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ABSTRACT
The present study was aimed at categorising the elements that help to join different sentences in selected Gikuyu texts. This study falls in the broad area of discourse analysis. The texts selected for this study were those written in continuous prose and were from the literary and the reportage text categories. The work followed the Halliday and Hasan’s model of Cohesion to categorise cohesive devices in these texts. Gikuyu texts analysed showed evidence of the five categories of cohesion proposed in the Halliday and Hasan’s model of cohesion. These are the reference, lexical organisation, conjunction, ellipsis, and substitution cohesive devices. The data showed evidence of only one sub-category of substitution as a cohesive device. This is a kind of verbal substitution known as verbal reference. Nominal and clausal substitutions did not occur at all in the data. Future researchers may analyse more Gikuyu data or data from other Bantu languages to find out if nominal and clausal substitutions occur cohesively. Only the nominal subcategory of ellipsis occurred cohesively in the data. Clausal and Verbal ellipsis were cohesive only within the sentence. However, a type of ellipsis not mentioned in the Halliday and Hasan model of cohesion was found to be cohesive: ana-link construction, common in Bantu languages was ellided to be recovered in preceding sentences. Future researchers may analyse more Gikuyu data or data from a related language such as Swahili or Kikamba, to find out if a-link constructions occur cohesively. The present study provides a theory-governed description of cohesion in Gikuyu. This is useful for the writers of Gikuyu grammars used for the teaching of this language. The study also contributes to the increasing body of knowledge in Bantu linguistics, Gikuyu being a Bantu language.

INTRODUCTION

Different linguists recognise different categories of cohesion, though most categories proposed by different linguists overlap. Halliday & Hasan (1976) recognise five categories of cohesion which include reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical organisation. Cook (1989:14) on the other hand identifies seven cohesive devices that create cohesion in English. Among them are referring expressions, lexical chains and repetition, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. These, in some way, correspond to those identified by Halliday & Hasan (1976).

Cook (1989) further recognises parallelism and verb form as cohesive devices. Parallelism is said to occur when the form of one sentence repeats that of another, as illustrated below:

(1) Minute by minute they change; minute by minute they live.

In this example, the two clauses separated by a semicolon take the same form and it is argued that this makes them appear to belong together. Verb forms on the other hand create links between sentences in that the form of a verb in one sentence limits the choice of the verb form in the next sentence. Consider the following example:
Heaven is above us and ever keeps above us. It never gets easy to go heavenward. It is a slow and painful process to grow better. The tense of the first verb conditions the tense in all the others. Cook’s categories provide further insight into the nature of cohesion. Hasan (1984) revises Halliday & Hasan’s (1976) lexical category of cohesion. The 1976 model outlines lexical ties as subcategorised into collocation and reiteration. Hasan (1984) resubcategorises the lexical category into general and instantial categories. The general category consists of ties created by repetition, synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, and metonymy. The instantial category on the other hand is subcategorised into equivalence, naming, and semblance. Naming can be exemplified as in the example below, where dog and toto refer to the same entity and their relationship is that of naming.

The dog was called toto

This revision provides a clearly defined lexical category, and enhances a better understanding of this category of cohesion. Hoey (1991) is of the view that cohesive devices with the exception of conjunctions are similar in that they are all ways of repeating. He proposes repetition categories that can be used in the analysis of cohesion. These include; simple lexical repetition, complex lexical repetition, simple paraphrase, reference, substitution/ellipsis, particular to general, and complex paraphrase. For example, simple paraphrase occurs whenever a lexical item may substitute for another in context without loss or gain in specificity and with no discernible change in meaning. This is exemplified in the underlined words in the following sentences:

Quirk et al (1985) is a huge volume. The book is very helpful for the study of English grammar.

The word volume refers to the word book without losing the intended meaning at all. However, Hoey’s repetition categories have been earlier captured by those of Halliday and Hasan (1976) and will not be dealt with in this study to avoid unnecessary repetition.

Phillips, S. & Hardy, C. (2002) proposed eight categories of cohesion. They are same word repetition, synonyms, super ordinates and generals, opposites and related words, substitutes, ellipsis, reference and connectives. For instance, related words would include such words as cricket and play. If these two words occurred in different sentences in a text, the connection in the meaning of the two words would cause the two sentences to be seen as belonging together. Phillip & Hardy’s categories shed more light on the nature of cohesion in texts.

The Study Data and Sampling Techniques

The corpus for this study is drawn from selected Gĩkũyũ texts. These are the literary category as represented by Ngũgĩ (1980) and Mwangi (1998), and the reportage category as represented by the January 2000 issues of 3 periodicals circulated in Nairobi namely Mûrata, Mwîhoko, and Kîmûrî. These particular categories were selected because they provide excerpts of continuous prose, which are necessary for an analysis of cohesion in texts. Ngũgĩ (1980) and Mwangi (1998) were selected because unlike other novels that have short chapters which often break into dialogues and songs, these two novels contain stretches of continuous prose, which are long enough for our purposes. Mûrata, Mwîhoko and Kîmûrî periodicals are selected because they contain reports that are written in continuous prose and have a length of up to 40 sentences, which is considered long enough for an analysis of cohesion.

The study sample was considered sufficient to represent all the cohesive devices that help to create cohesion in Gĩkũyũ texts. This is in accordance with Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) argument that if a passage containing more than one sentence is perceived as a text, there will be certain linguistic features present, which contribute to its total unity. This is regardless of its genre or style. The total study sample consists of 240 sentences. The selected texts were typed and coded for ease of identification. Examples drawn from our data have been used as illustrations in this paper. The specific source of each illustration is given before each example in code form. Following the above coding scheme, LTC1:16-20 means that the example is drawn from...
the literary text category, Ngũgĩ (1980) extract, from sentence 16 to 20. Similarly, RTC 2:3 means that the example is drawn from the reportage text category, Mûrata extract, sentence 3.

Data Analysis and Presentation
The analysis of data in this study entailed the identification and description of cohesive devices in sample texts. The analysis followed the procedure below:

a) All the sentences in the particular text being analysed were numbered.
b) The number of cohesive ties contained in a sentence was indicated.
c) The cohesive item(s) and its/their gloss(es) were then written down.
d) For each of the ties, the type of cohesion involved was specified.

The analysis was presented in tables as the one shown below.

