CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This chapter discusses relevant literature on discourse cohesion. It gives a brief introduction to discourse analysis and its importance to linguistic work. The chapter also synthesizes the concepts relating to cohesion by Dooley and Levinsohn (2001) and Halliday and Hasan (1976). Discussion on each topic will be made following the order just mentioned.

2.1 Literature review

A review of relevant literature on discourse analysis will be presented under this section of the thesis. Its content is divided into three topics and they are (1) General Background of Discourse Analysis, (2) Importance of Discourse Analysis, and (3) The Concept of Cohesion. The selected theoretical framework used for this study of discourse cohesion in Lahu Si folktales will be discussed in greater detail in section 2.1.3.

2.1.1 General background of discourse analysis

A discourse is a connected speech which contains sufficiently clear and specific cultural elements that tie it together into a unified whole. Based on this definition, three important elements are required to make up any type of discourse and they are: cohesion, progression, and prominence. Cohesion makes the discourse coherent allowing it to make sense by using different types of conjunctions and sequence markers. Progression moves the discourse forward in some identifiable manner according to the different types of discourse. Prominence refers to whether someone, something, or some event is in focus at any given point in the discourse. The term discourse analysis "... covers two areas of linguistic concern: the analysis of dialogue, especially of live conversation, and the analysis of monologue" (Longacre 1996:7).

Longacre (1996) indicates four different etic monologue types that may occur in any language: narrative, procedural, behavioral, and expository. These etic discourse types result from the classification by means of two main characteristics: contingent succession and agent orientation. He proposes:

> To begin with, we can classify all possible discourses in all languages according to two basis etic parameters: contingent temporal succession and agent orientation. Contingent temporal succession refers to a framework of temporal succession in which some of the events or doings are contingent on previous events or doings. Agent orientation refers to orientation towards agents with at least a partial identity of agent reference running through the discourse. These two parameters intersect so as to give us a four-way classification of discourse types: Narrative discourse is plus in respect to both parameters. Procedural discourse is plus in respect to contingent succession but minus in respect to the agent orientation. Behavioral discourse is minus in regard to contingent succession but plus in regard to agent orientation. Expository discourse is minus in respect to both parameters (1996:8-9).

Table 2 summarizes Longacre's proposed categories of discourse genres.

	+Agent Orientation	-Agent Orientation
+Contingent Succession	Narrative	Procedural
-Contingent Succession	Behavioral	Expository

Table 2: Categories of Discourse Genres (Longacre
1996:10 adapted)

This classification creates four possible discourse genres. Other "additional parameters to create further subdivisions which Longacre refers to in classifying discourse types are projection, tension, tense/aspect/voice features, participants and themes, person selection of pronouns, linkage and specific genres" (Longacre in Morris 2008:26).

The three texts discussed in this thesis are all '+ agent orientation', '+ contingent succession', '- projection', and '+ tension'. They are '+ agent orientation' and '+ contingent succession' because the participants initiate the actions and develop them sequentially throughout the entire story. Each text is '+ tension' and '- projection' since the conflict increases as the story develops and the setting of each story is in the past. Each of these texts is a folktale that has human charactors as the major participants in the story. Each folktale tells the story about

these major charactors who perform the actions and go through different events which develop the storyline. The first story, "The Story of the Blind Man and the Lame Man," is a story of two disabled men who went on a journey and found a treasure which almost caused division between them if it wasn't for a twist at the end. This story is the shortest story of all the three folktales used in this thesis and it has 30 sentences. The second story, "*Huhr puh Huhr mawd*," is the story about two friends, "*Huhr puh*" and "*Huhr mawd*," who, together, took their bulls and went on a trip to get salt in Tayand. This story has 43 sentences. The third story, "The Two Beloved Orphan Brothers," is the longest story and the entire story contains 110 sentences. This folktale tells the story about two orphan brothers who went searching for their missing father in the river which led to the development of the entire story.

2.1.2 Importance of discourse analysis

> Linguists agree upon discourse analysis's crucial contribution to the field of linguistic work, in translation and other areas. In translation, it is not sufficient for translators to know only the exact meaning of the original text, but also the words and syntax of the receptor language (RL).

