



CATEGORISATION OF LINGUISTIC FEATURES CREATING COHESION IN SELECTED GIKUYU TEXTS

ANNE WACHERA SOMBA¹, ANTONY SOMBA MANG'OKA²

¹JAFFERY ACADEMY MOMBASA, KENYA

²SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, KABARAK UNIVERSITY KENYA



ABSTRACT

The present study was aimed at categorising the elements that help to join different sentences in selected Gikũyũ 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. Gikũyũ 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 Gikũyũ 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 ellipted to be recovered in preceding sentences. Future researchers may analyse more Gikũyũ 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 Gikũyũ. This is useful for the writers of Gikũyũ grammars used for the teaching of this language. The study also contributes to the increasing body of knowledge in Bantu linguistics, Gikũyũ 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:

(2) 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.

(3) 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:

(4) 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 Gikũyũ 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 *Mũrata*, *Mwĩhoko*, and *Kĩmũrĩ*. 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. *Mũrata*, *Mwĩhoko* and *Kĩmũrĩ* 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 Gikũyũ 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:

- All the sentences in the particular text being analysed were numbered.
- The number of cohesive ties contained in a sentence was indicated
- The cohesive item(s) and its/their gloss (es) were then written down.
- 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)

Sentence Number	Number of ties	Cohesive item		Type of cohesion	Presupposed item	
		Item	Gloss		Item	Gloss
2	1	Ngaari	Vehicle	Lexical: Collocation	Tonya ûmbûke	- Proper noun
12	4	Athii	Passengers	Lexical: reiteration: Superordinat e term	Makanga, Kahonoki, Ngoima. Nyina	Conductor, kahonoki Ngoima, his wife and other
		gwîka ûguo	To do that	Substitution: verbal: verbal	Kuona na kûigua	To see and to hear voices
		ngaari	Vehicle	Lexical: reiteration:	Ngaari	Vehicle

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.

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.

Frequency of cohesive devices in the study corpus

COHESIVE DEVICE	EXTRACTS					TOTAL
	LTC1	LTC2	RTC1	RTC2	RTC3	
Reference	44 (30%)	37 (25%)	19 (13%)	24 (16%)	24 (16%)	148 (17.51%)
Substitution	-	1 (100%)	-	-	-	1 (0.12%)
Ellipsis	5 (38%)	3 (23%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	3 (23%)	13 (1.54%)
Conjunction	10 (24%)	10 (24%)	6 (14%)	9 (21%)	7 (17%)	42 (4.97%)
Lexical organisation	164 (26%)	155 (24%)	109 (17%)	122 (19%)	91 (14%)	641 (75.86%)
TOTAL	224 (26%)	216 (25%)	135 (16%)	156 (18%)	125 (15%)	845 (100%)

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 ìmwe na magana keenda ma mĩroongo ìtano na inya, ithe

wa Warĩnga akĩnyitwo agĩthamĩrio Manyani.

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



7. Thuutha wa mwaka ūmwe nyina Ø naake akīnyitwo agīthaamīrio

Raangata na kamīti.

After one year, mother Ø also was arrested and deported to Lang'ata and

Kamiti.

In example (1) above, the a- link construction **wa Warĩnga** (of Warĩnga) 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 Warĩnga** (of Warĩnga) causes the interpretation of sentence 7 to depend on the preceding sentence where the phrase **wa Warĩnga** (of Warĩnga) 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

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

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 ellipsis 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 ûrîa 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 ûrîa mengîenda no ti maririkane atî nî mûhonokia Jesû waciariroo ta ûrîa 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 in the text. Consider the following example from RTC2: 30, 33 & 34.

- (3) 30. Krismas yaambîrîirie gûkûngûîrûo mwaka wa AD 334 hîndî îrîa Pope Gregory aatûmire Mûtheru Augustine, athîi 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 athîire bûrîri 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 magîage na magongona ma gûkûngûîra gûciarwo kwa Jesû, nî getha **acenji acio** nao 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 **andû 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** nîtwariganîrwo nî gûthiinga marima marîa ûtoonga na wîyathi witu ûngîrîre, tûgîtigîra ariâ meendaga kûhuria na haao mweke woothu.

*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 **Mbuurûcia** Rûraya ciambîrîrie kîrîa cietaga "the 74--24-1 Development plan", na îrîa 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 rûû rwa Gura na nîjra njega.