Sample of analysis of Mwangi (1998)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence Number</th>
<th>Number of ties</th>
<th>Cohesive item</th>
<th>Type of cohesion</th>
<th>Presupposed item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ngaari</td>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Athii</td>
<td>Passengers</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lexical: reiteration: Superordinate term</td>
<td>Gloss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tonya ümbûke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Proper noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Makanga, Kahonoki, Ngoima. Nyina kahonoki na angî</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conductor, kahonoki Ngoima, his wife and other Passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gwîka ûguo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To do that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Substitution: verbal: verbal reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kuona na kûigua miario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To see and to hear voices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ngaari</td>
<td>Vehicle</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lexical: reiteration:</td>
<td>Gloss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ngaari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occurrence of Cohesive Devices
The categorisation of the linguistic features identified as creating cohesion in the data follows the Halliday and Hasan’s model of cohesion in texts. The study corpus shows evidence of the presence of all the five cohesive devices posited by Halliday and Hasan (1976). These are reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical organisation.

It has, however, been observed that though all five cohesive devices are represented in the data, their frequency of occurrence varies greatly. The table below shows the frequency of occurrence for the different cohesive devices in the study corpus.

Frequency of cohesive devices in the study corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COHESIVE DEVICE</th>
<th>LTC1</th>
<th>LTC2</th>
<th>RTC1</th>
<th>RTC2</th>
<th>RTC3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>44 (30%)</td>
<td>37 (25%)</td>
<td>19 (13%)</td>
<td>24 (16%)</td>
<td>24 (16%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Out of the 240 sentences that comprise the study’s data, 845 cohesive ties have been identified. On average, every sentence has approximately 4 cohesive ties. In the texts analysed here, a pair of cohesively related items which constitutes a tie can be categorised as belonging to one out of the five cohesive devices identified. These are the reference, lexical organisation, conjunction, substitution, and ellipsis cohesive devices.

From the table above, one can observe that lexical organisation cohesive devices have the highest frequency of occurrence with 641 ties, which account for 75.86% of all the identified cohesive ties. This high frequency of lexical ties may be because Gĩkũyũ texts tend to repeat lexical items that have occurred before instead of ellipting or using substitute forms to represent them.

The table also reveals that reference as a cohesive device has the second highest frequency in the study data occurring 148 times. This represents 17.51% of all the identified cohesive ties. The cohesive device with the third highest frequency of occurrence is the conjunction, which occurs 42 instances which accounts for 4.97%of all the identified cohesive devices. The least frequent cohesive devices are ellipsis and substitution. Their frequencies are 13 and 1 respectively. This extremely low frequency of these two devices could possibly be because Gĩkũyũ language lacks in the equivalents of the pro-forms that the English language uses as substitutes. These are the nominal substitute one, the verbal substitute do, and the clausal substitute so. To make up for the lack of these substitutes, sample texts in this study reveal repetition of words, use of synonyms and other meaning-related forms, and regular use of demonstrative reference to refer to items that could have otherwise been substituted for or ellipted. This consequently raises the frequency of lexical and reference cohesive devices in the study data.

The figures in table 8 above show a discrepancy in the number of ties in the LTC and RTC categories. It is may be the case that since the RTC extracts are shorter (40 sentences each) as compared to the LTC extracts which are 60 sentences each, the shorter text may have fewer cohesive devices. Generally, the category of text, as can be observed in table 8 above does not seem to have a very significant influence on the frequency of cohesive devices in this study data.

Within these five broad categories of cohesive devices are subcategories as posited in Halliday and Hasan (1976). In this study data however, only one sub-category of the substitution category is represented. A sub-category for the category of ellipsis which is not evident in the Halliday and Hasan (1976) model occurs in the sample data. This happens when an a-link is left out to be recovered from surrounding text. Consider the following example from LTC1:6-7.

(1) 6. Mwaka wa ngiri imwe na magana keenda ma mirongo itano na inya, ithe wa Warĩŋa akĩnyiitwo agĩthamiriĩo Manyani.

In the year one thousand nine hundred and fifty four, father of Warĩŋa was arrested and deported to Manyani.

7. Thuutha wa mwaka ūmwe nyina Ǿ naake akĩnyiitwo agĩthamiriĩo Raangata na kamĩti. After one year, mother Ǿ also was arrested and deported to Lang’ata and
In example (1) above, the a-link construction wa Warîînga (of Warîînga) is left out after the noun nyina (mother) in sentence 7 to be recovered from sentence 6. The ellipsis of the a-link construction wa Warîînga (of Warîînga) causes the interpretation of sentence 7 to depend on the preceding sentence where the phrase wa Warîînga (of Warîînga) is found. This causes the two sentences to be interpreted as belonging together.

Lexical Organisation

This is a cohesive device that covers any cohesive effect that is achieved by the selection of vocabulary. It is divided into two broad sub-categories: reiteration; collocation. Reiteration involves the repetition of a lexical item, the use of a synonym or a near synonym, the use of a superordinate term, or the use of a general noun to refer back to a lexical item. Collocation on the other hand is the cohesive force contracted by any pair of lexical items whose meanings are related in a recognisable manner. These subcategories are discussed and exemplified in the sub-sections that follow.

All the relations that Halliday and Hassan (1976) categorise under the lexical organization category are observed in the study corpus. The table below summarises the distribution of different lexical ties in the data.

### Frequency of Lexical Ties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-category of Lexical organisation</th>
<th>LTC1</th>
<th>LTC2</th>
<th>RTC1</th>
<th>RTC2</th>
<th>RTC3</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a) Reiteration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same word</td>
<td>85(22%)</td>
<td>103(26%)</td>
<td>66(17%)</td>
<td>72(18%)</td>
<td>65(17%)</td>
<td>391(61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synonymy</td>
<td>1(7%)</td>
<td>4(26%)</td>
<td>9(60%)</td>
<td>1(7%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superordinate Term</td>
<td>11(46%)</td>
<td>1(4%)</td>
<td>1(4%)</td>
<td>5(21%)</td>
<td>6(25%)</td>
<td>24(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General noun</td>
<td>3(20%)</td>
<td>4(27%)</td>
<td>1(6%)</td>
<td>3(20%)</td>
<td>4(27%)</td>
<td>15(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b) Collocation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64(33%)</td>
<td>43(22%)</td>
<td>32(16%)</td>
<td>41(21%)</td>
<td>16(8%)</td>
<td>196(31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>164(26%)</td>
<td>155(24%)</td>
<td>109(17%)</td>
<td>122(19%)</td>
<td>91(14%)</td>
<td>641(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above reveals that the most frequent sub-category of the lexical organisation category is same word repetition sub-category. All the extracts show a high incidence of this sub-category, and in total, there are 391 same word repetition ties in the study corpus. This represents 61% of all lexical ties in the data.

