

## Linguistic Features that Mark Cohesion in Selected Gikuyu Texts

Anne Wachera Somba    Antony Somba Mang'oka  
Department of Arts, Kabarak University, Private Bag, 20157 Kabarak  
tonymuli@gmail.com

### Abstract

The present study was aimed at identifying and describing elements that help to join different sentences in selected Gikũyũ texts. This study falls in the broad area of discourse analysis. The texts selected for this study were those written in continuous prose and were from the literary and the reportage text categories. The work followed the Halliday and Hasan's model of Cohesion to identify and describe cohesive devices in these texts. Gikũyũ texts analysed showed evidence of cohesion as proposed in the Halliday and Hasan's (1976) model of cohesion. The paper describes affixes, words, phrases, clauses and syntactic gaps that have been identified as creating cohesion in Gikũyũ texts. The paper explains how these linguistic features that create cohesion relate with other parts of the texts being analyzed to realize cohesion. Yule (1985) argues that cohesion is marked differently in different languages. He further observes 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. By describing cohesion in Gikũyũ, the present study adds to the body of knowledge on Gikũyũ, and language in general.

**Keywords:** Cohesion, Gikuyu, Features, Linguistic, Texts

### Introduction

Scholars such as de Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) and Van Dijk (1977) are among others who have studied aspects of language beyond the sentence level. Text linguists have attempted to predict, "how large chunks of language come to be interpreted as texts", as noted in Brown & Yule (1983, p.190). Halliday & Hasan (1976, p.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 organization, conjunction, and reference.

This study focuses on cohesion in an African language, Gikũyũ. Gikũyũ 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, Gikũyũ. Henceforth in this study, the term Gikũyũ is used because it more clearly represents the actual pronunciation of the word by native speakers.

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. 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.

However aspects of Gikũyũ language have been studied by different scholars. For instance, Barlow (1951), Leakey (1959) and Mareka (1953) are some of the earliest Gikũyũ grammars. Other studies that have analysed aspects of Gikũyũ include Gathenji (1981) who studied the morphology of verbal extension, Armstrong (1967) who has written about the phonetic and tonal structure of the language, and Mũtahi (1977) who studied sound change and classification of dialects of southern Mt. Kenya.

### The Study Data and Sampling Techniques

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

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

### Data Analysis and Presentation

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

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

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

### Sample of analysis of Mwangi (1998)

Sentence Number	Number of ties	Cohesive item		Type of cohesion	Presupposed item	
		Item	Gloss		Item	Gloss
2	1	Ngaari	Vehicle	Lexical: Collocation	Tonya ũmbũke	- Proper noun
		Athii	Passengers		Makanga, Kahonoki, Ngoima. Nyina kahonoki na angĩ	Conductor, kahonoki Ngoima, his wife and other Passengers
12	4	gwĩka ũguo	To do that	Substitution: verbal: verbal reference	Kuona na kũigua mĩario	To see and to hear voices
		ngaari	Vehicle	Lexical: reiteration: same word	Ngaari	Vehicle

### Linguistic Features Marking Cohesion

Cohesion in Gikũyũ texts analysed here is marked by affixes, words, phrases, clauses and syntactic gaps. These are discussed below.

#### 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 Gikũyũ, 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.

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 Gikũyũ 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, 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 yaambiriire gũkũnguirwo mwaka wa AD 334 hĩndĩ irĩa **Pope Gregory a-atũmire Mũtheru Augustine**, athiĩ akahunjĩrie **andũ a Rũraaya** arĩa matoŋĩ ũhoru 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. Rĩria **a**-thiire bũrũri wa Aroma nĩ aakorire atĩ **ma**-ahoyaga riũ ta ngai.  
*When **he** went to Rome, **he** found that **they** worshipped the sun as a god.*
32. **A-gĩkĩ-ma**-hunjĩria ũhoru akĩmera ekũmaruta ũhoru wa Ngai ũngĩ wĩtagwo “Riua Rĩtahotagwo”.  
**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-atũmire** (*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 **Mũtheru 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 **Mũtheru Augustine** (*Saint Augustine*) in the previous sentence. This cohesive item, **a**- (*he*) and the presupposed item, **Mũtheru 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 **andũ a Rũraaya** (*people of Europe*) in sentence 30.