If he drove fast he would not have been able to cross the river of Gura well.

5. Ngaari **ya**-ringa rûû rûu ndereba nî aamîakîrîrie mûno nî getha îhote kwambata kîrîma 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 **î-** 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 **îa**-.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*, complementaries 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. Mĩaka ya mbeere ya wĩyaathi, rĩrĩa “Harambee” na “Uhuru na Kazi” ciarĩ
uuge wa mũingĩ, nĩkuonekete ta **ũtoonga** ũrĩa Ngeretha yaatigĩte ũngĩarigirie mooko-inĩ maitũ.

*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. Gũtirĩ waarĩ na kahũa kana macaani kana pareto ũtakoragwo na wagatũũ, gũtirĩ mũrĩithi ũtaarĩagĩra iriya na nyama cia ũhiũ 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. Ũmũthĩ ũyũ twaigananirio ta magego nĩ **thĩĩna**.

*This today we are all made equal by **poverty**.*

In sentence 23 above, the word **ũtoonga** (*wealth*) is semantically related to the word **thĩĩna** (*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

Sub-categories of the reference cohesive device	LTC1	LTC2	RTC1	RTC2	RTC3	TOTAL
<i>Personal reference</i>	29(42%)	17(24%)	7(10%)	9(13%)	8(11%)	70(47%)
<i>Demonstrative reference</i>	10(17%)	19(31%)	8(13%)	11(18%)	13(21%)	61(41%)
<i>Comparative reference</i>	5(29%)	1(6%)	4(24%)	4(24%)	3(17%)	17(12%)
Total	44(30%)	37(25%)	19(13%)	24(16%)	24(16%)	148(100%)



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 **mûingî** (*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. This argument is supported by Kioko's (1994) observation that in Bantu, in the absence of the subject and object NPs, the agreement morphemes assume pronominal functions. 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. **Warĩinga** aari wa mĩaka ĩĩrĩ
***Warĩinga** was two years old.*
9. Taata-**we** wahikite Naikuru akĩmuoya
***Her** aunt who was married in Nakuru took her.*
10. **Mũthuuri wa taatawe** aarutaga wĩra na Reeriwe, na thuutha-inĩ na Kaanjũ ya Naikuru.
***Her aunt's husband** was working with the railway and later with the Council of Nakuru.*
11. Waarĩinga aakurĩire Naikuru hamwe na aihwa aa-**ke**.
***Waarĩinga** grew up in Nakuru together with **her** cousins.*
12. Hĩĩndĩ ĩyo **ma**-aikaraga Land panya Estate, no ũhuru wakuhĩrĩria magĩtoonya nyũũmba ya Kanjũ section 58.
*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 **Warĩinga** 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*), **mũthuuri wa taatawe** (*her aunt's husband*) taata-**we** (*her aunt*)



and **Wariinga** 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 Wariinga aaciarirwo Kaamburû mwena wa Githuungûri Kîa Wairera **Mwaka-inî wa ngiri imwe na magana keenda ma mîrongo itaano na ithatû**

Jecinta Wariinga was born in Kaamburû in Ghuunguri of Wairera in the year one thousand nine hundred and fifty three.

2. **Hîndî iyo** bûrûri ûyû witû wa Kenya waathagwo nî thûkûmû cia Ngeretha na watho ûrîa mûûru wa kûhinyîrîria mûingî, nî guo watho wa wîhuuge.

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.

Hîndî iyo (*that period*) in sentence 2 of the example above contains the proximate to the listener demonstrative **iyo** (*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 **Hîndî** (*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 mîrongo itano 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** ûmwene wa acio eerî maarî na ikanga kûrîa igûrû nî aarûgîre mwena

wa ûrîo 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. **Ûrîa** ûngî naake aarûgîre mwena wa ûmotho, 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** nîyakûngûîre miaka 36 ya wiyaathi...

On December 12 1999, Kenya celebrated 36 years of independence...