The collocation sub-category ranks second in frequency of ties within the lexical organisation category. The Superordinate term sub-category ranks third, and the synonyms and general noun sub-categories tie for the fourth position. Each of these sub-categories is discussed and exemplified below.

Reiteration

**a) Same Word Repetition**

As noted, the cause for the high frequency of same word repetition ties in the data is the lack of substitute forms that could replace words, phrases, or clauses instead of repeating them. In addition, the sample texts...
dealt with in this study tend to repeat words rather than ellip them. Another reason for the high frequency of same word repetitions is that texts always tend to be on particular topics, which must be developed logically for the purpose of coherence. Consequently, several words that are pertinent to the topic of discussion are inevitably repeated several times. For instance, in the RTC2 extract which is on Christmas, the word Krismas (Christmas) is repeated some 22 times, and 17 out of these occurrences are cohesive (cf. appendix for a sample of RTC2). Words and phrases related to the topic of Christmas such as Akristiano (Christians), Fatha Krismas (Father Christmas), Mûhonokia Jesû Kristû (Saviour Jesus Christ) are also repeated several times. This same trend repeats itself in all the texts analysed.

b) Superordinate Term

A Superordinate term is a name for a more general class. Terms that are more specific comprise the membership of the general class referred to using a Superordinate term. For instance, poultry is a Superordinate term, and within its scope of reference are more specific terms such as chicken, duck, hen, and turkey. A Superordinate term and a more specific member of a Superordinate class are therefore closely related in meaning. This relation is what brings about a cohesive tie when a Superordinate term appears in a particular sentence, and a more specific member of the Superordinate class occurs in the surrounding sentences.

The following example from RTC2:1-2 illustrates this point.

(2) 1. Mweri wa Desemba ûkoragwo wetereirwo nî andû aingî ta mîgithi ya Kambara (Kampala) nî kûmenya ūría ikeno ciitîkaga ta kîguû.  
The month of December is usually awaited by many people like the train to Kampala because they know that pleasures fall like a flood.  
2. Ûyû nîguo mweri andû makorogwo meharîirie gûgakena ota ūría mengîenda no ti maririkane atî nî mûhonokia Jesû waciariruo ta ūría Akristiano arîa aa ma makoragwo meharîirie.  
This is the month that people usually prepare to enjoy themselves to their desire but not to remember that the saviour Jesus was born as the true Christians prepare to do.

In this example, the word Mweri (month) in sentence 2 is a superordinate term, and the word Desemba (December) in sentence 1 is a member of that superordinate class. Their meaning relation causes sentences 1 and 2 above to be interpreted as belonging together.

c) General Noun

The class of general noun is a small set of nouns having generalised reference. They include nouns such as people which can refer to a wide range of human beings such as woman, girl, or teacher, which in themselves are also general nouns which could refer to specific persons. In this study’s data, most general nouns are accompanied by demonstratives indicating that the general noun is co-referential with a noun or an NP that has occurred earlier. Consider the following example from RTC2: 30, 33 & 34.

(3) 30. Krismas yaambîrîirie gûkûngûîrûo mwaka wa AD 334 hîndî ìrîa Pope Gregory aatûmire Mûtheru Augustine, athiî akahunjîrie andû a Rûraaya arîa matoî ûhoro wa Ngai.  
Christmas was first celebrated in the year AD 334 when Pope Gregory sent Saint Augustine to go and preach to the people of Europe who didn’t know about God.  
33. Rîrîa athiire bûrûri wa Aroma nî aakorire atî maahoyaga riûa ta ngai.  
When he went to the country of Rome, he found that they worshipped the sun as god.  
34. Nî getha metîkîre Ukristiano, Pope agîathana nao Akristiano maŋonga ma gûkûngûîra gûciarwo kwa Jesû, nî getha acenji acio nî meetîkîre ûhoro wa Ngai.  
So that they could accept Christianity, Pope ruled that Christians too should have ceremonies to celebrate the birth of Jesus so that those pagans too could accept God.

The NP acenji acio (those pagans) in sentence 34 above consists of a demonstrative acio (those) and general noun acenji (pagans). The demonstrative points to a noun that has occurred before, while the general noun
helps to make the reference specific to a noun with the meaning of acenji (pagans). In this case, the reference is made to the NP andú a Rûraaya (the people of Europe) in sentence 30, and in particular, those in Aroma (Romans) as mentioned in sentence 33. The general noun therefore contracts a cohesive relation between the three sentences concerned. As in the case of the superordinate term, the use of general nouns depends on the topic of a text and the writer’s choice of words. In this case, there are only 15 occurrences of cohesive general nouns in the study corpus. This represents 2% of all lexical ties in the data.

d) Synonyms and Near Synonyms

According to Halliday & Hasan (1976), synonyms are words with identical meanings. Near synonyms are words with meanings that are very closely related to the extent that they can refer to the same entity. A cohesive relation occurs when different members of a synonym or a near synonym set are in separate sentences. Such cohesive relations occur in the data as can be seen in the following example from RTC3:27 &30.

(4) 27. Gîkeno-inî giitû gîa kûigwa atî nî twaingata mubeberû nîtwariganîirwo nî gûthiinga marîa marîa moweke woothe. In our happiness of getting rid of the coloniser we forgot to seal the holes through which our wealth and independence could slip and get lost, we left the chance open for those who wanted to grab for their own benefit.

30. Kahinda-inî oo gaaka nîguo Mbuurû ciambîrîirie kirîa cietaga “the 74–24-1 Development plan”, na irîa yaaheagwo mabûrûri marîa maaheagwo wîyaathi. In this same period oppressive rulers from Europe started what they called “the 74-24-1 Development Plan”, which was being given to the countries that were becoming independent.

In this example, the word Mûbeberû (coloniser) in sentence 27 is a near synonym with Mbuurû (oppressive rulers) in sentence 30. This occurrence of the same meaning in the two sentences ties them together cohesively.

Synonym and near- synonym ties occur 15 times in all our data. This accounts for 2% of all lexical ties.

d) Collocation

Halliday and Hasan (1976, p.285) define collocation as a lexical relationship “between any part of lexical items that stand to each other in some recognisable lexicosemantic (word meaning) relation”. Gîkûyû being an agglutinative language, word stems tend to take different affixes for grammatical or semantic purposes, resulting in words related in meaning but not identical. The following is an example from LTC2:4-5.

(5) 4. Angîateng’erire ndîngîahotire kû-ringa rûûî Gura na njira njega. If he drove fast he would not have been able to cross the river of Gura well.