A person wanting to convey a message successfully in any language must use words and organize the words in such a way that the message sounds natural to the audience as if it were originally written in their own language.

Longacre (Pickering 1980:4), moreover, states that, after two workshops (in Fall 1974 and Spring 1975) concentrating on discourse structure in a number of languages in Colombia and Panama, it is impossible to achieve a correct grammatical analysis of a language without accounting for its discourse level conventions. He claims, "In view of these considerations, discourse analysis emerges not as an option or as a luxury for the serious student of a language [grammar] but as a necessity" (1980:4-5). Likewise, Pickering (1980:4) claims that "only a discourse grammar has a chance of being fully valid since a sentence grammar based on context forms would be partly invalid because a larger part of the relevant context would have been ignored" (1980:5). He further states that

other well-known linguistic scholars, Gerald Sanders and Joseph Grimes, also support this argument.

Kenneth L. Pike (Pickering 1980:5), in 1949, found it necessary to include a hierarchy in grammatical theory, since the definition of a unit depends upon its external structures as well as its internal structure. This led him to levels above the sentence and to postulating a cultural-behavioral setting for language. He later chose to begin his grammar course at the discourse level (Pike and Pike 1977).

2.1.3 The concept of cohesion

Cohesion is one of the important elements in creating a discourse that communicates effectively and naturally; only a text (or a passage), spoken or written, of whatever length that forms a unified whole is called "discourse". The passage must exhibit cohesion in order to be called a discourse. This section discusses cohesion as relevant to the study of discourse analysis, definitions and importance of cohesion, and a summary of the framework used for the study of cohesion in the Lahu Si folktales found in this thesis.

Cohesion is a linguistic phenomenon in a discourse which assists the hearer to understand and perceive the text as a single unit. It is impossible for a collection of unrelated sentences to make sense to the audience unless all the sentences are tied together to form a unified whole, or a discourse, by cohesion.

Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:27) state that cohesion is achieved by "using linguistic signals in the text as clues to help hearers in coming up with an adequate mental representation [or coherence]"[16]. Within a discourse structure, these linguistic signals function as a link which glues the individual parts of discourse together. Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:27) states:

---

[16] Coherence, another concept in discourse analysis, is closely relevant to the concept of cohesion. While cohesion is a linguistic phenomenon occurred in the text, coherence is a conceptual phenomenon created in the hearer's mind when he determines whether what he has conceptualized from his perception about the text, which resulted from processing through the text and with the aid of linguistic signals or clues, is coherent or, in other words, represents a single representation or not. Good detailed information on the topic of coherence in discourse can be seen in Dooley and Levinsohn's *Analyzing Discourse: A Manual of Basic Concepts* (2001).

> COHESION… can be defined briefly as the use of linguistic means to signal coherence… Signals of cohesion indicate how the part of the text with which they occur links up conceptually with some other part. It is common to speak of such signals as COHESIVE TIES.

In addition, Pickering's discussion in the introduction paragraph of *Cohesion* (1978) implies that how much and fast a person's mind can accommodate new information depends on how much that piece of new information relies on what the person has already known, that is, old information (or what Pickering calls "redundancy"). This statement relates directly to the concept of cohesion. He states,

> Every language seems to have a good bit of redundancy built into it, and also a sort of short hand ("pro" forms) to make that redundancy more **economical**. In the discussion of cohesion, we are concerned with anything that signals redundancy as well as anything that serves to **tie** a discourse together in a linear way. This will include the sorts of things that are discussed under the headings of "unity" and "coherence" in textbooks on English composition (Pickering 1978:29 emphasis added).

Pickering also views cohesion as something which ties a discourse together in a linear way.

Hasan and Halliday (1976:4) explain that cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another element and that one presupposes the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it.

Thus, cohesion is the use of linguistic means or linguistic devices to knit the unity of a text, including both temporal unity and logical unity of the text. It may be possible for different discourse genres to employ different linguistic devices to signal the unity of a text. The study of cohesion, therefore, investigates and seeks to discover what makes the text hold together cohesively, and describe what linguistic means, or cohesion sources, that a language uses to constitute the unity in different types of discourse.

