THE NATURE OF COHESION IN SELECTED GİKÜYÜ TEXTS

BY

CHEGE ANNE WACHERA, B.ED (Arts)

REG: NO. C50/8479/98

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS OF KENYATTA UNIVERSITY

SEPTEMBER 2009

KENYATTA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
DECLARATION

“This thesis is my original work and to the best of my knowledge has not been presented for a degree in any other university”

Signature: Chege Date: 21st October, 2009

CHEGE ANNE WACHERA
C50/8479/98

This thesis has been submitted for examination with our approval as university supervisors:

Signature 1: Dr. Eunice A. Nyamasyo Date: 12/10/09

DR. EUNICE A. NYAMASYO
Department of English and Linguistics

Signature 2: Charles M. Gecaga Date: 12/10/2009

MR. CHARLES M. GECAGA
Department of English and Linguistics
DEDICATION

To my loving parents, Gilbert Chege and the late Esther Wanjiru, who taught me the virtue of working hard. To my dear husband Antony Somba for cheering me on, and to my lovely children, Esther Mwikali and Eva Wanjiru, who have been my greatest source of inspiration.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I am grateful to God through whose grace I have completed this study, and to all who have ceaselessly prayed for me and wished me well. The Lord bless you.

My heartfelt acknowledgement goes to my tireless supervisors, Dr. Eunice A. Nyamasyo, and Mr. Charles M. Gecaga, whose valuable guidance has helped shape this work, and for their patience throughout the research process.

My appreciation goes to the lecturers and support staff in the Department of English and Linguistics, for their input in this study. I especially thank Dr. Phyllis Mwangi for her valuable support, and I also thank my classmates, Caleb, Eva and Carmeline for their assistance and moral support.

To my loving husband, Tony, and my father, Gilbert and stepmother, Beth, my siblings: Njoroge, Mama Penny, Wambui, Betty, Wanja, Naomi, and Karungu, thank you for believing in me all through.

Finally, I especially thank my father, Gilbert, my sister Betty and her husband Henry, who gave financial assistance at different points in my study. May the Lord always meet all your needs.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION ..................................................................................................................... ii

DEDICATION ....................................................................................................................... iii

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..................................................................................................... iv

TABLE OF CONTENTS ....................................................................................................... v

OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS ........................................................................... x

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS ................................................................ xi

LIST OF TABLES ................................................................................................................... xii

ABSTRACT ......................................................................................................................... xiii

CHAPTER ONE .................................................................................................................... 1

1.0 Introduction .................................................................................................................. 1

1.1 Background to the study Problem ................................................................................. 1

1.2 Statement of the Problem ............................................................................................. 3

1.3 Research Questions ...................................................................................................... 4

1.4 Objectives of the Study ................................................................................................. 4

1.5 Research Assumptions ................................................................................................. 5

1.6 Significance of the Study ............................................................................................. 5

1.7 Scope and Limitations ................................................................................................. 6

1.8 Chapter Summary ....................................................................................................... 7

CHAPTER TWO .................................................................................................................... 8

LITERATURE REVIEW ....................................................................................................... 8

2.0 Introduction .................................................................................................................. 8

2.1 A Brief Review of General Works in the Field of Text Linguistics ......................... 8

2.1.1 Review on the Categories of Cohesion ................................................................. 10
2.2 Literature Related to Gikuyu Language ......................................................................................... 13
  2.2.1 Introduction .............................................................................................................................. 13
  2.2.2 Gikuyu Concord System .......................................................................................................... 13
  2.2.3 Nominal Concord ..................................................................................................................... 14
  2.2.4 Pronominal Concord ................................................................................................................ 15
  2.2.5 Verbal Concord ....................................................................................................................... 16
  2.2.5 The Gikuyu Sentence .............................................................................................................. 19
  2.2.6 The Gikuyu Noun Phrase ........................................................................................................ 19
  2.2.7 The Gikuyu Word ..................................................................................................................... 21
  2.2.8 The a-Link Construction ........................................................................................................ 21
  2.3 Theoretical Framework ............................................................................................................. 22
    2.3.1 Reference ............................................................................................................................... 23
    2.3.2 Substitution ........................................................................................................................... 24
    2.3.3 Ellipsis ................................................................................................................................... 25
    2.3.4 Conjunction .......................................................................................................................... 26
    2.3.5 Lexical Organisation ............................................................................................................. 27
  2.4 Chapter Summary ....................................................................................................................... 28

CHAPTER THREE ................................................................................................................................. 29
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY ........................................................................................................... 29
  3.0 Introduction ................................................................................................................................ 29
  3.1 Research Design ......................................................................................................................... 29
  3.2 Sources of the Study Corpus ....................................................................................................... 30
  3.3 Sampling Procedures and Data Collection .................................................................................. 31
  3.4 Data Analysis and Presentation .................................................................................................. 33
OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

Agglutinative languages: Languages in which various affixes may be added to the stem of a word to add to its meaning or to show its grammatical function.

Clitic: Linguistic forms that function as pronouns that occur affixed to verbs.

Cohesion: The property of a text whereby certain grammatical or lexical features of the sentences in a text connect them to other sentences in the text.

Corpus: A collection of written or spoken texts.

Discourse analysis: The study of how sentences in spoken and written language form larger meaningful units such as paragraphs or conversations.

Lexicostatistics: This is a criterion used by linguists to compare the vocabulary in languages in order to classify them into language families such as Bantu or Nilotic. It involves determining the percentage of a language’s vocabulary that is similar to that of another language.

Sentence: This study delimits a sentence by an initial capital letter and a final period.

Text: A written piece of language that forms a unified whole. This may be as short as one word or as long as a novel.

Text category: This is used in this study to refer to the text categories such as religion and reportage as proposed in corpus linguistics.

Tie: A pair of cohesively related items, which realise a single instance of cohesion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LTC</td>
<td>Literary text category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTC1</td>
<td>Ngũgĩ (1980) extract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTC2</td>
<td>Mwangi (1998) extract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC</td>
<td>Reportage text category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC1</td>
<td>Mwĩhoko extract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC2</td>
<td>Mūrata extract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTC3</td>
<td>Kīmûrī extract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Noun phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADVP</td>
<td>Adverb phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADJP</td>
<td>Adjective phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Table Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Gikuyu Noun Classes and Pronominal Concord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>A Summary of the Study Corpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Sample Analysis of Mwangi (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Sample Analysis of Ngugi (1980)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Sample Analysis of Mwihoko Extract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Sample Analysis of Murata Extract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Sample Analysis of Kimuri Extract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Forms of Cohesive Object and Subject Markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Frequency of Cohesive Devices in the Study Corpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Frequency of Lexical Ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Frequency of Reference Ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Frequency of Conjunction Ties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Frequency of Ellipsis Ties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The present study was aimed at identifying, describing and categorising the elements that help to join different sentences in selected Gikũyu 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 identify, describe and categorise cohesive devices in these texts. Gikũyu 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 Gikũyu 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’s 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 Gikũyu 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 Gikũyu. This is useful for the writers of Gikũyu grammars used for the teaching of this language. The study also contributes to the increasing body of knowledge in Bantu linguistics, Gikũyu being a Bantu language. This thesis is organised into six main chapters. Chapter 1 is composed of the background information introducing the study. Chapter 2 investigates other research findings that relate to the current one, and the theoretical framework in which this study is carried out. Chapter 3 contains methodology, data presentation and analysis. Categorisation of the cohesive devices identified in chapter four is done in chapter five. To conclude the thesis, chapter six presents a summary of the entire work, and identifies gaps requiring research in this field.
CHAPTER ONE

1.0 Introduction

This chapter introduces the study by giving a background to the problem, statement of the problem, research questions, objectives, research assumptions, significance of the study, and scope and limitations of this study.

1.1 Background to the study Problem

Studies of supra-sentential aspects of language have been the interest of various scholars in the last three decades. These scholars include de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) and Van Dijk (1977) among others. Most of these studies have been referred to as discourse analysis, a term used by linguists such as Brown and Yule (1983) and Van Dijk (1977) to cover both written and spoken language. Other linguists such as Riley (1985) and Halliday (1985) draw a line between discourse and texts. Riley (1985:2-3), for example, views the difference between text and discourse as being based on interaction. In this view, spoken language is seen as interactive while written language is not. Accordingly, he refers to spoken language as discourse, and written language as text. The present study adopts this perspective, and uses the term text to refer to written language.

Over the years, text linguists have attempted to predict “how large chunks of language come to be interpreted as texts”, as noted in Brown & Yule (1983:190). Halliday & Hasan (1976:2) are of the view that the property of being a text is best expressed through the concept of texture. “A text has texture, and this is what distinguishes it from something that is not a text…. The texture is provided by the cohesive relation…”
This implies that cohesion is central to the identification of what constitutes a text and what does not. The question that arises at this point is that of how cohesive relations are expressed in languages. In the English Language, Halliday & Hasan (1976) identified five devices that mark cohesion in a text. These are ellipsis, substitution, lexical organisation, conjunction, and reference.

Halliday & Hasan (1976) uses these five categories to analyse different literary texts, which include poetry, drama, and prose for cohesion. Some studies have highlighted the central role played by cohesion in texts. For instance, Mohammad & Muhammad (2006) established that text cohesion, especially lexical cohesion and reference, aid in reading comprehension, especially so for non-natives. Other studies of cohesion have mainly focused on different kinds of written English language. For instance, Hoey (1991) uses repetition categories of cohesion to analyse discursive texts. Ambiyo (1999) compares cohesion in newspapers and in academic texts, while Thiga (1997) focuses on cohesion and compactness in written compositions drawn from Kenyan primary school learners of English as a second language. The present study shifts this attention from studies of cohesion in English language texts to a description of cohesion in an African language, Gikuyû.

Gikuyû belongs to the Bantu family of languages that, according to Guthrie (1948), are spoken over much of Central and Southern Africa. This language is also commonly referred to as Kikuyu, which is a corruption of the original name, Gikûyû. Henceforth in this study, the term Gikûyû is used because it more clearly represents the actual pronunciation of the word by native speakers.
Two orthographies for Gikũyũ language have been in use: Guthrie (1948) notes that one such orthography adopts a 5-vowel system similar to the five English vowels, while the other adopts a system with seven vowels. This later orthography as Guthrie, (1948, p.7) notes, most suitably represents the actual pronunciation of Gikũyũ by native speakers. It is also the orthography used in all Gikũyũ texts that are analysed in this study.

Nurse (1980), using lexicostatistics, and with the support from Guthrie’s classification techniques, classifies Gikũyũ as belonging to the Central Kenya group. This group corresponds to the group that Guthrie (1948) codes as E50, meaning that it belongs to Bantu zone E according to Guthrie’s Bantu zones. These zones were further divided into language groups and Gikũyũ belongs to group 50, also known as Kikuyu- Kamba group. It consists of six languages, which are Gikũyũ, Kĩembu, Kimerũ, Kĩtharaka, Kikamba, and Kidaiso. As is the case for other languages in this group, there is hardly any literature on cohesion in Gikũyũ language. In view of this, it can be argued that a study on how texts in the language achieve cohesiveness is in order.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

This study investigates the nature of cohesion in Gikũyũ texts. For the English language, it has been established that texts achieve texture through cohesive relations that may be marked by either semantic or grammatical features. No theory-governed study known to the researcher has analysed Gikũyũ texts for cohesion. The present study, therefore, seeks to fill this gap.
Yule (1985) argues that cohesion is marked differently in different languages. He further notes that these differences pose difficulties when texts are being translated from one language to another. Theory governed descriptions of cohesive relations in different languages would provide valuable insights to translators. The current study responds to this challenge and has described cohesive relations in Gikuyu.

Finally, cohesive devices in the English language fall into certain categories, and this study seeks to find out if Gikuyu cohesive devices fall into categories similar to those of the English devices.

1.3 Research Questions

In determining cohesive devices occurring in Gikuyu texts, this study sought to answer the following questions:

1) Which elements in the Gikuyu sentence enter into cohesive relations?
2) How do these elements relate with the rest of the text to realise cohesion in sample texts?
3) Into which categories and subcategories do cohesive devices used in Gikuyu texts fall?

1.4 Objectives of the Study

This study is based on the following objectives to:

1) Identify and describe the linguistic features that mark cohesion in Gikuyu texts.
2) Explain how the linguistic features identified above relate with the rest of the text in order to achieve a cohesive effect.
3) Discuss and classify those linguistic features into types and sub-types into which they fall.

1.5 Research Assumptions

This study is based on the following three assumptions:

1) That the sample texts used in this study are cohesive.

2) That different kinds of linguistic features mark cohesion in Gikuyu texts.

3) That such linguistic features occurring in Gikuyu texts to realise cohesion are, in a broad sense, similar to those cohesive devices occurring in English texts, and that they fall into similar categories.

1.6 Significance of the Study

Ngũgĩ (1993, 1986) express a need for Africans to develop their own languages. Ngũgĩ (1993) in particular argues that this can be done by writing and publishing in these languages, or by conducting theory-governed studies to analyse aspects of the languages. In Ngũgĩ (1986), it is further argued that Europe has stolen treasures of the mind from Africa to enrich their languages and cultures. It is argued that Africans should use their intellect to study their own languages, and publish all their writings in their own languages. By describing cohesion in Gikuyu, the present study adds to the body of knowledge on Gikuyu, and language in general.

Secondly, though studies have been done in Gikuyu language, among them Muthahi (1977) and Gathenji (1981), none that the researcher knows of has dealt with the analysis of cohesion. This further gives a justification for a study of this nature on the language. Furthermore, as noted earlier, Yule (1985, p.141) has noted that the conventions of
cohesive structure differ from one language to another. Such differences, he argues, pose difficulties when texts are being translated from one language to another. Therefore, a study on the nature of cohesion in Gikũyũ texts might give translators useful insights.

In addition, this study may be helpful to the writers of Gikũyũ grammars used for the teaching of Gikũyũ. This is because the findings of this study provide a research-based description of cohesion in the language, which can form a basis for their statements on cohesion.

1.7 Scope and Limitations

The focus of this study is on cohesion in Gikũyũ texts. The investigation opts for textual data because as Nyamasyo (1992, p.75) notes, the choice of an already existing body of written texts reduces the cost of obtaining representative data.

In the text, the concern is on those linguistic features marking cohesion, and the relations they create. To do this, the study adopts Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) model of cohesion as it provides a comprehensive description of point-to-point cohesion in text as noted in Ogutu (1996). The study overlooks some approaches to the analysis of texts such as that by de Beaugrande & Dressler’s (1981), since investigating all the seven standards of textuality as propounded by de Beaugrande & Dressler would go beyond the description of cohesion, which is the focus of this study.

The present study is not an evaluation of texts based on their effectiveness, but a description of cohesion in the texts.
1.8 Chapter Summary

This chapter has introduced the study, and has defined the study’s focus and boundaries. It has also stated the significance of the study’s findings. The next chapter reviews literature related to this study and outlines the theoretical framework within which the study is carried out.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

In the preceding chapter, the focus of this study has been stated. In this chapter, the present study is put into perspective against related works. To begin with is a brief review of general works in the field of text linguistics, followed by reviews on the categories of cohesion, and a review of Gikuyu grammar, necessary for the analysis of cohesion. Finally, the theoretical framework in which this study is carried out is discussed.

2.1 A Brief Review of General Works in the Field of Text Linguistics

The current study falls in the broad field of discourse analysis or text linguistics, terms that have been used interchangeably by scholars such as Van Dijk (1977), and de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981). In this field, diverse contributions by different scholars have taken one of three approaches. Brown and Yule (1983), Edmondson (1981), and Coulthard and Sinclair (1975) are among those who view a text as an interaction existing between the producer, the text and the receiver of the text, and their knowledge of the world around them. Van Dijk (1977) on the other hand focuses on the functional structure of text, arguing that societal features determine the unity of texts. Finally, there are those who are preoccupied with the structuring of texts through lexical and grammatical units operating beyond sentence boundaries. Hoey (1991), Halliday (1985), Hasan (1984), and Halliday & Hasan (1976) belong to this category, and they have generally been referred to as text grammarians. The present study falls under text grammar. This is because cohesive devices operate beyond the sentence, and are realised as lexical or grammatical features in text.
In addition to recognising cohesion as a property of texts, text linguists also concern themselves with the significance of cohesion in the texts. De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) for example view cohesion as just one of some seven standards that a text must fulfil for it to qualify as a text. These include coherence, cohesion, situationality, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, and intertextuality. Acceptability, for instance, means that the content of a text should tally with the reader’s knowledge of the world.

Widdowson (1978), Brown & Yule (1983), and Enkvist (1981) on the other hand argue that a text can be coherent even in the absence of cohesion. These linguists seem to take into consideration implicit semantic relations between sentences. Brown and Yule (1983, p.196) for example support this argument by quoting the following example:

(1) A: There’s the doorbell  
    B: I’m in the bath.

In the given example, the cohesion in the exchange is not marked by any grammatical or lexical feature. But what Brown and Yule (1983) argue is that a reader will interpret the sentences in example (1) as constituting a text, which is meaningful depending on the context, such that speaker B in the response would be understood as excusing himself from answering the door because he is in the bath. The present study however examines cohesion that is explicitly marked in texts.

Among recent studies of cohesion are Thiga (1997) and Ambiyo (1999). Both of these studies analyse English language texts. Thiga (1997) studies cohesion and compactness in compositions written by Kenyan urban primary school children, while Ambiyo (1999) compares cohesion in academic and newspaper texts. Both analyses reveal the occurrence of examples of all the five types of cohesive devices as posited by Halliday & Hasan (1976). In Thiga’s study, the most common cohesive device is reference followed by the
lexical category. This order is reversed in Ambiyo’s study. In both studies, the substitution/ellipsis category is the least frequent. The findings in these two studies are important to the present one as their analyses of cohesion is based on Halliday & Hasan’s model, which forms the theoretical framework for the present study.

Still on the subject of cohesion, Nesil & Basturkmen (2006) investigate the cohesive role of lexical bundles in a corpus of 160 university lectures. They define lexical bundles as strings of frequently co-occurring words. Their finding is that a majority of the lexical bundles serve to show how different parts of a particular lecture are related. These lexical bundles are therefore cohesive. Nesil & Basturkmen’s study gives insight as to the nature of cohesion.