5. Ngaari ya-ringa rûûî ndereba nî aamiakiriérie mûno nî getha ìhote kwambata kirîma gîa Tambaya. When the vehicle it-crossed that river the driver accelerated a lot so that it could ascend the hill of Tambaya.

In sentence 4 above, the stem –ringa (cross) takes the affix kû-(to) to form the infinitive kû-ringa (to cross). In sentence 5, the root verb –ring- (cross) takes the subject prefix i- for class 9 nouns, the class to which the noun ngaari (vehicle) belongs. Following this subject prefix, the root verb also takes a tense affix a- to mark past tense and a phonological process causes these two vowels to glide giving rise to ya-(it, past tense) instead of ìa-. The verb then takes a final vowel -a giving rise to ya-ring-a (it crossed). Though kû-ring-a (to cross) and ya-ring-a (it crossed) are different in form, the basic meaning of the root verb -ring - (cross) is maintained in both instances. This meaning relation creates cohesion between sentences 4 and 5 above, and fits in the Halliday and Hasan (1976) collocation category by virtue of there being a semantic relation between the two lexical items concerned.
Other words that fit in the collocation sub-category according to Halliday and Hasan (1976) include antonyms, such as right and left, complementsaries such as boy and girl, members of an ordered series such as January and March and practically any other words that are related semantically. Consider the following example from RTC3 23-25.

(6) 23. Mîaka ya mbere wa wiyaathi, rîra “Harambee” na “Uhuru na Kazi” ciarî uuge wa múngï, nikuonekete ta ûtoonga ūria Ngeretha yaatigîte ūngîarigirie mooko-inî maitû. In the first years of independence, when “Harambee” and “Uhuru na Kazi” were the motto of the public, it had appeared as if the wealth left behind by the Britons would end up in our hands.

24. Gûtîri waarî na kahûa kana macaani kana pareto ûtakoragwo na wagatû, gûtîri múrîithi ûtaarîagîra iriya na nyama cia ûhiû wake. There wasn’t any who had coffee or tea or pyrethrum who didn’t have something; there wasn’t any who kept animals who didn’t earn from the milk and meat of his/her cattle.

25. Ûmûthî ûyû twaigananirio ta magego nî thîîna. This today we are all made equal by poverty.

In sentence 23 above, the word ûtoonga (wealth) is semantically related to the word thîîna (poverty) in sentence 25 of the example above. These two words are antonyms and therefore a cohesive relation of collocation exists between the two sentences.

There are 196 collocation ties in our study corpus, and this accounts for 30.6% of all the lexical ties in our data. This high frequency can be accounted for by the wide range of relations that fall into the collocation sub-category as defined by Halliday and Hasan (1976). In addition, as mentioned earlier, the frequency of collocation ties is considerably increased because this study classifies different word forms that contain the same stem or root as collocations as illustrated in example 5 above.

e) Reference

Reference is the cohesive device with the second highest frequency of occurrence in the study corpus. There is a total of 148 reference ties in the data, accounting for 17.51% of the total number of cohesive devices in the study corpus.

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976, p.31), reference items can be defined as items which, “instead of being interpreted semantically in their own right, make reference to something else for their interpretation”. It is also observed that reference items in English are sub-categorised into the following: personals, demonstratives, and comparatives. The reference items identified as being cohesive in this study data also fall into those sub-categories posited by Halliday and Hasan (1976). This is shown in the table below.

Frequency of Reference Ties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-categories of the reference cohesive device</th>
<th>LTC1</th>
<th>LTC2</th>
<th>RTC1</th>
<th>RTC2</th>
<th>RTC3</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal reference</td>
<td>29(42%)</td>
<td>17(24%)</td>
<td>7(10%)</td>
<td>9(13%)</td>
<td>8(11%)</td>
<td>70(47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative reference</td>
<td>10(17%)</td>
<td>19(31%)</td>
<td>8(13%)</td>
<td>11(18%)</td>
<td>13(21%)</td>
<td>61(41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative reference</td>
<td>5(29%)</td>
<td>1(6%)</td>
<td>4(24%)</td>
<td>4(24%)</td>
<td>3(17%)</td>
<td>17(12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44(30%)</td>
<td>37(25%)</td>
<td>19(13%)</td>
<td>24(16%)</td>
<td>24(16%)</td>
<td>148(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It can be observed from the table above that the most frequent reference tie in the data falls under the personal reference subcategory. There is a total of 70 personal reference ties accounting for 47% of all the reference ties in the data. Demonstrative reference is second in frequency with 61 ties that form 41% of all reference ties, while comparative reference is the least frequent sub-category of reference with a frequency of 17 ties representing 12% of all reference ties in the data. A more detailed discussion of the sub-categories of reference follows.

a) Personal Reference

Personal reference has been defined as reference by means of function in the speech situation (or written text), through the category of person (Halliday and Hasan 1976). In English texts, the category of person is marked on personal pronouns. These include first person pronouns, I, me, we, and others, second person pronouns you, yours, and third person pronouns it, he/she, her/his and others.

Though personal reference is the most frequent reference tie in this study data, it can be noted that apart from the LTC1 extract, the frequency of demonstrative reference ties is higher than that of personal reference ties in all the other extracts. It is possible that this is due to LTC1 being a narrative text that contains numerous human characters to whom reference is made repeatedly. Though LTC2 is also a narrative text, some of its characters are referred to generally using such general nouns as andû (people) and mûngî (public) instead of referring to them by the use of personal reference markers available to the writer. This therefore leaves a small number of characters to whom the writer may refer to using personal reference items. The RTC category in this study data is shorter and this may account for the lesser number of reference ties. Moreover, the reporting nature of text in this category may not necessitate the use of personal reference.

In the texts analysed in this study, the sub-category of personal reference is marked by personal pronouns, subject and object agreement markers affixed to verbs, and a genitive suffix –we (hers/his) affixed to nouns. It is necessary to note that in examples from sample texts, the subject and object agreement markers have the referential force of the English pronoun. When this happens, these pronominal morphemes can refer to nominals in surrounding sentences, thus creating cohesive ties between the concerned sentences. The following is an example from LTC1:8-12.

(7) 8. Warîînga aari wa mîaka îîrî
   Waarîînga was two years old.
 9. Taata-we wahikite Naikuru akîmuoya
   Her aunt who was married in Nakuru took her.
10. Mûthuuri wa taatawe aarutaga wîra na Reeriwe, na thuutha-inî na Kaanjû ya Naikuru.
   Her aunt’s husband was working with the railway and later with the Council of Nakuru.
   Waarîînga grew up in Nakuru together with her cousins.
   That time/period they lived in Land Panya Estate, but when independence neared, they moved into a council house in section 58.

