

**AN ANALYSIS OF GRAMMATICAL COHESION ON
O HENRY'S SHORT STORY " The Cop and the Anthem"**

Tetiana Nikolaevna Surzhykova¹

Faculty of Post-Graduate Studies Department: English Language and Literature, Zarqa university²

ABSTRACT

Cohesion refers to the linguistic devices by which the author can signal the experiential and interpersonal coherence of the text, and is, thus, a textual phenomenon. The research has two purposes, i.e. to know the kinds of Grammatical cohesion and to explain how grammatical cohesion makes the narrative text, 'The Cop and the Anthem', coherent. The data is taken from an anthology of O Henry's short stories, The Stories of O Henry. The research uses qualitative as well as quantitative methods. The story is analyzed using cohesion theory by Michael Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan. The result of the research shows that all types of grammatical cohesion, Personal reference, Substitution, Ellipsis and Conjunctions, are found in the text. Based on the analysis, the grammatical cohesive ties in the text construct the unity as well as the context in the text. In other words, the grammatical cohesion makes the text function in which it is embedded. It can be said that grammatical cohesion creates the coherence of the text.

Keywords: *Coherence, Ties, Discourse*

© Copy Right, IJAHSS, 2020. All Rights Reserved.

INTRODUCTION:

Language is an important aspect of communication in a daily life. The process of communication could be spoken or written. A text is a unit of language in use. The word 'text' is used in linguistics to refer to any passage spoken or written of whatever length that does form of unified whole [1]. The text is characterized by coherence as well as cohesion and these linguistic resources are found in every language for linking one part of the text to another. A text will convey its meaning related to its context and the interaction among participants. The meanings of the text have to be expressed or coded, in words and structures.

Texture is the quality of being recognizably a text rather than a collection of unconnected words or clauses. These are resources that are not constrained within the limits of the complex clause but contribute to the creation of texture across whole texts or stretches of texts. They are generally grouped together under the label of 'cohesion' [1].

Cohesion is one of the language aspects that distinctively gives us explanation how the sentences are related to each other. Cohesion in the text can be achieved through the grammatical and lexical relationship within a sentence. It holds a sentence together and gives it meaning. The concept of grammatical cohesion as one of cohesive devices should be fully mastered while interpreting the meaning in a text. It is to show how the sentences are related in form to make the text coherent.

Coherence is in the mind of the writer and reader: it is a mental phenomenon and cannot be identified or quantified in the same way as cohesion.

'Short story is one kind of writing language which is a short work of fiction. It is a story with a fully developed theme but significantly shorter and less elaborate than a novel. Analyzing the grammatical cohesion in the short story is interesting since the difficulty in understanding the meaning of the word often happens. In order to determine the coherence or discourse structure and the larger meaning of a text in the short story, it is very important to understand the cohesion used in the text. There is also specific information about the actual component present in the short stories to give a clear understanding of what actually to be conveyed to the reader.'

In addition, Halliday considers a text as a form of social exchange of meaning. When people produce text, they seem to arrange words or sentences. In fact, they transfer meaning. They convince their idea to others through this linguistic unit. Naturally, the idea, knowledge or anything people attempt to share with others is to be understood by participants.

It is of great interest to analyze different kinds of cohesion, because it shows relation from one word to another word in order to make the text cohesive. A strong argumentation is provided by Adlen J.Moe who states that the more implicit the cohesive relationship is, the more difficult text is to be understood. So, to make the message in the short story delivered clearly, it should be cohesive. It provides the relation between words or sentences in the text so that the readers can easily understand the text.

The short story which will be analyzed is from a prolific writer, O Henry: "The Cop and the Anthem".

Problem of the study:

Based on the background stated above, the problem can be formulated as:

1. What types and uses of all forms of Grammatical cohesion are used in the short story "The Cop and the Anthem" by O Henry?

Aims of the study:

The aims of the study are:

1. To find out the types and uses of all forms of Grammatical cohesion such as, *Reference*, *Substitution*, *Ellipsis* and *Conjunctions* in the short story: "The Cop and the Anthem" by O Henry.
2. To find out the frequency of all forms of Grammatical cohesion in the short story: "The Cop and the Anthem" by O Henry.