Another study on lexical cohesion is JinKai (2008). Her study uses Halliday & Hasan’s (1976) theory of text cohesion, backed-up by Hoey’s (1991) model for analysis. She compares patterns of lexical cohesion for native speakers’ dissertation abstracts with those of non-native speakers’. Her finding is that native speakers’ abstracts use more complex repetitions, while non-native speakers’ abstracts demonstrate a high rate of simple repetitions. JinKai (2008) uses Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) model of text analysis as part of her theory, which is the theory used in the present study.

2.1.1 Review on the Categories of Cohesion

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. (Cf. 2.6). 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:

(2) 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:

(3) 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.

(4) 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:

(5) 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 word repetition, synonyms, superordinates 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.

2.2 Literature Related to Gikũyũ Language

2.2.1 Introduction

This section addresses issues in Gikũyũ grammar that are of relevance to an analysis of cohesion in the language. It starts with Gikũyũ concord system, which is divided into nominal, verbal and pronominal concord. Secondly, this section briefly discusses the Gikũyũ sentence, noun phrase, word and the a-link construction.

2.2.2 Gikũyũ Concord System

Like all Bantu languages, Gikũyũ nouns are categorised into noun classes based on the prefixes the nouns take in their singular and plural forms. (Leakey 1959). The Gikũyũ noun is therefore composed of a stem and a prefix. Examples:

(6) mú-ndũ (person)

(7) a-ndũ (people)

In example (6) above, prefix mú- on the noun, mú-ndũ (person) is the noun prefix for class 1 nouns. Similarly, prefix a- on the noun andũ in example (7) is for class 2 nouns.

According to Kioko (1994), the Bantu noun governs all its modifiers as well as verbs such that they take an affix that has to agree with the subject noun. These markers of agreement are called concords. This is the case in Gikũyũ. Examples:

(8) mú-ndũ ú-mwe mú-thaka
person one beautiful (one beautiful person)
(9)  a-ndû a-tandatû a-kûrû nî-ma-kinya
People six old they have arrived (six old people have arrived)

In example (8) above, the numeral ū-mwe (one) and adjective mû-thaka (beautiful) both take prefixes that mark them as agreeing with the subject noun, mû-ndû (person). In example (9), the noun that governs its modifiers is a-ndû (people). The numeral a-tandatû (six), the adjective a-kûrû (old) and the verb complex nî-ma-kinya (they have arrived) all take affixes to agree with the noun andû (people).

2.2.3 Nominal Concord

Barlow (1951) notes that nominal concord is identical to the noun class prefix which determines which class the noun belongs to. This concord is prefixed on nouns and adjectives that qualify these nouns. The following examples illustrate this.

(10) nyûmba njûru (house bad) (bad house)
(11) mûndû mûûru (person bad) (bad person)
(12) ha-ndû ha-ûru (.can be broken down to: place bad) (bad place)

Nominal concords in Gîkûyû do not playa major role in connecting different sentences cohesively. They help in connecting a noun and all its modifiers within a single sentence. This helps to create what Halliday and Hasan (1976) call structural cohesion, that is, cohesion within a sentence. This kind of cohesion is not our focus because it is achieved by virtue of grammatical structure. That is to say that any grammatically correct sentence will be cohesive. In some instances however, nominal concord prefixed on an adjective can signal that an ellipted noun necessarily belongs to the noun class to which the prefix belongs.
Example:


People crowded around him. O Who were short stretched in order to see him/her.

In this example, the second sentence starts with the noun phrase, A-ria a-kuhí (who were short), whose head noun A-ndú (people) is ellipted to be recovered from the preceding sentence. The complete noun phrase without ellipsis should read A-ndú a-ria a-kuhí (People who were short). The nominal concord a- for class 2 nouns prefixed on the adjective a-kuhí (short) suggests that the noun A-ndú (People) is an appropriate head for this noun phrase because it belongs to class 2 nouns.

2.2.4 Pronominal Concord

The subject noun in Gikũyũ provides a pronominal affix that is prefixed on all the other noun modifiers apart from the adjective. According to Barlow (1951), noun modifiers that take the pronominal prefix in Gikũyũ are the possessive pronouns, demonstratives, the referential particle, cardinal numbers, a-link construction (cf. 2.2.8) and pronouns –iki (alone), -iri (both), -ngići (another), -rikú (which), -igana (how many), -mwe (some), and –othe (all, the whole of). Consider the following examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>múndu úria úkomete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>person who is asleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>andú ari a atatu màkomète</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>people who (three people) who are asleep (three people who are asleep)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>múndu wa njohi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>person of beer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>ng’ombe ya Kamau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cow of Kamau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In example (14), the referential particle -ria takes the pronominal prefix ú - to agree with the noun múndu (person). In example (15), the numeral stem –tatú (three) takes the
pronominal prefix a- to agree with the noun a-ndů (people), and in sentence (17), suffix a- of the a- link construction is joined to prefix i-, the pronominal prefix for singular nouns of class 9, the class to which noun ng’ombe (cow) belongs.

These pronominal affixes always signal that the nouns they refer to belong to the same noun class as themselves. When these affixes are not in the same sentence as the noun they refer to, then they are cohesive. Consider the following example:

(18) Ng’ombe ya Kamau ni ndungu. Yakwa nĩ hĩnju
Ng’ombe i-a Kamau ni ndungu. Í-akwa nĩ hĩnju.
Cow of Kamau is fat. Of mine is thin.

In the example above, the pronominal concord -i affixed to the possessive pronoun stem -akwa (mine) is the pronominal concord for class 9 nouns, the class to which the noun ng’ombe (cow) belongs. It therefore refers to the noun ng’ombe (cow) in the preceding sentence thus creating cohesion.

2.2.5 Verbal Concord

According to Polome (1967), the verbal concords are identical to pronominal concords. Verbal concords are divided into two. These are subject and object markers. Kioko (1994) notes that the subject agreement marker is an indispensable component of the tensed verb complex. On the other hand, the object marker is added to the verb when the nominal object is omitted from the sentence. This is the case in Gĩkũyũ.

Example:

(19) Mw-ana a-rarîrîre n-gui ya-mû-ṟûma
Mû-ana a-ra-rîr-ire n-gui i-a-mû-ṟûm-a
child he/she cried dog bit him/her (the child cried when the dog bit him/her).
In example (20) above, the object marker -mû- in the verb ya-mû-ruma (it bit him/her) marks the verb as agreeing with the object noun mwana (mû-ana) (child). Similarly, the subject prefix a- in the verb a-rarihire (he/she cried) is the subject agreement marker. It marks the verb as agreeing with a class 1 noun such as mwana (child) in this case.

In texts, both the subject agreement marker, and the object marker 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 preceding sentences, thus creating cohesive ties between the concerned sentences. Consider the following example:

(20) Kamau aahitukire wega múno. Aciari aake ma-ki-mû-twara cukuru njega.
Kamau passed very well. His parents they took him to a good school.

In example (21) above, the object marker mû- (him) in the verb complex ma-ki-mû-twara (they took him), refers back to noun Kamau (Kamaui) in the preceding sentence, joining the two sentences cohesively.

Below is a table of all the 17 noun classes of Gikûyu and examples of nouns that are found in each class. For each noun class, the pronominal/verbal concord is given.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class prefix</th>
<th>example</th>
<th>gloss</th>
<th>pronominal/verbal concord</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mû-</td>
<td>mûndû</td>
<td>person</td>
<td>û-, w-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a-</td>
<td>andû-</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>a-, ma-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mû-</td>
<td>mùtû</td>
<td>tree</td>
<td>û-, w-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mî-</td>
<td>mùtî</td>
<td>trees</td>
<td>î-, y-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-</td>
<td>ihiga</td>
<td>stone/rock</td>
<td>rî-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rî- /ri</td>
<td>riitho</td>
<td>eye</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ma-</td>
<td>mahiga</td>
<td>stones/rocks</td>
<td>ma-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maitho</td>
<td></td>
<td>eyes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kî-</td>
<td>kîhato</td>
<td>broom</td>
<td>kî-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kîondo</td>
<td></td>
<td>basket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i-</td>
<td>ihato</td>
<td>brooms</td>
<td>ci-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cîondo</td>
<td></td>
<td>baskets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-</td>
<td>nyûmba</td>
<td>house</td>
<td>î-, y-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngû</td>
<td></td>
<td>firewood (plural)</td>
<td>i-, ci-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rû-</td>
<td>rûkû</td>
<td>firewood (singular)</td>
<td>rû-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ka-</td>
<td>kahiî</td>
<td>boy</td>
<td>ga-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tû-</td>
<td>tûhiî</td>
<td>boys</td>
<td>tû-, tw-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>û-</td>
<td>ûhoro</td>
<td>news (singular)</td>
<td>û-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kû-</td>
<td>kûrîra</td>
<td>to cry</td>
<td>kû-, gw-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kûgûrû</td>
<td></td>
<td>leg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ha-</td>
<td>handû</td>
<td>place</td>
<td>ha-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kû-</td>
<td>kûndû</td>
<td>places</td>
<td>kû-, gw-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.5 The Gikuyu Sentence

Polome (1967:165) notes that a Swahili sentence consists of a clause or a sequence of clauses. This is also the case in Gikuyu, where the juxtaposition of clauses is a common syntactic pattern. Consider the following example,

(21) Kamau agithoma niokiraga tene ona kwina heho niguon akorwo na mweke wa guthoma atanathi kirathi-ini hamwe na arutwo aria angi

Kamau when he was learning he would get up early even when it was cold so that he could have a chance to read before he went into class together with other students.

The sentence above can be analysed into five clauses that have been juxtaposed to form a single sentence. When a clause that has occurred in preceding sentences is referred to in a subsequent sentence, the norm in Gikuyu texts is to use demonstratives to refer to it, rather than repeat such a clause. Consider the following,

(22) Ahituka ni aguirwo iratu. Ucio niguu undu uria wamkenirie muu 

When he passed he was bought shoes. That is the thing that pleased him most.

In the example above, undu ucio (that thing) in the second sentence presupposes the clause aguirwo iratu (he was bought shoes) which is in the first sentence. The two sentences are therefore cohesively related.

2.2.6 The Gikuyu Noun Phrase

Mwove (1987, p. 32) observes that the elements that occur with a nominal to form a noun phrase in Bantu languages fall into two major categories: that of determiners and that of nominal modifiers. The determiners in Gikuyu include numerals, demonstratives, and the referential particle. The numerals and the referential particle follow the noun, while the demonstrative can either precede or follow the noun it qualifies.
Examples:

(24) Ng’ombe igíří
    Cows two

(25) Ířá Ng’ombe
    That cow

(26) Ng’ombe Ířá
    Cow that (that cow known to both speaker and listener) - Ířá (that) in this case is a referential particle.

Gikúyu nominal modifiers, on the other hand, are the a-link modifiers, the adjective, and the relative clause.

Examples:

(27) mundú ūmwe wa ndoro
    Person one of clay (one person made out of clay)

(28) mú-ndú ū-mwe mú-thaka
    Person one beautiful (one beautiful person)

(29) mú-ndú ū-mwe ū-ria w-endagia nduka
    Person one who sells shop (one person who sells in the shop)

Sometimes a noun phrase may contain one or more of these noun phrase components without a head noun. In such cases, the head noun is ellipted, and can be recovered from the preceding text. Example:

(30) Andú aria mathomaga na Kamau nimakenire mahítûka. Ø A-ria Maguíre matiaragia na mundú.
    The people who were learning with Kamau were very happy when they passed. Ø Who failed were not talking with anyone.

In the second sentence of the example above, the pronominal prefix a- in a-ria (who) signals that it ought to agree with a noun from class 2. The noun andú (people) in the preceding sentence satisfies this presupposition, joining the two sentences cohesively.
2.2.7 The Gikũyu Word

According to Barlow (1951), most words in Gikũyu occur in morphologically complex forms. This means that a particular stem may take different affixes that will make it assume different grammatical functions and meanings. These different occurrences of the same stem bearing different affixes can create cohesion if the two word forms derived from the same stem are in different sentences. Example:

(31) Kamau athomeire Naikuru. No aari a nyina mathomagira Nairobi.

Kamau he learnt in Nakuru. However, his sisters were learning in Nairobi.

The two verbs athoomeire (he learnt in) and mathoomagira (they learnt in) are related because they contain the basic meaning of learning (-thom-). These two words constitute a cohesive tie binding the two sentences.

2.2.8 The a-Link Construction

According to Armstrong (1967), Gathenji (1981) and Mwove (1987), an a-link is a possible constituent of the Bantu noun phrase. According to Mwove (1987, p.36), the construction is called an a-link because the noun is linked with its modifiers by an ‘a’. An a-link construction functions as an adjective or as a marker of possession. For example, in the constructions below ‘a’ joins two nouns in each case, but in example (32), the construction is an adjective, while in example (33), the construction marks possession.

(32) Karamu k-a goro
Pen of expensive (expensive pen)

(33) Karamu k-a Wacuka
Pen of Wacuka (Wacuka’s pen)
In Gikũyũ texts, the noun modified by the a-link construction can at times be left out when it is possible to recover it from the surrounding text. Example:

(34) Wacuka ena karamu gakwa. Ø Gake nikarorire.  
*Wacuka has pen of mine. Ø of hers got lost.*

In the second sentence of example (34) above, the noun karamu (*pen*) that is modified by the a-link construction Gake (*of hers*) has been ellipted to be recovered from the preceding sentence. This binds the two sentences cohesively. At times, the a-link construction itself is ellipted joining two sentences cohesively. Consider the following example:

(35) Karamu gaka nî ka nyina wa Wacuka. Ka ithe Ø nikorire.  
*This pen belongs to mother of Wacuka. For father Ø is lost.*

In the first sentence of example (35) above, the noun nyina (*mother*) is modified by the a-link wa Wacuka (*of Wacuka*). However, in the second sentence, the a-link wa Wacuka (*of Wacuka*) is ellipted after the noun ithe (*father*), and the reader recovers it from the first sentence. This causes the interpretation of the second sentence to depend on the first sentence, thus binding the two sentences cohesively.

2.3 Theoretical Framework

Among the models for the analysis of cohesion, there exists a development of Halliday & Hasan (1976) by one of the authors Hasan (1984). In this modified version, Hasan (1984) revises the lexical cohesive category already identified in the 1976 model. Hasan (1984) proposes two major subcategories of the lexical category of cohesion, which are general and instantial subcategories. The general subcategory consists of repetition, synonymy, antonymy, hyponymy, and metonymy. Instantial relations are equivalence, naming, and
semblance. Since Hasan (1984) is primarily concerned with evaluating texts in terms of coherence, the proposed categories are inappropriate for the present study, whose focus is the identification and description of cohesion in non-English textual data.

Hoey (1991) argues that cohesion is mostly achieved through repetition. Accordingly, repetition categories are identified as simple lexical repetition, complex lexical repetition, simple paraphrase, reference, substitution/ellipsis, particular to general and complex paraphrase. These categories are however considered not sufficient for the purposes of this study because as Hoey (1991, p.51) notes, his topic is not on cohesion, but that he uses cohesion as a tool in describing the organisation of text. His work therefore focuses on repetition, which aids in giving text some structure, and overlooks other cohesive devices such as sentence conjunctions, collocations, and some types of reference items, which are not ways of repeating. The present study being a description of cohesion finds repetition as well as other cohesive devices equally important.

Halliday & Hasan’s (1976) model of cohesion is used in this study. It perceives a text as having five devices through which cohesion is realised. These are reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical organisation. Accordingly, a single instance of cohesion is marked by the occurrence of a pair of cohesively related items, which, it is argued, form a tie. A detailed discussion of the cohesive relations developed in this model is given below:

2.3.1 Reference

Reference items refer to other items for their interpretation. (Halliday & Hasan 1976, p.31). What a reference item refers to can always be retrieved from the surrounding text.
Example:

(36) The tree fell. It blocked the road.

In the second sentence of example (36), “it” refers to “The tree”.

The reference in example (35) is anaphoric, since the reference item points backwards, for its interpretation. The forward pointing reference items are said to be cataphoric. In this example, cohesion is achieved because the second sentence presupposes that the reader has encountered the first sentence, which provides the information needed for the interpretation of it in the second sentence. In English, reference items are personal pronouns, demonstratives and comparatives. Personal reference is such as has been exemplified in example (36) above.

Example of demonstrative reference:

(37) Mombasa is hot. There, the temperatures are very high.

In example (37), there is a demonstrative referring back to Mombasa.

The comparative category of reference includes indirect reference by means of identity or similarity. (Halliday & Hasan 1976, p.37). Example:

(38) He has a long name. His son uses the same name.

In example (38), same name is semantically related to a long name through similarity.

2.3.2 Substitution

The second cohesive device in this model is substitution. This is the replacement of one item by another. In substitution, the substitute always replaces an item of the same word class and grammatical function as itself. In English, the substitute may have the function
of a noun, a verb, or a clause. Thus, there are three kinds of substitution namely, clausal, nominal, and verbal. Examples:

Nominal substitution:

(39) She bought the black *shoes* and I bought the brown *ones*.

The substitute *ones* above replaces the noun *shoes*.

Verbal substitution:

(40) I wished it would *rain* and it *did*.

The substitute *did* in example (40) replaces the verb *rain*.

Clausal substitution:

(41) *He doesn’t like lazy people*, and he told me *so*.

The substitute *so* replaces a whole clause; *he doesn’t like lazy people*.

2.3.3 Ellipsis

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976 p.142), ellipsis can simply be said to be “substitution by zero”. An elliptical item is one which leaves specific structural slots to be filled from elsewhere in the text. Ellipsis, just like substitution can be nominal, verbal or clausal. The sign Ø has been used in this study to mark an empty syntactic slot

Examples:

Nominal ellipsis:

(42) She bought two sodas. I took *one Ø* and she took the other Ø.

The noun *soda* is presupposed after both the pronouns *one* and *other*.
Verbal ellipsis:

(43) She bought two sodas. I took one and she the other.

The verb took has been presupposed after the second occurrence of she in example (43). It is supplied by the verb took in the same sentence.

Clausal ellipsis:

(44) Did I lock the door? – No

In the response, the clause, you did not lock the door, is presupposed from the preceding question.

2.3.4 Conjunction

Conjunction is a semantic relation specifying the way in which what is to follow is systematically connected to what has gone before. Halliday and Hasan (1976) have adopted a scheme with four categories of conjunctions namely, additives, adversatives, causal, and temporal conjunctions. Below are examples of each.