The framework employed for the analysis of cohesion in this thesis is taken from two major sources: (1) Dooley and Levinsohn's (2001:28-32) common types of

25

cohesion, (2) Halliday and Hasan's sources of cohesion in English (1976). From these sources some concepts that were found to be of interest and assistance, were employed for this study. Since some notions on sources of cohesion in both pieces of literature overlap, those of interest have been integrated to make the framework which is used for this analysis.

2.1.3.1 Dooley and Levinsohn's Common types of cohesion

Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:27) state, "Each language will, of course, have its own range of devices which can be used for cohesion, but some general types will be found cross-linguistically." They present six major common types of cohesive devices which can be found cross-linguistically, taken largely from the treatment of cohesion by Halliday and Hasan. The six common types of cohesion designated by Dooley and Levinsohn are descriptive expressions alluding to entities mentioned earlier, identity, lexical relations, morphosyntactic patterns, signals of relations between propositions, and intonation patterns. Since some of these cohesion sources do not occur in Lahu Si and cannot be applied to the written form of Lahu Si texts, e.g. intonation patterns and morphosyntactic patterns such as tense marking, only the sources which overlap those of Halliday and Hasan (1976) are examined in this thesis and they are: identity, lexical relations, and signals of relations between proposition, specifically conjunctions. Following is a brief discussion of each of these selected cohesion types along with examples from English where necessary[17].

Identity creates cohesion through the use of "identical forms, identical meaning, and identical reference or denotation" (Dooley and Levinsohn 2001:29). Six subcategories are found under 'Identity' and they are: repetition (whole or partial), lexical replacement, pronouns, other pro-forms, substitution, and ellipsis. Each sub-type of identity will be discussed shortly in the following section.

---

[17] All examples and explanation of the common types of cohesion in this section are from Dooley and Levinsohn's Analyzing Discourse: A Manual of Basic Concepts (2001), except where it is specifically stated otherwise.

26

Repetition includes the repetition of an entire expression or a partial expression, at least a recognizable part of it. The repetition of an entire expression and a partial expression are illustrated in example (1) and (2) respectively.

(1) Page 29 [11]

> **The Prime Minister** *recorded her thanks to the Foreign Secretary.* **The Prime Minister** *was most eloquent.*

(2) Page 29 [12]

> **Dr. E. C. R. Reeve** *chaired the meeting.* **Dr. Reeve** *invited Mr. Phillips to report on the state of gardens.*

Lexical replacement is the use of a different lexical form to refer to the same referent point. The form in question is successful in referring to the referent point if the accessible part of the hearer's mental representation contains the entity which fits that form. Concerning this, Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:29) conclude, "In lexical replacement, the forms in question differ, but the referent or denotation is the same". Example (3) below illustrates this statement.

(3) Page 29 [13]

> **Ro's daughter** *is ill again.* **The child** *is hardly ever well.*

Pronouns involve identity of reference, for example, co-reference, generally without identity of form. Example (4) illustrates the personal pronoun, *she,* which refers back to the proper noun *Ro* preceding it.

(4) Page 29 [14]

> **Ro** *said* **she** *would have to take Sophie to the doctor.*

Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:29), with reference to Halliday and Hasan (1976), propose that, besides pronouns, other kinds of pro-forms do exist and pro-verbs such as *do…it* and *do…that* are one type. Example (5) shows how the pro-verb *do…it* is applied in an English sentence.

(5) Page 29 [15]

    *I told someone to **feed the cat**. Has **it** been **done**?*

Substitution uses "a kind of partial identity of denotation" to substitute for another thing (Dooley and Levinsohn 2001:29). In substitution, "two things are of the same type, but are different instances (tokens) of that type" (2001:29). Example (6) shows the use of the word 'one' as a substitute for the word 'a birthday'.

(6) Page 29 [16]

    *Jules has **a birthday** next month. Elspeth has **one** too.*

Ellipsis occurs when a reference is replaced by zero or nothing. It is the substitution or coreference by means of zero. Example (7) demonstrates coreferential ellipsis and example (8) illustrates the substitution type of ellipsis. The symbol Ø represents the use of ellipsis where it appears in examples.

(7) Page 30 [17]

    Jules has a birthday next month and Ø is planning a big celebration.