In sentence 9 of example 7, the word taata-we (her aunt) consists of a noun stem taata-(aunt), and a genitive suffix –we (her/his). This genitive suffix is the referential item referring to Warîînga in sentence 8. In sentence 12 of the same example, the verb complex ma-aikaraga (they lived) contains the subject prefix ma - (they) referring back to aihwa aa-ke (her cousins), mûthuuri wa taatawe (her aunt’s husband) taata-we (her aunt) and Warîînga in sentences 11, 10, 9, and 8 respectively. By referring to these nouns and NPs, the subject prefix ma - (they) unites the four sentences cohesively.
b) Demonstrative reference

Demonstrative reference is reference by means of location, on a scale of proximity. (Halliday and Hasan 1976:37). In English, demonstrative reference is marked by circumstantial (adverbial) demonstratives, here, there, now, and then, demonstratives this, these, that and those, and the definite article the.

Demonstrative reference ties occur 61 times in the study corpus, ranking second in the frequency of reference ties. They account for 41% of all reference ties in the study corpus. Since demonstratives refer to the location of a process or an entity in space or time, they tend to be common in most texts.

In the texts analysed here, demonstrative reference is marked by the demonstrative adverbs, proximate to speaker demonstratives, proximate to listener demonstratives, and the referential particle. The following are examples from LTC1:1-2.

(8) 1. Jacinta Waarîînga aaciarîirwo Kaamburû mwena wa Gîthuungûri Kîa Wairera Mwaka-inî wa ngiri îmwe na magana keenda ma mirongo îtaano na ithatû
   Jacinta Waarîînga was born in Kaamburû in Ghuunguri of Wairera in the year one thousand nine hundred and fifty three.

2. Êndî iyo bûrûri ûyû witû wa Kenya waathagwo nî thûkûmû cia Ngeretha na watho ûrîa mûuru wa kûhinîrîria mûingo, nî guo watho wa wiwuuge.
   That time/period this our country of Kenya was ruled by the British forces with the bad rule of oppressing the public, that is the emergency rule.

Hindi ìyo (that period) in sentence 2 of the example above contains the proximate to the listener demonstrative ìyo (that - proximate to listener). This proximate to the listener demonstrative is also used to refer to a noun that has already been mentioned as observed by Mwove (1987). This is also the case in example (8) above where it refers back to a period of time mentioned before as is signaled by the presence of the noun Hindi (period) preceding it. The occurrence of the noun preceding the demonstrative helps to make the reference specific as Halliday and Hasan (1976:65) note that when demonstratives occur anaphorically, they require the explicit repetition of the noun, or some form of synonym if they are to signal exact identity of specific reference. In this case, the period of time referred to is mwaka-inî wa ngiri na magana kenda ma mirongoîtano an itatû (In the year one thousand nine hundred and fifty three) in sentence 1. Demonstrative reference is further exemplified below. Example (9) is from LTC2:22-23, and example (10) is from RTC3:1& 4.

(9) 22. Mwanake úmwe wa acio eerî maarî na ikanga kûrîa igûrû nî aarûgire mwena wa úro wa ngaari, akîgwa rami-inî gatagatî.
   One young man of those two who were with the conductor up there jumped to the right side of the vehicle, and fell in the middle of the tarmac.

23. Ùrîa ñungi naake aarûgüire mwena wa úmo tho, akîgwa igûrû rîa rûgîka na akîgaragara na kûrîa andû a thoko maarî.
   That other one jumped to the left side and fell on the roadside and rolled towards where the market people were.

(10) 1. Kûrî Nditheemba 12 1999, Kenya nîyakûngûîire miaka 36 ya wiyaathi...
   On December 12 1999, Kenya celebrated 36 years of independence...

4. Ñrîa nao maarî mîciî moomîte na mahoya, magîthathayagia Jehova amaiguîre tha na kûmakûûra kuma mútondo-inî ûrîa maikîtio nî atongoria a bûrûri ûyû.
   And those who were at home prayed and pleaded with Jehova to have mercy on them and deliver them from the muck into which they had been thrown by the leaders of this country.

In example (9) above, the referential particle ûrîa (that – refers to something mentioned before or understood by both the reader and writer), in sentence 23 refers to Mwanake (young man) in sentence 22 of the same example, joining the two sentences cohesively. In example (10) above, the proximate to speaker/writer demonstrative ûyû (this) is preceded by the noun bûrûri (country) which serves to make the reference specific.
Together, the noun and the proximate to speaker/writer demonstrative and noun, bûrûri úyû (thiscountry) refer to Kenya in sentence 1 of this example, creating cohesion between sentence 1 and 4 of RTC3. Generally, demonstratives are fairly frequent in the text samples in this study, and some of them are cohesive as is illustrated above. The high frequency of demonstratives in these texts can partly be explained by the fact that Gîkûyû lacks articles. This is such that the demonstrative is the only way to show that a noun is co-referential with one that has already been mentioned in the preceding text, a role played by the definite article the in English.

c) Comparative Reference

Comparative reference has been defined as the indirect reference by means of identity or similarity. (Halliday & Hasan 1976, p.37) In English, comparative reference is expressed by comparison adjectives like identical, similar, same, or by comparison adverbs such as identically and similarly. It is also expressed by comparative adjectives, which may be qualified by adverbs such as equally good and more quickly.

As is indicated in table 8, there are 17 comparative reference ties in the study corpus, and this accounts for 12 % of all reference ties in the data. In this study data, comparative reference is expressed by the use of indefinite pronouns, adjectives of comparison and adverbs. This is illustrated below. Example (11) is from LTC1:44-45, example (12) is from RTC1:31-32, and example (13) is from RTC3:8-10.

(11) 44. Hwaî-ini akiuma cukuru ìyo ìyaârûmagîrîra ya Oginga Odinga aakhirîkära Afraha Stadium
   In the evening when leaving school, she mostly followed that (route)
   45. No rîîngi nî aarûmagîrîra ya Oginga Odinga akahîtûkîra Afraha Stadium
   Agathî o kwahûkîra Menengai High School akaambata akoimîrîra kiriniki-
   inî, agakîrîra kîng’eero inî nginya o section 58.

But other times she followed Oginga Odinga (road) passed through Afraha Stadium and diverted at Menengai High School and went up till the clinic, and crossed through the slaughter house till section 58.