Research Methodology:

Method and Technique of Collecting Data

The data in this study were collected using the library research method. The technique of collecting the data in this study was conducted in several steps. The first step was deep studying all cohesive devices in order to get a good understanding of them. The next step was finding out and highlighting the words which were considered the category of grammatical cohesion, forms of Reference, Substitution, Ellipsis and Conjunctions. Finally, it was identifying the data based on the category of grammatical cohesion.

Method and Technique of Analyzing Data

The data in this study were analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively. There are some steps in analyzing the data in this study. The first step of the analysis concerned analyzing the data quantitatively: identifying and categorizing the grammatical cohesion based on the theory of cohesion that was proposed by M.A.K Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan in their book entitled *Cohesion in English* (1976). The next step was the analysis of different forms of Grammatical cohesion, finding out their frequency in the short story and showing the analysis of data on the table.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK:

Previous Studies

This section reviews some previous studies that are related with this research.

This research is not the first study analyzing and discussing cohesion in texts. There are some others, such as Kuncahya's [2] research which is focusing on the types of cohesion and the interpretation of the occurring types of cohesion in terms of compatibility as language inputs in 16 narrative texts presented in the electronic textbook of senior high school grade 10 entitled *Developing English Competence*.

Another one is Astuti [3] who describes the cohesion related to discourse opinions of politics. Specifically, she focuses on grammatical and lexical aspects that become a cohesion device of opinion discourse of politics in *Kedaulatan Rakyat* daily newspaper in January 2011 and the role of these aspects is in the process towards a complete and coherent text.

Further, Husein [4] conducted a research focusing on grammatical cohesion on corpus-based discourse analysis. He tried to explore eighth-grade Emirati EFL learner's familiarity in generating expository text. Compared to those previous studies, this research investigates students' awareness toward grammatical cohesion in composing essays in a writing class and goes deeply to meet inappropriate cohesive devices used.

The fourth research is by Abdul Rohim [5], in the thesis entitled *Cohesion Analysis on The Jakarta Post's Editorial*. His data analysis technique adopted a library study and quantitative analysis. The result of this research showed that cohesion devices, both the grammatical and lexical, had the highest and lowest frequency, the cohesion through the grammatical cohesive devices which had the highest frequency was reference item especially personal reference. Substitution did not influence the cohesiveness of the text because its absence was changed by the oral agency. In the lexical cohesion, he found some repetition words stretched across several sentences in every text of the Poet's editorial and it was the highest frequency.

The fifth research is by Nurul Laili Mariani Fadjrin [6], entitled *An Analysis of Grammatical and Lexical Cohesion of Journalistic Text in 2011*. This thesis studied the journalistic texts in online media to know the dominant cohesive devices are used and to know the cohesiveness degree of cohesion markers. She used Halliday and Hasan's theory about cohesion. The result of the research was that all kinds of grammatical and lexical cohesion devices were utilized in the journalistic texts which she analyzed. But generally speaking, lexical cohesion devices are very rarely utilized in the text, except repetition.

Discourse Analysis

Discourse is the way of combining and integrating language, actions, interactions, and ways of thinking, believing and valuing by using various symbols, tools and objects to enact a particular sort of socially recognizable identity [7]. Referring to text, discourse has pragmatic and semantic dimensions [8], which means that discourse is constructed with layers of meanings; based on what is written/spoken and based on when, how, and where it is written/spoken by who (context).

The analysis of discourse is, necessarily, the analysis of language in use. As such, it cannot be restricted to the description of linguistic forms independent of the purposes of functions which those forms are designed to serve in human affairs. While some linguists may concentrate on determining the formal properties of a language, the discourse analyst is committed to an investigation of what that language is used for [9].

Discourse analysis is a study of meaning in the use of language and the action when language is used in specific context. It has similarity to pragmatics. Both are the approaches to studying language relation to the contextual background features. Both study context, text and function.

In addition, language use is the main point in discourse analysis [10]. Discourse analysis studies the highest unit of language in the text, and language is studied in its context. This is because discourse is acceptable to the extent that it exhibits coherence relations between its discourses [11].

The relationship makes discourse understandable and is requirement to be a text. It is the most salient phenomenon of discourse and two concepts, cohesion and coherence, are used referring to the relationship.