(8) Page 30 [18]

    *Hans is **a freshman**. I am Ø too.*

Lexical relations, Dooley and Levinsohn's third type, refer to pairs of lexical items which are related in ways that do not involve identity. Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:30) present three such lexical relations: Hyponymy, Part-Whole, and Collocation. Following is an illustration of each type of lexical relations.

Hyponymy is a generic-specific lexical relation in which one word is a subtype of the other. It is the use of a less general meaning word to refer to a more general meaning word, or vice versa. Example (9) shows hyponymy in English where *daffodils* are a subtype of flower so *daffodil* is a hyponym of *flower*.

(9) Page 30 [19]

    ***Flowers** have always been interesting to me. **Daffodils** are my favorite.*

The *part-whole or whole-part relationship* of lexical items is another important thing to look at when studying discourse cohesion. Cohesion can be created in the text when two or more words relate in a way that one represents a part or whole of the other. This link between words is also called meronymy. An example of the part-whole lexical relation in English is represented in Example (10) below.

(10) Page 30 [20]

> **The human body** is an intricate mechanism. **The arm**, for example, is used for different kinds of leverage.

Collocations are words that co-occur or go together to form semantically unified texts. Words of this type normally belong to the same semantic domain or lexical set and that is where cohesion derives.

In example (11) collocation by means of belonging to the same lexical set is demonstrated.

(11) Page 30 [21]

> **Monday** is not my favorite day. **Tuesday** is only slightly better.

Signals of relations between propositions can also contribute to cohesion in a discourse. According to a general principle in human language stated in Behaghel's Law[18], Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:31) indicate that "when two sentences or clauses are adjacent within a sentence, then, other things being equal, the propositions they embody should be interpreted as being in a close conceptual relation." This indicates that juxtaposition, though by itself does not signal a specific conceptual relation, can suggest cohesion. Moreover, at times, conjunctions and other linguistic markers explicitly render conceptual (semantic) relations between propositions and this is illustrated in a computer software brochure in example (12).

---

[18] This principle states, "items that belong together mentally are grouped together syntactically" (MacWhinney 1991:276).

(12) Page 32 [25]

> *For the first time, you can display Help and work on your document at the same time. **For example**, you could display and read the procedure for creating a glossary entry at the same time you create one in your document.*

In (12), the expression *for example* makes the intended interpretation easier and surer even though it may not be strictly necessary.

2.1.3.2 Halliday and Hasan's sources of cohesion in English

Halliday and Hasan (1976) present a thorough treatment of cohesion in English in their foundational book, Cohesion in English. They posit that five sources of cohesion can be found in English: cohesion through reference, cohesion through substitution, cohesion through ellipsis, cohesion through conjunction, and cohesion through lexical items. Of these various types of cohesive relations, the first four are grammatical, while the other is lexical. Each of these cohesion sources will be discussed briefly in the following section[19].

The first source of cohesion discussed in English by Halliday and Hasan (1976) is **cohesion through reference**. They state,

> Reference is the specific nature of the information that is signaled
> for retrieval... and the cohesion lies in the continuity of reference,
> whereby the same thing enters into the discourse a second time
> (1976:31).

In general, reference is subcategorized into two groups: exophora, or exophoric reference (situational reference which is not cohesive) and endophora, or endophoric reference (textual reference). Endophora reference may be either anaphora (reference to preceding text) or cataphora (reference to following text).

In English three types of reference are distinguished under cohesion through reference: personal reference, demonstrative reference, and comparative reference. The following is a brief discussion on each type of references.

---

[19] All information, including examples, tables, and explanation, discussed in this section is primarily from Halliday and Hasan (1976) unless stated otherwise.

Halliday and Hasan (1976:37) define personal reference as "reference by means of function in the speech situation, through the category of PERSON." There are three classes of personal reference: personal pronouns, possessive adjectives (possessive determiners), and possessive pronouns. Table 3 shows three classes of personal reference found in English.