(12) 31. Athoomi aitû nî mekûririkana atî nî kwagîire na mateta hîîndî îrîa kwamenyekanire atî thirikaari nî
   our readers will remember that there were disagreements when it became known that the government was
   ìraaka kîharo kîa ndege hakuhî na mûciî wa Eldoret o rîrîa ûhoro ûcio ûtaakoretwo warîrîirio na kûgu thanîrio
   thîinî wa Nyûmba ya iciirîro.
   Similarly, (happened) when the plan to buy a presidential jet was discussed in parliament.

(13) 8. Arîa aitangu maaî nîmaikagia maitho na thuutha, makoona atî ona
   32. O Undû ûmwe, mûbango wa kûgûra ndege ya gûkuua raici warîrîirio mbunge.
   Even though they were whipped and overworked they got food without much trouble, educated the children
   hindî yamûkooroni. Those who are older looked behind and realised that even though we have independence, living was easier in
   who were interested, and they got medicine to heal them when they went to hospital.

the days of the colonialist.

9. Ona magîcamûragwo njamiû na kurûtithio wira wa gîtâti, nî maheagwo ndawa ya kûmarigita maathiî thibitarî.
   Even though they were whipped and overworked they got food without much trouble, educated the children
   who were interested, and they got medicine to heal them when they went to hospital.

10.Ümûthî úyû mareeroera ciana ìgîkua nî ng’aragu, ìgîtoroira múciî nî
   This today they are watching children dying of hunger, loafing at home for lack of school fees, entering into
   kwagîrîro mbeça cia cukuru, ikîingîrîra wîki-
   crime for lack of jobs or being killed by disease because there is no money to pay doctors or buy medicine.
In Example (11), the indefinite pronoun rîîngî [other (times)] in sentence 45 presupposes that the reader has come across sentence 44 to which sentence 45 adds information which is different from what is in sentence 44 as is implied by the indefinite pronoun.

In example (12), the NP o ûndû ûmwe (similarly) presupposes that the reader is aware of what has gone before in sentence 31 which, as the adjective implies, is similar to what follows in sentence 32. This joins the two sentences cohesively through the relation of comparative references.

In example (13) above, the noun ûmûthî (today) in the adverb phrase ûmûthi ûyû (this today) suggests that a contrast is being drawn between what happens today and what happened some other period that is accessible to the reader. The presupposed period in this case is hîîndî ya mûûkoroni (the period of the colonialist) in sentence 8.

The frequency of comparative reference in any text depends on the writer’s choice of words and the nature of the text. Each of the extracts analysed contains situations that required comparison, and the writer’s choice of words has entirely determined the occurrence of comparative reference ties.

g) Conjunction

Conjunctive elements achieve cohesion by expressing certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse. (Halliday & Hasan 1976, p.226). In addition, conjunction has been defined as a specification of the way in which what is to follow is systematically connected to what has gone before or vice-versa. The cohesive function of conjunctive elements is to relate linguistic elements that occur in succession but are not related by other structural means. The phrase conjunctive element is significant in the conjunction category because according to Halliday & Hasan’s model of cohesion, this category does not consist of pure conjunctions only, but also includes any semantic relation, which is conjunctive. The model recognises four sub-categories of the conjunction cohesive category. These are the additive conjunctions, adversative conjunctions, temporal conjunctions, and causal conjunctions. All the cohesive conjunctive elements identified in the study corpus fit into these four sub-categories. The table below summarises the distribution of conjunction ties in the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-category of the conjunction cohesive category</th>
<th>LTC1</th>
<th>LTC2</th>
<th>RTC1</th>
<th>RTC2</th>
<th>RTC3</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adversative conjunctions</td>
<td>7(37%)</td>
<td>6(32%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4(21%)</td>
<td>2(10%)</td>
<td>19(45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additive conjunctions</td>
<td>1(7%)</td>
<td>3(20%)</td>
<td>5(33%)</td>
<td>3(20%)</td>
<td>3(20%)</td>
<td>15(35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal conjunctions</td>
<td>1(25%)</td>
<td>1(25%)</td>
<td>1(25%)</td>
<td>1(25%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4(10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal conjunctions</td>
<td>1(25%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1(25%)</td>
<td>2(50%)</td>
<td>4(10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10(24%)</td>
<td>10(24%)</td>
<td>6(14%)</td>
<td>9(21%)</td>
<td>7(17%)</td>
<td>42(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are 42 conjunction ties in the study corpus. This makes 4.97% of all cohesive ties identified in the study data (cf. 4.1). From the table above, it can be observed that the adversative conjunction sub-category has the highest frequency of occurrence with 19 ties, forming 45% of all conjunction ties. Additive conjunctions rank second forming 35% of all conjunction ties, while temporal conjunctions form 10% of all conjunction ties. A discussion of these sub-categories of conjunction follows.

i) Adversative Conjunctions

According to Halliday and Hasan’s model of cohesion, the basic meaning of the adversative relation is “contrary to expectation.” English adversative conjunctions include yet, though, however, and instead among others. The adversative conjunction ties represent 45% of all conjunction ties in the data. These relations are
expressed by conjunctions such as **no** (*but*), ïndî (*however*), and **handû ha** (*instead of*). The following example is from LTC1:44-45.

(14) 44. Hwai-ini akiuma cukuru kaingî aacookagîra ooro iyo
    *In the evening when leaving school, she mostly followed the same (route)*

45. **No** rîngî nî aarûmagîrîra ya Oginga Odinga akahîtûkîra Afraha stadium agathiî o kwahûkîra Menengai High School akaambata akoimirîra kiriniki-inî, agakîrîra king’eero-inî nginya o section 58.
    *But other times she followed Oginga Odinga (road) and passed through Afraha Stadium and branched at Menengai High School and went up till the clinic, she crossed through the slaughter house till section 58.*

The adversative conjunction **no** (*but*) in sentence 45 of example (14) above expresses contrast between the contents of sentences 44 and 45. It therefore presupposes that the reader has come across sentence 44 in order to be able to draw the contrast. This contrastive relation is cohesive binding the two sentences.

**ii) Additive conjunctions**

Additive conjunctions are elements that signal that whatever information that follows is being added to what has already been given. Additive conjunctions in English include *and, also, furthermore,* and or among others. In the corpus for this study, additive conjunctions form 35% of all conjunction ties in the data. They are expressed by such items as **na** (*and*), **ningî** (*also*), and **ona** (*even*). The following example is from LTC2:40-41.