Additive conjunctions:

(45) He is quite brilliant. Moreover, he works very hard.

Additive conjunctions signal that the following clause adds more information to what the preceding one had offered.

Adversative conjunctions:

(46) He worked very hard. However, he failed.
*However* is the adversative conjunction in example (46). Adversative conjunctions signal that the following clause provides information that contrasts with that of the preceding clause.

Causal conjunctions:

(47) He worked very hard. *Consequently*, he passed.

*Consequently* is the causal conjunction in example (47). As the word causal implies, these conjunctions signal that what follows is caused by the preceding clause or vice versa.

Temporal conjunctions:

(48) At first he worked very hard. *Later*, he relaxed.

The conjunction *later* is temporal. These conjunctions show relations of time.

2.3.5 Lexical Organisation

The last cohesive device as outlined in the cohesive model is lexical cohesion. This is the cohesive effect achieved by the selection of vocabulary. This category is divided into two broad categories namely, collocation, and reiteration. Reiteration is in turn sub-categorised into four sub-categories as outlined below:

(a) The same word: This refers to a repetition of the same word in a passage.

Example:

(49) This *house* belongs to Florence. It is a good *house*.

(b) a synonym or near – synonym. Example:

(50) *We climbed* the Ngong hills, and then went swimming. The *ascent* was more taxing than anything else that we did.
(c) a super-ordinate term

Example:
(51) She has little furniture. It is wise for her to buy some seats

(d) a general noun.

Example:
(52) John plays football. The boy is really good at it.

The boy is a general term referring to John in the example above.

Halliday & Hasan (1976) classify all lexical cohesion that is not covered by reiteration under the general heading of collocation. They point out that collocation results from co-occurrence of lexical items that are in some way or other typically associated with one another, because they tend to occur in similar environments.

Example:
(53) When I got to the house, I found the door open.

House and door are collocates in this sense, because they tend to occur in the same environment in different contexts.

2.4 Chapter Summary

This chapter has reviewed general works in the field of text linguistics, followed by a review of the categories of cohesion. The chapter has also reviewed literature on Gikūyū grammar as it relates to the study of cohesion in the language. Finally, the chapter outlines Halliday and Hasan’s 1976 model of cohesion, which forms the theoretical framework for this study. The next chapter presents the research methodology.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

In the preceding chapter, literature related to this study has been reviewed. The present chapter describes the research design and gives the sources of the study corpus as well as sampling procedures and data collection methods. Methods used to analyse and present data in this study have been outlined, and finally there is an explanation of how data has been coded and processed.

3.1 Research Design

This study is descriptive. A descriptive research establishes the existence of phenomena by explicitly describing them. It utilizes already existing data, and has a preconceived hypothesis (Seliger and Shohamy 1989, p.117-125). The present study sets out with the assumption that Gikuyu texts are cohesive, and describes cohesion in the language using already existing written texts. The study sample consists of 240 sentences taken from two text categories: reportage and literary categories. All the sentences are numbered for ease of identification. The cohesive ties in each sentence are indicated, and the cohesive items together with their glosses are written down. For each of the ties, the kind of cohesion involved is specified. This is followed by a discussion of the linguistic features that create cohesion, and a description of how these linguistic features relate with other parts of the sentences to achieve cohesive effects. Finally, the linguistic features identified as creating cohesion in the texts have been categorised following the Halliday and Hasan's model of cohesion.
3.2 Sources of the Study Corpus

The corpus for this study was drawn from selected Gikuyû texts. Published texts in Gikuyû include different types of articles, novels, and plays by various authors. For example, novels include Mwangi (1998), Ngûgî (1986), Ngûgî (1980), Mwangi (1950) and Sadler (1957); periodicals such as Mûrata, Kimûrî, and Mwihoko; academic writings such as Wirute gûthoma books 1, 2, & 3; religious books such as the Bible, and a Gikûyû translation of Bunyan’s Pilgrim’s Progress among others.

Taking into consideration that an analysis seeking to identify and describe linguistic features marking cohesion requires a sizeable extract of flowing texts, the whole range of varieties of Gikuyû texts would be most appropriate. However, this would be too much data for this particular study. For this reason, the study is limited to printed prose from which five extracts from two categories were selected. These are the literary category as represented by Ngûgî (1980) and Mwangi (1998), and the reportage category as represented by the January 2000 issues of 3 periodicals circulated in Nairobi namely Mûrata, Mwihoko, and Kimûrî. These particular categories were selected because they provide excerpts of continuous prose, which are necessary for an analysis of cohesion in texts.

Ngûgî (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 an analysis of cohesion. Mûrata, Mwihoko and Kimûrî 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 the analysis of cohesion.

The focus of the present study being on the cohesive devices that help to create unity in Gikuyu texts, this study sample was considered sufficient to represent all the cohesive devices that help to create cohesion in Gikuyu 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.

3.3 Sampling Procedures and data Collection

This being a descriptive study, the observation method of data collection was most appropriate. A survey was done of texts written in continuous prose in Gikuyu language. From the relatively small range of the available texts, a purposive sample was selected. A chapter from Ngugi (1980) and another from Mwangi (1998), each of which had a minimum of 60 sentences were selected. From these selected chapters, the first 60 sentences provided part of the sample for this study. It is, here, argued that not using the whole chapter does not affect an analysis of cohesion as other studies of cohesion such as Hoey (1991) have also used only part of a chapter successfully.

Three 40 sentence extracts were selected from lead articles in three periodicals circulated in Nairobi. Each article selected had a length of not less than 40 sentences. A total of 120 sentences were analysed for each of the two selected text categories. From the reportage category, three 40 sentence extracts were used. For novels, 60 sentence extracts were
drawn. The difference in length was occasioned by the fact that the articles in the particular periodicals analysed here were fairly short as compared to the literary category.

A minimum of forty sentences was considered sufficient for an analysis of cohesion since it is the approximate length of text that other analyses of cohesion have used. Hoey (1991) for instance analyses the first 40 sentences of a chapter of discursive text for cohesion.

The total study sample consists of 240 sentences. This was considered sufficient data as Milroy (1987) observes that language tends to be more homogeneous than many other types of behaviour, and consequently requires less data. She further notes that too much of it tends to exhibit repetitive characteristics and increased data handling problems. The sample for this study is as summarised in the Table 3.0 below.

Table 3.0: A Summary of the Study Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of text</th>
<th>Source of excerpt</th>
<th>Number of sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reportage category</td>
<td>Murata,</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kimuri</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mwihoko</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary category</td>
<td>Caitani mutharaba-ini (Ngugi, 1980)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ngoima (Mwangi, 1998)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of sentences</td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The selected texts were typed and coded for ease of identification.
3.4 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 3.1 - 3.5 shown below.
<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>Lexical: Vehicle</td>
<td>Item: Tonya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collocation</td>
<td>Gloss: 乡镇</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Athii</td>
<td>Lexical: Passengers</td>
<td>Item: Makanga,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reiteration:</td>
<td>Conductor,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Superordinate</td>
<td>kahonoki,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>term</td>
<td>Ngoima,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nyina,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kahonoki na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>angí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gwíka úguo</td>
<td>Substitution: To do that</td>
<td>Item: Kuona na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>verbal: verbal</td>
<td>verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reference</td>
<td>kuíigua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ngaari</td>
<td>Lexical: Vehicle</td>
<td>Item: Ngaari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reiteration:</td>
<td>Verbal: Ngaari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>same word</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kwambata</td>
<td>Lexical: to ascend</td>
<td>Item: Kwambata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reiteration:</td>
<td>To ascend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>same word</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence number</td>
<td>Number of ties</td>
<td>Cohesive Item</td>
<td>Type of Device</td>
<td>Presupposed Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Gloss</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hiindi iyo</td>
<td>Time that (that time)</td>
<td>Mwaka-ini wa ngiri imwe na Magana kenda ma miro ngo itano na itatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reference: demonstrative</td>
<td>In the year one thousand nine hundred and fifty three</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Thutha wa mwaka umwe</td>
<td>After one year</td>
<td>Mwaka wa ngiri imwe na magana kenda ma miro ngo itano na inya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conjunction: temporal</td>
<td>The year one thousand nine hundred and fifty four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nyina Ø</td>
<td>Ellipsis: a-link</td>
<td>Wa Waringga Of Wariinga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother Ø</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nyina</td>
<td>Lexical: collocation</td>
<td>Ithe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Akinyitwo</td>
<td>Lexical: same word</td>
<td>Akinyitwo She/he was arrested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agithamirio</td>
<td>Lexical: same word</td>
<td>Agithamirio She/he was detained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Akinyitwo</td>
<td>Lexical: collocation</td>
<td>Agithamirio He/she was detained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence number</td>
<td>Number of ties</td>
<td>Cohesive item</td>
<td>Type of cohesion</td>
<td>Presupposed item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>gloss</td>
<td>item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Angi</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Atongoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kuregana</td>
<td>To disagree</td>
<td>a bata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Watho wa githuri</td>
<td>Enforced rule</td>
<td>Gukararia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reference:</td>
<td>To oppose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>comparative</td>
<td>Enforced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lexical: near</td>
<td>rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>synonym</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lexical: synonym</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-Mû- in mamû-</td>
<td>He/she in the</td>
<td>Moi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kararirie</td>
<td>opposed him/her</td>
<td>Proper noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reference:perso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amemba</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Amemba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lexical: same</td>
<td>Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>word</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mawatho</td>
<td>Laws</td>
<td>Watho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lexical:</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>collocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ciira</td>
<td>Debate</td>
<td>ciira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lexical: same</td>
<td>debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>word</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mbunge</td>
<td>parliarment</td>
<td>mbunge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lexical: same</td>
<td>parliarment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>word</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence number</td>
<td>Number of ties</td>
<td>Cohesive item</td>
<td>Type of cohesion</td>
<td>Presupposed item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Item Gloss</td>
<td>Reference: demons-trative</td>
<td>item gloss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Úyú This</td>
<td>Lexical: superordinate term</td>
<td>Desemba December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mweri Month</td>
<td>Lexical: collocation</td>
<td>Desemba December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gûgakena To be happy</td>
<td>pleasures</td>
<td>Desemba ikeno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Matukû These days</td>
<td>Lexical: collocation</td>
<td>Mìaka ya tene Past years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ø aria Ø who</td>
<td>Ellipsis: nominal</td>
<td>Andû People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maragûra They are buying second hand Clothes</td>
<td>Lexical: collocation</td>
<td>Magûraga nguo njerû They were buying new clothes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Krismas christmas</td>
<td>Lexical: same word</td>
<td>krismas christmas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From Tables 3.1 – 3.5 as presented above, a deduction can be made that the linguistic features that mark cohesion in Gikuyu texts range from affixes to words, phrases, and even clauses. It is also evident that the features of reference, conjunction, substitution, ellipsis and lexical organisation as posited by Halliday and Hasan (1976) contract cohesive relations.

All the five extracts that form the data in this study were analysed in the manner outlined. This made it possible to identify and classify the linguistic features that create cohesion in these texts.
3.5 Data Coding

The data for this study is drawn from two text categories. These are the literary text category (LTC), and the reportage text category (RTC). These are represented by Ngũgĩ (1980) extract which is coded as LTC1 and Mwangi (1998) extract which is coded as LTC2. The reportage text category on the other hand is represented by three extracts. These are extracts from Mwlhoko coded as RTC1, Mûrata coded as RTC2, and Kimûrî coded as RTC3. The data for this study forms the appendices.

3.6 Data Processing

Examples drawn from the study data have been used as illustrations in this work. 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, RTC2:3 means that the example is drawn from the reportage text category, Mûrata extract, sentence 3.

3.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter has described the research design and the source of the study corpus, as well as explained the sampling procedures and data collection methods. The chapter has also explained the methods used to analyse, code, and present data in this study. The next chapter identifies the linguistic features that have been identified as creating cohesion in the study corpus. It also describes how these linguistic features relate with the rest of the text to realise cohesion.
CHAPTER FOUR
IDENTIFICATION OF LINGUISTIC FEATURES THAT MARK COHESION

4.0 Introduction

The preceding chapter has focused on the methods used to identify, describe and categorise linguistic features creating cohesion in the study corpus. The present chapter zeros in on the description of these linguistic features. The chapter also explains how these linguistic features relate with the rest of the text to achieve a cohesive effect.

4.1 Types of Markers of Cohesion

This section describes the linguistic features identified as creating cohesion in the study corpus. In addition, the section explains how these linguistics features relate with the rest of the text to make it cohesive. This section is divided into three sub-sections based on the forms taken by these linguistic features. The sub-sections are headed affixes, words, phrases and clauses and lastly, syntactic gaps.

4.1.1 Affixes

According to the Collins dictionary (1985), an affix is a linguistic element added to a word to produce an inflected or derived form. Among other affixes in Gikuyu, nouns and adjectives take the nominal concord supplied by the subject noun in a sentence. The subject noun also supplies a pronominal concord affixed on all the other noun modifiers other than the adjective. (Cf. sections 2.2.3 and 2.2.4).
All the affixes identified as creating cohesion in the sample texts have two things in common: One, they are all either affixed to a verb stem, a noun stem, a pronoun stem, a conjunction, a preposition or to a complex with a connective particle {a} that has an adjectival or possessive function, and is also referred to as an a-link (Mwove, 1987; Gathenji, 1981). Two, they all have the referential force of the English pronoun. These affixes have indeed been referred to as pronoun affixes by Gĩkũyũ grammars such as Mareka (1953), Barlow (1951), and Leakey (1959).

The cohesive affixes that are affixed to the verb stem are of two kinds: the subject marker and the object marker. As already mentioned, (cf.2.2.4) the subject and object markers are agreement morphemes which are affixed to verbs to make them agree with the subject noun and object noun respectively. In cases where a noun with which these morphemes agree is in the same sentence as the verb to which they are affixed, these affixes are not cohesive. However, in cases where the noun with which they agree is in a preceding or a following sentence, the affixes are cohesive because they create a relation between the two sentences concerned. The example below from RTC 2:30-32 illustrates this point.

(1) 30. Krismas yaambiriri gůkůnguirwo mwaka wa AD 334 hǐndi irǐa Pope Gregory a-ātuĩari Mútheru Augustine, athii akahunjiri handu a Rūraaya ari matooi ūhoro wa ngai.

*Christmas was first celebrated in the year 334 AD when Pope Gregory sent Saint Augustine to go and preach to the people of Europe who didn’t know God.*

31. Riri a-thiire būrūri wa Aroma nǐ aakorire ati ma-ahoyaga riũta ta ngai.

*When he went to Rome, he found that they worshipped the sun as a god.*

32. A-gíki-ma-hunjiriia ūhoro akîmera ekûmaruta ūhoro wa Ngai ūngi wîtagwo “Riua Rîñahotagwo”.
He then preached to them and told them that he would teach them about another God called “the unbeatable Sun.”

In sentence 30 of example (1) above, the subject prefix a – (he) in the verb a-atūmire (he sent) refers to the proper noun Pope Gregory. Since both the affix a – and the noun Pope Gregory are in the same sentence, this particular affix is not cohesive for the simple reason that it does not play any part in joining the sentence in which it is found to any other sentence in that particular text. It is in this case creating structural cohesion which is necessary for a sentence to be grammatically correct, but is not cohesive beyond the sentence level. (Halliday & Hasan 1976). On the other hand, the subject prefix a- (he) in the verb a-thire (he went) in sentence 31 is cohesive because it refers back to the noun phrase Mūtheru Augustine (Saint Augustine) in sentence 30. In this case, the subject prefix a – (he) functions as a pronoun referring to a noun in the immediately preceding sentence. Therefore, affix a- is a cohesive item presupposing that the reader has come across the noun phrase Mūtheru Augustine (Saint Augustine) in the previous sentence. This cohesive item, a- (he) and the presupposed item, Mūtheru Augustine (Saint Augustine) form a single cohesive tie.

In example (1) above, there is another cohesive tie joining sentences 30 and 31. It is marked by the cohesive item ma – (they) in the verb complex ma-ahoyaga (they worshipped). This plural subject prefix presupposes the noun phrase andū a Rūraaya (people of Europe) in sentence 30.

An example of an object maker functioning cohesively is also found in example 1 above. This is signaled by object marker –ma– (them) in the verb complex Agikī-ma-hunjiria
(he then preached to them) in sentence 32. This particular tie is more complex than the other two that we have discussed above. This is because this object marker—ma- (them) presupposes ma - (they) in ma-ahoyaga (they worshipped) in sentence 31, which is also a cohesive item and is in turn presupposing the noun phrase andû a Rûraya (people of Europe) in sentence 30. This kind of chain presuppositions is a common feature in the Gikuyû texts analysed. Consider the following example from RPT 3: 35-38.

(2) 35. Undû wa mbere vari gûcaria andû arîa mangîatuíkire ngati ciao, matongoretio nî Moi na Njonjo wa Mugane.

_The first thing was to look for people who could have been their collaborators, led by Moi and Njonjo son of Mugane._

36. Aya nî andû arîa magereire macukuru ma mâceeni na matoî rûngî tiga rwa Mûbeberû.

_These are the people who went through missionary schools and did not know another (song) other than the colonialists’._

37. Ni-ma-rüfítwo irathi na kûndû kûngî kûrîa maarutaga wîra, na makîambîrîria kûharîrio wîra wa ngaati.

_They had been taken from classrooms and other places where they worked, and they had started being prepared to work as collaborators._

38. Gûgîkînya 1960 rîrîa mâcemanio ya kwârîrîria wîyaathi ya Lancaster House yeetânîwro andû aya nîmarîkîitie kwîgâcîra.

_By 1960 when meetings of Lancaster House that discussed independence were called these people were already established._

In sentence 38 of example 2 above, the noun phrase andû aya (these people) refers to the subject marker –ma- (they) in the verb complex, nî-ma-rüfítwo (they had been taken from), in sentence 37. The subject marker in turn presupposes the demonstrative aya (these) in sentence 36, which points to the noun phrase Moi na Njonjo wa Mugane (Moi and Njonjo son of Mûgane) in sentence 35. In this way, a chain of presuppositions joins the four sentences cohesively.
The subject and object markers occur as cohesive items in both their singular and plural forms, and in their phonologically variant forms. Consider examples 3, 4 and 5 drawn from LTC 1: 8-9, RTC 2: 31-33 and LTC 1:55-56 respectively.