4. Arîa nao maarî mîcîi moomîte na mahoya, magîthathayagia Jehova amagûire tha na kûmakûûra kuma mûtondo-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 ûyû* (*this country*) 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 Gĩkũyũ 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-inî akiuma cukuru kaingî aacookagîra ooro îyo

In the evening when leaving school, she mostly followed that (route)

45. No rîngî nî aarûmagîrîra ya Oginga Odinga akahîtûkîra Afraha Stadium

Agathiî 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 kwagîre na mateta hîîndî îrîa kwamenyekanire atî thirikaari nî îraaka kîharo kîa ndege hakuhî na mûcîi wa Eldoret o rîrîa ûhoro ûcio ûtaakoretwo warîrîrio na kûiguithanîrio thîinî wa Nyûmba ya iciirîro.

Our readers will remember that there were disagreements when it became known that the government was building an airport near Eldoret while that had not been discussed and agreed upon in parliament.

32. O Undû ûmwe, mûbango wa kûgûra ndege ya gûkuua raici warîrîrio mbunge.

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

gwatuîka wîyaathi nîtwaherwo, mîikarîre yaarî mîhûthahûthû hîndî yamûkooroni.

Those who are older looked behind and realised that even though we have independence, living was easier in the days of the colonialist.

9. Ona magîcamûragwo njamiû na kurûtithio wîra wa gîtatî, nî maahotaga kûona gîa kûrîa hatarî na thîna mûnene, gûtwara ciana iria ciendaga gîthoomo cukuru, na 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. Ûmûthî ûyû mareerorera ciana igîkua nî ng'aragu, igîtoroira mûcii nî



kwagîrwo mbece cia cukuru, ikîingîrîra wîki-naî nî kwaga mawîra, kana ikîûragwo nî mîrimû tondû mbece cia kûrîha arigitani na kûgûra ndawa gûtirî.

This today they are watching children dying of hunger, loafing at home for lack of school fees, entering into 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 **rîngî** [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** (thistoday) 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 **hîndî 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.

f) 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.*

Frequency of Conjunction ties

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



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*), **îndî** (*however*), and **handû ha** (*instead of*). The following example is from LTC1:44-45.

- (14) 44. Hwaî-inî akiuma cukuru kaingî aacookagîra ooro îyo
In the evening when leaving school, she mostly followed the same (route)
 45. **No** rîngi 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) 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 the exit.
 41. **Ningî** ngaari yakomeete na mwena na athii othe 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 **kuma...nginya** (*from...to*). The following example is from RTC3: 34 – 35.

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



35. **Ūndū wa mbere** waarī gûcaria andû arîa mangîatuîkire 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, **Ūndū 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.

iv) Causal conjunctions

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 **tondū** (*because*), **nî ūndū** [*because (of)*], and **kwa ūguo** (*because of that*). The following example is from RTC1:10-11.

(17) 10. Wathani wa njûgûma wîkîraga andû guoya no ti wendo wa ūrîa ūraathana.

The rule of the club imparts fear in people but not love for the ruler.

11. **Nî ūndū**wa guoya andû no mooneke ta mareenda mûthamaki 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 ūndū** (*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 ellipsis. 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.

Frequency of Ellipsis ties

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



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 Gikũyũ 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.

(18) 21. Rîrîa andũ acio moonire atĩ ndereba nĩ aremirwo bĩũ nĩ kũrũũgamia ngaari nĩ maambĩrĩrie kũrũũga thĩ kuuma **keeria – igũrũ**, ngaari o ĩgĩcokaga 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 ũmwe wa acio eerĩ maarĩ na ikanga kũũrĩa Ø **igũrũ** nĩ aarũũgĩre mwena wa ũrĩo wa ngaari, akĩgũa rami-inĩ gatagatĩ.

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 **Urĩa ũngĩ** naake aarũũgĩre mwena wa ũmotho akĩgũa igũrũ rĩa rũgĩka na akĩgaragara na kũrĩa andũ a thoko maarĩ.

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

(19) (44) Hau agakĩra **Oginga Odinga Road** agathiĩ ĩmwe kwa ĩmwe nginya Nakuru Day.

There she crossed Oginga Odinga Road and went one by one till Nakuru Day

(45) **Hwaĩ-inĩ** akiuma cukuru kaingĩ aacookagĩra ooro ĩyo.

In the evening when leaving school many times she used that same (route).

(46) No **rĩngĩ** Ø nĩ aarũmagĩrĩra Ø **ya Oginga Odinga** akahĩtũkĩra Afraha Stadium agathiĩ o kwahũkĩra Menengai High School akaambata akoimĩrĩra Kiriiniki-inĩ, agakĩrĩra Kĩng'eero-inĩ nginya o Section 58.