An example of an object marker functioning cohesively is also found in example 1 above. This is signaled by object marker **-ma-** (*them*) in the verb complex **Agĩkĩ-ma**-hunjĩria (*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 **andũ a Rũraaya** (*people of Europe*) in sentence 30. This kind of chain presuppositions is a common feature in the Gikũyũ texts analysed. Consider the following example from RPT 3: 35-38.

- (2) 35. Ũndũ wa mbere warĩ gũcarĩa andũ arĩa mangĩatuĩkire ngati ciao, matongoretio nĩ **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** nĩ andũ arĩa magereire macukuru ma mĩceeni na matoĩ rũngĩ tiga rwa Mũbeberũ.  
*These are the people who went through missionary schools and did not know another (song) other than the colonialists'.*
37. Nĩ-**ma**-rutĩtwo irathi na kũndũ kũngĩ kũria maarutaga wĩira, na makĩambĩria kũharĩrio wĩra 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. Gũgĩkinya 1960 rĩria mĩcemanio ya kwarĩria wĩyaathi ya Lancaster House yeetanirwo **andũ aya** nĩmarĩkĩtie kwĩgacĩra.  
*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 **andũ aya** (*these people*) refers to the subject marker **-ma-** (*they*) in the verb complex, nĩ-**ma**-rutĩtwo (*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 Mũgane*) 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. **Warĩnga** aarĩ wa mĩaka ĩĩrĩ.  
*Warĩnga was two years old.*
9. Taatawe wahikĩte Naikuru akĩ-**mu**-oya.  
*Her aunt who was married at Nakuru took **her**.*
12. **Warĩnga** akũriire Naikuru **na aihwa aake**.

*Warĩnga grew up in Nakuru together with her cousins.*

13. Hĩndĩ ìyo **ma**-ikaraga Land Panya Estate...

*That time they lived in Land Panya Estate...*

14. **Waarĩnga** athoomeire Mbaharini Full Primary School...

*Warĩnga 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 Manjeengo in Boonde.*

16. **A**-aikũrũkagĩra gatagatiĩni ka Mĩthoonge na kĩng'eero gĩa kanju.

*She used to go down between Mĩthoonge and the council's*

*Slaughter rhouse.*

(4) 31. Kĩrĩmas yaambĩrĩrie gũkũngũrwo mwaka wa AD334 hĩndĩ ĩrĩa Pope Gregory aatũmire **mũtheru Augustine**, athĩi akahunjĩrie **andũ a Rũraya** arĩa matooi ũhoro 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. Rĩrĩa **a**-thiire bũrũri wa Aroma nĩ **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**-gĩkĩ-**ma**-hunjĩria ũhoro **a**-kĩ-**me**-ra ekũ-**ma**-ruta ũhoro wa Ngai ũngĩ wĩtagwo "Riua Rĩtahotagwo".

*He then preached to them and he told them that he would teach them about another God called "the unbeatable Sun."*

(5) 55. Gũtirĩ wĩra mũirĩtu ataangĩhota eetikĩtie na ngoro yaake no ahote, nĩ guo

Warĩnga eeraga **airĩtu arĩa angĩ** nao magatheka.

*There is no work that a lady cannot do when she believes in her heart that she can, this is what Warĩnga used to tell the other ladies who would laugh (at it).*

56. No niingĩ nĩ **mo**-onaga atĩ we Warĩnga no atoorie ona kĩa ũũinjĩnia ...

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

In sentence 9 of example 3, the singular object marker **-mu-** (*her*) in the verb complex **akĩ-mu**-oya (*she took her*) presupposes the noun **Warĩnga** 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 **Warĩnga** 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**-aikũrũkagĩra (*she used to go down through*) in sentence 16 presupposes **Warĩnga** 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 **Warĩnga** 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 **mũtheru 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 **andũ a Rũraya** (*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 **Mũtheru 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-kĩ-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-kĩ-ma**-ĩra. 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 /ɛ/. Thus **-ma-** (*them*) in the verb complex **a-kĩ-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 **airĩtu arĩa angĩ** (*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 **airĩtu arĩa angĩ** (*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.