(3) 8. Warĩŋa aarī wa mĩaka iĩri.  
Warĩŋa was two years old.
Her aunt who was married at Nakuru took her.

12. Warĩŋa akũrũire Naikuru na aihwa aake.  
Warĩŋa grew up in Nakuru together with her cousins.

13. Hindi iyo ma-ikaraga Land Panya Estate…  
That time they lived in Land Panya Estate…

14. Waariinga atsomeone Mbaharini Full Primary School…  
Warĩŋa learnt in Mbaharini Full Primary School…

15. No aihwa aa-ke maathoomagĩra Bondeni D.E.B o hau mũhuro wa Section 58 hakuhi na Manjeengo ma Boonde.  
But her cousins learnt in Bondeni D.E.B. just there south of Section 58 near Manjengo in Boonde.

She used to go down between Mĩthoonge and the council’s Slaughter rhouse.

(4) 31. Krismas yaambiriirie gukunguirwo mwaka wa AD334 hindi irĩa Pope Gregory aatumire mũtheru Augustine, athii akahunjiriie andũ a Rũraya aria matooi ūhoro wa Ngai.  
Christmas was first celebrated in the year AD334 at the time when Pope Gregory sent Saint Augustine, to go and preach to the people of Europe Who did not know about God.

32. Riri a-thiire bũrũri wa Aroma ni a-akorire atĩ ma-ahoyaga riũa ta ngai.  
When he went to Rome, he found that they worshipped the sun as a god.

33. A-giki-ма-hunjiriia ūhoro a-ki-me-ra ekũ-ма-ruta ūhoro wa Ngai ūngi witagwo “Riuia Ṭiathotagwo”.  
He then preached to them and he told them that he would teach them about another God called “the unbeatable Sun.”

(5) 55. Gũtiri wira muiriitu ataangihota eetikĩitiie na ngoro yaake no ahote, nĩ guo Warĩŋa eeraga airtu aria angi nao magatheka.
There is no work that a lady cannot do when she believes in her heart that she can, this is what Wariingga used to tell the other ladies who would laugh (at it).

56. No niingi ní mo-onaga atì we Wariingga no atoorie ona kìa úünjinia …

But also they used to see that Wariingga was capable of doing even engineering ...

In sentence 9 of example 3, the singular object marker -mu- (her) in the verb complex aki-mu-oya (she took her) presupposes the noun Wariingga in the preceding sentence. Similarly, the plural subject marker -ma- (they) in the verb complex ma-ikaraga (they used to stay) in sentence 13 refers to Wariingga and the phrase na aihwa aake (with her cousins) in the preceding sentence. In the same way, the singular subject marker a- (she) in the verb complex a-aikurukagira (she used to go down through) in sentence 16 presupposes Wariingga in sentence 14. In sentence 15, the possessive pronoun stem -ke (her) is attached to the pronominal concord for class one nouns, a- to form a-a-ke (her). The pronominal concord a- agrees with the noun aihwa (cousins) in the same sentence. This possessive pronoun stem -ke (her) presupposes that the reader has come across the noun Wariingga in the preceding sentence. It therefore joins sentences 14 and 15 cohesively.

In example 4 sentence 32, the singular subject marker a- in the verb complexes, a-thiire (he went) and a-korire (he found) refer to the noun phrase mútheru Augustine in sentence 31. The plural subject marker ma- (they) in the verb complex ma-ahoyaga also is cohesive since it presupposes the noun phrase andú a Rúraya (people of Europe) in the preceding sentence.

Sentence 33 is part of a chain presupposition: all the subject and object markers in the sentence refer to Mútheru Augustine (saint Augustine), the same noun phrase being
presupposed by the subject and object markers in sentence 32. Their interpretation is to be found in sentence 31 where the noun phrase occurs.

However, in the verb complex a-ki-me-ra (he told them), the object marker is –me-(them) instead of –ma-(them). This variation is purely phonologically conditioned. The verb complex can be analysed into a-ki-ma-ira. When vowels /a/ and /e/ are juxtaposed, reciprocal assimilation takes place such that the mid-front vowel /a/ assimilates the front feature of /e/, while /e/ assimilates the low feature of /a/ to become /e/. Thus –ma-(them) in the verb complex a-ki-me-ra is realised as –me-(them).

In example 5 above, the subject prefix mo-(they) in the verb complex mo-onaga (they used to see) in sentence 56 refers to the noun phrase airitu aria angi (other ladies) in sentence 55, thus joining the two sentences cohesively. This subject prefix mo- takes this particular form because of the phonological process of assimilation as explained below.

As earlier observed, the singular pronominal subject prefix for class 2 nouns is a- and the plural form is ma-. It is therefore clear that the verb stem – onaga (used to see) in sentence 56 should take the subject prefix ma- (they) in order to agree with the noun phrase airitu aria angi (the other ladies) in sentence 55. However, when the subject prefix ma-(they) and the verb stem – onaga (used to see) are juxtaposed, regressive assimilation occurs such that the open vowel /a/ in ma- (they) assimilates the rounded feature of the vowel /o/ in - onaga (used to see) to become /o/. As a result, the resultant verb complex is mo-onaga (they used to see) and not ma-onaga.

Below is a table showing subject and object markers found to be cohesive, together with their phonological variants.
Table 4.0: Forms of Cohesive object and subject markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subject marker</th>
<th>Object marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singular</strong></td>
<td>a -</td>
<td>- mû -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plural</strong></td>
<td>ma -</td>
<td>- ma -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phonological Variants:**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singular</strong></td>
<td>e -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plural</strong></td>
<td>mo -, me -</td>
<td>-me-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4.0 above, one can observe that the subject marker can occur as a - or e- in its singular form and as ma-, mo- or me- in its plural form. The object marker on the other hand can occur as -mû- in its singular form, and as -ma- or -me- in its plural form.

It is important also to note that Gikũyũ orthography has no female-male gender distinction, and therefore the forms of the affixes do not vary to mark gender.

Other affixes that have featured as being cohesive in the study corpus have occurred affixed to noun stems. These affixes are strictly suffixes marking possession, and all of them take one form. The example below is from LTC1:20-21.

(6) 20. No kĩrĩa Warĩngẹ eendete mũno ti kuona maraya makirũĩra arũme, kana o arũme makirutanĩra tũhiũ, kana arũ magĩthuguma na gũtahĩka mĩtaro-inĩ, aaca - kĩrĩa Warĩngẹ eendete mũno ni gũthiĩ kaniĩha mahoya na kuũiga ũhoro wa Ngai.

But what Warĩngẹ liked most was not to watch prostitutes fighting for men, or even men threatening one another with knives, or drunkards urinating and vomiting in gutters, no - what Warĩngẹ liked most was going to church to pray and listen to the word of God.
21. O kiumia o kiumia rúcinií taata-we nì aamútwaraga miitha kanitha-nì wa Holy Rosary.

Every Sunday morning her aunt used to go with her for mass in Holy Rosary Church.

The genitive suffix – we (her/his) affixed to the noun stem taata - (aunt) in sentence 21 refers back to Warínga in sentence 20, and this referential relation joins the two sentences cohesively. This suffix commonly occurs in nouns, especially those denoting relations. For instance, mürüta-we means her/his friend and consists of noun stem mürüta- (friend) and the possessive suffix - we (her/his).

Cohesive affixes have also occurred in the study corpus when affixed to a pronoun stem. These are invariably subject markers. Consider the following example from LTC1:24-25.

(7) 24. Ma-bica maingi maarî ma Njiïcù e mwana anyïitïtwo nì thingï Maria na e mûnene akïambwo mûharaba-inï.

Most pictures were of Jesus as a child being held by Virgin Mary and as an adult being crucified on a cross.

25 I-ngï ciari cia caitani...

Others were of the devil...

In example 7 above, the indefinite pronoun I-ngï (Others) in sentence 25 presupposes that the reader has come across the noun phrase Mabica maingï (many pictures) in sentence 24. The pronoun I-ngï (others) and the noun phrase Mabica maingï (many pictures) therefore form a single cohesive tie. In addition to this, the subject prefix I – (it) affixed to the indefinite pronoun stem – ngï (other) ought to agree with the noun phrase it refers to, which in this case is Mabica maingï (many pictures) in the preceding sentence. However, this is not the case in this example, and this can be construed as a grammatical
error in the text. The error concerns the agreement morpheme I – (it) in i-ngí (others) which cannot possibly refer to the noun Mabica (pictures – big/bad ones) because the morpheme i- belongs to noun class 5, while the noun mabica belongs to class 6. Consequently, the pronominal concord and the noun belong to two different noun classes and therefore do not agree.

The appropriate subject prefix on the pronoun stem – ngí (other) so that it can refer to the noun phrase mabica maingí (many pictures – big ones) would be ma – (they). Thus, the pronoun should be ma-ngí (others – big/bad ones) and not i-ngí (others).

Other cohesive affixes in the study corpus appear suffixed to conjunctions. The following is an example from LTC 2: 37-38.

(8) 37. Mwanake utaringítwo múno ní úríía warúgire rúgíka – igúrú

_The young man who wasn’t badly hurt is the one who jumped onto the Road side._

38. No na-a-ke no aararamaga no ní aahoteete gúkorwo eikarítie thí múngí úgíkinya hári we.

_But also he was still groaning but had managed to sit up by the time the public got to him._

In example (8) above, suffix – ke (he) affixed on conjunction na – (also) in sentence 38 refers back to mwanake (young man) in sentence 37. This creates cohesion between the two sentences.

Some cohesive affixes in the study corpus have also occurred suffixed to prepositions. Consider the following example from RTC3:32-33.
32. Kwa njira nguhi **plan ya 74-25-1** yaari ya kūgaya ūūtoonga.

*In short, the **74-25-1 plan** was meant for the division of wealth.*

33. Kūringana na-yo, Icunj 74 hari100 (74 percent) ya útonga wa maburūri maya wagirirwo nǐ gucooka Rūraya na ageni, icunj 25 hari igana (25 per cent) ithi na nyabara kana ngaati ciao maburūri-ini macio, nao eene būrūri (kana ngirimiti na ritwa rīngi) matigirwo o gacuunjī kamwe hari igana (1 percent).

*According to it, 74 parts in 100 (74 percent) of these countries’ wealth was meant to go back to Europe with foreigners, 25 parts in a 100 (25 percent) to go with their overseer or guards in those countries, and the owners of the country (or natives in another word) to be left with 1 part in 100 (1 percent).*

In sentence 33 of the example above, affix – **yo (it)** is attached to preposition na (to). The affix refers back to noun phrase **plan ya 74 – 25 - 1** (the **74-25-1 plan**) in sentence 32. This joins the two sentences cohesively.

There are also affixes that are suffixed to a complex with the connective particle {a} also known as an a– link prefix. (cf.2.2.8). The following example from LTC2. 32-33 illustrates this:

32. No úria műingi weciiragia, ati no ùhonokie muoyo wa ikanga riu ona riatūra ririkionje, gūtiahotekire tondū nī riakoretwo ririkitie gūkua.

*But what the public hoped, that they might rescue the life of that conductor even if he lived to be crippled, was not possible because he had died.*

33. Nda **ya-akeharia yathiirirwo iguru nī kūguru** kwa ngaari yari mondore na mara makaminjūka nja.

**Tummy of his**, where the vehicle’s wheel had run over had been smashed and the intestines had oozed out.

In sentence 33 of example (9) above, possessive pronoun stem – **ke (his)** is affixed to affix ya – (of) of the a – link construction **nda yake** (tummy of his). The possessive
pronoun stem- **ke** *(his)* presupposes **Ikanga** *(conductor)* in the preceding sentence, and this joins the two sentences cohesively.

From the analysis given above, we observe that all the affixes that can function as cohesive items in Gikuyu texts are either agreement morphemes themselves, as in the case of cohesive subject and object markers attached to verb stems, or they occur as stems on which agreement morphemes are attached as in the case of the possessive pronoun stem - **ke** *(his/hers)* on which affix *ya* *(of)* of an a – link construction is prefixed.

Being affixed to agreement morphemes or being agreement morphemes themselves, cohesive affixes can take as many forms as there are noun classes in Gikuyu. This is because every noun class has a specific concord morpheme as has been noted. (cf.2.2). This means that agreement morphemes (concents) in Gikuyu are potentially cohesive, and are actually cohesive when the noun with which they agree is not in the same sentence as they are.

**4.1.2 Words**

Different words or lexical items have featured as cohesive items in this study's corpus. (cf. Tables 3.1 – 3.5) Most of these cohesive words fall under the noun word class, but there are also a few conjunctions, pronouns, and adverbs that are used cohesively in the data.

The different words that create cohesion in the data have done so in four ways: The most common means is by being repeated from sentence to sentence, words with related meanings, words which are basically referential and thus create cohesion by referring to
other words in the surrounding sentences, and finally there are words that are connective in nature, and are cohesive when they serve to connect separate sentences.

Nouns create cohesion in the data in two ways. One, by being repeated from sentence to sentence and two, by contracting relations in their meanings. Below is an example from RTC1:1-3 to illustrate this.

(11) 1. Ngarari ciiragwo nĩ kamena

Arguments are said to be hatred

2. Õgûo na ruthiomi rûhûthû nĩ kuuga maciaro ma ngarari nĩ rûmena.

That in simple terms is to say that the fruits of arguments are hatred.

In example (11) above, the word ngarari (arguments) occurs both in sentence 1 and 2. These two occurrences of the same word in different sentences of the same text form a cohesive tie. This repetition of the noun ngarari (arguments) implies that the two sentences address the same issue and are therefore related.

In this same example, there is the occurrence of the diminutive noun kamena (hatred-small one) in sentence 1, and the related form rûmena (hatred) in sentence 2. The close relation in the meaning of these two words causes sentences 1 and 2 to be perceived as related and the relation between these two sentences is therefore cohesive.

Verbs also contribute to the creation of cohesion in the sample texts. This happens when the same verb occurs in different sentences, or when different verbs in different sentences, have related meanings, or when a verb contracts a cohesive relation with a noun which is derived from it. Consider the examples below drawn from LTC2:10-11 and LTC1:16-17 respectively.
10. Many passengers of Tonya Umbâke were looking outside the vehicle and they could see and hear the voices and bargaining of the people who were in the market.

11. Voices of the people who were bargaining in the market could be heard by a person in the vehicle going up the hill.

16. Sometimes, after school or on Saturday or Sunday, Wariînga and her cousins roamed Bonde to see (for themselves) women trapping men or even men fighting with knives.

17. Other times they went through all the villages on that side - Kiziwani, Karoreni, Kivumbini, Shauri Yako, Ambongorewa or Kaambi cumari just to see (for themselves) people and houses and shops.

In example (12) above, the noun gûthogorana (bargaining) in sentence 11 is derived from the verb thogora (bargain), which is found in sentence 10 in a derived form, maathogoranaga (they were bargaining). This verb complex and the verbal noun above are related in such a way that the noun is derived from a stem of the verb. Since the two related words are in separate sentences, their relation is cohesive because it causes the concerned sentences to be interpreted as belonging together.

In example (13) above, the verb complex maacangacaangaga (they roamed) in sentence 16 is close in meaning to the verb maahunguraga (they went through) in sentence 17.
This relation in the meanings of the two verbs is cohesive as it creates unity between the concerned sentences.

Finally in example (13) above, the verb kwïrorera (to see- for oneself) occurs in both sentences 16 and 17. The two occurrences form a cohesive tie binding the two sentences together.

Another class of words that features as being cohesive in this study is conjunctions. These signal connections between sentences in the texts as illustrated in the following example drawn from RTC2: 2-3.

(14) 2. Ùyù nïguo mweri andù makoragwo mehariïrie gùgakena ota ùrìa mangïenda no ti maririkane atì nimûhonokia Njiïcù waciarirïo ta ùrìa Akristiano ari a aam makoragwo mehariïrie.

This is the month when people prepare to enjoy themselves as much as they would want but not to remember that the saviour Jesus was born, as the true Christians prepare to do.

3. Ìndì Krïmas ya mwaka ùyù ndïgûkorùo ìrì na riiri ta ya miaka ìrìa ihïtûkïte nì ùrìa andù aingï mahinyïrirïkïte nì kwaga mbeca, ìndì ona kûrì ùguo matiaga o gûkorïo na gatûû ga gûkenera.

However this year’s Christmas will not be as joyful as those of the past years due to the way many people are pressed by lack of money, but even in the circumstances, they cant lack something little to make them happy.

The conjunction ìndì (however) at the beginning of sentence 3 in example (14) above connects sentence 3 to Sentence 2 by contrasting them. The conjunction presupposes that the reader has come across sentence 2 in order to contrast its content with that of sentence 3. Since conjunction ìndì (however) connects two separate sentences, it is cohesive.
Another class of words that we identified as being cohesive in the study data is the pronoun. Pronouns create cohesion in the texts by referring to nouns across the texts.

The following is an example drawn from LTC2:7-8.

(15) 7. Taïni ya Tambaya nî niini mûno na maita maria maingî ndiakoragwo na andû aingî.

_The town of Tambaya is very small and most of the times it does not have many people._

8. Mundû angiitana na kayû kanene arî mweno ûmwe wa yo no aiguo nî mundû arî mûico ûfîa ûngî wa matuka.

_If a person called out loudly from one side of it, he/she can be heard by a person who is on the other side of the shops._

In the example above, pronoun yo (_it_) in sentence 8 refers to the noun phrase Taïni ya Tambaya (_Town of Tambaya_) in sentence 7. By presupposing this noun phrase, pronoun yo (_it_) creates cohesion between sentences 7 and 8.

Adverbs are also identified as being cohesive in the study corpus. The relations contracted by cohesive adverbs in our data are those of reference. Example (16) is from LTC 2: 47-48. It shows a cohesive relation contracted by a referential adverb.

(16) 47. Ñi aathiûrûkire ngaari agithiî na mbere oone kana ñi akuona Nyaindo haria maaikaire mbere ngaari ţtanagîa na mútino.

_He went round the vehicle to the front to try and see Nyaindo where they had sat before the vehicle was involved in an accident._


_Before he got there, his foot stumbled over something and he fell down on his right side._
Adverb ho (there) in sentence 48 of example (16) above is referring to mbere (front) in sentence 47 of the same example. This referential relation is cohesive joining the two sentences concerned.