But otherØ she followed Oginga Odinga Ø 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.

In sentence 22 of example (18) above, the noun **keeria** (carrier) has been omitted after the demonstrative adverb **kũũrĩa** (there). The ellipsed 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 **ũrĩa** (that). This referential particle carries the semantic meaning of afore- mention or an understanding between the generator and receiver of text. (Mwove1987). The ellipsed noun **mwana** (youngman) can be recovered from sentence 22.

In sentence 45 of example (19) above, the temporal noun **hwaĩ-inĩ** (in the evening), is omitted after the indefinite pronoun **rĩngĩ** (other). It can be recovered from the preceding sentence. It is important to note from this example that the indefinite pronoun **rĩngĩ** (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 **Hwaĩ-inĩ** (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 Odinga** (of OdingaOdinga). 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.



i) A – Link Ellipsis

According to Armstrong (1967), an a – link construction is common in Bantu languages. It is composed of a connective particle {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 particle {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** harîa yathîirwo igûrû nî kûgûrû kwa ngaari yarî mondore na mara makaminjûka 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. Kîongo Øna kîo kîarî kîmondore nî mwena wa ngaari harîa yamûkomeire yagwa thuutha wa kûringa rûgîka.

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 **gî-a-ke** (*of his*) is left out after the noun **kîongo** (*head*) to be recovered from sentence 33. Below is another example of a-link ellipsis from LTC1: 6-7.

(22) (6) Mwaka wa ngiri îmwê na magana keenda na mîroongo îtaano na inya, ithe **waWarîinga**akînyitwo agîthaamîrio Manyani.

In the year one thousand and fifty four, father of Warîinga was arrested and detained at Manyani.

(7)Thuutha wa mwaka ûmwê **nyina** Ønaake akînyitwo agîthamîrio Raangatana na Kamîitî

After one year mother Ø also was arrested and detained at Lang'ata and Kamiti.

In example (22) above, the a- link construction **wa Warîinga** (*of Warîinga*) 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 kîrîma-inî gîetirîte mûno na ndîarî na mburîki, ndereba nî aageririe kûmîoha na ngia îrûûgame no ûguo gûtiashotekire tondû nî yarî na 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 nî 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 Gîkûyû necessitate that the complete noun phrase in sentence 18 should read **thîinî wa ngari** (*inside of vehicle*) and not **thîinî ngari** (*inside vehicle*) that Gîkûyû 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 substitution



ties, 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 aingĩ a Tonya ũmbũke nĩ maiikagia maitho nja ya ngaari na makeyonera na makaigua mĩario na gũthogorana kwa andũ arĩa maarĩ 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.

11. Athii mahotaga gwĩka ũguo tondũ ngaari nĩ yahotetwo nĩ kwambata

kĩrĩma mũno na yathiiaga kahora ta ikũrũgama nĩ gũkuua kũrĩa yakuĩte.

Passengers were able to do that because the vehicle was unable to ascend the hill and was slow as though it would stop because of the way it was overloaded.

In sentence 11 of example (24) above, the infinitive clause *gwĩka ũguo* (*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. Gĩkũyũ 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 Gĩkũyũ 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 Gĩkũyũ data or data from a related language such as Swahili or Kikamba, to find out if a-link constructions occur cohesively.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ambiyo, S. (1999). "A Comparative Study of Cohesion in Academic and Newspaper Texts." Unpublished M.A Thesis. Kenyatta University.
- Armstrong, L. M. (1967). *The Phonetic and Tonal Structure of Gĩkuyu*. London: Longman.
- Barlow, A. R. (1951). *Tentative Studies in Kikuyu Grammar and Idiom*. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and sons Ltd.
- De Beaugrande, R and Dressler, W. (1981). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*, London: Longman.
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coulthard, M. & Sinclair, J.M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of Discourse: The English Used by Teachers and Pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Dijk, Van T. A. (1977). *Text and Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse*. London: Longman.