### Forms of Cohesive object and subject markers

	Subject marker	Object marker
Singular	a -	- mû -
Plural	ma -	- ma -
<b>Phonological Variants:</b>		
Singular	e -	-
Plural	mo -, me -	-me-

From the table 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 Gîkûyû 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 our 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 kîria **Warînga** eendete mûno ti kuona maraya makîrûira arûme, kana o arûme makîrutanira tûhiû, kana arîu magîthuguma na gûtahîka mîtarô-inî, aaca - kîria Waarînga eendete mûno ni gûthî kanitha mahoya na kûigua ûhoro wa Ngai.

*But what Waarînga 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 Warînga liked most was going to church to pray and listen to the word of God.*

21. O kiumia o kiumia rûciinî taata-**we** nî aamûtwaraga miitha kanitha-nî 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 **Warînga** in sentence 20, and this referential relation joins the two sentences cohesively. This suffix commonly occurs in nouns, especially those denoting relations. For instance, **mûrata-we** means her/his friend and consists of noun stem **mûrata-** (*friend*) and the possessive suffix - **we** (*her/his*).

Cohesive affixes have also occurred in our 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** maingî maarî ma Njîcû e mwana anyiitwo nî thiingi Maria na e mûnene akiambwo mûharaba-inî.

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

- 25 **I-ngî** ciarî cia caitani...  
*Others were of the devil...*

In example 7 above, the indefinite pronoun **I-ngî** (*Others*) in sentence 25 presupposes that the reader has come across the noun phrase **Mabica maingî** (*many pictures*) in sentence 24. The pronoun **I-ngî** (*others*) and the noun phrase **Mabica maingî** (*many pictures*) therefore form a single cohesive tie. In addition to this, the subject prefix **I** – (*it*) affixed to the indefinite pronoun stem – **ngî** (*other*) ought to agree with the noun phrase it refers to, which in this case is **Mabica maingî** (*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-ngî** (*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 – **ngî** (*other*) so that it can refer to the noun phrase **mabica maingî** (*many pictures – big ones*) would be **ma** – (*they*). Thus, the pronoun should be **ma-ngî** (*others – big/bad ones*) and not **i-ngî** (*others*).

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

- (8) 37. **Mwanake** ûtaringîtwo mûno nî ûria warûgire rûgîka – igûrû  
*The young man who wasn't badly hurt is the one who jumped onto the Road side.*

38. No **na-a-ke** no aaramaga no nî aahoteete gûkorwo eikarîtie thî mûingî ûgîkinya harî 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.

(9) 32. Kwa njira nguhi **plan ya 74-25-1** yaari ya kugaya uutoonga.

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

33. Kuringana na-**yo**, Icuji 74 hari100 (74 percent) ya utonga wa maburuhi maya wagirirwo ni gucooka Ruraya na ageni, icuji 25 hari igana (25 per cent) ithi na nyabara kana ngaati ciao maburuhi-ini macio, nao eene bururi (kana ngirimiti na ritwa ringi) matigirwo o gacuunji kamwe hari igana (1 percent).

*According to it, 74 parts in 100 (74 per cent) 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. The following example from LTC2. 32-33 illustrates this:

(10) 32. No uria muingi weciiragia, ati no uhonokie muoyo wa **ikanga** ru ona rituru ririkionje, gutiahokire tondū ni riakoretwo ririkitie gukua.

*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-ake** haria yathirirwo iguru ni kuguru kwa ngaari yari mondore na mara makaminjuka 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. This means that agreement morphemes (concord) 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.

## Words

Different words or lexical items have featured as cohesive items in our study corpus. 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 our 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 ni **kamena**

*Arguments are said to be hatred*

2. Uguo na ruthiomi ruhuthu ni kuuga maciaro ma **ngarari** ni **rumena**.

*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 **rumena** (*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 our 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.

- (12) 10. Míario ya andû aría **maathogoranaga** thoko-iní ní yaiguíkaga ní mûndû arí ngaari-iní íkîambata kîrîma-iní.

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

11. Athii aingî a Tonya ûmbûke ní maikagia maitho nja ya ngaari na makeyonera na makaigua mîario na **gûthogorana** kwa andû aría maarî thoko.

*Many passengers of Tonya Umbûke were looking outside the vehicle and they could see and hear the voices and bargaining of the people who were in the market.*

- (13) 16. Rîmwe na rîmwe, thuutha wa gîthoomo kana o mûthenya wa njuuma na Kiumia, Warînga na aihwa aake **nîmaacaangacaangaga** Boonde kwîrorera atumia magîtega arûme kana o arûme makîrûa mbaara ya ibiindo.