Semantic category	Existential	Possessive	
Grammatical function	**Head**		**Modifier**
Class	**noun (pronoun)**	**determiner**	
Person:			
speaker (only)	I me	mine	my
addressee(s), with/without			
other person(s)	you	yours	your
speaker and other person(s)	we us	ours	our
other person, male	he him	his	his
other person, female	she her	hers	her
other person; objects	they them	theirs	their
object; passage of text	it	[its]	its
generalized person	one		one's

Table 3: Personal reference in English (Halliday and

Hasan 1976:38)

Demonstrative reference is achieved by means of location, on a scale of proximity. These demonstratives are also semantically subcategorized into selective demonstratives and non-selective demonstratives. Table 4 shows the system of demonstrative reference found in English.

Semantic category	Selective		Non-selective
Grammatical function	**Modifier/Head**	**Adjunct**	**Modifier**
Class	**determiner**	**adverb**	**determiner**
Proximity:			
near	this these	here [now]	
far	that those	there then	
neutral			the

Table 4: Demonstrative reference in English (Halliday

and Hasan 1976:38)

31

Comparative reference involves identity or similarity. The reference may be anaphoric, or cataphoric or even exophoric[20] depending on its referent point. Table 5 gives Halliday and Hasan's system of comparative reference in English.

Grammatical function	Modifier: Deictic/Epithet (see below)	Submodifier/Adjunct
Class	**adjective**	**adverb**
General comparison: identity general similarity difference (ie non-identity or similarity)	same identical equal similar additional other different else	identically similarly likewise so such differently otherwise
Particular comparison:	better, more etc [comparative adjectives and quantifiers]	so more less equally

Table 5: Comparative reference in English (Halliday

and Hasan 1976:39)

As shown in Table 5, English comparative reference grammatically functions as either a modifier or an adjunct and it consists of two classes: adjectives and adverbs. Moreover, its system is categorized into two groups including general comparison and particular comparison. General comparison is a "comparison that is simply in terms of likeness and unlikeness, without respect to any particular property: two things may be the same, similar or different ... [and it] is expressed by a certain class of adjectives and adverbs" (Halliday and Hasan 1976:77). Particular comparison, on the other hand, is a "comparison that is in respect of quantity or quality which is also expressed by means of adjectives or adverbs; not of a special class, but ordinary adjectives and adverbs in some comparative form" (1976:77).

Cohesion through substitution is the second source of cohesion discussed by Halliday and Hasan (1976:88-141). They (1976:88) define substitution as the replacement of one item by another. It is a relation between linguistic items, such

---

[20] Exophoric reference is an extralinguistic referent. It does not require another linguistic expression in the text for the interpretation, instead the audience supplies the information from his own experience.

as words or phrases, rather than a relation between meanings and this distinguishes it from reference[21].

Halliday and Hasan (1976:90) divide substitution into three types based on their inherent characteristic. The three types of substitution in English include nominal substitution, verbal substitution, and clausal substitution.

		Non-prominent (given)	Prominent (new)
Nominal	Thing (count noun)	one(s)	the SAME
	Process (nominalized) Attribute Fact }	so	do be } the SAME say
Verbal	Process(+…)	do	Do so
Clausal (β): report, condition, modality	positive negative	so not	SO NOT

Table 6: Substitution forms in English (Halliday and

Hasan 1976:141)

As shown in Table 6 above, in nominal substitution the English substitute one/ones always functions as the head of a nominal group and can substitute only for an item which is itself the head of a nominal group. In example (13), the word 'one' is a substitute for the nominal group 'the box with those candles in'.

(13) Page 91 [3:5]

If only I could remember where it was that I saw someone putting away the box with those candles in I could finish the decorations now. —You mean the little colored one?

Verbal substitution is the second type of substitution. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976:112), the verbal substitute in English is *do* and it operates as the head of a verbal group, in the place that is occupied by the lexical verb; and its position is always final in the group. Verbal substitution may either function within the same sentence scope or extend across sentence boundaries.

---

[21] This is because reference is "a relation between meanings" (Halliday and Hasan 1976:89).

In example (14) the verb 'do' is a substitute for the previous verbal group 'know the meaning of half those long words' and the presupposed item is in the same sentence.

(14) Page 112 [3:56] b

> *'I don't know the meaning of half those long words, and, what's more, I don't believe you do either!'*

The third type of substitution is clausal substitution, a "further type of substitution in which what is presupposed is not an element within the clause but an entire clause. The words used as substitutes are *so* and *not*" (Halliday and Hasan 1976:130).

