



Rencana Nasional Bahasa & Sastra
SENABASTRA

Universitas Trunojoyo Madura
1 April 2016

Prosiding



Penyunting: Anandita Kusuma & Nurul
SENABASTRA
Prodi Sastra Inggris
Universitas Trunojoyo Madura

Prodi Sastra Inggris
Universitas Trunojoyo Madura

Prosiding

Seminar Nasional Bahasa & Sastra

SENABASTRA | 8

978 - 602 - 18506 - 1 - 9



ISBN 978-602-18506-1-9

Editor

Diah Ikawati A., SS., M.Pd
Iqbal Nurul Azhar, SS., M. Hum
Erika Citra Sari H., SS., M. Hum

Tim Seleksi

Tim Senabastra | 8

Layout

Tim Senabastra | 8

Desain Sampul

Tim Senabastra | 8

Hak cipta dilindungi undang-undang
All rights reserved

Cetakan I, Juni 2016

Diterbitkan oleh



Prodi Sastra Inggris

Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Budaya
Universitas Trunojoyo Madura

Jl Raya Telang No. 2 Telang, Kamal, Bangkalan, Jawa Timur. 69162
www.sasing.trunojoyo.ac.id | sasing@trunojoyo.ac.id

Bahasa Jerman sebagai Bahasa Plurisentris Iwa Sobara	110
Bahasa dan Kekuasaan (Perspektif Analisis Wacana Kritis) Mujianto	115
Bahasa Indonesia Kekinian di Era Teknologi Komunikasi Nani Sunarni	121
Development of Language Used in A Puppet Show: A Study of Code Switching Nita Suryawati	127
Tindak Tutur Memuji oleh Guru Perempuan dalam Interaksi Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia Pandu Meidian Pratama, Gamal Kusuma Zamahsari	137
Rhetorical Features in Research Article Abstracts Written By Non-Native English-Speaking Novice Researchers Rita Darmayanti	147
Bahasa Kontemporer: Syurga atau Neraka? Rozali Jauhari Alfanani, Nursyahidah, Abdul Nasip	151
Are We Really Equal? : Questioning Gender Equality and The Gender Ideology of the Representation of Male and Female in Thematic English Text Books Published by The Ministry of National Education, A Critical Discourse Analysis Sabta Diana	156
Pemertahanan Bahasa Daerah oleh Masyarakat Suku Madura di Yogyakarta Sigit Arba'i	165
Dispreferred Response in <i>Journey 2: The Mysterious Island</i> Movie Nur Mufidah, Diah Ikawati A.	173
Cohesive Analysis of Chaterine Mansfield's <i>The Fly</i> Rosyida Ekawati	180
Antroponim sebagai Cerminan Identitas Bangsa Susi Machdalena	186
Sikap Bahasa Para Guru Bidang Studi Nonbahasa Indonesia di Jawa Timur terhadap Bahasa Indonesia Yani Paryono	190

COHESION ANALYSIS OF KATHERINE MANSFIELD'S *THE FLY*

Rosyida Ekawati

English Department – Faculty of Social and Cultural Sciences
University of Trunojoyo Madura

Abstract: This study deals with the cohesion analysis of the opening of the short story. It is from the view of reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesions. It is a descriptive qualitative research. The data are the opening of Catherine Mansfield's short story entitled *The Fly*. The opening of the story gives the introduction and clear background of the story so that it is better to make an analysis on it. By analyzing the short story from the point of view of cohesion, is expected to help us understand how the function of cohesion in the text to understand the overall structure of the work as a whole text. From the analysis it is found that the story uses cohesive ties in form of reference, substitution, conjunction and lexical cohesion. There is no ellipsis used in the text. The absence of elliptical form in the text profoundly provides no questionable the omitted materials but the fixed and clear one.

Keywords: Grammatical, Lexical, Cohesion, *The Fly*

INTRODUCTION

Analyzing texts of any kind is a very useful method for the aim of describing language functions. When we speak of a text, we speak of any passage, spoken or written, of whatever length, that forms a unified whole. The question that is put first is what is a text and what is not, what are the features that distinguish text from a collection of unrelated sentences. Halliday defines text as any authentic stretch of written or spoken language. Beyond the grammar and lexis of language, understanding the mechanisms for how text is structured is the basis for his work. Halliday also adds that every text has a texture. 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

A text derives this texture from the fact that it functions as a unity with respect to its environment. There are certain linguistic features that contribute to textual unity. Apart from other concepts this fact is described by the concept of cohesion. The concept of cohesion is a semantic one; it refers to relations 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.