Text

Text is a unit of language in use. Some researchers such as Stubbs and Chafe viewed text as a unit of language in use that is larger than a sentence [12]. On the contrary, Halliday and Hasan do not restrict the size. They used it to refer to any passage of language of whatever length that forms a unified whole (1). Another definition in agreement with this statement comes from Lyons. According to him, text is made up of a sequence of sentences, sentence-fragments and ready-made locutions that are connected in some contextual way.

Text is a semantic unit of meaning coded in lexico-grammatical system [1]. In linguistic system, meaning is expressed in lexico-grammatical features. So, a word, a sentence or sentences are representations of text.

Then, the meaning in the text must show unity. This unity is the character of text that distinguishes it from what is not a text. It is a text when the meaning is contingent between parts, if not, it is only a stretch of sentences [1]. At the same time, language in use is called text when it becomes functional. Functional means that language takes its role in some context in which it is placed. It is opposed to isolated words or sentences [1].

Cohesion

Halliday and Hasan have much attention to cohesion. In their work *Cohesion in English*, they define it explicitly. To begin with, cohesion is meaning relations which can connect between parts of the text (26). Cohesion arises when the interpretation of elements in text relates to another element. The one functions as presupposing item to the other in making sense of the interpretation. This occurrence establishes a cohesive relation and the relation constitutes a tie, i.e. a term for one occurrence of two cohesively related elements, the presupposing and the presupposed items [1].

Cohesion is not only concerned with grammar, but also with vocabulary. Hence, it is divided into *grammatical* and *lexical* cohesion.

Based on Halliday and Hasan, cohesion is expressed by grammar and vocabulary. The former is called grammar cohesion, and it has four devices: *reference*, *substitution*, *ellipsis* and *conjunction*. The latter is called lexical cohesion, and it has several devices: *repetition*, *synonymy*, *general words*, *superordinate* and *collocations* (6).

FINDINGS AND DATA ANALYSIS:

Data Analysis

This section is concerned with the analysis of the data taken from the text of the short story entitled "*The Cop and the Anthem*", which is a modern short story by O Henry. It is about Soapy, a homeless young man living in a big city. Soapy repeatedly tries to get arrested so he can spend the winter in a warm jail cell, but is continually unsuccessful. The short story

"*The Cop and The Anthem*" critiques how the homeless are treated by moral and immoral characters of society. This text was analyzed through the analysis of the Grammatical cohesion.

Grammatical Cohesive Devices

References

The text analysis shows that the author used a variety of references. Table 1 displays the number of each type of reference, and the total number of references used altogether. Each grammatical cohesive device can be found bold and italicized.

Personal, Comparative and Demonstrative references

*A dead leaf fell in Soapy's lap. **That** was Jack Frost's card. Jack is kind to the regular denizens of Madison Square, and gives fair warning of **his** annual call. At the corners of four streets **he** hands his pasteboard to the North Wind, footman of the mansion of All Outdoors, so that the inhabitants thereof may make ready.*

O Henry uses many instances of personal anaphoric references to refer to presupposed items in the text. In the second paragraph, two of them were identified. *His* (in the third sentence) is a possessive determiner which refers anaphorically to Jack Frost who was mentioned beforehand in the previous sentence. The personal reference item *he* (sentence four) is a pronoun functioning as Head, this refers back to Jack, too. There is one more referential instance in this paragraph, *that* (sentence two), but in this case it tends to be associated with a past-time demonstrative referent to a *dead leaf that fell in Soapy's lap*.

*The hibernatorial ambitions of Soapy were not of **the** highest. In **them** were no considerations of Mediterranean cruises, of soporific Southern skies or drifting in **the** Vesuvian Bay. Three months on **the** Island was what **his** soul craved. Three months of assured board and bed and congenial company, safe from Boreas and bluecoats, seemed to Soapy **the** essence of things desirable.*

Seven referential instances were identified in the fourth paragraph of the story. In five cases, it is the definite article '*the*' which has no content by itself, it indicates that the item is specific and identifiable. The three instances such as, '*the* Vesuvian Bay', '*the* highest' and '*the* Island' refer to Homophoric type of exophoric reference, which does not depend on specific situation. Both are not textual therefore they are not cohesive. The other two, such as, '*the* hibernatorial ambitions of Soapy...', '*the* essence of things desirable' are cataphoric referential instances since there is no lexical relation between hibernatorial ambitions, essence and anything in the preceding passage. But they are textual and therefore cohesive. Whenever the information is contained in the text, the presence of *the* creates a link between the sentence in which it itself occurs and that containing the referential information.