(15) 40. No naake nî aateithîkire nî kûnyitwo mooko nî mûingî nî getha ahote kuuma tondû mûrango wa ikumbî warî muhûhûnjîku na ûkahinga riumîrîro.
    *But he also was helped by being held hands by the public so that he could get out since the door of the cabin had been smashed and had blocked theexit.*

41. **Ningî** ngaari yakomeete na mwena na athii ote the magakomanîra mahihinyaine.
    *Also the vehicle was lying on its side and all the passengers were lying on one another pressing against each other.*

The additive conjunction **Ningî** (*Also*), at the initial position of sentence 41 signals that what follows is additional information to what is contained in the preceding sentence 40.

**iii) Temporal conjunctions**

Temporal conjunctions express sequence or succession in time. In English, it is expressed by conjunctions such as *hitherto, from now on, previously, then,* and *next.* In this study data, 10% of all conjunction ties are temporal conjunctions. They are expressed by conjunctions such as **rîu** (*now*), **wa keerî** (*secondly*), **ûndû wa mbere** (*the first thing*) and **kumâ…nginya** (*from…to*). The following example is from RTC3: 34 – 35.

(16) 34. Rîrîa Thûngû ciakîonire Kenya nîgwacaca, nîciambîrîirie makinya ma kûrutithia mûbango úyû wîra.
    *When Europeans realised that things were bad in Kenya, they took steps towards making this plan work.*

35. **ûndû wa mbere** waaari gúcâria andû ari mangiûtûkire ngaati ciao, matongoretio nî Moi na Njonjo wa Mugane.
    *The first thing was to look for people who could become their guards, led by Moi and Njonjo son of Mûgane.*

In this example, **ûndû wa mbere** (*the first thing*) in sentence 35 is a temporal conjunctive element expressing the sequence of the steps to implement the plan mentioned in sentence 34. This temporal relation cohesively joins sentences 34 and 35 above.
Conjunctions in this category express a generally causal meaning, which includes the more specific meanings such as those of reason, result, and purpose. In English, it is expressed by such conjunctions as because, as, so, hence, therefore, and as a result. It is interesting to note that there are only 4 causal conjunctions in the data dealt with in this study, and these make 10% of all conjunction ties in the data. The items that express this type of cohesion are **tondû** (because), **ní ùndû** [because (of)], and **kwa úguo** (because of that). The following example is from RTC1:10-11.

10. Wathani wa njûgûma wîkîraga andû guoya no ti wendo wa ùria ûraathana. **The rule of the club imparts fear in people but not love for the ruler.**
11. **Nî ùndû** wa guoya andû no mooneka maareenda múthamaki no ngoro-inî ciao makorwo na rûthûûro na marûrû maingî. **Because of fear people may appear as if they love the ruler but in their hearts they harbour hatred and a lot of bitterness.**

In this example, **Nî ùndû** (because of) in sentence 11 expresses the result of the fear mentioned in sentence 10. This relation of result binds the two sentences cohesively.

g) Ellipsis

Ellipsis happens in texts when something “goes without saying”. This means that it is left out because it is understood from the linguistic context. Halliday & Hasan’s model of cohesion identifies three sub-categories of ellipsis, which are nominal, verbal, and clausal ellipses. Of these sub-categories, only nominal ellipsis occurs cohesively in this study data. Both verbal and clausal ellipses occur within the structure of the sentence and are, therefore, not cohesive beyond the sentence level. Instead of ellipting verbs and clauses, texts in this study repeat them in their exact forms, use synonyms, or other meaning–related forms. It is possible, therefore to observe that the texts exhibit a high percentage of lexical cohesion (75.86%) on the one hand, but an extremely low frequency of ellipsis cohesive ties on the other: only 13 elliptical ties accounting for about 1.54% of all the cohesive ties identified in the data. Interestingly, a form of ellipsis that does not appear in the Halliday & Hasan’s (1976) model of cohesion was identified in this data. This is the presupposition of an a – link construction (cf.2.2.8) to be recovered from the surrounding text. The table below shows the distribution of ellipsis cohesive ties in the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-categories of the Ellipsis cohesive device</th>
<th>LTC 1</th>
<th>LTC 2</th>
<th>RTC1</th>
<th>RTC2</th>
<th>RTC3</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal ellipsis</td>
<td>4(40%)</td>
<td>1(10%)</td>
<td>1(10%)</td>
<td>1(10 %)</td>
<td>3(30%)</td>
<td>10(77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A – link ellipsis</td>
<td>1(33%)</td>
<td>2(67%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3(23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5(38%)</td>
<td>3(23%)</td>
<td>1(8%)</td>
<td>1(8%)</td>
<td>3(23%)</td>
<td>13(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that the study corpus contains 10 nominal ellipsis ties, and 3 a – link ellipsis ties. These are discussed below.

i) Nominal Ellipsis

Nominal ellipsis is a syntactic gap found within the NP. The structure of the NP as found in Gîkûyû is outlined in section 2.2.6 of this study. This kind of ellipsis happens when a head noun is omitted and one of the other elements in the NP takes on the function of head. The sign Ø is used in this study to indicate the position of the empty syntactic slot as a result of ellipsis. The elements that take the function of head in an elliptical NP
are demonstratives, indefinite pronouns, a–link constructions, and demonstrative adverbs. The following are examples taken from LTC2:21-23 and LTC1 44-46 respectively.

21. Rîrîa andû acio moonire atî ndereba nî aremirwo biû nî kûrûûgamia ngaari nî maambîriie kûrûûga thî kuuma keeria – igûrû, ngaari o îgîcokaga na thuutha. 

When those people realised that the driver was completely unable to stop the vehicle, they started jumping down from on the carrier as the vehicle moved backwards.

22. Mwanake ûmwe wa acio eerî maarî na ikanga kûûrîa Ø igûrû nî aarûûgire mwena wa ûrîo wa ngaari, aklûgûa rami-inî gitagatî.

One of those two young men who were with the conductor up there Ø jumped to the right side of the vehicle and fell in the middle of the tarmac.

23) Ø Urîa ûngî naake aarûûgûire mwena wa ûmotho akîgûa igûrû rîa rûgîka na akîgaragara na kûria andû a thoko maarî.

The other Ø jumped to the left side, and fell on the roadside and rolled towards the market people.

In sentence 22 of example (18) above, the noun keeria (carrier) has been omitted after the demonstrative adverb kûûrîa (there). The ellipted noun can be recovered from the preceding sentence 21. Similarly, in sentence 23 of the same example, the noun Mwanake (young man) is omitted in the position preceding the referential particle ûria (that). Thisreferential particle carries the semantic meaning of afore-mention or an understanding between the generator and receiver of text. (Mwove1987). The ellipted noun mwanake (youngman) can be recovered from sentence 22.