The common view that a literary text is likely to be comprehended better if it is studied in parallel with stylistic analysis which emphasizes the crucial role of the linguistic features of the text contributes much to the development of literary criticism. Halliday is one of the text linguists who sees grammar as a network of systems of relationships which account for all the semantically relevant choices in language, which is the standpoint of the stylistic analysis as well.

In the light of Halliday's discipline, the study analyzes a piece of literary text written by Katherine Mansfield in the format of a short story entitled *The Fly* and try to criticize the text objectively in relation to its cohesion features, particularly the opening part of the short story. By analyzing the short story from cohesion point of view, it is hoped to help us understanding how cohesion functions within text in order to understand the overall structure of the work as a whole text. From the previous background, the objectives of this study are: a) to identify the cohesive devices used in the text leads to the wholeness of the text in order it will be easier to comprehend the text; b) to explain the function of the element of cohesive devices in the text; c) to provide an alternative way in understanding and comprehending literary text, especially short story.

STUDY FRAMEWORK

Before examining the cohesive ties in the short story it is necessary to have a general understanding of cohesion and its function in texts. Baker (1992) states that cohesion is the network of lexical, grammatical, and other relations which provide links between various parts of a text. These relations or ties organize and, to some extent create a text, for instance by requiring the reader to interpret words and expressions by reference to other words and expressions in the surrounding sentences and paragraphs. Cohesion is a surface relation; it connects together the actual words or expressions that we can see or hear.

Normally, we can recognize a text as a sentence or a group of sentences because we can see a clear relationship of ideas unfolding. For example: *Wash and core six cooking apples. Put them into a fireproof dish.* This text is coherent because *them* in the second sentence clearly refers back to *apples* in the first. By itself, either sentence would not mean the same as they do together, and, in fact, the second sentence without its contextual reference would not make much sense.

While a text may be of any length, it is normally longer than one sentence. Such things as public notices and slogans, however, may be only a short phrase: a) *No smoking,* and b) *Site of an early chapel.* The cohesive relationships between words and sentences in both sentences have certain definable qualities that allow us to recognize reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction, and lexical cohesion as well.

Halliday and Hasan elaborate five types of cohesive devices in English and in the lexicogrammatical system of the language. They are reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. Reference, substitution, and ellipsis are grammatical; lexical cohesion is lexical; conjunction stands on the border line between the two categories. In other words, it is mainly grammatical but sometimes involves lexical selection.

a. Reference

Referencing functions to retrieve presupposed information in text and must be identifiable for it to be considered as cohesive. In written text, referencing indicates how the writer introduces participants and keeps track of them throughout the text. There are three general types of referencing: exophoric referencing, which refers to information from the immediate context of situation, and endophoric referencing, which refers to information that can be “retrieved” from within the text. It is this endophoric referencing which is the focus of cohesion theory. Endophoric referencing can be divided into three areas: anaphoric, cataphoric, and exophoric. Anaphoric refers to any reference that “points backwards” to previously mentioned information in text. Cataphoric refers to any reference that “points forward” to information that will be presented later in the text. Exophoric refers to any reference within the same nominal group or phrase which follows the presupposed item. For cohesive purposes, anaphoric referencing is the most relevant as it provides a link with a previous portion of the text (Halliday and Hasan, 1976). Functionally speaking, there are three main types of cohesive references: personal, demonstrative, and comparative. Personal reference keeps track of function through the speech situation using noun pronouns like “he, him, she, her”, etc. and possessive determiners like “mine, yours, his, hers”, etc. Demonstrative reference keeps track of information through location using proximity references like “this, these, that, those, here, there, then, and the”. Comparative reference keeps track of identity and similarity through indirect references using adjectives like “same, equal, similar, different, else, better, more”, etc. and adverbs like “so, such, similarly, otherwise, so, more”, etc. (Halliday and Hasan, 1976).