It is proper at this point to observe that all words have a potential of contracting cohesive relations. Halliday and Hasan (1976, p.288) similarly observe that every Lexical item may enter into a cohesive relation. However, words that are too frequent in system of a language tend to contract relations with every other word in the language. Halliday and Hasan (1976) observe that such words can hardly be said to contract significant cohesive relations because they go with almost all words in a language.

In Gikuyu language, such words include prepositions, verbal auxiliaries, and other lexical items with high frequency such as Mûndû (person). Consider the following example from RTC 2:1-2,

(17) 1. Ngarari ciiragwo nî kamena.

Arguments are said to be hatred.

2. Ûguo na rûthiomi rûhûthû nî kuuga maciaro ma ngarari nî rûmena.

That in simple terms is to say the outcome of arguments is hatred.

The copula verb nî (BE) occurs twice in sentence 2 above. It also occurs once in the preceding sentence. Since it co-occurs with many words, it can possibly occur in almost every sentence and as a result, its occurrence cannot be said to be binding the text together, but as serving a grammatical function within a sentence.
4.1.3 Phrases and Clauses

Several kinds of phrases are cohesive items in this study’s corpus. A good number of them are NPs (noun phrases) composed of a demonstrative and a noun. In addition, there are other kinds of NPs as well as adverb phrases (Advps), and adjectives phrases (Adjps), which occur as cohesive items in our data.

The NPs that are composed of demonstratives and a noun or an NP (noun phrase) create cohesion by referring to a noun or an NP which has occurred in the preceding sentence. The demonstrative in the NP is the reference item, while the noun or NP in the phrase serves to make the reference specific in order to signal exact identity as in the following example from LTC1:1-2.

(18) 1. Jacinta Warĩnga aaciariirwo kaamburu mwena wa Githũngũri kia Wairera mwaka-inĩ wa ngiri Ŭmwe na magana keenda ma miroongo ĩtaano na ĩtatũ.

_Jecinta Warũnga was born in Kaamburũ in Githũngũri of Wairera in the year one thousand nine hundred and fifty three._

2. Hiĩndĩ ĩyo bũrũi ũyũ witu wa Kenya waathaguo ni thũkũmũ cia Ngeretha na watho ŭria múũru wa kũhĩnyĩriira múŋĩ, nĩguo watho wa wĩhũũge.

_That time this our country of Kenya was ruled by British colonialists with the bad rule of oppressing people, that is the emergency rule._

In this example, the NP Hiĩndĩ ĩyo (_that time_) consists of a demonstrative ĩyo (_that_), and a noun Hiĩndĩ (_period_). The demonstrative signals that reference is being made to something accessible to the reader, while the noun makes the reference specific to a period of time in the preceding text. In this case, the demonstrative and the noun in sentence 2 presuppose the phrase mwaka-inĩ wa ngiri Ŭmwe na magana keenda ma miroongo ĩtaano na ĩtatũ. (_In the year one thousand nine hundred and fifty three_) which is in sentence 1. This relation is therefore cohesive because it connects the two sentences.
Other cohesive NPs in the data consist of an adjective or an adjectival and a noun. These create cohesion in the texts either by being repeated from sentence to sentence or by being closely related to other text constituents’ meanings.

Example from LTC2:22-23.

(19) 22. Mwanake úmwe wa acio eeri maarí na ikanga kùria igùrù nì aarùgìre mwena wa úrió wa ngaari, akígwa rami-iní gatagáfí.

One young man of these 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. Úría úngí naake aarùgìre mwena wa úmootho, akígwa igùrù ría rùgiìka na akígargarára na kùria ìndù a thoko maarí.

The other one jumped to the left side and he fell on the road side and rolled to where the market people were.

In this example, the NPs mwena wa úrió (right side) and mwena wa úmootho (left side) in sentences 22 and 23 respectively form a cohesive tie. The relation holding between their meanings is that of antonymy.

Advps in the data create cohesion by signaling connections between sentences, and by reference. Consider examples (20) and (21) from LTC 1:6-7 and LTC 2:21-22 respectively.

(20) 6. Mwaka wa ngiri îmwe na magana keenda ma múroongo ítaano na inya, ithe wa warĩnga akínyitwo agíthaamírío Manyani.

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

7. Thuutha wa mwaka úmwe nyina naake akínyitwo agíthaamírío Raang’ata na Kamîtì.
After one year the mother also was arrested and deported to Lang’ata and Kamiti.

(21) 21. Riria and fi acio moonire ati ndereba ni aremirwo biu ni kuriugamia ngaari ni maambiriire kuriuga thi kuuma keeria-igurû, ngaari o igicookagana 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 umwe wa acio eeri maari na ikanga kuria iguru ni aarugire mwena wa urio wa ngaari, akigwa rami-ini gatagafi.

One young man of those two who were up there jumped to the rightside of the vehicle, and fell in the middle of the tarmac.

In example (20) above, the Advp Thuutha wa mwaka umwe (After one year) in sentence 7 is a temporal conjunctive element presupposing that the point in time from which this phrase proceeds is accessible to the reader. The presupposed element is mwaka wa ngiri imwe na magana keenda ma mirongo itano na inya (year one thousand nine hundred and fifty four). Both the cohesive Advp and the presupposed element constitute a single cohesive tie.

In example (21), the Advp Kuria igurû (up there) in sentence 21 is referential, referring back to the locative noun keeria-igurû (on the carrier) in sentence 21.

Cohesive Adjps consist of one or more adjectives and a noun. They create cohesion in the texts by contracting meaning relations with other parts of the text. The example that follows is from LTC1:27-29.

(22) 27. Thiingi Maria, Njicu na Araika a Ngai maarî eeru ta athungu, no Caitaani na araika ake maarî airu ci. Virgin Mary, Jesus, and angels of God were white like Europeans, but Satan and his angels were completely black.
28. Útukû nî arootaga mahahûratoro nî ùndû wa mbica icio.

At night she would have nightmares because of those pictures.

29. No haandû ha kûrooto na njîîcû akîambio, arootaga na Caitaani arî na gîkoonde kîeru cua ta gîa kîmûthûngû kîmwe kînoru mûno Wariînga oonire rîmwe hakuhî na Rift Valley Sports Club...

But instead of dreaming with Jesus being crucified, she would dream with Satan with a skin completely white like for one, fat European (bad/big) Wariînga once saw near Rift Valley Sports Club...

Sentence 29 above is related to sentence 27 because the adjective phrase kîeru cua ta gîa kîmûthûngû (completely white like for one, big/bad, fat European) in sentence 29 is semantically related to eerû ta athûûngû (white like Europeans) in sentence 27. The two adjps bind the two sentences together.

A few clauses are also identified as cohesive items in the study corpus. Consider the following example from LTC2:11-12.

(23) 11. Athii aingî a Tonya Úmbûke nî maaikagia maitho nja ya ngaari na makeyonea na makaigua mìario na gûthogorana kwa andû arîa maraî thoko.

Many passengers of Tonya Umbûke looked outside the vehicle and saw and heard the voices and bargaining of the people who were in the market.

12. Athii maahotaga gwîka úguo tondû ngaari nî yahootetwo nî kwambata kirima mûno na yathiaga kahora ta ikîrûgama nî gûkuua kûriya yakuûîte.

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

In example (23) above, the infinitive clause gwîka úguo (to do that) in sentence 12 refers to maaikagia maitho nja (they were looking outside) in sentence 11. This verbal reference creates cohesion between the concerned sentence.

Some clauses create cohesion by simply contracting meaning relationships with other parts of the text as in the example below from RTC 2:3-7.
3. Rûmena naruo rûcokakaga rûkareehe *mbaara* kana njatûkano

*Hatred in turn brings about war or division.*

4. Andû a Kenya makoretwo magíathamwo na njûgûma màaka mîngî.

*Kenyans have been ruled by the club for many years.*

5. Athamaki arîa maathaga andû na njûgûma meetagwo na kîng’ênû , ‘dictators’.

*Rulers who rule people by a club are known as ‘dictators’ in English.*


*They are not opposed or asked a question: when they say a word whether it is oppressive or meant to kill – they expect people to do what they say.*

7. Nîkieha tûkîririkana atî *kûrî mîoyo yûrînte* na *thakame ìitikîte* bûrûriini ūyû witû...

*It is sad as we remember that there are lives that have been lost and blood that has poured in this our country...*

In this example, clauses *kûrî mîoyo yûrînte* (*there are lives that have been lost*) and *thakame ìitikîte* (*blood which has been poured*) in sentence 7 are semantically related to *mbaara* (*war*) in sentence 3. The cohesive item and the presupposed item are separated from one another by three sentences. Consequently, this cohesive relation is not as strong as one in which the cohesive item and the presupposed item are more proximate than is the case here. The more the intervening sentences between a cohesive item and a presupposed item, the less the cohesive force of the relation contracted. (Halliday and Hasan 1976, p. 290).

### 4.1.4 Syntactic Gaps

Several examples of the device of presupposition in the structure of sentences are evident in this study data. This is such that where the syntactic rules of the language allow a
noun, a verb or a clause, the writer puts nothing and expects the reader to fill in the empty syntactic slot with information from surrounding text. When the empty slot and the presupposed item are in the same sentence, the effect is not cohesive beyond the sentence level and as a result, it is not significant for the present study. It is only when the empty syntactic slot and the presupposed item are in separate sentences that the effect is cohesive. Most cohesive relations of this nature found in the data in this study involve an empty position that can be occupied by a noun in a sentence as in the example below from RTC2:7-8.

(25) 7. Riu mwago úcio wa Krismas nĩ waathirire na rĩria kuraari na mbeca andũ nĩ maragûraga nguo njerũ cia thigûkûũ na makiria atumia matingiiguia Christmas ñrĩ nginyanũru hari o atari na gakuo kana karatũ keerũ ga thigûkûũ.

Now, that joy of Christmas is no longer there, and when there was money were buying new clothes for the great day especially women would not people find Christmas satisfying to them without a dress or shoe for the great day.

8. Matuku maya O ari a marĩ na úhoi maragûra nguo cia mîtuba ñrĩa ikuoneka ta ïi njerũ mûno nîyo agekîra hindî ya Krismas.

These days O who have ability are buying second hand clothes and the one that looks new is the one they wear on Christmas day.

In sentence 8 of example (25) above, the noun andũ (people) is considered understood and is therefore omitted after the relativiser ari (who). To fill in the syntactic gap created by this omission, the reader only has to look in the preceding sentence 7. This structural presupposition cohesively unites the two sentences concerned.
4.2 Chapter Summary

In this chapter, there is a description of affixes, words, phrases, clauses, and syntactic gaps that have been identified as being cohesive in our data. In addition, the chapter explains how these cohesive elements relate with the rest of the text to form cohesive ties. The next chapter deals with the categorisation of these cohesive devices.
CHAPTER FIVE

CATEGORISATION OF THE LINGUISTIC FEATURES CREATING COHESION.

5.0 Introduction

This chapter begins with a general discussion of the occurrence of cohesive devices in the sample texts. The chapter then moves on to categorise the identified cohesive devices into the categories and sub-categories posited by Halliday & Hasan (1976).

5.1 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 Table 5.0 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 Gikũyu 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 0.12% and 13% 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 (cf.2.2.8) is left out to be recovered from surrounding text. Consider the following example from LTC1:6-7.

(1) 6. Mwaka wa ngiri îmwe na magana keenda ma miroongo îtano na inya, ithe wa Wariînga akînyiitwo agîthamîrio Manyani.

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

7. Thuutha wa mwaka umwe nyina Ø naake akînyiitwo agîthaaamîrio Raangata na kamîtî.

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

In example (1) above, the a-link construction wa Wariînga (of Wariînga) 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 Wariînga (of Wariînga) causes the interpretation of sentence 7 to depend on the preceding sentence where the phrase wa Wariînga (of Wariînga) is found. This causes the two sentences to be interpreted as belonging together.

5.2 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.

**Table 5.1 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>a) Reiteration</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>b) Collocation</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>TOTAL</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>

Table 5.1 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.

5.2.1 Reiteration

5.2.1.1 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 (cf.4.1). In addition, the sample texts dealt with in this study tend to repeat words rather than ellipt 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 Kristmas* (*Father Christmas*), *Mûhonokia Jesù Kristû* (*Saviour Jesus Christ*) are also repeated several times. This same trend repeats itself in all the texts analysed.

5.2.1.2 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 úkoragwo wetereirwo nì andû aingî ta mígithi ya Kambara (Kampala) nì kûmenya úría ikeno ciîtikaga ta kíguû.

*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. Úyû nìguo mweri andû makorogwo mehariirie gûgakena ota úría mengîenda no ti maririkane atî nì múhônokia Jesù waciariiruo ta úría Akristiano arîa aa ma matoragwo mehariirie.

*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.

5.2.1.3 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 yaambiriirie gükünűğûrûo mwaka wa AD 334 hündi ìría Pope Gregory aatûmiri Mûtheru Augustine, athii akahunjîrie andû a Rûraaya arìa matoî ûhorò 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. Rìria atiirë bûrûri wa Aroma nî aakorìre 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 metikire Ukristiano, Pope agiathana nao Akristiano magiâge na magongona ma gükünűğûra gûciarwo kwa Jesù, nî getha acenji acio nao meetikire ûhorò 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.
5.2.1.4 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. Gïkeno-inï giïtû giã kûigwa atî nî twaingata mubeberû nïtwariganïirwo nî gûthiinga marîma marîa útoonga na wiyathi witu úngîorîire, tûgîtigîra arîa meendaga kûhurîna na haao mweke 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.


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.

5.2.2 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”. Gikûyû 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. Angateng’erire ndingiahotire kû-linga rûûi rwa Gura na njira njega.

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

5. Ngaari ya-linga rûûi rûu ndereba nî aamika’iriie mûno nî getha ihote 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 –linga (cross) takes the affix kût-(to) to form the infinitive kû-linga (to cross). In sentence 5, the root verb –ling- (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 ia-. The verb then takes a final vowel -a giving rise to ya-ling-a (it crossed).

Though kût-ling-a (to cross) and ya-ling-a (it crossed) are different in form, the basic meaning of the root verb -ling - (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.
23. 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. 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. This today we are all made equal by poverty.

In sentence 23 above, the word ùtoonga (wealth) is semantically related to the word thïîna (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.

5.3 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.

Table 5.2: 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 Table 5.2 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.

5.3.1 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. 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. Warĩ nga aari wa mĩaka iĩrĩ

Warĩ nga 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.


Warĩ nga 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 genetive suffix –we (her/his). This genitive suffix is the referential item referring to Warĩ nga 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
and Warĩŋa 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.

5.3.2 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 LTC 1:1-2.

(8) 1. Jacinta Warĩŋa aaciariirwo Kaamburũ mwena wa Githuungũri Kĩa Wairera Mwaka-inĩ wa ngiri îmwe na magana keenda ma mîrongo ìtaano na ithatũ

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

2. Hîndî iyo bûrüri ũyũ witũ wa Kenya waathagwo nĩ thûkûmũ cia Ngerertha na watho ũria mûuru wa kûhinyirĩria múingĩ, nĩ 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.
Hindi 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 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-ini wa ngiri na magana kenda ma mirongo ãtano an ãtatû (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 ümwe wa acio eerî maarî na ikanga kûria igûrû nî aarûgire mwena wa ûrio wa ngaari, akîgwa rami-ini gatagaîi.

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. Úria üngi naake aarûgire mwena wa ûmotho, akîgwa igûrû rûgïka na akîgaragara na kûria 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. Kûri Nditheemba 12 1999, Kenya niyakûmguiire miaka 36 ya wiyaathi...

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

4. Aria nao maarî micii moomîte na mahoya, magîthathayagia Jehova amaiiguire tha na kûmakûûra kuma mûtondo-ini ûria 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 ūría (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 ūyū (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 ūyū (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.

5.3.3 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 5.2, 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. Hwai-ini akiuma cukuru kaingi aacookagíra ooro íyo  
*In the evening when leaving school, she mostly followed that (route)*

45. No rííngi ní aarúmagíríra ya Oginga Odinga akahíítkííra Afraha Stadium Agathií o kwahúkííra Menengai High School aakaambata akoimííríra kiriniki-iní, agakííríra king’eero-iní ngíínya 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. Athoomí aitú ní mekurírikaná atí ní kwágiíre na mateta hííndí íríí kwaményíkaníre atí thiríkaari ní íráaka kííaro kíía ndege hakuhi na múuíí wa Eldoret o ríírí ëíhoro Úcíí Útáakoretwo warííriíro na kúíguíítharííro thííííííí wa Nyúumba ya iciííííííro.

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 Undú ñímwe, múbango wa kúíguííra ndege ya gúkuua raicíí warííriíro mbunge.

Similarly, (happened) when the plan to buy a presidential jet was discussed in parliament.

(13) 8. Aria aitangí maaí nímaíkagia maitho na thuutha, makoona atí ona gwátúikí wííyáathi nítwaíírííwó, mííkarííre yaarí mííhúthahúthú hííndí ya múíkooríí.
Those who are older looked behind and realised that even though we have independence, living was easier in the days of the colonialist.

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.

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 rĩngĩ [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 ūndũ ūmwe (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 ūmũthĩ (today) in the adverb phrase ūmũthĩ ūyũ (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 hĩndĩ ya mũũkoronĩ (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.

5.4 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 5.3 below summarises the distribution of conjunction ties in the data.
Table 5.3: Frequency of Conjunction ties

<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.

5.4.1 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), indi (however), and handu ha (instead of). The following example is from LTC1:44-45.

44. Hwaï-ini akiuma cukuru kaingi aacookagïrà ooro iyo  
*In the evening when leaving school, she mostly followed the same (route)*

45. No rïngi nï aarumaçïrà ya Oginga Odinga akahïtûkïra Afraha stadium agathiï o kwahûkïra Menengai High School aakaambata akoïmïrïra kiriniki-ini, agakïrïra king'eeero-ini ngïnya 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.

5.4.2 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), ningi (also), and ona (even). The following example is from LTC2:40-41.

40. No naake nï aateithïkire nï kûnyitwo mooko nï mûingï nï getha ahote kuuma tondu mûrango wa ikumbi warî mûhûhûnjïku na ûkahinga riumïriro.

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

5.4.3 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 riu (now), wa keerî (secondly), ündû wa mberë (the first thing) and kuma...nginya (from...to). The following example is from RTC3: 34 – 35.

