference: this occurs when the referent has appeared at an earlier point in the text.

- Cataphoric reference: this occurs when the referent has not yet appeared, but will be provided subsequently (Halliday&Hasan, 1976:60-63)

2.2 Review of Related Studies

There were several similar studies or research about cohesive device in some of text. The first research was conduct by Tarsidasari (2014), which entitled "Cohesive Device Used in The Headline of The Jakarta Post." There were seven articles, which analyzed in this study. In this research identified and derived the types of cohesive devices dominantly used in headline news of the Jakarta Post. She used descriptive method and the result showed that the most dominant type of cohesive devices was conjunction because she would like to connect ideas within the text to make its readers easy to understand.

The second research was conduct by Ilyas, Asim Ismail (2014) which entitled "Cohesive Devices in the Short *Surahs* of the Glorious Quran." This study tackled cohesive devices in the short *Surahs* of the Glorious Quran which connected sentence or text relations that contribute to the text's unity

18

or texture beyond intra sentence relations or ties. The writer of this study was use qualitative method to analyze each *Surah*. The result of this research was the main cohesive devices in the short *Surah*s of the holy Quran were the sound unit, reference, repetition, conjunction, and synonymy. The least used devices were substitution, ellipsis, hyponym, and antonym.

The third research was conduct by Hatab, Wafa Abu (2003) which entitled "The Cohesive Role of Reference in Qur'anic Text." The study was confined to analyze the cohesive device in the following *Surahs*: Yunus, Hud, Yusuf, Ar-ra'd, and Ibrahim. It dealt with the distribution and frequency of personal, demonstrative, and comparative reference on the discourse level. The result of this research showed that personal reference was the most frequent than comparative and demonstrative reference in all *Surahs* which have to be analyzed.

The fourth research was conduct by Abdurrahman, Nur Aziz (2013) which entitled "Grammatical Cohesion Analysis of Student's Thesis Writing." This research aimed to find out types of grammatical cohesive devices students mostly used in their thesis writing and how these devices create cohesive discourse. In this study, researcher applied descriptive case study as form of research. The result of the research was the students were more familiar with the use of reference although they were able to use other type of grammatical cohesive devices as well.

The fifth research was conduct by Tangkiengsirisin, Supong(2014) which entitled "Cohesion and Coherence in A Text."This paper presented

various pointed of view regarding cohesion and coherence in text and provided a review of research studies on cohesion and coherence in writing. The result of the research showed differences in the frequencies of grammatical cohesive devices in good versus poor essays.

The sixth research was conduct by Sunarto (2014) which entitled "Study of Cohesive Device in The Article of Newsweek Magazine." This study was discuss about cohesive device in some articles in *Newsweek* Magazine, and the writer used qualitative approach because the fact that the data collected were in the form of words. The finding showed that cohesive devices used grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion.

Overall, the researches analyzed cohesive device in several texts such us in news paper, magazine, kinds of *Surahs* in Al Qur'an, and analyzed cohesive device in student's thesis writing. From those researches can conclude that most of Surah in Qur'an text used more personal reference than comparative and demonstrative reference. In Qur'an text also there were many repetition, conjunction, and synonymy, whereas in a news paper, the most dominant type of cohesive devices was conjunction, it was different with one of magazine which has been analyzed by Sunarto (2014), that showed grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion such us reference, ellipsis, substitution, conjunction, reiteration, and collocation. It different with Abdurrahman (2013), he analyzed cohesive device in student's thesis writing, which showed that reference as the dominant in their writings.