In sentence 45 of example (19) above, the temporal noun hwai-ini (in the evening), is omitted after the indefinite pronoun rîîngî (other). It can be recovered from the preceding sentence. It is important to note from this example that the indefinite pronoun rîîngî (other) is usually taken to imply other times. However, this happens when no time specification has been given in the surrounding text. The appearance of Hwaî-ini (in the evening) in the preceding sentence makes the reference of the indefinite pronoun specific to that particular time of day. Finally in sentence 45 of the example above, the noun bara (road) is left out before the a-link construction, ya Odinga Oginga (of OdingaOginga). This presupposed noun is recovered from the preceding sentence. From these examples, it is evident that nominal ellipsis causes sentences of a text to be dependent on one another and thus to be cohesive.

ii) A – Link Ellipsis

According to Armstrong (1967), an a – link construction is common in Bantu languages. It is composed of a connective partical {a} that is suffixed on the pronominal concord, and a complement. Example:

20) Icembe rîa kûrîma

Hoe for digging

In example (20) above, rî-a kûrîma (for digging) is the a-link construction. It is composed of the pronominal prefix rî- for class 5 nouns, the class to which the noun icembe (hoe) belongs. Attached to this pronominal concord is the connective partical {a}, and finally there is the complement kûrîma (digging).
A - link constructions have been omitted to be recovered from the preceding sentences and thus creating cohesion. Consider the following example from LTC2:33-34.

(21) 33. Nda yake harla yathiiriirwo igurur ni kugurur kwa ngaari yari mondore na mara makaminijuka nja.
Abdomen of his (his abdomen) where it had been ran over by the vehicle’s wheel had been smashed and the intestines had oozed out.
34. Kiongo Ø na klo kla kimbledon ni mwena wa ngaari harla yamukomeire yagwa thuutha wa kuringa rügika.
Head Ø also was smashed by the side of the vehicle where it lay on him when it fell after hitting the roadside.

In sentence 34 of example (21) above, the a – link construction gi-a-ke (of his) is left out after the noun kiongo (head) to be recovered from sentence 33. Below is another example of a-link ellipsis from LTC1: 6-7.

(22) (6) Mwaka wa ngiri imwe na magana keenda na miroongo itaano na inya, ithe wa Warïînga akïnyiitwo agïthaamîrio Manyani.
In the year one thousand and fifty four, father of Warïînga was arrested and detained at Manyani.
(7) Thuutha wa mwaka umwe nyina Ø naake akïnyiitwo agïthamîrio Raangatana na Kamïîtî.
After one year mother Ø also was arrested and detained at Lang’ata and Kamiti.

In example (22) above, the a-link construction wa Warïînga (of Warïînga) is left out after the noun nyina (mother) in sentence 7 to be recovered from sentence 6. The ellipsis of a-link constructions causes the interpretation of one sentence to depend on another, joining the concerned sentences cohesively. The third instance of a-link ellipsis in this study data is from LTC 2:17-18, and is shown below.

(23) 17. Na tondû ngari yarî kirîma-inî getirîte mûno na ndârî na mburîki, ndereba nî aageririe kûmîoha na ngia ûritû mûingî na nî yacookaga na thuutha.
And since the vehicle was on a very steep hill and it did not have breaks, the driver tried to stop it with gears but that was not possible it was very heavy and was moving backwards.
18. Athii arîa maarî thîinî Ø naa maambîrîrie kuuga mbu.
Passengers who were inside Ø had started screaming.

In sentence 18 of example (23) above, the a-link construction wa ngari (of vehicle) is presupposed after the word thîinî (inside). The presence of the word ngari (vehicle) in sentence 17 satisfies the presupposition. It provides ngari (vehicle), the entity into which passengers who are mentioned in sentence 18 get into. Although ngari (vehicle) is in this case not preceded by the connective particle {a}, the grammatical rules of Gikùyû necessitate that the complete noun phrase in sentence 18 should read thîinî wa ngari (inside of vehicle) and not thîinî ngari (inside vehicle) that Gikùyû grammar rules do not allow.

h) Substitution
Substitution, as a cohesive device, involves the replacement of a second or subsequent occurrence of an element with another element; usually a pro-form. This study data contains no nominal or clausal substitutions, but has one instance of verbal substitution of the kind Halliday and Hasan (1976) call verbal reference. This is discussed and exemplified below.

i) Verbal Substitution
In English, substitution by verbal reference is expressed by the use of the lexical verb do and a demonstrative. It substitutes for an action that has already occurred in the preceding texts by referring to it using the demonstrative. The data in this study contains only one instance of verbal reference. It is in LTC2:10-11, and is discussed below.

(24) 10. Athii aingî a Tonya ûmbûke nî maikagia maitho nya ngaari na makeyonera na makaigua miario na gûthogorana kwa andû aria maarî thoko.
Many passengers of Tonya Umbuke were looking outside the vehicle and they saw and heard the voices and bargaining of the people who were in the market.

In sentence 11 of example (24) above, the infinitive clause gwïka ûguo (to do that) refers to the action of looking outside the vehicle and seeing and hearing the voices and bargaining of the people in the market. All this is found in the preceding sentence number 10, and therefore the verbal reference relation joins 10 and 11 cohesively.

Summary

This paper has categorised the identified cohesive ties into Halliday and Hasan (1976) categories and sub-categories of cohesion, which are all represented, at least partly, in the data analysed here. Gïkûyû texts analysed showed evidence of the five categories of cohesion proposed in the Halliday and Hasan’s model of cohesion. These are the reference, lexical organisation, conjunction, ellipsis, and substitution cohesive devices. The data showed evidence of only one sub-category of substitution as a cohesive device. This is a kind of verbal substitution known as verbal reference. Nominal and clausal substitutions did not occur at all in the data. Future researchers may analyse more Gïkûyû data or data from other Bantu languages to find out if nominal and clausal substitutions occur cohesively. Only the nominal subcategory of ellipsis occurred cohesively in the data. Clausal and Verbal ellipsis were cohesive only within the sentence. However, a type of ellipsis not mentioned in the Halliday and Hasan model of cohesion was found to be cohesive: an a-link construction, common in Bantu languages was ellipted to be recovered in preceding sentences. Future researchers may analyse more Gïkûyû data or data from a related language such as Swahili or Kikamba, to find out if a-link constructions occur cohesively.
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