We could have mentioned the superlative "*the highest*" which means higher than any other and, actually, is the most generalized comparative. It could be referred to Comparative reference, but it is not, taking into consideration that superlatives are non-referential because they are self-defining.

There are two more instances of Personal reference, such as, *them* (sentence 2) and *his* (sentence 3). *Them* refers to *ambitions* and *his* refers to *Soapy*. Both are anaphoric, textual, and therefore cohesive.

*He scorned **the** provisions made in **the** name of charity for **the** city's dependent. In Soapy's opinion **the** Law was **more benign** than Philanthropy. There was an endless round of institutions, municipal and eleemosynary, on which **he** might set out and receive lodging and food accordant with **the** simple life. But to one of Soapy's proud spirit **the** gifts of charity are encumbered. If not in coin you must pay in humiliation of spirit for every benefit received at **the** hands of philanthropy. As Caesar had **his** Brutus, every bed of charity must have **its** toll of a bath, every loaf of bread its compensation of a private and personal inquisition. Wherefore **it is better to be a guest of the law**, which, though conducted by rules, does not meddle unduly with a gentleman's private affairs.*

There are two instances of Comparative reference in this paragraph. The first one is '*more benign than Philanthropy*' (sentence two) and '*it is better to be..*' (sentence seven). The instance '*more benign than Philanthropy*' is the comparison in terms of quality, with an Epithet as the comparative and Philanthropy as a referent. There are five instances of personal reference and all are anaphoric because refer to items, in particular to people, that were mentioned in the preceding text. Two instances of "*he*" refer to the main character, Soapy. "*His*" refers to Caesar. Two instances of '*its*' refer to different items: the first refers to 'every bed of charity' and the second - to 'every loaf of bread'. And there is one instance that represents a composition of an elliptical structure with a comparative reference, such as "*it's better to be a guest of the law*".

There are seven instances of Demonstrative reference represented by the definite article '*the*', all refer cataphorically to the text because there is no lexical relation between the items they refer to, such as, '*provisions*', '*name*', '*city's*

dependent', 'Law', 'gift of charity', 'hands' and anything in the preceding passage. But the last instance of *'the law'* in the paragraph represents Demonstrative reference that refers to the text anaphorically in consideration of mentioning it before in the same paragraph.

'My umbrella,' he said sternly.

'Oh, is it?' sneered Soapy, adding insult to petit larceny. 'Well, why don't you call a policeman? I took it. Your umbrella! Why don't you call a cop? There stands one at the corner.'

The umbrella owner slowed his steps. Soapy did likewise, with a presentiment that luck would again run against him.

The policeman looked at the two curiously.

'Of course,' said the umbrella man - 'that is - well, you know how these mistakes occur - I - if it's your umbrella I hope you'll see - I picked it up this morning in a restaurant - If you recognize it as yours, why - I hope you'll - '

'Of course it's mine,' said Soapy viciously.

The text above demonstrates some more other types of referential instances. In fact, they are representatives of Personal and Demonstrative references which have been already mentioned above, but they are represented in a little bit different way.

The 1st and the 2nd person forms usually refer to the situation, not to the text. Consequently, they are not cohesive. First and second person forms don't normally refer to the text at all; their referents are defined by the speech roles of speaker and hearer, and hence they are normally interpreted exophorically, by reference to the situation. But in the text above, the forms *'I'* and *'you'* are in the quoted clause and refer back, like the preceding *he* refers to *'the man lighting a cigar'*. These are instances of anaphora, albeit indirect anaphora. They still refer to the speaker and the hearer, but it is necessary to look in the text to find out who they are.

The possessive pronouns *'yours'* and *'mine'* are doubly anaphoric because they are both referential and elliptical: they are anaphoric by reference, to the possessor, Soapy; and by ellipsis, to the thing possessed, to the umbrella.

Extended demonstrative reference is represented by means of *'that'* which refers to the total event and functions as Head in the sentence.

Unlike the Demonstrative references presented by the definite article *'the'* that were mostly referred cataphorically, there are two anaphoric instances of the definite article *'the'* which refer to different referents, to *'umbrella'* and to *'policemen'*.