b. Substitution and Ellipsis

Whereas referencing functions to link semantic meanings within text, substitution and ellipsis differs in that it operates as a linguistic link at the lexicogrammatical level. In Bloor and Bloor (1995), substitution and ellipsis is used when “a speaker or writer wishes to avoid the repetition of a lexical item and is able to draw on one of the grammatical resources of the language to replace the item”. Ellipsis is a cover-term for a number of linguistic phenomena where a sentence lacks material that would normally be obligatory and the missing material is nevertheless semantically recoverable from the local syntactic or semantic context (Collins & Parker, 2014). The three types of classification for substitution and ellipsis:

nominal, verbal and clausal, reflect its grammatical function. When something in text is being substituted, it follows that the substituted item maintains the same structural function as the presupposed item. In nominal substitution, the most typical substitution words are “one and ones” and they substitute nouns. In verbal substitution, the most common substitute is the verb “do” and is sometimes used in conjunction with “so” as in “do so” and substitute verbs. Halliday and Hasan (1976) point out that “do” often operates with the reference items “it” and “that” but still have the main function as a verbal substitute because of its grammatical role. In clausal substitution, an entire clause is substituted and though it may seem to be similar to either nominal or verbal substitution, the difference is the presupposed anaphoric reference. Though substitution and ellipsis are similar in their function as the linguistic link for cohesion, ellipsis differs in that it is “substitution by zero. Ellipsis refers to a presupposed anaphoric item although the reference is not through a “place-marker” like in substitution. The presupposed item is understood through its structural link. As it is a structural link, ellipsis operates through nominal, verbal and clausal levels. Halliday and Hasan further classify ellipsis in systemic linguistic terminology as deictic, numerative, epithet, classifier, and qualifier.

c. Conjunction

Conjunction, as described by Bloor and Bloor (1995: 98) acts as a “cohesive tie between clauses or sections of text in such a way as to demonstrate a meaningful pattern between them”, though Halliday and Hasan (1976) indicate that “conjunctive relations are not tied to any particular sequence in the expression”. Therefore, amongst the cohesion forming devices within text, conjunction is the least directly identifiable relation. Conjunction acts as a semantic cohesive tie within text in four categories: additive, adversative, causal and temporal. Additive conjunction acts to structurally coordinate or link by adding to the presupposed item and are signaled through “and, also, too, furthermore, additionally”, etc. Additive conjunction may also act to negate the presupposed item and is signaled by “nor, and...not, either, neither”, etc. Adversative conjunctions act to indicate “contrary to expectation” and are signaled by “yet, though, only, but, in fact, rather”, etc. Causal conjunction expresses “result, reason and purpose” and is signaled by “so, then, for, because, for this reason, as a result, in this respect, etc.”. The last conjunctive category is temporal and links by signaling sequence or time. Some sample temporal conjunctive signals are “then, next, after that, next day, until then, at the same time, at this point”, etc.

d. Lexical cohesion

Lexical cohesion differs from the other cohesive elements in text in that it is non-grammatical. Lexical cohesion refers to the “cohesive effect achieved by the selection of vocabulary” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). The two basic categories of lexical cohesion are reiteration and collocation. Reiteration pertains to the repetition of a lexical item, either directly or through the use of a synonym, a superordinate or a generally related word. Collocation pertains to lexical items that are likely to be found together within the same text. Collocation occurs when a pair of words are not necessarily dependent upon the same semantic relationship but rather they tend to occur within the same lexical environment (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). The closer lexical items are to each other between sentences, the stronger the cohesive effect.

A group of words is *lexically cohesive* when all of the words are semantically related; for example, when they all concern the same topic. Lexical cohesion can also form relational patterns in text in a way that links sentences to create an overall feature of coherence with the audience, sometimes overlapping with other cohesion features. Lexical cohesion concerns such features as [synonymy](#), [antonymy](#), [metonymy](#), [collocation](#), repetition.

METHODOLOGY

It is a descriptive qualitative research. It is interpretation of the data from the perspective of cohesion theory proposed by Halliday. The data are the opening of Catherine Mansfield’s short story entitled *The Fly*. The opening of the story gives the introduction and clear background of the story so that it is better to make an analysis on it. The data are analyzed through cohesion analysis proposed by Halliday in form of analysis of reference, analysis of ellipsis, analysis of substitution, analysis of conjunction, and analysis of lexical cohesion as well.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The opening of the short story