In example (15) the word 'so' substitutes for the whole clause 'There is going to be an earthquake', while the word 'not' in example (16) is a substitute for the clause 'No one has gone home'.

(15) Page 130 [3:96]

> *Is there going to be an earthquake? –It says so.*

(16) Page 133 [3:100]

> *Has everyone gone home? –I hope not.*

Cohesion through ellipsis can be thought of as the omission of an item in which the form of substitution is replaced by nothing. In other words, it can be regarded as substitution by zero.

Ellipsis is, thus, a relation within the text; where there is ellipsis in the structure, there is a presupposition that something is to be supplied or understood, and in the great majority of instances the presupposed item is present in the preceding text. Three types of ellipsis can be found in English: nominal ellipsis, verbal ellipsis, and clausal ellipsis.

Nominal ellipsis is ellipsis within the nominal group. In the following examples (17 and 18) the context allows the listener to understand what is eluded.

However, as shown in the examples, both 'chocolates' and 'messengers', are omitted and replaced by nothing in the sentences.

(17) Page 162 [4:38] a

Have another chocolate. –No thanks; I've had my three.

(18) Page 163 [4:38] b

'The other messenger's called Hatta. I must have two, you know. One to come, and one to go.'

Verbal ellipsis is ellipsis within the verbal group. In example (19), the progressive verb form 'been swimming' in the answer 'Yes, I have…' is omitted.

(19) Page 167 [4:54] a

Have you been swimming? –Yes, I have.

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976:197), a clause in English, either in a monologue or dialogue, can be deleted if the clause is still communicative. Since a clause in English has two elements, the modal element and the propositional element, either of them can be omitted in clausal ellipsis. Clausal ellipsis, therefore, includes the ellipsis of either element.

As noted above, two types of clausal ellipsis are derivable from the two major divisions of the clause. Example (20) shows the ellipsis of the modal element and example (21) shows the ellipsis of the propositional element. The modal element 'the Duke was' is omitted in the answer of the first example, while in the latter example the propositional element 'going to plant a row of poplars' is omitted in the answer.

(20) Page 197 [4:97]

What was the Duke going to do? –Plant a row of poplars in the park.

(21) Page 197 [4:98]

Who was going to plant a row of poplars in the park? –The Duke was.

Cohesion through conjunction is the fourth type of cohesive relation discussed in *Cohesion in English.* According to Halliday and Hasan, conjunction, since it is not simply an anaphoric relation, is rather different in nature from other types of cohesive relation, from both reference and substitution and ellipsis. They state,

> Conjunction elements are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their 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 the discourse (1976:226).

Since cohesion is the relation between sentences in a text and the sentences of a text can only follow one after the other, in describing conjunctions as a cohesive device, the focus of attention will be on their function in relating linguistic elements that occur in succession together. Conjunction differs greatly from the previously discussed cohesive devices in that it adds not only meanings of their own but also creates ties between entire segments of text of various lengths.

Halliday and Hasan (1976:238) identify four types of conjunction in English: additive, adversative, causal, and temporal. These types of conjunction are described and given examples to illustrate as follows.

Additive conjunction is a generalized semantic relation in the text-forming component of the semantic system that is based on the logical notion of 'and'. Since sentences follow one another one at a time as the text unfolds; they cannot be rearranged in different sequences and different bracketings. Therefore each new sentence either is or is not linked to its predecessor. If it is, 'and' (the additive relation) is one way in which it may be so linked. The non-temporal additive conjunction 'and' is shown in example (22).

(22) Page 235 [5:8]

> *He heaved the rock aside with all his strength. And there in the recesses of a deep hollow lay a glittering heap of treasure.*

The *adversative conjunction* is a relation used as "contrary to expectation" (Halliday and Hasan 1976:250). Since the expectation may be derived from the content of what is being said, or communication process, cohesion can be found as

36

being either external or internal adversative relation. The normal adversative conjunction in English is 'yet'. In example (23), the cohesive form *yet* is used to add another sentence which is contrary to what the preceding sentence implied.