- Enkvist, N. E. (1981) "Categories of Situational from the perspective of stylistics." *Language Teaching and Linguistics Abstracts* 13: 75-74.
- Fairclough, M. (2003). *Analysing Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Gathenji, W. H. (1981). "The Morphology of the Verbal Extensions in Gikuyu-A Functional Approach." Unpublished MA Thesis. University of Nairobi.
- "Gikeno gia Krismas Gukinya." *Murata Iruta ria* 11 January 2000. Pg. 6, col. 1.
- Guthrie, M. (1948). *The Classification of the Bantu Languages*, London: Dawsons of Pall Mall.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K and Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*, London: Longman
- Hartnett, G. C. (1980). *Cohesion and Mental processes in Writing Competence*. London: Routledge.
- Hasan, R. (1984). "Coherence and Cohesive Harmony" in Flood, J. (Ed) (1984) *Understanding Reading Comprehension* 181-218, Delaware: M.P. International Reading Association.
- Hoey, M. (1991). *Patterns of Lexis in Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jinkai (2008) Lexical Cohesion Patterns in NS and NNS Dissertation Abstracts in Applied Linguistics: A Comparative Study. In the Linguistic Journal, Volume 3, Issue 3.
- Kioko, A. N. (1994). "Issues in the Syntax of Kikamba: A Bantu language." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Monash University, Australia.
- Leakey, L.S.B. (1959). *First Lessons in Kikuyu*, Nairobi: The Eagle Press.
- Mareka, B. G. (1953) *A Short Kikuyu Grammar*. Nairobi: The Eagle Press.
- "Migwi ya Moi gutuuhio." *Mwihoko Mweri wa Ndithemba* 1999/Njanuari 2000. Pg. 1, col. 1.
- Milroy, L. (1987). *Observing and Analyzing Natural Language*, New York: Basil Blackwell Inc.
- Mohammad, H. P. & Muhammad, A. S. (2006). *The Effect of Text Cohesion on Reading Comprehension*. Karen's Linguistic Issues, January 2006.
- Mutahi, E. K. (1977). "Sound Change and the Classification of the Dialects of Southern Mt. Kenya." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. University of Nairobi.
- Mwangi, M. (1998). *Ngoima*. New York: Mau Mau research center.
- Mwove, N. (1987). The Kikamba Noun Phrase. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. University of Nairobi.
- Nesil, H. & Basturkmen, H. (2006). "Lexical Bundles and Discourse Signaling In Academic Lectures." In Specials Issue Of International Journal Of Corpus Linguistics Vol 11:3 Edited By Flowerdew, J & Mahlberg, M. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ngugi wa Thiong'o (1980). *Caitani Mutharaba-ini*. Nairobi: Heinemann Kenya Ltd.
- Ngugi wa Thiong'o (1986). *Decolonizing the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. London: James Currey.
- Ngugi wa Thiong'o (1993). *Moving the Centre*. Nairobi: East African Educational publishers.
- Nurse, D. (1980). *Bantu Migration into E. Africa: Linguistic Evidence*. Paper no. 138. Nairobi: University of Nairobi.
- Nyamasyo, E. A. (1992). "A Corpus-based Study of Grammatical and Lexical characteristics of the writing of Kenyan Pre-University Students", Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Lancaster.Uk.
- Ogotu, E. (1996). "An analysis of Cohesion and Coherence structure in Texts written by Secondary School ESL learners in Kenya." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. University of Birmingham.Uk.
- Overton, H.J. (1972). "A Generative-Transformational Grammar of Kikuyu Language Based on the Nyeri Dialect." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. The Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College.
- Phillips, N. & Hardy, C. (2002). "Discourse Analysis: Investigating Process of Social Construction." Sage University Papers Series on Qualitative Research Methods, Volume 50. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage



-
- Polome, E.C. (1967). *Swahili Language Handbook*. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Richards, J. C. Platt, J. and Platt, H. (1985). *Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Riley, P. (Ed) (1985). *Discourse and Learning*, New York: Longman Inc.
- Scinto, L. F. M. (1986). *Written Language and Psychological Development*, Orlando: Academic Press Inc.
- Seliger, H. W. and Shohamy, E. (1989). *Second Language Research Methods*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thiga, E. N. (1997). "Cohesion and Compactness in compositions written by Kenyan Urban Primary school children." Unpublished M.A Thesis, Kenyatta University.
- Vitale, J. A. (1981). *Swahili Syntax*, Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: O.U.P. "Wiyathi: Miaka 36 ya Utuguugi." *Kimuri Iruta* namba 06, Njanuari 2000. Pg4, col1.
- Yule, G. (1985). *The Study of Language*, Cambridge: C. U. P.
-