Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter is present the related theories in solving the problem of the research.

2.1 Previous Researches

There are some studies done to analyze reference of cohesive device in different kinds of analysis.

2.1.1 Azarizad and Tohidian (2012) stated that using cohesive devices, which referencing is one of them, helps the writer to keep the cohesion. Looking for the differences in the commonality of the existence of cataphora and anaphora, they are going to come up with the most prevalent type of referencing, in order to help students to write in the most common way.

Cataphora is usually defined as the referential relation in which the element referred to is anticipated by the referring element, usually a pronoun. Anaphora is a linguistic relation between two textual entities which is defined when a textual entity (the anaphor) refers to another entity of the text which usually occurs before (the antecedent).

Two English and Persian contemporary short stories have been waded through to discover the most common pattern in terms of using anaphora and cataphora referencing in English writing. Ten English narrative essays and ten Persian narrative essays have been analyzed too for the same purpose. In the end, the results tend to show that anaphoric referencing comparing to cataphoric one is more prevalent in Persian narratives comparing to English ones. Of course, if we consider the frequency of anaphoric and cataphoric referencing, anaphora is more common in both languages. However, it is more common in Persian, as we see rare samples of cataphoric referencing in Persian, while there are more samples of cataphoric referencing in English narratives.

2.1.2 Mokrani (2009) stated that this study is a textual contrastive analysis of English and Arabic. The focus is on reference as a cohesive device and the shifts that may occur when translating narrative due to differences in the grammatical systems of the source and target languages. It compares the translation strategies that translators use in transferring referential cohesion from an English literary text to its Arabic translation version. To achieve this aim, two paragraphs from an English novel have been translated by an experienced translator, and the two corpuses have been compared to show those shifts. The hypothesis is that the linking devices in English would be a lot more implicit in the target text than in the source one. This is because of the agglutinating and inflecting nature of the target text as compared to the source one. The results show that reference is utterly affected in the Arabic target text.

2.2 The Theory of The Research
2.2.1 Discourse

Discourse is commonly used in various senses, including (a) meaning-making as an element of the social process; (b) the language associated with a particular social field or practice (e.g. 'political discourse'); (c) a way of construing aspects of the world associated with a particular social perspective (e.g. a 'neo-liberal discourse of globalization') (Paul Gee and Handford, 2012:11).

A good discourse is defined with some factors, including cohesion or ties which exist within text. Cohesion is a syntactical organization, and is a 'container' where the sentences are arranged in harmony intensively to produce discourse" Tarigan in Ma'wa and Mirahayuni (2010:50).

2.2.2 Cohesion

Cohesion is promoted through focus and emphasis, it can also be achieved by a series of processes that establish explicit connections between clauses (Meyer, 2009:102). In the sentences *My brother is a doctor. He works at a nearby hospital* the pronoun *He* in the second sentence creates a cohesive link with the first sentence because it refers back to *My brother* in the first sentence (Meyer, 2009:223).

Renkema in Jambak & Gurning (2014:61) gives more explanation about cohesion with states that cohesion is the connections which desires result when the interpretation of textual element is dependent on another element in the text. This means that no part of text which does not have relationship with other parts and it occurs because of help of cohesive devices Jambak and Gurning (2014:61).

Cohesion can be categorized and based on the concern, some of which are the ones investigating the correlation of the number of cohesive devices with the writing quality as aforementioned Hananta and Sukyadi (2015:38). There are four cohesive resources that appear in all communicative modalities and are essentially grammatical in their forms: reference, ellipsis and substitution, conjunction and lexical cohesion Halliday in Baslova (2017:22).

There are two different types of cohesive relations: grammatical and lexical cohesion (Srihua & Wilawan, 2016:49). The table below presents the division of the types of cohesion:

Cohesion					
Grammatical Cohesion				Lexical Cohesion	
Reference	Exophoric [situational]		Reiteration	Repetition	
	Endophoric [textual]			Synonyms	
	Anaphoric [to preceding text]	Cataphoric [to following Text]		Superodinate	
Substitution				General word	
Ellipsis			Collocation		
Conjunction					

Tsareva in Srihua and Wilawan (2016:49)

2.2.3 Reference

According to Halliday and Hasan in Jabeen et al (2014:105) references in a text can be interpreted in relation to the whole context of the text or conversation. There are three general types of referencing: homophoric referencing, which refers to

shared information through the context of culture, 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 (Crane, 2006:133).

This implies the use of language to point to something (Akindel, 2011:101). Reference therefore has the ability to point to something within or outside a text (Akindel, 2011:101). Reference shows the connection between the real world and the entity, because of that it cannot refer to something that does not exist (Gorjian et al, 2015:17). Reference can be accounted as "exophoric" or "endophoric" functions. This is because simply when we refer to a given item, we expect the reader to interpret it by either looking forward, backward, or outward.

2.2.4 Endophora

Endophoric, instructing the hearer/reader to look inside the text to find what is being referred to by a particular form Buja (2010:265). The endophoric co-reference, in its turn, is of two types (Buja, 2010:265):

anaphoric: for the interpretation of a particular form, the hearer/reader has to look back in a text.

cataphoric: the hearer/reader has to look forward in the text in order to be able to interpret some forms.

Endoporhic relations are of two kinds: those which look back in the text for their interpretations, which Halliday and Hasan call anaphoric relations and those which look forward in the text for their interpretation, which are called cataphoric relations.

These relationships are exemplified in Brown and Yule (1983:192) :

A. Anaphoric : Look at the sun. It's going down quickly.

(It refers back to the sun)

B. Cataphoric : It's going down quickly, the sun.

(It refers forwards to the sun)

      In grammar, the person who is speaking is called the first person. The one spoken to is called the second person and the one spoken about is called the third person (Sargeant, 2007:25).

      Here is a table to help you remember which pronouns to use (Sargeant, 2007:25).

	Subject	Object
first person singular	I	Me
second person singular	You	You
third person singular	he she it	him her it
first person plural	We	Us
second person plural	You	You
third person plural	They	Them

      Here is a table to help you remember which possessive pronoun to use with which personal pronouns (Sargeant, 2007:27).

Singular Personal Pronoun	Possessive Pronoun	Plural Personal Pronoun	Possessive Pronoun

I, me you he, him she, her	mine yours his hers	we, us you they, them	ours yours theirs

Here is a table to help you remember which reflexive pronoun to use with which personal pronoun (Sargeant, 2007:26).

Singular Personal Pronoun	Reflexive Pronoun	Plural Personal Pronoun	Reflexive Pronoun
I (subject pronoun)	myself	we (subject pronoun)	ourselves
me (object pronoun)	myself	us(object pronoun)	ourselves
you (subject/object pronoun)	yourself	you (subject/object pronoun)	yourselves
he (subject pronoun)	himself	they (subject pronoun)	themselves
him (object pronoun)	himself	them (object pronoun)	themselves
she (subject pronoun)	herself		
her (object pronoun)	herself		
It	Itself		