(1) "Y'are very snug in here," piped old Mr. Woodifield, and he peered out of the great, green leather armchair by his friend, the boss's desk, as a baby peers out of its pram. (2) His talk was over, it was time for him to be off. (3) But he did not want to go. (4) Since he had retired, since his...stroke, the wife and the girls kept him boxed up in the house every day of the week except Tuesday. (5) On Tuesday he was dressed up and brushed and allowed to cut back to the city for the day. (6) Though what he did there the wife and girls couldn't imagine. (7) Made a nuisance of himself to his friends, they supposed...(8) Well, perhaps so. (9) All the same, we cling to our last pleasures as the tree clings to its last leaves. (10) So there sat old Woodifield, smoking a cigar and staring almost greedily at the boss, who rolled in his office chair, stout, rosy, five years older than he, and still going strong, still at the helm. (11) It did one good to see him.

Analysis of Reference

In this short story, there are more pronominal forms acting as tie across sentences. In sentence (1), "Y'are very snug in here," *Y* (*You*) as the personal pronoun for the boss. It refers forward cataphorically to the boss mentioned later on. In the next clause, there is personal pronoun. This *he* refers back anaphorically to Mr. Woodifield mentioned before. Then, there is possessive adjective *his* which also refers back anaphorically to Mr. Woodifield. While in the last clause of this sentence, there is also possessive adjective *its* which refers back anaphorically to *baby* mentioned before.

In sentence (2), we are introduced to *his* and *him*. Both refer to Mr. Woodifield, not to the boss because there is no reference to the boss. We are introduced also to *it*. The *it* in this sentence can refer to the talk that was over. In sentence (3), personal pronoun *he* occurs. It refers also to Mr. Woodifield that actually mentioned in the first sentence. In sentence (4), there are personal pronoun as subject *he*, possessive adjective *his*, and personal pronoun as object *him*. All are clear reference to Mr. Woodifield and provide one obvious way in which this sentence is tied to the previous sentences. In sentence (5), there is only one personal pronoun as subject *he* which is also refers back anaphorically to Mr. Woodifield in sentence (1).

In addition, in sentence (6), the personal pronoun *he* is a clear reference to Mr. Woodifield, too. It is tied to the previous sentences. The *there* refers to the city in the previous sentence. Meanwhile, in sentence (7), the reflexive pronoun *himself* and possessive adjective *his* also clear reference back to Mr. Woodifield. There are no other references aside from Mr. Woodifield mentioned before or later on. This sentence is tied to the previous sentence. Besides, there is also personal pronoun *they*. As *they* is the personal pronoun as subject for plural, it is impossible a reference back to Mr. Woodifield. In the previous sentence, sentence (6), it is mentioned *the wife and the girls*. So that, the *they* here is a clear reference back to the wife and the girls, Mr. Woodifield's wife and Mr. Woodifield's daughters. In sentence (9), there appears personal pronoun as subject *we* and possessive adjective *our*. They seem to be exophoric reference. The *we* is actually used for first person plural. Another form of references in this sentence is possessive pronoun *its*. The *its* is an anaphoric reference to the tree comes earlier in the sentence.

Furthermore, in sentence (10), there are personal pronoun *his* followed by office. It makes a clear reference that the one who has the office is the boss. So that *his* here refers back anaphorically to the boss comes earlier in this sentence. Then, there is also personal pronoun *he* following the previous pronominal. Of course, *he* does not have the same reference as the previous pronominal form *his*, since there is a comparison form. Clearly, *he* has reference back to Mr. Woodifield. In sentence (11), at the beginning of the sentence there is *it*. The *it* can refer to the fact visiting the boss in his office is a good activity. Further, the personal pronoun as object *him* at the end of the sentence. The *him* refers back anaphorically to the boss, as it is said *good to see him*. The one who see someone is Mr. Woodifield, so that it is impossible if Mr. Woodifield sees himself. So that, the clear reference should be the boss to whom Mr. Woodifield is visiting.

From the analysis of reference, it is understood that the use of pronominal are often used. It can be said that pronominal here as the reference which is absent in the surface structure from the exact person referred to, means that with its reference being left open for contextual interpretations.

Analysis of Substitution

There is only one substitution form in this text, it is in sentence (8), 'Well, perhaps so'. It is assumed that *so* is a substitute for clause 'made a nuisance of himself to his friends' mentioned in the previous sentence. The *so* here occupies the same function as the item substitute for, though sometimes it embraces more than single function. The only one substitution used in the opening of Catherine Mansfield's *The Fly* make no open interpretation of the text. Substitution and ellipsis in this matter can be one of the constraints in understanding of content.

