

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, the writer explains about text, lexical cohesion, types of lexical cohesion, and a general description of the movie. Basically, a researcher needs some theories to conduct the research. Those theories are applied to collect and analyze the data. For this study is the writer mainly uses the theory proposed by Lyons (1996), Coulthard (1994), Halliday & Hasan (1976) and Renkema (1993). The definitions of the linguistics terms are taken from the Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics, by Peter Matthews (1997).

2.1 Text

According to Lyons (1996:263), a text is usually defined as sequence of sentences. However, Lyons also states that this definition is clearly unsatisfactory. It is true that there are some texts that would satisfy the definition, notably texts of a more formal character. But the vast majority of everyday colloquial texts are made up of a mixture of sentences, sentence-fragments and ready-made locutions. However, they must be connected in some contextually appropriate way. The text as a whole must exhibit the related, but distinguishable, properties of cohesion and coherence.

Discussions of written communication are often presented in terms of a writer communicating directly with his/her readers by means of a written text. Because texts are designed for specific audience; indeed, as no writer can create

even a single sentence without a target imagined reader, almost every sentence provides some clue(s) about this reader which allows any real reader to build up cumulatively a picture of his/her imagined counterpart. Ultimately a text is a string of words and a writer has to encode the ideational meaning into, and the reader to decode that meaning from, words. Problems arise because word meanings are not fully fixed; rather, words derive some of their meaning from the context in which they appear. Indeed, it is one of the fascinating features of texts that they can alter quite significantly the accepted meanings of words. (Coulthard, 1994:4,8)

2.2 Seven Criteria for Textuality

Robert de Beaugrande (1980) formulates seven criteria for textuality. Beaugrande (in Renkema 1993:34-337) says that a sequence of sentence must meet the seven criteria of textuality in order to qualify as a text. The seven criteria are: cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativeness, situationality, and intertextuality.

- a. *Cohesion* is the connection which results when the interpretation of a textual element is dependent on another element in the text. Consider the following example.

The store no longer sold porcelain figurines. It used to, the man behind the counter said, but they didn't sell very well. Since the business had switched to plastic, sales were doing a lot better.

The interpretation of "it" is dependent on that of "store" just as "they" is dependent on that of "porcelain figurines". The meaning of "used to" is dependent on "sold porcelain figurines". The word "plastic" can only be completely interpreted in relation to "(porcelain) figurines". Cohesion refers to the connection which exists between elements in the text.

- b. Coherence* is the connection which is brought about by something outside the text. This 'something' is usually knowledge which a listener or reader is assumed to possess.
- c. Intentionality* means that writers and speakers must have the conscious intention of achieving specific goals with their message, for instance, conveying information or arguing an opinion. According to this criterion, a sequence of words can only be called a text after an authorial intention has been assigned to it. When no intention is assigned, the word sequence becomes the equivalent of a page of random words not unlike the penmanship practice of elementary school pupils.
- d. Acceptability* requires that a sequence of sentences be acceptable to the intended audience in order to qualify as a text.
- e. Informativeness* is necessary in discourse. A text must contain new information. If a reader knows everything contained in a text, then it does not qualify. Likewise, if a reader does not understand what is in a text, it also does not qualify as a text.

- f. Situationality* is essential to textuality. So, it is important to consider the situation in which the text has been produced and dealt with.
- g. Intertextuality* means that a sequence of sentences is related by form or meaning to other sequences of sentences.

2.3 Lexical Cohesion

According to Halliday & Hasan (1976:279-280) Lexical cohesion is an analysis through the selection of vocabulary and analysis of lexical relations. In general, lexical cohesion is an analysis of semantic relations. The lexical environment of any item includes, naturally not only the words that are in some way or other related to it, but also all other words in the preceding passage, and all of these contribute to its specific interpretation. The words that are more closely related to some other than to others and it is the closeness of the relationship that determines the cohesive effect. The word “*boy*” in the following example is a superordinate from “*child*”, and it shows lexical cohesion.

For example:

There is a boy climbing that tree. The child is going to fall if he does not take care.

The writer uses this theory of cohesion to help her in analyzing the data of her research, because her research is about cohesion in the film-script. In addition, the writer uses this theory because this is the most authentic and comprehensive theory among the other research. In this theory, cohesion was deeply and accurately discussed

2.4 Types of Lexical Cohesion

The existence of lexical cohesion shows the fact that discourse does not wonder at random from one topic to another but has a systematic line. There are two types of lexical cohesion based on the use of general nouns as cohesive agents: reiteration and collocation.

Reiteration means either restating an item in later part of the discourse by direct repetition or else reasserting its meaning by exploiting lexical relations.

According to Halliday & Hasan (1976:288), a reiterated item may be a repetition of the same item in the previous text, and reiteration can be divided into four types, which are:

- Repetition → the repeating of something or thing repeated.
- Synonyms or near-synonyms → words or phrase with the same meaning as another in the same language, though perhaps with a different style, grammar or technical use. e.g. *ascent-climb, sword-blade, voice-sound, etc.*
- Superordinate → the category of superordinate refers to any items whose meaning includes that of the other. Example: *tulip-rose-lotus-flower*. Here, *flower* is the subordinate of *tulip[-rose-lotus]* while *tulip-rose-lotus* are the subordinates of *flower*.
- General word → corresponds to major classes of lexical items and has more general meaning than the other. Example: *Anna loves John very much. The man is the apple of her eyes*. Here, *man* is the general word for *John*.