(16) 34. Rîrîa Thûngû ciakionire Kenya nîgwacaca, niciambîriïrie makinya ma kûrutithia mûbango ûyû wîra.

When Europeans realised that things were bad in Kenya, they took steps towards making this plan work.

35. ÜNû kwa mberë waari gûcaria andû arîa mangîatuïkire ngaati ciao, matongoretio ni 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 Mugane.

In this example, ądû wa mberë (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.

5.4.4 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 tondu (because), ni undu [because (of)], and kwa uguo (because of that). The following example is from RTC1:10-11.

(17) 10. Wathani wa njaguma wikiraga andu guoya no ti wendo wa uria uraathana.

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

11. Ni undu wa guoya andu no mooneke ta mareenda muthamaki no ngoro-ini ciao makorwo na ruthuro na marurua maingi.

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, Ni undu (because of) in sentence 11 expresses the result of the fear mentioned in sentence 10. This relation of result binds the two sentences cohesively.

5.5 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. Table 5.4 below shows the distribution of ellipsis cohesive ties in the data.

Table 5.4: Frequency of Ellipsis ties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-categories of the Ellipsis cohesive device</th>
<th>LTC 1</th>
<th>LTC 2</th>
<th>RTC 1</th>
<th>RTC 2</th>
<th>RTC 3</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>

Table 5.4 above shows that the study corpus contains 10 nominal ellipsis ties, and 3 a – link ellipsis ties. These are discussed below.

5.5.1 Nominal Ellipsis

Nominal ellipsis is a syntactic gap found within the NP. The structure of the NP as found in Gíkúyû 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.
When those people realised that the driver was completely unable to stop the vehicle, they started jumping down from the carrier as the vehicle moved backwards.

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

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

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

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

But other she followed Oginga Odinga 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.
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-inî* (*in the evening*), is omitted after the indefinite pronoun *rîngî* (*other*). It can be recovered from the preceding sentence. It is important to note from this example that the indefinite pronoun *rîngî* (*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 *Hwai-inî* (*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 Odinga Oginga*). 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.

5.4.2 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) *Icecube rîa kûrima*

*Hoe for digging*

In example (20) above, *rî-a kûrima* (*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 *icecube* (*hoe*) belongs. Attached to this pronominal concord is the connective partical {a}, and finally there is the complement *kûrima* (*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* haría yathiiriirwo igûrû nî kûguñû kwa ngaari yari 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. *Kiongo Ø na kío kiaři kimondore nî mwena wa ngaari haría yamûkomeire yagwa thuutha wa kûringa rûgìka.*

*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 ţimwe na magana keenda na miroongo ÿtaano na inya, ithe wa Warïînga akînyiitwo agîthamîrio Manyani.*

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

(7) *Thuutha wa mwaka ţimwe nyina Ø naake akînyiitwo agîthamîrio Raangatana na Kamîtti*

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

In example (22) 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 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 tondu ngari yari kûriña-ini gëtirîte mûno na ndiari na mburiko, ndereba nî aageririe kûmiâho na ngia irûûgame no ÿguo gûtiahotekire tondu nî yari na ţurù mûnìgî 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 aria maari thiinì ð nì maambîriie kuuga mbu.

Passengers who were inside ð had started screaming.

In sentence 18 of example (23) above, the a-link construction wa ngari (of vehicle) is presupposed after the word thiinì (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 Gîkûyu necessitate that the complete noun phrase in sentence 18 should read thiinì wa ngari (inside of vehicle) and not thiinì ngari (inside vehicle) that Gîkûyu grammar rules do not allow.

5.5 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.

5.5.1 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 ñmbûke nî maiikagia maitho nga ya ngaari na makeyonera na makaigua miario na gûthogorana kwa andû arîa 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.

11. Athii mahotaga gwika úguo tondû ngaari nî yahotetwo nî kwambata kîrîma mûno na yathiiaga kahora ta ìkûrûgama nî gûkuua kûrîa yakuîte.

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 gwika úguo (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 number10, and therefore the verbal reference relation joins 10 and 11 cohesively.

5.6 Chapter Summary

This chapter 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. The next chapter provides a summary of the study’s findings, conclusion and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER SIX
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.0 Introduction

This chapter summarises the findings of the study by reviewing the study’s objectives, giving concluding remarks, and giving recommendations for further research.

The objectives of this study were:

1) To identify and describe the linguistic features that mark cohesion in Gĩkũyũ texts.

2) To explain how the linguistic features identified as marking cohesion in Gĩkũyũ texts relate with the rest of the text in order to achieve a cohesive effect.

3) To discuss and classify the linguistic features that mark cohesion in Gĩkũyũ texts into types and sub-types into which they may fall.

This section examines every objective in light of the findings and assesses how far our objectives have been met. This chapter also identifies areas that need further research, and finally there are conclusions of the study.

6.1 Summary of Findings

The first and the second objectives have been discussed in chapter three. The linguistic features identified as being cohesive in the study data are affixes, words, phrases clauses, and syntactic gaps.

Cohesive affixes in the data can be categorised into three: subject markers, object markers, or a suffix marking possession, which occurs affixed to nouns. Cohesive subject
and object markers occur affixed to a verb, noun, conjunction, preposition, pronoun, or an a-link construction stem. All the cohesive affixes carry the referential force of the English pronoun. These affixes, therefore, create cohesion by referring to other words in the surrounding sentences. (cf. 3.2.1)

Different words create cohesion in the data by various means. The most common means is by being repeated from sentence to sentence. This causes the concerned sentences to be interpreted as belonging together. Words also create cohesion in this study data when their meanings are related. When these words with related meanings are in separate sentences, the sentences are perceived as being related. In addition, there are words which are basically referential, and they create cohesion by referring to other words in the surrounding sentences. Finally, there are words that are connective in nature, and are cohesive when they serve to connect separate sentences. (cf. 3.2.2) Words that are found to be cohesive in our study fall in the noun, conjunction, pronoun, adverb, and adjective categories.

Phrases that are cohesive in this study are noun phrases, adverb phrases, and adjective phrases. These phrases create cohesion in three ways: there are those that refer to information in the surrounding sentences, there are those that are connective in nature and therefore connect sentences to surrounding sentences, and finally there are those phrases that create cohesion by simply being repeated across the texts. (cf. 3.2.3)

The few clauses that are cohesive in this study achieve a cohesive effect by being related in meaning to other parts of the texts in which they occur.
Syntactic gaps occur when the writer of the texts being analysed puts nothing in a slot where the Gikuyu syntactic rules allow a noun, verb, or a clause. The writer leaves these syntactic gaps unfilled expecting the reader to fill them using information in the surrounding text. These gaps become cohesive only when the empty syntactic slot and the presupposed item are in separate sentences. Only syntactic gaps presupposing noun phrases and a-link constructions are cohesive in this study data.

All the five categories of cohesion as posited by Halliday and Hasan (1976) are represented in the Gikuyu data analysed here. All the subcategories of reference, lexical organisation, and conjunction are fully represented in Gikuyu data analysed in this study. However, ellipsis as a category of cohesion is only cohesive when the presupposed item is a noun. Verbal and clausal ellipsis is present, but only within the structure of sentences, and they are, therefore, not cohesive.

Substitution ties are also not frequent in the study’s data. There is only one instance of verbal substitution, while nominal and clausal substitution ties are not present in the data. Gikuyu texts analysed here repeat words, use synonyms, near synonyms or generally meaning related words instead of ellipting or substituting information.

Interestingly, the data shows the presence of a category of ellipsis that is not part of the subcategories of ellipsis as posited by Halliday and Hasan (1976). This new subcategory of ellipsis is here referred to as a-link ellipsis. This is because a construction referred to as an a-link construction in Mwove (1987) and Gathenji (1981) is left out, and the
presupposed information is to be retrieved from the preceding sentences. Three out of all the eleven ellipsis ties are of the a-link construction type.

6.2 Conclusion

From the analysis of the data, this study has established that Gĩkũyũ texts are cohesive, and that all the five categories of cohesion as posited by Halliday and Hasan (1976) occur in Gĩkũyũ texts. However, Gĩkũyũ texts analysed here have the tendency to repeat words instead of using proforms, or leaving information out to be retrieved from the surrounding texts. This has caused the frequency of lexical ties to be extremely high (75.86 %), and the percentages of substitution and ellipsis are comparatively low, at 1.54% for ellipsis, and 0.12% for substitution.

The data has shown evidence of the existence of a subcategory of ellipsis that is not present in Halliday and Hasan’s model of cohesion. This is the ellipsis of an a-link construction that is a possible constituent of the Gĩkũyũ NP, and can function either as an adjective or a marker of possession. (cf.2.2.8).

6.3 Recommendations for Further Research

Halliday and Hasan’s model of cohesion recognises three types of substitution. These are nominal, clausal and verbal substitution. This study found only one substitution tie in the study data. It falls under verbal substitution. Halliday and Hasan (1976) have subcategorised verbal substitution into substitution of a verb or verb phrase with the auxiliary verb DO, and verbal reference, whereby substitute DO is accompanied by a demonstrative. The only instance of substitution found in the study sample falls under the
subcategory of verbal reference. The recommendation is that future researchers analyse more texts written in Gikũũũ or indeed, other related languages such as Kiswahili and Kikamba among others, to find out if other forms of substitution not found in this study's data occur cohesively.

This study found examples of nominal and a-link construction ellipsis. Verbal and clausal ellipses were not cohesive beyond sentence level. Future researchers can analyse more Gikũũũ or related languages' texts to see if other forms of ellipsis occur cohesively.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


APPENDIX 1: CAITAANI MUTHARABA-INI EXTRACT: LTC 1

(1) Jacinta Wariinga akiaririroo Kaambûru mwena wa Githûungûru kia Wairera mwaka-ini wa ngiri imwe na magana keenda ma miroongo itaano na štatû.

(2) Hîndì iyo bûrûri ūyu witu wa Kenya waathagwo nî ūkûkûmû cia Ngeretha na waatho ūrîa múûru wa kûhînîryîria mûngì, ni guo Watho wa Wihûnge.

(3) Na cio njaamba cia bûrûri, itongooreetio nî Kîmaathi wia Waciuri nî ciehîtîite na muuma wa ūûrûmwe wa mûngì, ikoiga atî gûtîrî wa Iregi ūû̄tîire, nîmekûng’ëng’ana na Itoï cia ngeretha irîa cietagwo Njoni ngînya ūnyariiri na ūnyamaarana ūgaathîra bûrûri-ini.

(4) Miciingga na mboomu ciariraga irîma-ini cia Nyaandarwa na Kûrînînuya ta ngwa.

(5) Rûriia Itoï cia Ngeretha hamwe na ngaati irîa ciamatungatagira bûrûri-ini – thaata cia bûrûri mwendagia bûrûri nî ūndû wa nda! - moonire ati maari hakuhi kûhootho nî mbûtû cia Mau Mau, makíongerera kûnyariirana kwa arîmi anyinyi na arutî-a-wîra a bûrûri wothe.

(6) Mwaka wa ngiri imwe na magana keenda na miroongo itaano na inya, ithe wa Wariinga akînyiitwo agîthamîriro Manyani.

(7) Ithuutha wa mwaka ūmwe nyina naake akînyiitwo agîthamîriro Raangatana na Kamîtti.

(8) Warîniga arî wa mîaka ërî.

(9) Taatawe wahîkîfte Naikuru akîmuoyya.

(10) Mûthuuri wa taatawe aarutaga wîra na Reeriwe, na thuutha-ini na Kaanjû ya Naikuru.

(12) Warîniga akûrîre Naikuru hamwe na aihwa aake.

(13) Hîndî iyo maaikaraga Land Panya Estate, no Uhuru wakuhîrîria magîtoonya nyûûmba ya Kaanjû section 58.

(14) Warîniga aathoomoore Mbaharini Full Primary School hakuhi na Shauri Yako Estate.

(15) No aihwa aake maathoomagîria Bondeni D.E.B o hau múûhu wa Section 58 hakuhi na Manjeengo ma Boonde.


(17) Rimwe na rimwe, thuutha wa gîthoomo kana o múthennyo wa njuuma na kiumia, Warîniga na aihwa aake nî maakaangacaangaga Boonde kwîrîrera atumia magîtega arûme kana o arûme makûrûa mbaaara ya ibiindo.

(18) Rîngî nî maahunguraga matûûra moothe ma mwena úcio - Kiziwani, Karoreini, Kivumbiini, Shauri yako, Ambongorewa kana kaambî ya cumaari – o kwîrîrera andu na manyumba na matuka.

(19) Rimwe na rimwe nî maathiiaga kuona mathaako ma managi kana mathaako ma ngerekano thiënî wa hûûru ya Mîningai, na rîngî thenema cia nja na hau Kamûkûnji.

(20) Rîngî na rîngî nî maaiûrûkagîra na bara ya Lake Nakuru magathîi o irîa-ini kwîrîrera nyoni, kana rîngî magathîi kîhhaaro kia raangaraanga kuona mahenyâ ma bikibiki na ma mîtoko.

(21) No kîrîa Warîniga eendete múno –ti kuona maraya makûrûa arûme, kana o arûme makûrûanîria tûhîu, kana arîtu magîthuguma na gûthahika mitaro-ini, aaca-kîrîa Warîniga eendete múno nî gûthhi kanitha mahooya na kûgûgà uhoro wa Ngai.

(22) O kiumia o kiumia rûdûcîni taatawe nî aamûtuwaraga miitha Kanîthankini wa Holy Rosary.

(23) Kûu o na nî kuo Warîniga aabatîthîrinto agîthîto Jacinta.
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(24) Kĩndũ Wariĩga eegiragia mũno kwĩrörera – o na aakorwo maitho nĩ maaregaga gwañhiĩka - nĩ mabica maria maakoragwo thingo-inĩ na matirica-inĩ ma Kanitha ucio wa Holy Rosary.
(25) Mabica maingi maari nĩ Njĩču e mwana anyitiĩtwo nĩ Thiingi Maria na e munene akĩambwo mutharba-inĩ.
(26) Ingiçaari cia Caiitaani (arĩ na hĩa igĩrĩ ta cia ng'oombe na mũcutũhi ta wa nūgũ, na ooeeete kagũrũ kanwe na igũrũ ta arĩ ndaci araina na ariaka ake makĩgariũra andũ icua-inĩ rĩa mwaki.
(27) Thiingi Maria, Njĩču na Araika a Ngai maari eerũ ta athũungũ, no Caiitaani na araika ake maari airĩ ci.
(28) Utukũ nĩ arootaga mahahũratoro nĩ ùndũ wa mbica icio.
(29) No haandũ ha kũroota na njiču akĩambwo, arootaga na Caiitaani arĩ na gĩkoonde kĩeru cua ta gĩa kimũthũngũ kĩmwe kĩnoru mũno Wariĩngia oonire rĩmwe hakuhi nĩ Rift Valley Sports Club, akĩambwo mutharaba-inĩ nĩ andũ atarũkaanũgĩre – ta arĩ oonaga Boondenĩ na thutha wa thũkũ ithatũ, o rĩrĩ e hakuhi gũkĩka thari cia gũkũa, aakaũmbũrũwo nĩ andũ maari na thũtuũ ni tai agocookio muoyo akamũbirũria gũthirĩkĩga Wariĩngia akũmukoombanga.
(30) Aciari a Wariĩngia moimire nditini mwaka wa ngiri ikumi na keenda na miroongo itandatu-miaka itatu tu mbebe ya Kenya kuoya Ubruru- magikora kaguunda kaaao Kaamburu keendeirio ngaati tene nĩ thiriũkĩri yĩ giikoorni.
(31) Magigithamira mwena wa Ilmorog kuhooya wako na urimi.
(32) Toondu maakorire Wariĩngia aamũbirirrie cukuru Mbaheĩrini, Naikuru, makireka akuirere oooro kuo.
(33) Magigithiũra mata gĩthuri, makiuga mwana athoome amu hĩhi rĩmwe no gukaamaruta miņyororo-inĩ ya thĩna wa uthiĩni.
(34) Wariĩngia arĩ kaana koogi ma; nĩ ko gokaga naamba ũmwe kĩrathĩ-inĩ kĩao.
(35) Wariĩngia o na nĩ we kaingĩ wonagĩ aihwa aake mathabu, o na arĩ maari kĩraathi kĩmwe mbernĩ mbere yaka.
(36) Ririũ C.P.E. yaakinyire, Wariĩngia nĩ ũmwe wa araĩ meekũþite wega mũno.
(37) Ajiũtũro haandũ thiĩni wa Nakuru Day Secondary School.
(38) Wariĩngia ndarĩ aakena ta ʊrũla aakenire kihiĩnda-inĩ kũ.
(39) Kwansaþa ririũ agaũrũũroo Yuniboomũ yũ iriĩnda rĩa bururu, gĩcĩbaaũ kĩerũ, thũũgũthiũ njerũ, na irstaũ njũrũ, Wariĩngia aagĩũiare ta angũrĩra nĩ ngoro kũyũra gĩkeno.
(40) Miaka yake ya e boomuwanu na boomutũu yaarũ miaka ya gĩkeno.
(41) Wariĩngia ndarĩ na kihe aana bikiũri ngoro-inĩ tiga o wendo wa atoorie gĩthoomo.
(42) Anyiũtiũte mabuku maake, na ruura, na karamu ũguo na guoko, Wariĩngia aaukũrũkagĩra o miũthoongoĩĩĩ akoiũmĩra Ladũshes Road akahũtũka kiriũniki yĩ Kaanũjũ mwenena wa ʊũro.
(43) Hau macemaniriĩo-inĩ ma bara, agatiga ya Boonde na ɪrĩa yĩ kwambata na taaiũni, akariĩngia na ya Ronald Ngala ikamuuũmũrĩria nyũũmba-inĩ cia mathia ma andũ airũ hakuhi n AHL Rosary.
(44) Hau agaĩũra Oginga Odinga Road agathĩĩ imwe kwa ũmwe ngĩny管理局 Nursery.
(45) Hwaĩ-inĩ akiũma cukuru kaĩgĩ aacoogagĩra oooro ɪyo.
(46) No riĩĩgĩ nĩ aarũmagĩrĩra ya Oginga Odinga akahũtũkũra Afrahũ Stadium agaĩthĩĩ o kwaũhũkũra Menengai High School akamũbata akoiũmũrĩra Kiriũniki-inĩ, agaĩũrĩra King’eero-inĩ ngĩny管理局 Section 58.
(47) Rĩmwe ririũ atũmũtũwo taani nĩ aainũkagĩra ya igootĩ-inĩ wabici-inĩ cia Kaanũjũ akoiũmũrĩra taaiũni thiĩni.
(48) No kũu guothe, gũtĩrĩ haandũ ati Wariĩnga arũũgamaga njĩra-inĩ gũte mathaa burĩ.
(49) Wariĩnga ooĩ ihuurũko igũrĩ: Cukuru na mũcii.
(50) Ririã aageraga tũcĩra tũu tuote, rũũciini agĩthiĩ gĩthoomo, kana hwa-inĩ akiĩnũka mũcii, Wariĩngĩ eegiuuaga ati we ni we ngatha ya Naikuru uuũũgĩ-inĩ wa gĩthoomo.
(51) Atũuragio ni irooto irĩ cama mũno cia mwũrĩ mwũthi na thakame hiũ ngoro theru.
(52) No Wariĩnga arootaga tu o ũrĩa hiĩi aangĩahotire gũthoma ngĩnyã agakĩnya Yunibaaacĩ̯i.
(53) Muoorooporto wake warĩ agaatuũka linjinia wa thii̯timĩa, linjinia wa macĩni, linjinia wa maai, kana o linjinia wa mĩako.
(54) Kiugo linjinai ni kĩo aaiiguuaga gikũriraingariingana gũthuri-inĩ gĩake ririã aahiinga maitho akarora rũũciũ rwa muoyo wake.
(55) Wariĩnga ni aarigagwo ni kũrĩa kiagiragia aĩrĩtu aĩngĩ meende mawĩra ta macio, magatigaĩrĩa arũme kihaaro kĩa waki wa mooko.
(56) Gũtũrĩ wũra mũũrĩftũ ataangĩhota eetũkũtíte na ngoro yake no aohote, ni guo Wariĩnga eeraça airĩtu aĩrĩa angĩ na o magatheka.
(57) No niingĩ ni moonaga ati we Wariĩnga no atoorie o na kĩa ũũiĩninjĩa: Nakuru Day Secondary gũtũrĩ mũũrũũtu kana mwanake wamũcĩiindago mathabu.
(58) Ngumo ya ũmũenyĩ wake wa mathabu yaatambiũte mũno rũũtwĩ ũũake rũũkamyẽka cukurũ-inĩ irĩa ingĩ ciariĩ hakũũhi ta Afrahũ, St. Josephs, St. Xaviour Crater, Lake Nakuru Secondary o na ngĩnyã irĩa ciaraihũũritẽ ta Nakuru High.
(59) Gũthoomo, kwũrũta ũtũkũ na mũthẽnxa, gũthiĩ Kaniĩthã o kiũĩmia, gũteĩthia taatawe kũũrĩmã mũgũũnda maaheetwo ni Kaanjoũ Baari na ũngĩ yaariĩ igũũũũ wa Kiũĩma hakũũhi na Menengaĩ Crater, ũcĩo ni guo warĩ mũũkiarĩre wa Wariĩnga kuũma Njumataũũ ngĩnyã o njumabiri.
(60) Ngumo ya ũũthiĩngũ, ya ũũrũmi wake, ya kiyo gĩake mauundu-inĩ moothe yaacãĩũte Section 58 guothe.
APPENDIX 2: NGOIMA EXTRACT: LTC 2

