



PRONOUN AS ONE OF COHESIVE DEVICES IN ENGLISH AND INDONESIAN HORTATORY TEXT: A TEXTUAL STUDY

By Itoni Ludji

ifoniludji@gmail.com

Artha Wacana Christian University, Kupang - Indonesia

Abstract: This research aims at analyzing pronouns as cohesive devices in English and Indonesian hortatory text. For completing this research, the pronoun notion comes up as the fundamental theory. This research is a kind of library research. The result indicates that English text and Indonesian text needs pronouns to make it be more expressive.

Keywords: *pronoun, cohesive devices.*

INTRODUCTION

Actually in composing a text, there are some elements should be considered by the author. The consideration depends on how to make good understanding for readers. It means that, readable text is very important to be spotlighted. In this case, one of the cohesive devices in hortatory text is discussed. The hortatory text is written in two languages, namely; Indonesian and English. Indonesian hortatory text comes as the source text while the English hortatory text is the target text.

According to Larson (1984: 433), pronoun is one of cohesive devices of discourse, for example to introduce a new participant with a noun phrase and then refer to this participant by a pronoun throughout the rest of the paragraph. Furthermore, in cohesive devices, it is important for us (translators, readers or authors) to comprehend what is named *referent*.

Quoting the statement of M.A.K Halliday and Ruqaiyah Hasan (1976) in Candrawati (2011) is as follow,

“The concept of cohesion is semantic one; it refers to relation of meaning that exist within the text, and that define it as text. Cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one presupposes the order, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it. When this happens, a relation of cohesion is setup, and two elements the presupposition of cohesion is setup, and two elements the presupposition and the presupposed, are there by least potentially integrated into text”.

Since pronoun is used to show that this particular participant is the topic of the entire paragraph, thus it is important to talk more about the elements which have correlation with pronoun. In Halliday and Hasan

statement, there is **reference**. It comes in grammatical cohesion. The **reference** is divided into two main parts namely, endophora and exophora. The endophora reference is proved by pronoun. In addition, the endophora reference can be divided into two main parts, namely; **anaphoric** and **cataphoric** reference.

In this paper, **pronoun** as one of cohesive devices is going to be examined. The exploring pronoun as cohesive devices in hortatory text either in Indonesian or in English can contribute a new comprehension in translation study, where when a translator wants to conduct a translation activity in particular translating hortatory text, he or she should to understand how to comprehend a hortatory text by considering the pronouns in the text.

In the hortatory text entitled, *Cellular World Shop, One Stop Cellular Shop and Entertainment* either in English and Indonesian, there is a delicacy phenomenon. In English text, the pronoun *we* comes in various forms while the Indonesian hortatory has pronoun *kita* and *kami* to indicate *we* as in English. If we consider deeply about the meaning brought by the single word *kita* or *kami*, they have different concept and function. They cannot be used in the same context. If an Indonesian speaker wants to express the communicant involved as the agent, thus it is proper if he or she uses *kami* while when he or she wants to convey a notion that the communicant is not involved as the participants thus he or she should use *kita*. It deals with the semantic operation in syntactic level. Nevertheless, English hortatory text of *Cellular World Shop, One Stop Cellular Shop and Entertainment* shows different phenomena. The pronoun *we* comes because of semantic operation as Indonesian has, but it is more complex than in Indonesian that has been conceptualized as above. English Pronoun is more complex than Indonesian pronoun. In expressing possession or the pronoun as the object, English pronoun comes in various forms but

Indonesian pronoun comes in the same form. For instance, the pronoun *kita* in subject position is same with the pronoun *kita* in object position. That is why, in composing a hortatory text, an author has to understand the knowledge of the language he or she uses. Since pronoun has different form either in English or Indonesian, thus it is important to examine its application in text, in particular in operating its function as cohesive device of a text.

COHESIVE DEVICES OF PRONOUN IN HORTATORY TEXT

The concept of pronoun as one cohesive devices has been discussed in the previous section, *introduction*, thus in this section let us see how a pronoun is applied in hortatory text (text which has goal to propose, suggest or command). This text is supposed as a good source of identifying *pronoun* as one of cohesive devices. The data below is a good illustration.

Source language	Target language
Sekarang ini kita memiliki segalanya untuk membuat hidup menjadi lebih mudah., Ya, benar sekali kita sedang dan akan berbicara tentang gadget modern. Sebagai contoh awal kita memulai dari kantor kami saja. Kami memiliki semua jenis gadget yang bisa memudahkan kita dalam mengerjakan hal – hal dari dari A-Z dengan mudah, cukup sekali tekan tombol saja dan semua selesai.	Today, we have everything we need to make our life more and more simpler. Yes, you are right, we are talking about modern gadgets. To begin with, let us take an example of our kitchen only. We have all the different kind of gadgets, which do A to Z work of kitchen, just press a button and you are done.

In Indonesian hortatory text, the pronoun *kita* (inclusive) and *kami* (exclusive) occur. The pronoun *kita* comes as cohesive device. As a whole, the inclusive *kita* occurs from the beginning of the paragraph until the end of the paragraph. The pronoun *kita* is called the agent of the EVENT in the text. Furthermore, it is the topic of the text. It is called as agent is proved in the sentence *memudahkan kita dalam mengerjakan hal-hal dari A-Z dengan mudah*. The EVENT of that sentence is *mengerjakan* and the agent is *kita*.