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

17. Rîngî ní **maahuunguraga** matûra moothe ma mwena úcio – Kiziwani, Karoreni, Kivumbini, Shauri Yako, Ambongorewa kana Kaambi ya cumari – o kwîrorera andû na manyûmba na matuka.

*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 **maacaangacaangaga** (*they roamed*) in sentence 16 is close in meaning to the verb **maahuunguraga** (*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 **kwîrorera** (*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 are conjunctions: These signal connections between sentences in the texts as illustrated in the following example drawn from RTC2: 2-3.

- (14) 2. Úyû nîguo mweri andû makoragwo meharîirie gûgakena ota úrîa mangîenda no tí maririkane atí nîmûhonokia Njîcû waciariûo ta úrîa Akristiano aría aama makoragwo meharîirie.

*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. **Índî** Krîsmas ya mwaka úyû ndîgûkorûo írî na riiri ta ya miaka írîa íhîtûkîte ní úrîa andû aingî mahinyîrîkîte ní kwaga mbeça, índî ona kûrî úguo matiaga o gûkorûo 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 **índî** (*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 **índî** (*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. **Taûni ya Tambaya** ní niini mûno na maita maría maingî ndîakoragwo na andû aingî.

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

8. Mûndû angîitana na kayû kanene arí mwena úmwe wa **yo** no aiguo ní mûndû arí mûico úrîa úngî 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 **Taûni 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. Nĩ aathiũrũkire ngaari agĩthĩ na **mbere** oone kana nĩ akuona Nyaindo harĩa maaikaire mbere ngaari itanagĩa na mũtino.  
*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.*

48. Ataanakinya **ho** nĩ aahĩngirwo nĩ kĩndũ kũgũrũ na akĩgwa thĩ na mwena wa ũrĩo.  
*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 Gĩkũyũ language, such words include prepositions, verbal auxiliaries, and other lexical items with high frequency such as **Mũndũ** (*person*). Consider the following example from RTC 2:1-2,

- (17) 1. Ngarari cĩragwo **nĩ** kamena.  
*Arguments are said to be hatred.*  
2. Ūguo na rũthiomi rũhũthũ **nĩ** kuuga maciaro ma ngarari **nĩ** rũmena.  
*That in simple terms is to say the outcome of arguments is hatred.*

The auxiliary verb **nĩ** (*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.

### Phrases and Clauses

Several kinds of phrases are cohesive items in our study 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 kaamburũ mwena wa Gĩthũngũri kĩa Wairera **mwaka-inĩ wa ngiri ĩmwe na magana keenda ma mũroongo ĩtaano na ĩtatũ.**  
*Jecinta Warĩnga was born in Kaamburũ in Githũngũri of Wairera in the year one thousand nine hundred and fifty three.*  
2. **Hĩndĩ ĩyo** bũrũri ũyũ witũ wa Kenya waathaguo nĩ thũkũmũ cia Ngeretha na watho ũrĩa mũũru wa kũhinyĩrĩria mũingĩ, 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 **Hĩndĩ ĩyo** (*that time*) consists of a demonstrative **ĩyo** (*that*), and a noun **Hĩndĩ** (*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 ĩmwe na magana keenda ma mũroongo 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 our 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 ũmwe wa acio eerĩ maarĩ na ikanga kũũrĩa igũrũ nĩ aarũgĩre **mwena** \_\_\_**wa ũrĩo** wa ngaari, akĩgwa rami-inĩ gatagatĩ.  
*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. Ūrĩa ũngĩ naake aarũgĩre **mwena wa ũmotho**, akĩgwa igũrũ rĩa rũgũĩka na akĩgaragara na kũrĩa andũ a thoko maarĩ.  
*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 ũrĩo** (*right side*) and **mwena wa ũmotho** (*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 mîroongo îtaano na inya**, ithe wa warînga akinyitwo agîthaamîrio Manyani.

*In the year one thousand, nine hundred and fifty four, Warînga's father was arrested and deported to Manyani.*

7. **Thuutha wa mwaka ûmwe** nyina naake akînyitwo agîthaamîrio Raang'ata na Kamîtî.

*After one year the mother also was arrested and deported to Lang'ata and Kamiti.*

- (21) 21. Rîrîa andû acio moonire afî ndereba nî aremirwo biû nî kûrûgamia ngaari nî maambîrîirie kûrûga thî kuuma **keeria-igûrû**, ngaari o igîcookagana thuutha.