(1) Tonya Umbûke ni yakoretwo igîthii kahora múno múikûrûko-inî wa rûûi rwa Gura.
(2) Akuuo aîngi meecirîtie hiîhi ngaari ni kûrwara yarwarîte.
(3) No ndereba wa yo aâmitwarîthagia kahora ni tondû nðiari na mburi ki na aâmîoheete na ngia.
(4) Angiateng’erire ndingîahotire kûringa rûûi rwa Gura na njîra njega.
(5) Ngaari yaringa rûûi rûû ndereba ni aâmîakirîrie múno ni getha ìhote kwambata kirîma gîa Tambaya.
(6) Kirîma kiù nî kînene múno na nðereba ni eetigagîra ùritù ùría ngaari ìyo yarî na guo.
(7) Tauni ya Tambaya ni ðiini múno na maita maria maingî ndîkoragwo na andû aîngi.
(8) Mûndû angîîntana na kàyà kanene ari mwena ûmwe ûmwe ya yo na aâiguuo ni mûndû ari múico ûùria ùngî wa matuka.
(9) Mûthenya ùçio varî wa thoko nene kûù taûní-inî ya Tambaya na ni ðiî ndündû ùçio ni kwarî na andû aîngi gûkîra mútugo.
(10) Miario ya andû ari maathogoranaga thoko-inî ni yaiguîkîtîgî na mûndû ari ngaari-inî ìkîambata kirîmainî.
(11) Athii aîngî nî Tonya Umbûke nî maaïkagia maitho nga ya ngaari na makeyonera na maaïkagia mîario na ngûthogoranana kwa andû ari ari thoko.
(12) Athii maahotaga gûkîa ùguo tondû ngaari ni yahootetwo nî kwambata kirîma múno kînya yathiiiga kahora ta ikûrûuguama nî gûkûa kûrûa ùkûuûte.
(13) Ngoîma ari hâria aainamîriire ikûmbî-inî ni aâiguuere ngaari yera na mwena wake ta i kuuma baraaba-ini yerekeire rûgiîka-inî rwa mwena wa umotho.
(14) Kwera kûù nî kwarûmûriîrîwîo ni inegene ðiâ mûgambo mûnene múno wahaanaga ta ûû: “TU tu tu tu tua!”
(15) Mûgambo ðiçio mûnene waumânire na ngaari-inî ni waiguirwo ni andû ari ari thoko-inî na mûgiûka mateng’erete kûrora ni kû kîahianika.
(16) Ndereba aigu aûmambo ðiçio na oona ngari ikûera mwena ûmwe ni aamenyire ari ni kûgûrûw gwâtûrûka.
(17) Na tondû ngaari yarî kirîma-inî gîetiirîte múno na ndiari na mbûrîki, ndereba nî aagerirî kûmûihoa na ngia ìrûûgûme no ûguo gûtiyahotekire tondû nî yarî na ùritù múngi ni na ðiâ yacookaga na thuuta.
(18) Athii ari mara tiini nî maâmûriirîrie kuuga mbu.
(19) Andû ari mara thoko na ari maâkoretwo maakhûrûria ngaari ìyo thuutha wa kûgûa kûgûrûw gwâtûrûka nî moereire mbu na ikûneneha múno.
(20) Ikanga riakoretwo riikarîire keeria-igûrû ya ngaari marî ni mhûûnî ðiâ ûri maikhanea ng’ano cia mathekânia.
(21) Rûrîa andû aîcio moonire ari ndereba nî aremirwo biû nî kûrûugâmia ngaari nî maaâmûriirîrie kûrûûga thi kuuma keeria-igûrû, ngaari o ìgicoookaga na thuutha.
(22) Mwanake ûmwe wa acio eerî mara ni ikanga kûûria igûrû nî arûûgûre mwena wa ûrîo wa ngaari, akûgwa rami-inî gatagatî.
(23) Úrûa ûngi naake aarûûgûre mwena wa umotho, akûgwa igûrû rûa rûgiîka na akûgarâgara na kûrûa andû a thoko mara.
(24) Nî ðiî ndû wa ndereba kuona ari ngaari yahota gûkûrûka ìthiî ìnigîre rûû nî yûrûge akuuo ooto, nî aâmîgatiere na mwena wa umotho amîringîthie rûgiîka.
(25) Kwa múûino múûuru ikanga riakoretwo rîarûûga hau mwena-inî hâria ndereba eerekeire ngaari.
Ni eengire andu na agíkinya múrango-iní wa mbere wa ngaari haría Nyaindo aaikaríte anyítíte mwana.

Múngí ní wageragia kúmateithíríria maume no ní kwári na thína.

Ngaari ní yakomeire na mwena múrango wa haría Nyaindo arí.

Na guo múrango wa kwa nderebe waroretene matu-iní.

Uhoro úcio níwekíríre Ngoima ihooru inene tondú ndamenyaga Nyaindo aahaanaga atí, na ndangíahotíre kúmwaríria arí haría arí.

Múngí úríia warí hau mbere wageragia kúhingúra múrango wa ndereba ní getha arutwo, acooke arúmírírwó ní andú acio maikaire hau mbere.

No múrango úcio wa ndereba ndwakinyíríkaga wega, na múngí ríu ní wetigagíra atí andú arií ngari-iní hau mbere maahota gúkorwo makomanííre úúru – maageragia mamarute na ihenya o ta úríia kwahotekága.

Ngoima ní oongereire ríciíría harí andú arií angí maarí na o.
APPENDIX 3: MWIHOKO ARTICLE (MIGWI YA MOI GUTUUHIO: RTCI

(1) Ngarari ciiragwo ní kamena.
(2) Úguo na rūthiomí rūthūthú ní kuuga maciaro ma ngarari ní rūmena.
(3) Rūmena naruo rūcookago rūkareehe mbaara kana njatūkano.
(4) Andú a Keny a makoretwo magiathwo na njūgūm a mìaka mìngī.
(5) Athamaki ari a maathaga andů na njūgūm a meetagwo na King’enū, dictators.
(6) Matikararagio kana kūürío kūiría: maarekia mūgambo wí wà kūihinýiriíria kana kūůraga-meendaga gwíkwo o úguo moiga.
(7) Ní kīe̊a tükūririíka atri kūri miyoyo ēyūřîte na thakame ēšīkīítē būrūrīnī ūyū wîtû ya andů ari a mañegerií kûruta mawoní maaò makônī kūría būrūrī wâgīrīrīwò ní gūtūngorio thūutha wa mawoní maaò kūonèka ta arí ūrēgani na watho.
(8) Athongoria a bata ta mūthuuri ti J. M. Kariūkī, Kûng’w wa Karūmba, Robert Ouko na angí aingí ní kūûkaine moorarīgírwo kana makûûragíthio ní ùndû wa kwaga gwaðēkīrá watho wà njūgūm a.
(9) Ní kūirí angí maatandidùrīwò kínya mākionjà, ti ùndû wa ino maiyîte no nûûndû wa kūrengena na watho wà gīthūrī.
(10) Wathani wà njūgūm a wîkīraga andū guo ya no ti wendo wa ūría ūrāthathā.
(11) Ní ùndû wà guo ya andû no mooneke ta marenda mûthamaksi no ngoroinî ciao makorow a rûuthûrō na marûrū mâinî.
(12) Hicītūría ní ēgûtūrīrīkania athamaksi aingí a gîthūrī ari a mookûrīrīwò ní ari a maathaga hîndî īrîa marakara maaremîre kûhungîrîrîkâ, makiehîrio ūneneînî na makûûragwò.
(13) Úguo ūkuonania atri marî ēhâtûrīrîaînî wà andû, aathâni acîo náo makoragwò magiakûrîrî kânyûûngû kaa ko marakara mâria macookaga gûtûîka ngarari na rûmena na mûcîoinî gîkūû kîa.
(14) Gûtûîrî mwathâni wà njûgûmâ ututauaga atri nîmwendê mûnû no andû.
(15) Ona rîrîa ahînýirisîrie andû kínya amakînynangage mîtîw, oîgaga ní kûmwendê mamwendîte mônu kínya makamûûría ageragîrî mîtîw yao handû ha barâbarâ.
(16) Ndarîri cia wathani wà njûgûmâ ní wàgitûrî mûkîrû, gwîtongia handû ha gûtuungata, gwîkumia handû ha gûkumio, gwathana handû ha gûthîkîrîria na kûûrâga handû ha ku hoera.
(17) Kûuma hîndî īrîa ūtetti wà ciama nyingû wacookîrî Keny a gûtûîrî mûmêmbar wà kîâma kîrîa giathanaga gía Kanu ūrí wakararìa Mîi tiga mùymbûne wà Cherangani mwenê wà Kîtale ūría ūkîaine na ritîw rîa Kîpruto ârap Kîrwâ.
(18) Kwahtëka gûkorwò kûrî na angî maanâmûkàrìa harî na mùbango a gwiwû ûguo nîgguo kûoneke ta Keny a kûrî ndëmûkària tondû nôdikîtîta o nacio ní cîiû kûhuûumba andû maitõ, no Kîrwâ akararirî Mîi na hînyà atri ona ageria gûthînîrîwò ndâgarûrûkîrî.
(19) Na gwà kahinda kanëna ma, nî akoretwò ari wîkî mûgambo w à ûrêgani na watîh na njûgûmà thînî wà Kanù.
(20) Rîtu ic wâ Kîrwâ nî araçiarirîrîwò!
(21) Nî múgûagûa gûkûrîwò atri kîrêma arrûme nî kîgâriûre!
(22) Uûrûûwè wà ambunge a ciama cia ëkàrìa na kiama gíà Kànu ní ëràrheîre andû à Keny a mwîhòko atri kwàhotà kûgìa na ëgàrûrûku mûnûne mwàthinàrînî wà bûrûrî ūyû.
(23) Úû nîgguo gwekkîkîre thînî wà ûyûmba ya irrîrirî to cìûmìa îgîri iirîkîkîtîte: kûrî múthêmîna wà mweri 9/11/99 mûthûùri múgûatî ti Oloo Aringo ūràrûgàmîtî o nî múngûî wà mwênà wà Alêngô Usônga, nî anîyîrîwò mbarû nî ambunge ooth thîtînî yake ya kûgeria kûñyîhanyîhia moonêna mà Môi.
Kuuma riria Kenya yagire na ciama nyingi cia uteti, gutiri kuoneka kana gük'gía ambunge kuuma kiamaini gia Kanu megúcuka miti me mwena wa kíama kia úkararia!

Muthuuri ti Aringo eendaga gicuunjí kíimwe gia gatiba giceenjio nígetha nỳumba ya iciiriro ikorwo na wiyathí handú ha gükorwo i rungu rwa Moi úria úkoragwo arí we múugi wiiki ng’a.

Matunda mega moimàntë na wiyathí úcio ní ta maya: Ati ambunge ní o ene manandikaga aruti wíra kuuma karani kinya múhaati, kana makamabuuta mangíona úguo ní kwagirìre gwíka úguo.

Wa keeri, ambunge ní o mariugaga riria Mbunge ìkúhúurúka na riria ígúcookerera gúcirá.

Wa gatafú ambunge ní marcíirágà maratí na guoya kana gwíciíria ațí maaga kúníyíta thirikari kanaa Moi mbarú ní mkeuoonio nganga mbute.

Hau kabere ní Moi úkoretwo akiuga riria Mbunge ìkùhíngwó kana kúhíngwúrwa na ní akoretwo akihúthíra hinya úcio wake múngí kúmìihinga na múno riria kúngíkorwo na nthitango njúru ikoníi thirikàari kana we kùumbe.

Mááundú maíngí makoretwo mághíthí úùrùr kahhindainí kàràí Moi akoretwo akihùùra múcaríca e wíki mbune.

Atheoomí aíúú ní mekùriríkàana ațí ní kwagìirë na mateta híndí íría kwamenýekànìre ațí thirikàari ní íráaka kìhàra kíía ndege hakahí na múcìí òwa Eldoret ò rìríra úhórá úcéio útakoretwo warírirìo na kúguíthaníriro thìníí na nỳumba ya iciiréro.

O úndú úmwe, múbangó wà kúguíra ndege ya gúkuúa raíci warírirìo Mbunge.

Ona ríita rírí ní agerirìe ota úría angíhòta kuuna ațí arúmirìrí aake thíni wà kíama gia Kanu ní maakínyangíríiríí ciíra úcéio no gútiahòtekìre.

Kiumia kíimwe mbere ya ciíra gútwarwó Mbunge ní múðhuuri ti Aringo, Moi ní eetíre amémbe a Kanu maikíkíi nthitango íjò ya Aringo ná.

Amémbe ainíí ní ma múkàraarìirì na ríríra oonííre ațí ndáríí na anyíiti mbarú me coho, ní aamoríiríe metíkìre kuuga múñene wa mawathó Amos Wako ní akareèhe ciíra ta úcéio thíníí wà Mbunge thuuthú wà mìéí ítandátù.

Rírííà Kanu youníre ațí ona yageríí ațí na ikúhootwó níguo yagarúrííkíre ta kímbù na ikíambríiríí kuuga ațí níguo yeendaga múñene ní guéríríí kíróre níwe níguo rétíikíe wathó.

Rírííà Kan uyouíre atí ona yageríí atí na ikúhootwó níguo yagarúrííkíre ta kímbú na ikíambríiríí kuuga ațí níguo yeendaga múñene ní guéríríí kíróre níwe níguo rétíikíe wathó.

Rírííà Kan uyouíre atí ona yageríí atí na ikúhootwó níguo yagarúrííkíre ta kímbú na ikíambríiríí kuuga ațí níguo yeendaga múñene ní guéríríí kíróre níwe níguo rétíikíe wathó.

Rírííà Kan uyouíre atí ona yageríí atí na ikúhootwó níguo yagarúrííkíre ta kímbú na ikíambríiríí kuuga ațí níguo yeendaga múñene ní guéríríí kíróre níwe níguo rétíikíe wathó.

Rírííà Kan uyouíre atí ona yageríí atí na ikúhootwó níguo yagarúrííkíre ta kímbú na ikíambríiríí kuuga ațí níguo yeendaga múñene ní guéríríí kíróre níwe níguo rétíikíe wathó.

Rírííà Kan uyouíre atí ona yageríí atí na ikúhootwó níguo yagarúrííkíre ta kímbú na ikíambríiríí kuuga ațí níguo yeendaga múñene ní guéríríí kíróre níwe níguo rétíikíe wathó.
APPENDIX 4: MURATA ARTICLE (GIKENO GIA KRISMAS): RTC 2

(1) Mweri wa Desemba úkoragwo wetereirfio ni andu aingi ta míghti ya Kambara (Kampaala) ni kúmenya üríya ikeno ciitíkaga ta kíguú.

(2) Úyú níggu mweri andu makoragwo mehariiri gúgakena o ta üríya mangienda no ti maririkane atí ní múhonorok Jesú waciariuru ta üríya Akristiano ari a makoragwo mehariiri.