Renkema (1993) states that reiteration includes not only repetition but also other lexical relations. Reiteration can also occur through the use of a word that is systematically linked to a previous one, for example, “young” and “old”. In general, reiteration consists of five types, and they are:

a. Repetition

The repeating of something or a thing repeated, for example the word “conference” in: “a *conference* will be held on national environmental policy. At this *conference* the issue of salination will play an important role.” (Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary)

b. Synonymy

Synonymy is used to mean ‘sameness of meaning’. It is obvious that for the dictionary-maker many sets of words have the same meaning; they are synonymous, or are synonyms of another. E.g. *brotherly* and *fraternal*, *buy* and *purchase*, *world* and *universe*, *mountain* and *hill*, etc. We can, in fact, define synonymy as symmetric hyponymy. However, it can be maintained that there are no real synonyms, that no two words have exactly the same meaning. Some words may be said to differ only in their emotive or evaluative meanings. The remainder of their meaning, their ‘cognitive’ meaning, remains the same. Several words are interchangeable in certain environments only, e.g. that *deep* or *profound* may be used with sympathy but only *deep* with *water*, that a *road* may be *broad* or *wide* but an accent only *broad*. But still will give us little measure of synonymy or similarity of meaning. (Palmer, 1981: 88-92)

c. Hyponymy

Hyponymy involves a notion of inclusion in the sense that *tulip* and *rose* are included in a *flower*, *lion* and *elephant* in *mammal*. Similarly *scarlet* is included in *red*. Inclusion is thus a matter of class membership. The upper term is the superordinate and lower term the hyponym. E.g. "We were in town today shopping for *furniture*. We saw a lovely *table*." (Palmer, 1981: 85)

d. Meronymy:

Meronymy is the relation between lexical units where the objects, etc denoted by one are parts of those denoted the other, e.g. "At its six-month check up, the *brakes* had to be repaired. In general, however, the *car* was in good condition."(Mathews, 1997:223)

e. Antonymy

The term Antonymy is used for oppositeness of meaning; words that are opposite are Antonyms. Antonymy is often thought of as the opposite of synonymy, but the status of the two are very different. English abounds in pairs of words such as *wide-narrow*, *old-young*, *big-small*, *giant and dwarf*, etc. these, all of them adjectives, have in common the fact that they may be seen in terms of degrees of the quality involved. Thus a road may be *wide* or *very wide* and road may be *wider* than another. We have, that is to say, gradation of width, age, size, etc. all indicated by such adjectives as these. E.g. "The *old* movies just don't do it any more. The *new* ones are more appealing." (Palmer, 1981:94)

Renkema (1993) proposes that collocation, the second type of lexical cohesion, deals with the relationship between words on the basis of the fact that these often occur in the same surroundings. Some examples are: “sheep” and “wool”, “congress” and “politician” or “college” and “study”.

Based on Halliday and Hasan, collocation is part of lexical cohesion that is achieved through the association of lexical items that regularly co-occur (1976:284). Collocation is also regular combination of words in which to fulfill the meaning, these words must occur together such as black coffee. In general, any two lexical items having similar patterns of collocation that is tending to appear similar contexts will generate a cohesive force if they occur in adjacent sentences.

2.5 General Description of American Beauty

2.5.1 The Synopsis

Lester Burnham (Kevin Spacey) is a man stuck in a rut. He works at a dead-end job, is married to Carolyn (Annette Bening), a wife he no longer cares for, and has a teenage daughter (Thora Birch) he pays no attention to. The film opens with Lester, as narrator, telling the audience about how pathetic his life has become. He would seem to have it all: a family, a house in the suburbs, and a steady job, but he is unhappy. Wishing his life weren't so boring, Lester waits for something to pull him out of his oppressively dull existence. His wait is ended when he is dragged to a basketball game at the local high school during which his daughter Jane will perform in a cheerleading routine. During the routine, Lester's

focus turns to his daughter's beautiful friend and fellow cheerleader Angela (Mena Suvari), who awakens his previously-dormant libido and inspires him to break out of his dead-end life. He quits his job (but not before blackmailing his former employers for a sizable severance payment), begins lifting weights and smoking pot with abandon, and buys a brand-new sports car in which he cruises around town blasting 70's rock music. Lester's newfound freedom has serious repercussions on his family, who are taken completely by surprise when he starts behaving so strangely.

Ultimately, this film is about people who feel trapped. Sometimes they are trapped by others, and sometimes they have trapped themselves. Lester is a tragic figure, but it has the added effect of creating him as a man who is "trapped" by fate. No matter how much Lester tries to recapture his youth, it is too late for him. But though he has lost his life, Lester Burnham has accomplished his goal. At the time of his death, he has long since broken out of his rut, while forcing others to break out of theirs, with sometimes disastrous results.

2.5.2 The Actors, Actresses and the Director

This film is directed by Sam Mendes and the script is written by Alan Ball. Several good actors and actresses starring this film, such as Kevin Spacey who plays as Lester Burnham, the main character. Then, Annette Bening as Carolyn Burnham and Thora Birch as Jane Burnham, they are Lester's wife and daughter. The other casts are the Burnham's neighbours: Wes Bentley as Ricky Fitts, Allison Janney as Barbara Fitts, and Chris Cooper as Col. Frank Fitts, USMC,

Mena Suvari as Angela Hayes who is Jane's best friend, Peter Gallagher as Buddy Kane, and many more.

2.5.3 The Awards

From eight nominations of Academy Award 2000, USA, American won five awards, which are for Best Picture, Best Actor, Best Director, Best Original Screenplay, and Best Cinematography. Three Golden Globe Awards for Best Picture, Best Director, and Best Screenplay-motion picture also went to this film. Others awards also went to this film, not only from USA but also from London.

CHAPTER III
DATA PRESENTATION AND
ANALYSIS