(23) Page 250 [5:30]

> *All the figures were correct; they'd been checked. Yet the total came out wrong.*

Causal conjunction is a cause-effect relation. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976:256), the specific relations of result, reason and purpose are included under the heading of causal relations. In English the simple form of causal relation is expressed by words and expressions such as 'so', 'thus', 'hence', 'therefore', 'consequently', 'accordingly', 'because of that', and 'as a result of that'. The word 'so' in the following example is a causal conjunction.

(24) Page 256 [5:43] a

> *...she felt that there was no time to be lost, as she was shrinking rapidly; so she got to work at once to eat some of the other bit.*

Temporal conjunction is simply a relation of sequence in time. It relates two sentences in terms of their sequence in time: the one is subsequent to the other. The conjunctive relations of the temporal conjunction can be simple or complex. The simple temporal conjunctions in English include the words 'then', 'next', 'after that', 'at the same time', 'previously', etc. The complex temporal conjunctions in English can be as specific as the expressions 'next day', 'five minutes later', or 'five minutes earlier'. Example (25) shows how a temporal conjunction 'then' connects all the sentences together as the story develops.

(25) Page 261 [5:53]

> *Alice began by taking the little golden key, and unlocking the door that led into the garden. Then she set to work nibbling at the mushroom...till she was about a foot high: then she walked down the little passage: and then – she found herself at last in the beautiful garden.*

Cohesion through lexical items is the last source of cohesion described in *Cohesion in English*. Therefore, according to Halliday and Hasan (1996:274),

lexical cohesion is the cohesive effect achieved by the selection of vocabulary. In English, there are two types of lexical cohesion, reiteration and collocation. The following section discusses each type of lexical cohesion.

Halliday and Hasan (1976:278) state,

> Reiteration is a form of lexical cohesion which involves the repetition of a lexical item, at one end of the scale; the use of a general word to refer back to a lexical item, at the other end of the scale; and a number of things in between the use of a synonym, near-synonym, or superordinate.

Example (26) a-c below illustrates each of these three major forms of reiteration. In (a) there is repetition: *mushroom* refers back to *mushroom*. In (b), *climb* refers back to *ascent*, of which it is a synonym. In (c), *car* refers back to *Jaguar*, a kind of car, and *car* is a name for a more general class, or in other words, a general word to refer to *Jaguar*.

(26) Page 278 [6:5] a, b, d

a. Repetition of the same word

> *There was a large **mushroom** growing near her, about the same height as herself; and, when she had looked under it, it occurred to her that she might as well look and see what was on the top of it. She stretched herself up on tiptoe, and peered over the edge of the **mushroom**,...*

b. The use of a synonym

> *Accordingly ... I took leave, and turned to the **ascent** of the peak. The **climb** is perfectly easy...*

c. The use of a general word to refer back to a lexical item

> *Henry's bought himself a new **Jaguar**. He practically lives in the **car**.*

Collocation is a form of lexical cohesion achieved through the association of lexical items that regularly co-occur. This not only brings extension to the basis of the lexical relationship that features a cohesive force but also indicates that cohesion lies between any pair of lexical items that relate to each other in some recognizable lexicosemantic (word meaning) relation. In addition, it is important

38

to note that cohesion obtained by collocation is not limited to a pair of words since it is also very common to see long cohesive chains that are built up out of lexical relations of this kinds, with word chains like 'hair...comb...curl...wave', or 'poetry...literature...reader...writer...style'.

2.1.3.3 Synthesis

Since most of the cohesion sources discussed in the above literature overlap and are similar to one another, the framework used in the analysis synthesizes both Dooley and Levinsohn (2001) and Halliday and Hasan (1976). That is, the cohesion sources from each of the literature that overlap are grouped together under the same heading throughout this analysis. There are altogether three major types of cohesion sources which are investigated in each of the three Lahu Si texts including cohesion through identity, cohesion through lexical relations, and cohesion through conjunction. Four sub-topics are studied under identity: repetition, reference (personal, demonstrative and comparative), substitution (nominal, verbal and clausal), and ellipsis (nominal, verbal and clausal). Likewise, four sub-topics are examined under lexical relations: part-whole relationship, synonym, hyponymy, and collocation. Conjunction includes additive conjunction, adversative conjunction, causal conjunction, and temporal conjunction.