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

22. Mwanake ûmwe wa acio eerî maarî na ikanga **kûrîa igûrû** nî aarûgire mwena wa ûrîo wa ngaari, akîgwa rami-inî gatagatî.

*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 ûmwe** (*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 îmwe na magana keenda ma mîroongo îtano 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 **Kûrîa igûrû** (*up there*) in sentence 21 is referential, referring back to the locative noun **keeria-igûrû** (*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, Njîcû na Araika a Ngai maarî **eerû ta athûungû**, no Caitaani na araika ake maarî airû ci.

*Virgin Mary, Jesus, and angels of God were white like Europeans, but Satan and his angels were completely black.*

28. Ûtukû nî arootaga mahahûratoro nî ûndû wa mbica icio.

*At night she would have nightmares because of those pictures.*

29. No haandû ha kûroota na njîcû akiambwo, arootaga na Caitaani arî na gîkoonde **kîeru cua ta gîa kîmûthungû** kîmwe kînoru mûno Warînga oonire rîmwe hakuhi 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) Warînga once saw near Rift Valley Sports Club...*

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

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

- (23) 11. Athii aingî a Tonya Ûmbûke nî **maaikagia maitho nja** ya ngaari na makeyonea na makaigua mîario na gûthogorana kwa andû arîa maarî 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 ûguo** tondû ngaari nî yahootetwo nî kwambata kîrîma mûno na yathiaga kahora ta ikîrûgama nî gûkuua kûrîa yakuufite.

*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 ûguo** (*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.

- (24) 3. Rûmena naruo rûcookaga rûkareehe **mbaara** kana njatûkano  
*Hatred in turn brings about war or division.*

4. Andû a Kenya makoretwo magiathwo na njûgûma mîaka mîingî.

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

5. Athamaki arîa maathaga andû na njûgûma meetagwo na kîng'enû , 'dictators'.

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

6. Matikararagio kana kûrio kûria: Maarekia mûgambo wî wa kûhinyîria kana kûraga- meendaga gwîkwo o ûguo moiga.

*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. Nîkîeha tûkîrikana atî **kûrî mîoyo yûrîite** na **thakame îitîkîte** bûrîiriî ûyû 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 yûrîite** (*there are lives that have been lost*) and **thakame îitîkîte** (*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).

### 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. Rîu mwago ûcio wa Krîsmas nî waathirire na rîria kuraarî na mbece **andû** nî maragûraga nguo njerû cia thigûkûu na makîria atumia matingûgua Christîmas îri nginyanîru harîo atarî na gakuo kana karatû keerû ga thigûkûu.

*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. Matukû maya Ø arîa marî na ûhoti maragûra nguo cia mîtuba îria îkuoneka ta îî njerû mûno nîyo agekîra hîndî ya Krîsmas.

*These days Ø 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 **andû** (*people*) is considered understood and is therefore omitted after the relativiser **arîa** (*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.

### Summary of Findings

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.

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. 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.

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 Gikūyū 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 in this study data.