The rest of instances that can be found out in the passage above are: *'his'* and *'him'*. They both refer to the umbrella owner. They both are anaphoric.

Soapy felt a hand laid on his arm. He looked quickly around into the broad face of a policeman.

'What are you doin' here?' asked the officer.

'Nothin',' said Soapy.

The demonstrative adverb *'here'* is anaphoric and locative. *'The'* that refers to officer is anaphoric that brings cohesion to the text.

The upshot of the research is that the most frequent types of reference are Personal reference represented by means of personal pronouns and Demonstrative reference represented by definite article *'the'*. The typical instance of 3rd person reference is textual, and therefore cohesive; in the text the 3rd person forms constitute the most frequent single class of cohesive items as a Personal reference.

Although the 1st and the 2nd person forms essentially refer to the situation, they can represent indirect anaphora in the case of the quoted clause as it can be noticed from the findings above.

The most frequent instances of cataphora were represented by the definite article *'the'* as Demonstrative reference. Its predominant function is cataphoric. In addition, it was noticed that all immediate situational instances of *'the'* are exophoric.

Substitution and Ellipsis:

In the text, there are four instances of Substitution and three cases of Ellipsis.

"It seemed that his route to the coveted Island was not to be an epicurean one".

Nominal Substitution *one* substitutes the route to the coveted Island.

'Oh, is it?' sneered Soapy, adding insult to petit larceny. 'Well, why don't you call a policeman? I took it. Your umbrella! Why don't you call a cop? There stands **one** at the corner.'

The same form of Substitution appears again, *one* as an instance of Nominal Substitution is used by author to avoid repetition of the word '*policemen*'. So to know what the word *one* substitutes, readers should go backwards to get the information.

*The umbrella owner slowed his steps. Soapy did likewise, with a presentiment that luck would again run against him. The policeman looked at **the two** curiously.*

The third Substitution in the text is also Nominal, but in this case it represented by '*the two*' which substitutes two persons, Soapy and the well-dressed man. The reader identifies Soapy from the excerpt above, but to identify the second person, the reader should go to preceding text.

Noisy; but no harm.

From the text above, the first form of Ellipsis was identified. The clause '*There is*' is omitted. For understanding the reader should presuppose the presence of the clause. This elliptical structure is cataphoric since it does not presuppose any item present in the preceding text.

'Of course,' said the umbrella man - 'that is - well, you know how these mistakes occur - I - if it's your umbrella I hope you'll excuse me - I picked it up this morning in a restaurant - If you recognize it as yours, why - I hope you'll -' Ellipsis identified in the excerpt above makes the researcher be in perplexity since it is not clear whether the author tends to avoid the repetition "...you'll excuse me" or he leaves out "recognize me as yours" for the same reason. But the main idea is not omitted for the reader.

*'He would find him to-morrow and ask for the position. He would be somebody in the world. **He would -'*** The next elliptical structure leaves out again two main ideas, but unlike the previous Ellipsis, it's clear which ideas are omitted: 'He would find him tomorrow and ask for the position' and 'He would be somebody in the world.' '*He would*' is a Modal element, '*find him tomorrow and ask for the proposition*' and '*be somebody in the world*' are Propositional elements. The elliptical structure is anaphoric, there is a sense of omission and it keeps the text cohesive.

The last two elliptical instances identified in the text represent one type of Ellipsis which is verbal Ellipsis. The first instance of Ellipsis is clausal.

All instances in the text categorized as Substitutions are Nominal. The items which are mentioned in the preceding text are substituted, so the reader again looks in the text, which is cohesive and Substitutions are applied in an anaphoric way.

The research resulted in small number of instances of Substitution and Ellipsis, three items of Ellipsis and four items of Substitution were found out. On the other hand, it can be said that there are 7 examples of Substitution, three of them are Zero Substitutions (0). Substitution is a replacement of one item by another, and Ellipsis is the omission of an item. Essentially the two are the same process; ellipsis can be interpreted as that form of Substitution in which the item is replaced by nothing. But the mechanisms involved in the two are rather different, and also, at least in the case of Ellipsis, fairly complex.

Conjunctions:

*At the corners of four streets he hands his pasteboard to the North Wind, footman of the mansion of All Outdoors, **so that** the inhabitants **thereof** may make ready.*

In the preceding sentence, two examples of Conjunctions were identified, what is more, they are representatives of one type. The conjunctions '*so that*' and '*thereof*' are simple general causal conjunctions. It can be suggested that they both are functioned to give the logical result of an activity and '*so that*', in first place, links two sentences with a causal effect.