The pronoun *kami* (exclusive) comes as the anaphoric reference in the paragraph as well. It is proved in the third sentence *sebagai contoh awal kita memulai dari kantor kami saja*. The sentence indicates that, *kami* refers to *kita* which has been stated before, at the beginning of the sentence. The delicacy phenomenon in this text is, the pronoun *kita* (inclusive) can function as anaphoric reference as well, as has been happened to *kami* too. The sentence construction *kami memiliki semua jenis gadget yang bisa memudah kita dalam mengerjakan hal-hal dari dari A-Z dengan mudah, cukup sekali tekan tombol saja dan semua selesai* is a good illustration. In that sentence, pronoun *kita* comes as

the anaphoric reference. It refers to *kami* which has been mentioned at the beginning of the sentence.

Nevertheless, in English hortatory text, the pronoun ‘we’ has various form. Those forms are: ‘we, our, and us’. The vary forms caused by semantic operation. The pronoun ‘we’ changes into ‘our’ because the meaning which is addressed is ‘possession’ meanwhile, pronoun ‘we’ which is change into ‘us’ is caused by brought meaning or notion of conveying the presupposition that pronoun ‘we’ as the object or the patient of an action. Furthermore, due to the meaning operates in the sentences. Thus, the embodied form of ‘we’ formed in syntactic level. It means that, ‘we’ which formed ‘our’ is the modifier of ‘kitchen’ while ‘us’ is the target of an action.

Unfortunately, in this context ‘us’ comes not as the object or patient of an action but it comes in persuasive context. It means that, the speaker roles as the initiator and the participant too. In addition, the participant is more than one person. It involves the speaker and those whom are being asked by speaker to make illustration as in sentence ‘let us take an example of our kitchen only’. Linguistically, the feature *we* is explained as in above concept.

Dealing with cohesion, English hortatory text brings different phenomenon. The repetition *we* in the same sentence is not very unique, but putting again the same meaning in different form is unique. Let consider the sentence, ‘today, we have everything we need to make our life more and more simpler’. The repetition pronoun *we* in the sentence is not affecting readers’ comprehension, nevertheless, the existence of *our* in the sentence can affect readers’ comprehension because it is in different form but bring the same meaning. It means that, *our* refers to *we* but the conveyed meaning here is possession. The possessive pronoun *our* comes as the anaphoric reference in the sentence. It refers to *we*.

The delicacy phenomenon also occurs in the second paragraph of either Indonesian hortatory text or English hortatory text. The cohesion in Indonesian hortatory text is not constant. In the first and second sentence of the paragraph is relying on *internet* is the main topic, while in the third sentence to the last sentence of the paragraph indicates that pronoun *we* is the main topic. It is different from the English hortatory text. In English hortatory text, there is cataphoric reference which enriches this examining. For the detail, let us consider the paragraph and explore it clearly.

Source language	Target language
Penemuan terbaik dalam sejarah peradaban manusia adalah internet . Internet adalah salah satu penemuan yang bisa melintasi batas ruang dan waktu. Kita dapat berkomunikasi tanpa harus datang ke tempat yang dituju, cukup	The best ever inventions of human brain is internet. Internet has shortened the boundaries. We can get any information from internet. We can communicate with anyone via internet and telecommunication system. Human has created satellites to get around the

menyapa lewat online kita sudah bisa berhubungan dengan siapa saja di belahan dunia mana pun. Selain itu kita dapat berkomunikasi, informasi juga bisa didapatkan dengan mudah. System telekomunikasi yang menggunakan satelit membuat semua komunikasi serasa mudah.	world. Earlier, we used to be unaware regarding what is going around the world but now the time has changed. It is human only who has made it possible which looked like utter impossible.
--	--

The Indonesian hortatory text indicates that the using pronoun *kita* is not in the all sentences in that text. Two previous sentences talk about *internet* as the main topic. Nevertheless, it still has correlation with the other sentences in the text because each sentence supports the information of one another. The same case also occurs in the English hortatory text. But in this section, the cataphoric reference in pronoun is going to be spotlighted.

The pronoun *we* in the sentence construction *we can communicate with anyone via internet and communication system* is referring to the word **human** in sentence construction *human has created satellites to get around the world*.

CONCLUSION

The discussion above can be deduced in a brief statement that, either English hortatory text or Indonesian hortatory text needs *pronoun* to make the text become more expressive in interrelatedness. The interrelatedness of text is tokenized by the existence of the *pronoun*. In English hortatory text, pronoun *we*, *our*, and *us* come to make the text be cohesive while in Indonesian hortatory text, the pronoun *kita* and *kami* appear to make the text be cohesive.

Studying bilingual text or translation text either two languages or more, pronoun (one of cohesive devices) is important. It does not bring new idea in composing text to be cohesive but it can enable a translator to know how a source language text is translated into another language. Due to different forms of texts can bring the same notion in the texts. That is why cohesive devices in particular *pronoun* cannot be avoided in translating a text into another language.

REFERENCES

Alhuda, et.al. 2009. *Al-Qur'an Tiga Bahasa*. Jakarta: Gema Insani Press
 Baker, Mona. 1992. *In Other Words: A course on Translation*. London and New York: Routledge
 Burton, Barbara, S and Sihombing Binsar. 2007 *English Grammar Comprehension*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Widia sarana.
 Catford, JC 1974. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London University Press.

Collins, Harper. 2006. *Collins English Dictionary*. London: Longman
 Crewel, John W. 2009. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. London; Sage Publications
 Fromkin, Victoria. 2007. *An Introduction to Language: Language Learning Australia Pty Limited*
 Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan R. 1976. *Cohesion in English*, Harlow, England: Longman.
 Halliday, M.A.K. 1985. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, London: Arnold.
 Larson M. L .1984. *Meaning Based Translation: A Guide to Cross – Language Equivalence second edition*. New York : Oxford University Press.
 Leech, Geoffrey. 1974. *Semantics*. Great Britain: Penguin Books Ltd. Mc Carthy, Michael. 1991. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.