(3) Índí Krismas ya mwaka úyú ndígoróo ìrí na riiri ta ya miaka üríya ìhiitési ni üríya andu aingi mahinyiríririté níkwaga mbeça, ìndí o na kúrí úguó matiaga o gúkoruo na gátuú ga gúkenera.

(4) Miaka ya tene Krismas níyo thigúkúú yaarí ìndú mûnene thiiní wa gícagi, ìría andu maririkanaga atí maríaga migate ya cabací (chapó) mwaka riita rímwe na handú ha kúrí múceere, ní mbembe ciathíáagwo, ciétagwo ‘njenga’ nacio ciárágwo na waru na mboga ci kabici na itiari nyama.

(5) Andú no maririkane miaka ìyo ya tene ìría Krismas yaarí ríiri ni andú gúthiì makíínaga nyímbo ciáa Krismas ta ríría rwítagwo Maíkaríte ìiri útúkú, na andú arií makoróorú múcii makahotha kindú gía gakenge.

(6) Hindi ìyo andú arií maarí itonga níggu maathínjägírìa andú aao mbúri, o ta üríya andú aingi meekaga matukú maya.

(7) Ríú mwago úcío wa Krismas ní waathíriíre, na ìría kúrarí na mbeça andú ní maragúragúra níggu níjíírú cia thigúkúú ná makííria atumía matíingíguá Krismas ìrí ngínyínanírú hário o atari ná gákuo kana karátú keerrú gá thigúkúú.

(8) Matukú maya arií mári na úhotí maragúúra níggu cia mítumba ìría ikuoneka ta ií njerú múdo níyó aagekírí híndí ya Krismas.

(9) Ìndú níggu ükénagírìa andú hindí ya Krismas, ní tondú níggu othe makoragwo màri hamwe, makarianírìa,

(10) Andú arií maíkaragá maíjííra-iní níggu maínúkága kwáo gícági na gúgakorúo na ndíía nene.

(11) Nággu hindí ìyo andú arií ene ngaari cia gukuua andú, mbathi kana matabú níggu mahaicagia mathogora, makiúgaga atí ino níyó hindí yao ya kúgetha.

(12) Índí gükú Gikýúúiní ní ìndú wá kúgíá na ëkuuí mwéga wa andú, andú aingí ní maínúkága o hingo o na akoroó kwáo ní Nýrírí, kana Múranga, tondú ngendo ní cíaikuhíírií ní ngaari.

(13) Kriísmas ya mwaka úyú ní igúkorúo ìrí nene ìría ìgúthí na mbere kínya mwaka mwerú gükínya kwa mwaka wa 2000.

(14) Kriísmas ya mwaka úyú ìkarínganína na ñíkendí, tondú Jumamosí níggu gúgakarúo kwí Desemba 25 na thigúkúú ya mwaka mwerú o nayo îkarínganína na ñíkendí ná ìtíííí na mbere kínya mwerí 3 Jánuaári, ní gúgakorúo gwí kwa holídeí.

(15) Ríú kwa úguó kuuma kiumíá kíá wetatu, Desemba 22 kínya Jánuaári 4, 2000 andú magákorúo mári na muoóo wa ikeno.

(16) Índí o na andú magííkénaga úguó ngoma nake ndañaaga ítemí hau ikeno ício tondú níggu kuonekága mogwáti maingí o íkuuí andú makíírúra ikeno-iní cíao cía njoohí, na níngí kuuma kwí mítííno ya barabara.

(17) Mítííno ya barbara yonekága kuma kwí andú magííkwaríthia ngaari mári ariíú, na níngí ngaari cia gúkua andú ikiígería gúthíí o thabárií níyingí ta üríya kwahtéka hindí ìyo ya Kriísmas.

(18) Ní kwírííkanaga atí kwí ngaari îmwe ìjííaga Gíthumo kuuma Naíróbi maíta mátátú håna mabáa 24, na ndéreba úcío ní ìndú wa kúngòa meecííra o na angíkorúo mári
eerë magiteithania, nï ùhùthù kuonana na mogwati tondù iheny a makoragwo nario nì ría ùgwati.

(19)Nao akuuo makoragwo mahihinyanìte ùù atì ngaari nì ndìtù atì ndereba ùcio mûnogu, kûmïegegïa hanini ùguo ùtùgùge yuümïte bara kûmïcïkïa nì nïnya.

(20)Matûkù macio mathirïte rïria andù maraarï na mbeca eene matuka nì marakenagïra mïnî hïndï ya Krismas tondù nïguo kûri na agùri aingï, no rïu metagïrïra Januari ikïnïe nïguo mathïi makagïure unïfïmï a cukuuru, na mabuku.

(21)Nduka nyingï nì ciagemagi o na ingi gûgakoragwo na mbïca ya 'kamûthee' karïa getagwo Fatha Krisma, ga gukënia twana.

(22)Ugùri mûnene wa hïndï ya Krismas, matûkù maya wonëkagana o ndukainï ci supamaketi, tondù wa andù kûhînîyrïrïka kïria rïu marï na bata nakïo no irïo ci nïda.

(23)Indï Akristiano arïa meerutïire mathïiga kânithïnï nï mooi bata waayo ti wa kûria na kûnyua, no nï nì kûri akîrïkana arïa marï na thïna na gwïcïkera thïiï nï ngoero ciao mereer mehïa maaom, makïrïkana mûhonokia ùria waciariïrïo.

(24)Akristiano a ndïnï ya Gatoreki nì mathïiga miïthâ ya ùtûkù gatagati, hwïai-inï na Desemba 24 na hamwe na acio na a ndïnï irïa ingi makaroka makanithïnï maaom kûhïo Ngïa nï ùndï wa kûmakïnïya hïndï iyï ya Krismas na kûriakana gûciarwo kwa mûhonokia Jesû Kristo.

(25)Makîrïkana ùrathi wa mûnabïi Isaiïa, ùrïa warathire miïka 700, mbere ya gûciarwo kwa Jesû Kristo atï nì tûciariïrïo kaana mûheami kïria wa magegani, mûnene wa thayï na ùathamaki ùkâgia ciandïnï ciake(Isaiïa 9.8)

(26)Rûgûno rïù ùrïa Jesû aciariïrïo nì rûheïntwo wega thïïnï na Kïrïkînïro Kïria Kîrû, mbuku ya Mathayõ na Luka, no mbuku ya Luka niïo ìheani te wega makïria ùhîro ùcio.

(27)Ngararï nì ikoragïo kuo, athomï matuïragïa maùndï mûnô makïnïda kûmënya ma kana Jesu aciariïrïo mweri na Desemba.

(28)Kûriingana na ùtuïria ùrïa waneekuô nï kuonekagana atï nïma ndaciariïrïo Desemba na nï kûri gitûmi kïria gïtatûmire kûriakînagowïo hïndï iyï.

(29)O na nïngï kûriingana na miïka ùrïa tûtûraga ya AD, thuutha wa gûciarwo kwa Jesu, rïu twï mwïka wa AD 1999, Jesû ndaciariïrïo AD 1, mwïka wa mberi wa gutara kuuma rïria aciariïrïo.

(30)Ûtuïria ùrïa waneekuô nï atï aaciariïrïo miïka ìna mberi ya kwamûriïrïa gûtara miïka ya rïria aaciariïrïo, kuumana na arïa mathondekire Kalenda ya miïka îno tûhùthagïra.

(31)Krismas yaambiïribiree gûkûngûrïwïo mwïka wa AD 334 hïndï ùrïa Pope Gregory aatûmïre Mûtheru Augustine, athïi akahùnjiire andù a ìrûraya arïa matooi ùhoro wa Ngïai.

(32)Rïria athishïi wa Aroma nï aakorire atï maahoyagïa rïuìa ta Ngïai.

(33)Agïkïmahùnjiire ùhîro akïmeera ekûmârûta ùhîro wa Ngïai ùnïgï wïtagwo "Rïûa Ritahotagwïo".

(34)Mweri wa Desemba nì maakoragwo na magongona na maraura ma gûkûngûra ngïai iyï yao ya rïaût.

(35)Ngïetha metiïkîre Uukristiano, Pope agïathana nao Akristiano magiaje na magongona ma gûkûngûra gûciarwo kwa Jesu nì getha acenjïi acio nao meetikïire ùhîro wa Ngïai.

(36)Krismas ndïonekagana ìna rïri ìtari na mbïca ya mûthee ùrïa wïtagwo Fatha Krismas.

(37)Maya no magemio no kïmerëa kïayo nï Bicobou ùmwe wïtagwo Nicholas wa handï hetañgo Myra, bûrûrï wa Asia wendete twana mûnô na nï arï thïnî kuonekag akïheana ihæeo.

(38)Nï aheïrë kana kamwe aciari aako marï atïhïni mbïca arïa aciïkïrie mûtûrïrïiïînî wa ndoogo ya rïiko.
(39) Miaka iyo ya tene Krismas yakungúagírwo Desemba 6 na thuutha igícoka gwíkírwo Desemba 25, hindí ıría kwíríkanaga riúa riáraga mathaa manyinyi múno mabúrúri ma Rúraya.

(40) Makanitha ma Orthodox mabúrúri ma Russia na Greece, makungúagíra Krismas Januari 6.
APPENDIX 5: KIMURI ARTICLE (WIYAATHI: MIAKA 36 YA UTUGUUGI):
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(2) Gūkūngūria kāu gūtiari kwa andu othe ni tmdu kirindi kūria kūngi gūtiari na kindū o na kīi kionaga kīi mana gūkūhe ndūuhī.
(3) Ùgārūrūku na miaka ya kabere, mwaka mūthiru ciūngano ciarī gūri mūthenya úcio: Mōi, Kanu na arumiriri aake maari Uhuru Park, kūrī oo ta mūtugo mbirārū ciegarikaga na aini kūrungithia nduumo na ateti kūhēnia mūngi, atongoria a mwena wa ēregani, atongoria a Kanīthā na mūngī maari Kamūkūnji, mena kīēa ngoro-inĩ cio ni Ũnūdū na Ũrīa maumūdū mahtañite būrūrī-inĩ
(4) Āria naa maario mūcĩi moomite na mahoyaya maigungūkṣa jehova amaiugure thaa na kūmakoūria kuuma mūtundo-inĩ Ũrīa maiñkītio ni Ũn tongoria a būrūrī Ũyū.
(5) Oo ta mūtugo Mōi aari mberē kwigāthā na kūgēria kuonanii marīa eekiiire būrūrī Ũyū, akīiārā mūngī wihotore kirūhūrāna na marīa marī mberē.
(6) Akīgweetgewarta, nī aairīrē ũhoro wa mabarabarā (maingī ma - marīa arī marima mathēri), mathēbitari (kūría ndawā itoonekaga na kūría andū mațiukre a gūkūrea maturi na mūteithia), makucurū(marīa mauti marī mabukū kana arutani aigānu) na marīingī trairi ake ētugaa phē miiigma ikīrē.
(7) Mwena Ūria ūngī, mūngī Ūria warī Kamūkūnji waari na kīēa ūkūría kūría būrī wateere ikinya.
(8) Aria aitangu maaĩ nīmaikagia maitho na thuuatha, makoono ați onagwatūika wiyathi nītwaheiro, mīkārii yaaĩ mihūthāhūthū īndī a Mūkkooroni.
(9) Ona makicmāraggo njamūĩ na kūruitihio ũwā ra gītāti, nī maahotaga kuonna gīa kūría hatarī na thīna mūnene, gūtwarā ciana īria ciendaga gūthoomo cukuura, na nī maheaggo ndawā ya kūmarigita maathī thībitari.
(10) Umūūthī ūyū mareeoroera ciana igikūa ni ng’araargū, igītorōora mūcĩi ni kwagīrwo mbeca cia cukūura, ikīिनgīrīra wīkī-naĩ ni kwagwa mawītra, kana ikūrura ngūwgo nī mīrimum mmbenda cia kūría arīgitani na kūgūra ndawā gūtīrī.
(11) Ndūkīrī Ũndū wa kīmakanī ați Ũrīa Mōi na thūkūmū ciake mathoakārīggo ni Mībirārū Uhuru Park, mūngī Ūría mūuhiynye noūthīre Kamūkūnji gūthathāiyā Ngai wao marore kana aigūa thaa!
(12) Tīga miaka īgana Ũna ya mberē, īyo īngī yootho ye īría 36 tūkoretno na wiyathī īkoretno īrī ye Ũtūgūūgī.
(13) Handū ha gūtīhī na mberē, tūkoretno tūkīrutanirīa gūcooka kīinhūtātī.
(14) Harī mbūrūrii marīa Mūngheretha aathīte Afrika ya Irahīro, gūtīrī waamūmbīte ta Keny.
(15) Būrūrī ūyū, Ūría ūtaagaga maaĩi kana irīo, niwawotete kuoya Thūkūmū ītaari kīndū nūgūcihaica gathūrūmūndū kī īuōoonga.
(16) Mūhīano mwega nī Lord Delamere, Ūría wookite gūkū eehīthite meeri-inĩ toondu ndangālahotire kūrīhīra, na Ūría waacokire gūkūra arī ītongoa kīnene.
(17) Ona he īndī eeyatite ați mūgūūnda Ūría wake wī Njoro mwenena wa Naivasha mūnghālūniirī Nairobi irīia na miberethi.
(18) Nī Ūndū wa Ūtīgana wa ērēa rīakē, Kenya nī Ũmwe wa mbūrūrii manyīnyi marīa māangihota gūkūria hakuhi irīo cia mītheemba yootho.
(19) Kuuma mbembe ngīnya macaani na kahūa na pareto, gūtīrī kīndū Mūngheretha atangākūrīrī.
(20) Kūría gūtārī kwagīrīrī na irīo ng’ombe niçio ciathēremagaa kwa ūngī.
(21) Tiga ni úcamba wa Mau Mau na itungati ingi cia bůrůri, Můñgeretha angiri o gůků! 
(22) Rů喘 bůrůri oo ćucio nigůo ǔtůutwo baragany a ǔtangihota kwĩhera irio cia kũmaigana! 
(23) Mĩaka ya mbere ya wiyaathi, riřa “Harambee” na “UhuRo na Kazi” ciaři uuge wa můngiŋ, nikuonekte ta ǔtůonga ūria Ngeretha yaatigige ūngĩriga mooko-ini maitū. 
(24) Gůtirĩ waarĩ na kahun kana macaani kana pareto utaakoragwo na wa gatū; gůtirĩ můtirĩti ǔtaaragĩria riři na nyama cia uhiũ wake. 
(25) Õumůthĩ ūyũ twaagainanirio ta magengo ni ūthĩna. 
(26) Athetauuhría a můńdũ ma history mekuuga atĩ ikinya twateire oo rĩria twaheirwo wiyaathi. 
(27) Gikeno-inĩ gĩiũ gĩa kũigũa atĩ ni twaingata Můbeberũ ni twariganirwo ni gũthiinga mariima marĩa ūtůonga na wiyaathi witũ ūngĩorĩire, ǔtũgĩirĩ aри meendaga kũhũria na hao mweke wothe. 
(28) Tũngĩcoka na thuutha hanĩni no tuone atĩ Můthũũngũ aambirĩirie kuohithio kibarũ 1952, riřa njamba cia růrũri rwa Gikũyũ cierutũire na kuambirĩiria mbaara ya gwũtĩa ithaka irĩa ciaři ciao agu na agu. 
(29) Gũgũkĩnya 1954 rĩria watho wa Wihũũge wahiũkĩriĩ, Můŋgeretha ni etikirire atĩ no ngiŋyagia agatiga bůrůri ūyũ kũri eene mūthenya ūmwe. 
(30) No ni aamenyaga atĩ ńgĩagĩre waara mańdũ maake ni ngĩŋi ągĩthaatiire, o hau hau akiambilirĩria mbangno ya gũtĩgĩrĩra atĩ ona twaheo wiyaathi ndũgatũgũna. 
(31) Kahĩndainĩ oo gaaka ūgūo Mbuuũrũ cia Růraaaya ciambirĩirie kĩria cieta “The 74-25-1 Development plan”, na ūria yaheagwo mabůrũri marĩa maheagwo wiyaathi. 
(32) Kwa njira nguhi, plan ya 74-25-1 yaari ya kugaya uutoonga. 
(33) Kũrĩngana naya, icunjį 74 hari 100 (74 per cent) ya ūtůonga wa mabůrũri maya waguiriirwo nĩ gũcůoka Rũraaya na ageni, icunjį 25 hari igana (25 per cent) ńithĩ na nyabara kana ngaati ciao mabůrũri-inĩ macio, nao cene bůrũri (kana ngĩrirĩi mĩa riũta rũngĩ) matigĩirwo o gacuunũjĩ kamwe hari igana (1 percent). 
(34) Rĩria Thũũngũ ciakǐonĩre Kenya ngwacaca, nćiambirĩirrie makinya ma kũrũthiĩa můbango ūyũ wĩra. 
(35) Undũ wa mbere warĩ gůcaria andũ ařia mangiautiikire ngati ciao, matongoretio ni Moi na Njonjo wa Můgane. 
(36) Aya ni andũ ařia magãreire macukũru ma mĩcẽeni na matoi rũngĩ tiga rwa Můbeberũ. 
(37) Nĩmarutũrũwa iraathi na kũndũ kũũngũ kũrũa maaaṛuta ga wiira, na makĩambilirĩria kũhaariirio wiira wa ngaati. 
(38) Gũgũkĩnya 1960 rĩria micemaniyo ya kwarĩrĩria wiyaathi ya Lancaster House yeetiirwo andu aya ni maari̱kitĩie kWĩgacĩra. 
(39) Moi kwa můhĩano, aatugĩrrĩio kuuma kĩrathĩ kũrũa athoomithagia aři mwarĩmũ ũtarĩ mũũhũtkũu (untrained Teacher), agatuuo memba wa Legco (1956) na mũtongoria wa KADU, kimwe gĩa cia ma irĩa ciaragĩirĩria ūhũo wa wiyaathi. 
(40) KADU, irĩa aři KANU ya ūmůũhĩ, gītiari na nuororo ūngĩ tiga gũtígĩrĩra atĩ můthũũngũ na Můňůũhĩndĩ marĩirĩga na rwa njora oo rĩria ngĩrirĩi cia bůrũri, irĩia ciateete ciana na athũuri na atumia mbaara-inĩ ya Mau Mau, marooya růũtiki rwa gacuunũjĩ kamwe hari igana.