*Soapy's mind became cognizant of the fact that the time had come for him to resolve himself into a singular Committee of Ways and Means to provide against the coming rigour. **And therefore** he moved uneasily on his bench.*

In the second sentence, two conjunctions were identified again. The conjunction '*therefore*' has the same form and semantic meaning as it has been already mentioned above. But the second instance of conjunction '*and*' represents another kind, it is a simple additive conjunction which connects two sentences. O Henry used 'and' at the beginning of the

sentence. Referring back to Halliday & Hasan [1], the use of conjunction 'and' is to connect two sentences which can give the additional information, while it is placed in between two sentences.

*Soapy walked eastward through a street damaged by improvements. He hurled the umbrella wrathfully into an excavation. He muttered against the men who wear helmets and carry clubs. **Because** he wanted to fall into their clutches, they seemed to regard him as a king who could do no wrong.*

The 'and' could have been mentioned as an additive item that operates conjunctively like in the example above. But it is not the case of linking the whole set of sentences together by single 'and' relation. The clauses which are linked with the 'and' can be rearranged, it could be written: "...the men who carry clubs and wear helmets". And this is not the case of an additive relation. It is the instance of coordination being realized in the form of a particular structural relation. As it is known, the coordinate relation is structural, whereas the additive relation is cohesive. Investigating the previous 'and' in the preceding example, where 'and' as a conjunctive relation and as a dominant sentence linker can really be said to form a cohesive whole.

The word 'because' in the text is categorized as a simple instance of Reversed causal relations. The first clause explains the reason why they seemed to regard him as a king who could do no wrong. Obviously, the Causal conjunction is used in an internal use.

*One dollar for the cigar would be enough. The total would not be so high as to call forth any supreme manifestation of revenge from the café management; **and yet** the meat would leave him filled and happy for the journey to his winter refuge.*

But as Soapy set foot inside the restaurant door the head waiter's eye fell upon his frayed trousers and decadent shoes.

An external adversative relation is expressed in the text in its simple form by the word 'yet' occurring initially in the second clause. Very similar to 'yet' in this function is 'but' mentioned in the third sentence. The word 'but' differs from 'yet' in that 'but' contains the element 'and' as one of the meaning components, whereas 'yet' does not. 'But' is never found with 'and' like 'and but', and it is used here to connect two passages giving a contrasting signal.

'What are you doin' here?' asked the officer.

'Nothin',' said Soapy.

'Then come along,' said the policeman.

In this part of the text, the only Temporal conjunction which refers to Simple temporal relation and categorized as a Sequential type was identified. A Simple temporal conjunction 'then' is used here to give a sequence. "Then go on if you're doing nothing", meant the policeman.

To sum up, all four types of Conjunctions were identified and investigated in the text. The additive conjunction is the most frequent conjunctive type found out in the story. Furthermore, 'and' as a form of coordination was ubiquitous, but as it is known, structural relation does not contain cohesive features. Taking into consideration, that this research is concerned with the analysis of cohesion, the instances of 'and' as coordinates were included neither in the data of the Tables nor in the analysis.

Table 1 Reference

Number of reference use					Total use
Reference	Paragraph/sentence	Number	No. total	%	
I	26/3; 28/2 (three), 3	5			
It	10/2; 11/2; 12/1; 14/2; 17/1; 21/5; 25/3; 26/3; 33/2	9			
You	18/7 ; 26/5; 28/1, 2, 3; 35/12;19/5,6;	8			
He	2/3; 5/4,6,8; 7/1; 8/2,3; 13/5; 14/5,6; 16/2; 17/2; 18/2; 19/3 (twice); 20/2; 21/1,2, 5 (twice); 22/2; 25/1,2,3; 30/2;3; 31/2; 33/2; 34/2 (twice); 35/3 (three), 4 (twice),	39			