Analysis of Conjunction

In sentence (3), the sentence is started by coordinating conjunction *but*. *But* has a function to contrast, so that the coordinating conjunction *but* here in this sentence is to contrast between the statement in the previous sentence. Actually he has to be off at that time, but he does not. In sentence (4), there is subordinating conjunction *since*. *Since* joins a [subordinate clause](#) to a [main clause](#) in the sentence referring to time. In sentence (6), the subordinating conjunction *though* supplies concession for the main clause. In sentence (10), the coordinating conjunction *so* denotes equality of relationship between the ideas it join.

Analysis of Lexical Cohesion

There is repetition form of conjunction *since*. The repetition is for emphasizing the condition that Mr. Woodifield has retired because of his stroke.

There is also repetition of the same words *the wife* and *the girls*. Both refer to Mr. Woodifield's. The repetition makes clearer understanding and links between sentences. Another form of repetition is the name of the day, Tuesday. It is repeated twice in sentences (4) and sentence (5). It is assumed to make clear understanding that in that day, every Tuesday, Mr. Woodifield is freer than other days within the week. Only on Tuesday, he can enjoy his life because at that day, his wife did not keep him boxed up in the house but she allowed him to cut back to the city.

Repetition of *cling* and *last* in sentence (9) functions as comparison. Formal visit is usually done by Mr. Woodifield introduced by *dressed up*. He visits his friend in his office. So that he needs to be more formal than usual. *Armchair* and *desk* are under the same group of furniture. Friendship is shown by *piped* in which someone who greets his friend in that manner, commonly they are close friend and knowing each other. In this story, Mr. Woodifield visits his friend, perhaps, his former office mate or boss during his working period.

There are example of contrastive cohesion between Mr. Woodifield and the boss. This contrast can be an implicit social between Mr. Woodifield who is not working anymore because of his health. He had retired since his stroke, while the boss is still strong enough though he is older than Mr. Woodifield.

Happy and unhappy life of both characters involved is also the example contrastive cohesion. Happy life of the boss and unhappy life of Mr. Woodifield. The boss is *very snug* while Mr. Woodifield's wife kept him *boxed up* in the house.

Then, the jealousy is involved as theme. It is introduced by Mr. Woodifield's greeting to the boss shown in the first sentence '*Y are very snug in here*'. Such expression, particularly *snug* shows that Mr. Woodifield, in his life, is not as comfortable as the boss. Then, in sentence (10) '*there sat old Woodifield.*' shows that Mr. Woodifield is not happy in his life comparing to the boss who is stout, rosy, still going strong though he is 5 years older than he, and also he still at the helm. On the contrary, Mr. Woodifield is younger than the boss but he had retired and getting stroke.

CONCLUSION

In the short story, cohesion of the text is achieved through some cohesive devices. They are grammatical cohesion in the form of reference, substitution and conjunction. There is no ellipsis form, assumed that the writer wants to make clear description or understanding on the story. Besides, the cohesion of the text is also achieved through lexical cohesive devices. From the analysis of cohesion, it is simply to make the comprehensive view of understanding the text as a whole one.

REFERENCES

- Baker, M. (1992). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London: Routledge.
- Blake, N.F. 1990. *An Introduction to the Language of Literature*. Macmillan Education Ltd. Hampshire. London.
- Bloor, T. and Bloor, M. (1995). *The Functional Analysis of English* London, New York, etc: Arnold
- Colin, Phillips and Dan Parker. (2014). The Psycholinguistics of Ellipsis. *Lingua* 151(78-95). www.elsevier.com/locate/lingua
- Haliday, M.A.K. & Ruqaiya Hasan. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London. Longman Group. Ltd.
- Morris, Jane. & Hirst, Graeme. (1991). *Lexical Cohesion Computed by Thesaural Relations as an indicator of the Structure of Text*. www.portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=971740&dl=GUIDE
- Querol, Mercedes. (2005). *Substitution As a Device of Grammatical Cohesion in English Narrative and Its Translation into Spanish*. Jornades de Foment de la Investigació. Spanyol. Universitat Jaume.
- Tomeldan, Yolanda V. et all. (1986). *Prism. An Introduction to Literature*. National Book Store. Quezon City.