## References

- Ambiyo, S. (1999). "A Comparative Study of Cohesion in Academic and Newspaper Texts." Unpublished M.A Thesis. Kenyatta University.
- Armstrong, L. M. (1967). *The Phonetic and Tonal Structure of Gikuyu*. London: Longman.
- Barlow, A. R. (1951). *Tentative Studies in Kikuyu Grammar and Idiom*. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and sons Ltd.
- De Beaugrande, R and Dressler, W. (1981). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*, London: Longman.
- Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coulthard, M. & Sinclair, J.M. (1975). *Towards an analysis of Discourse: The English Used by Teachers and Pupils*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Dijk, Van T. A. (1977). *Text and Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse*. London: Longman.
- Enkvist, N. E. (1981) "Categories of Situational from the perspective of stylistics." *Language Teaching and Linguistics Abstracts* 13: 75-74.
- Fairclough, M. (2003). *Analysing Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Gathenji, W. H. (1981). "The Morphology of the Verbal Extensions in Gikuyu-A Functional Approach." Unpublished MA Thesis. University of Nairobi.
- "Gikeno gia Krismas Gukinya." *Murata Iruta ria* 11 January 2000. Pg. 6, col. 1.
- Guthrie, M. (1948). *The Classification of the Bantu Languages*, London: Dawson's of Pall Mall.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K and Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*, London: Longman
- Hartnett, G. C. (1980). *Cohesion and Mental processes in Writing Competence*. London: Routledge.
- Hasan, R. (1984). "Coherence and Cohesive Harmony" in Flood, J. (Ed) (1984) *Understanding Reading Comprehension* 181-218, Delaware: M.P. International Reading Association.
- Hoey, M. (1991). *Patterns of Lexis in Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jinkai (2008) Lexical Cohesion Patterns in NS and NNS Dissertation Abstracts in Applied Linguistics: A Comparative Study. In the Linguistic Journal, Volume 3, Issue 3.
- Kioko, A. N. (1994). "Issues in the Syntax of Kikamba: A Bantu language." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Monash University, Australia.
- Leakey, L.S.B. (1959). *First Lessons in Kikuyu*, Nairobi: The Eagle Press.
- Mareka, B. G. (1953) *A Short Kikuyu Grammar*. Nairobi: The Eagle Press.
- "Migwi ya Moi gutuuhio." *Mwihoko Mweri wa Ndithemba* 1999/Njanuari 2000. Pg. 1, col. 1.
- Milroy, L. (1987). *Observing and Analyzing Natural Language*, New York: Basil Blackwell Inc.
- Mohammad, H. P. & Muhammad, A. S. (2006). *The Effect of Text Cohesion on Reading Comprehension*. Karen's Linguistic Issues, January 2006.
- Mutahi, E. K. (1977). "Sound Change and the Classification of the Dialects of Southern Mt. Kenya." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. University of Nairobi.
- Mwangi, M. (1998). *Ngoima*. New York: Mau Mau research center.
- Mwove, N. (1987). The Kikamba Noun Phrase. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. University of Nairobi.
- Nesil, H. & Basturkmen, H. (2006). "Lexical Bundles and Discourse Signaling In Academic Lectures." In Specials Issue Of International Journal Of Corpus Linguistics Vol 11:3 Edited By Flowerdew, J & Mahlberg, M. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ngugi wa Thiong'o (1980). *Caitani Mutharaba-ini*. Nairobi: Heinemann Kenya Ltd.
- Ngugi wa Thiong'o (1986). *Decolonizing the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. London: James Currey.
- Ngugi wa Thiong'o (1993). *Moving the Centre*. Nairobi: East African Educational publishers.
- Nurse, D. (1980). *Bantu Migration into E. Africa: Linguistic Evidence*. Paper no. 138. Nyamasyo, E. A. (1992). "A Corpus-based Study of Grammatical and Lexical characteristics of the writing of Kenyan Pre-University Students", Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Lancaster.Uk.
- Ogotu, E. (1996). "An analysis of Cohesion and Coherence structure in Texts written by Secondary School ESL learners in Kenya." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. University of Birmingham. UK.
- Overton, H.J. (1972). "A Generative-Transformational Grammar of Kikuyu Language Based on the Nyeri

- Dialect.” Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. The Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College.
- Phillips, N. & Hardy, C. (2002). “Discourse Analysis: Investigating Process of Social Construction.” Sage University Papers Series on Qualitative Research Methods, Volume 50. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Polome, E.C. (1967). *Swahili Language Handbook*. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Richards, J. C. Platt, J. and Platt, H. (1985). *Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Riley, P. (Ed) (1985). *Discourse and Learning*, New York: Longman Inc.
- Scinto, L. F. M. (1986). *Written Language and Psychological Development*, Orlando: Academic Press Inc.
- Seliger, H. W. and Shohamy, E. (1989). *Second Language Research Methods*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thiga, E. N. (1997). “Cohesion and Compactness in compositions written by Kenyan Urban Primary school children.” Unpublished M.A Thesis, Kenyatta University.
- Vitale, J. A. (1981). *Swahili Syntax*, Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: O.U.P.
- “Wiyathi: Miaka 36 ya Utuguugi.” *Kimuri Iruta* namba 06, Njanuari 2000. Pg4, coll.
- Yule, G. (1985). *The Study of Language*, Cambridge: C. U. P.

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

## CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

**Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:** <http://www.iiste.org/journals/> All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

## MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: <http://www.iiste.org/book/>

Academic conference: <http://www.iiste.org/conference/upcoming-conferences-call-for-paper/>

## IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