Personal Reference		6, 8,9, 10		152	49.1%	309
	They	13/3; 23/1; 30/4	3			
	My	25/5	1			
	Your	26/4; 28/2	2			
	His	1/2; 2/3; 3/2; 4/3; 5/1, 2 (thrice), 4 (thrice), 11; 6/1; 7/1; 8/ 1,2 (thrice), 3,7; 9/1; 10/2; 11/4 (twice); 13/6; 14/4; 15/1; 16/1; 17/2 (twice); 18/1 (twice); 18/5; 19/2; 20/1; 21/1; 22/1; 23/1(twice); 24/1,2,3; 25/2; 27/1; 31/2; 32/3; 33/2; 34/1,2; 35/1,4,9	52			
	Her	18/2, 4,5	5			
	their	1/2	1			
	him	3/1; 8/4,2,7; 9/2 (twice); 19/4; 21/4; 24/2; 27/2; 35/2,3,5,7	14			
	them	4/2; 35/4	2			
	himself	3/1; 8/1; 14/6; 16/2; 35/3 (twice)	6			
	mine	28/5	1			
	yours	28/4	1			
Descriptive Reference	its	16/3; 14/3 (twice); 5/11 (twice)	5	153	49.5%	
	'the'	1/2; 2/2, 3 (four); 3/1 (thrice); 4/ 1,2,3,4; 5/ 1,2 (twice), 3,4 (four), 5, 6 (twice), 7,8,9,10,12; 6/3,4; 7/1 (six); 8/1,3,4 (thrice),5,6, 7 (four); 9/1 (four); 11/2,3 (twice) 4 (twice); 13/1,2,3 (twice), 4 14/1,6,7 (twice); 15/1,2,4 (twice); 16/2,3; 17/1 (twice), 2 (five); 18/1 (thrice),2 (twice),3,4; 19/1,2,3 (twice),4,6; 20/3; 21/1,2 (twice), 5 (twice); 22/1 (twice),2; 23/2 (twice);24/3,4 25/3,4; 26/6; 27/1,2; 28/1; 28/1; 29/1,2 (twice); 31/1 (twice), 2 (twice); 32/3 (twice), 4 (twice); 33/1 (thrice), 2 (four); 34/1 (thrice),2 (twice); 35/ 6,8,9,11,12,14	139			
	this	14/4; 16/2; 23/1; 35/1	4			
	that	2/2; 11/4 (twice); 28/1; 29/2 34/2; 35/3	7			
	those	35/5	1			
	these	28/1	1			
	Here	35/13	1			
Comparat. Reference	More fortunate	5/2	1	4	1.3%	
	more benign	5/7	1			
	sooner	19/6	1			

	it is better to be a quest (Comparat.reference +Ellipsis)	5/12	1			
--	--	------	---	--	--	--

Table 2 Substitution

Type	Number of Substitution use			Total		Total use
	Substitution	Paragraph/sentence	Quantity	N	%	
Nominal	One	10/2; 23/1; 26/5	3	4	100%	4
	the two	27/2	1			
Verbal	- - - - -	- - - - -	0	0	0%	
Causal	- - - - -	- - - - -	0	0	0%	

Table 3 Ellipsis

Type	Number of Ellipsis use					Total use
	Substitution	Paragraph/sentence	Quantity		Total	
				No.	%	3
Nominal	- - - - -	- - - - -	0	0	0%	
Verbal	You will (recognize)	28/4	1	2	66.7%	
	Causal	He would (find)	35/10			
	(There is) no harm	23/2	1	1	33.3%	

Table 4 Conjunctions

Type	Number of conjunction use					Total Use
	Conjunction	Paragraph/sentence	Number	Total		
				No.	%	28
Additive	And	3/2; 5/3; 8/5; 14/6,8; 16/3; 33/2	7	7	25%	
	Adversative	But	9/1; 12/1; 15/3; 19/6 23/2; 31/1; 32/1; 35/5	8	11	
Yet		8/7; 35/4	2			
Though		5/12	1			
so that		2/4	1			

Causal	So	5/2,5	2	6	
	Therefore	3/2	1		21.4%
	Thereof	2/4	1		
	Because	30/4	1		
Temporal	Then	6/3; 8/5; 35/15	3		
	Sooner 14.3 % (conj.+ compar. reference)	19/6	1 4		14.3%

* Taking into consideration that 'and' where it is a coordinate has a structural relation, it does not refer to cohesion, these examples were not included in the analysis.

Table 5 GRAMMATCAL COHESIVE DEVICES

Total	Grammatical Cohesive Device	Total use	
		No.	%
343	Reference	309	90.1 %
	Substitution	4	1.3 %
	Ellipsis	3	0.9%
	Conjunction	27	7.9 %

*One device was intentionally removed from Conjunctions because 'sooner' was mentioned twice (in analysis of Comparative Reference and Conjunctions)

CONCLUSION:

Based on the analysis of different types of grammatical cohesion in the short story "The Cop and the Anthem" by O Henry, it can be noted that all four Cohesive types were identified such as, References, Substitution, Ellipsis and Conjunctions. The occurrences of grammatical cohesion in the text most frequently used by the writer are References. The domination of Cohesion devices in the story was presented by Personal reference (the 3rd person was demonstrated as the most frequent element of referential instances) and Demonstrative reference in the form of definite article 'the'. In majority of cases, Personal reference is used anaphorically since the 3rd person usually refers to the preceding text.

It is worth noticing that the least frequent grammatical devices were Substitution and Zero Substitution, in other words, Ellipsis. Substitution of two types was identified, such as, nominal and verbal.

The unique case of composition of comparative referential structure with ellipsis was identified in the story. For linking the sentences and making the text coherent, the writer employed four conjunctive devices: additive, adversative, causal and temporal.

The analysis reveals that 90.1% of grammatical devices used in the story is Reference (see Table 5). This might indicate that the writer has good background of the appropriate method of using reference. The remaining percentage (9.9 %) of the total grammatical devices applied in the text is divided between Conjunctions, Ellipsis and Substitution. However, there is no evidence of Causal, Verbal Substitution or Nominal Ellipsis in the text.

The results of previous studies that were mentioned in the Theoretical Framework coincide with our results. Abdul Rohim performed quantitative analysis on *The Jakarta Post's Editorial* which showed that Personal reference had the highest frequency. And it is not a fluke. So it can be concluded that the highest frequency in narrative texts belongs to Personal reference. And narrative texts usually lack of Substitution and Ellipsis.

Analyzing the text, the researcher came to conclusion that when we hear or read a passage of the language, which is more than one sentence in length, we can normally decide without difficulty whether it forms a unified whole or just a collection of unrelated sentences.

The concept of cohesion is a semantic one; it refers to relations of meaning that exist within a text, and that defines it as a text.

It was intentionally proved that cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one presupposes the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it. When it happens, a relation of cohesion is set up, and the two elements, the presupposing and the presupposed, are thereby potentially integrated into a text.

Cohesion occurs in a text if it has texture. In other words, a text is cohesive when the stretches of language are hung together with ties.

Works Citation

1. Halliday, MAK & Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman House.
2. Kuncahya, Astri Ollivia. 2015. *Cohesion in Narrative Texts Presented in the Electronic Textbook of Senior High School Grade X Entitled Developing English Competence*. (Undergraduate Thesis). Yogyakarta: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta
3. Astuti, KS. 2012. *Kohesi Wacana Politik Pada Rubrik Opini Surat Kabar Harian Kedaulatan Rakyat*. (Undergraduate Thesis). Yogyakarta: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta
4. Husein, Husein Maghawry. 2014. *A Corpus-based Discourse Analysis of Grammatical Cohesion Used in Expository Essays Written by Emirati EFL Learners at Al ghazali School, Abu Dhabi*. (PhD Dissertation). Dubai: The British University
5. Abdul Rohim, 2009. *Cohesion Analysis on The Jakarta Post's Editorial*. (A Thesis). Jakarta: Letters and Humanities faculty, State Islamic University "Syarif Hidayatullah"
6. Nurul Laili Mariani Fadjrini-Fah. 2011. *An Analysis of Grammatical and Lexical Cohesion on the Journalistic Text of VoANE WS.COM*, State Islamic University "Syarif Hidayatullah", Jakarta
7. Gee, James Paul and Michael Handford. 2012 "Introduction". *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Ed. James Paul Gee and Michael Handford. London: Routledge., 1-6
8. Rocci, A. : 2009. *An overview of Research in Discourse studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
9. Brown, G and George Yule. 1983. *Discourse analysis*., Cambridge University Press.
10. Schiffrin, et al..2001. *The Handbook of Discourse analysis*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
11. Blakemore, D. 2001. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
12. Widdowson, H.G. 2004. *Text, Context, Pretext: Critical Issues in Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.