

Cohesion and Coherence in Lubukusu: A Morphosyntactic Analysis

Mary K. Lonyangapuo

*Moi University, Department of Linguistics and Foreign Languages
P. O Box, 3900- 30100, Eldoret- Kenya*

Abstract: *This study analyzes cohesion and coherence in Lubukusu texts. It specifically makes analysis of linguistic strategies that trigger cohesion and coherence in this language. In the analysis, grammatical cohesion, which involves syntactic cohesive devices such as reference, ellipsis, substitution, and conjunctions as well as the morphological cohesive device which makes use of agreement features, has been considered. An interface approach is taken, where the syntactic cohesion has implication on the morphological cohesion and vice versa. Also analyzed is lexical cohesion that involves reiteration and collocation, which also interacts with morphological cohesion. The Systemic Functional theory has been used in the analysis of the Lubukusu texts. It is observed in the paper that cohesion in this language rests upon grammatical and lexical dependencies that are expressed through various devices; which in turn results into coherence in texts. The study concludes that cohesion and coherence are central to the interpretation and meaning in texts in Lubukusu.*

Keywords: *Cohesion, coherence, morphosyntax, systemic functional theory.*

I. Introduction

Lubukusu is one of the dialects of the Luhya subgroup of the Niger-Congo Bantu that is mainly spoken in the Western parts of Kenya, East Africa. It is one of the 23 Luhya dialects. According to Guthrie's (1967-1971) classification, Lubukusu belongs to Zone E30C. However, other linguists like Lewis (2009) has reclassified Lubukusu as a language alongside other Luhya dialects that belongs to Zone J30, while Maho (2008) reclassifies the same as belonging to JE31C. Lubukusu is closely related to other Luhya dialects such as luwanga, Lwidakho, Lunyore, Lusamia, Lukahayo, Lumarachi, Lunyala, Lutiriki, Lwisukha, Lumarama, Lukabras, Lutsotso, Lushisa, Lutachoni and Lulogooli.

Lubukusu like other Bantu languages predominantly follows the subject-verb-object (SVO) word pattern, with the inflection heading the sentence. The syllable structure of Lubukusu is mainly that of CVCV pattern, with a few cases of CCV and CCCV pattern. Being an agglutinating language, Lubukusu is a morphologically rich language. This characteristic makes it possible for this language to predominantly make use of the morphosyntactic cohesive devices, in which case an analysis of one (e.g. a syntactic device), has implication on the other (that is, the morphological).

Linguists have given various definitions for the term cohesion. For instance, Halliday and Hasan (1976:4), define the concept of cohesion as "a semantic one, it refers to relations of meaning that exist within the text and that define it as a text". While explaining how it works, Halliday and Hasan (1976:4) further say that "cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some elements in the discourse is dependent on that of another in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it. When this happens, a relation of cohesion is set up, and the two elements, the presupposing and the presupposed, are thereby at least potentially integrated into a text". Likewise, Schiffrin (1987:62) argues that "cohesion has to do with semantic meaning. It consists of related lexical and grammatical markers through discourse, to facilitate coherence and is a means by which speakers meet communicative goals effectively". On the other hand, Enkvist (1978:110) notes that "cohesive links go a long way towards explaining how the sentences of a text hang together but they do not tell the whole story; it is possible to invent a sentence sequence that is highly cohesive but none the less incoherent". For Baker (1992:180), "cohesion is a surface relation that connects together the actual words and expressions that we can see or hear".

Like Baker, Thompson (1996:147) on the other hand defines cohesion as "the linguistic devices by which the speaker can signal the experiential and interpersonal coherence of the text, and is thus a textual phenomenon: we can point to features of the text which serve a cohesive function".

In this paper, both versions of the definition of cohesion are adapted. It is assumed that both semantics and lexico-grammatical relations (surface relations) are central to cohesion in texts. Consequently, in this paper, I define cohesion as a semantic concept that is achieved through grammatical and lexical dependencies that are overtly realized in discourses.

Coherence on the other hand refers to “the underlying relations between assertions (or propositions) and how these assertions contribute to the overall discourse in them” (Grabe & Kaplan, 1996:70). Further, in distinguishing coherence and cohesion, Halliday (1994:308–309) notes that “coherence is the internal resource for structuring the clause as a message, including the notion of ‘theme’ and ‘information’ and cohesion refers to the external relationship between clauses and clause complexes, which are independent of grammatical structures”.

Based on the above definitions of cohesion and coherence, Halliday and Hassan (1976) view cohesion as an index of coherence of a text, without which communication would be hampered. This therefore means that the way language is used to make expressions is very important for it determines whether cohesion and ultimately coherence is achieved in a text.

That notwithstanding, most linguists do not agree on the relationship that holds between cohesion and coherence. For instance, Enkvist (1978) and Brown and Yule (1983) hold that ‘the presence of cohesion does not necessarily lead to coherence’ (cited in Xi, 2010:144). Others like Widdowson (1978) believe that “coherent texts do not have to be cohesive” (cited in Xi, 2010:144), while still the author Xi (2010:144) says that “most systemic functional linguists claim that that cohesion is a necessary but not a sufficient condition in achieving coherence”.

In this paper, I adapt the third option and I argue that as much as cohesion is important, it is not enough; there is much more that is required for a text to cohere. Basically, there are other factors that determine coherence besides cohesion in a text; such factors include context as well as one’s knowledge of the world in relation to the subject at hand.

Many studies have been done on cohesion and coherence (See Jakobson, 1960; Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Quirk et al., 1985; Hu, 1993; Martin, 1992, among others). However, despite this, no known studies (to the best of my knowledge) have so far been done on Lubukusu, the language under study, and especially based on the interface approach. This partly explains why this study has been carried.

The Problem

The relevance of cohesion and coherence in language cannot be underestimated. For effective communication, interlocutors must employ appropriate cohesive strategies in discourses. This is a pre-requisite for coherence (though of course it is possible to have cohesion in a text that is not necessarily coherent). Lubukusu’s morphological complexities make it possible to predominantly achieve cohesion and coherence through morphology-syntax interface that is exhibited in discourses through various syntactic and morphological cohesive strategies; besides other devices that are used to mark the same. Whereas most scholars have analyzed the syntactic and morphological devices distinctively, it is argued in this paper that it is not possible in Lubukusu to analyze one without implying the other, hence, the morphosyntactic approach. Through such strategies, speakers of Lubukusu are able to effectively communicate meaning.

Aim

The paper aims at examining the morphosyntactic aspect of cohesion and coherence in Lubukusu discourse and its implication to the communication of meaning.

Objectives

The objectives of this paper are to:

- i) Analyze Lubukusu discourses in order to make explicit the cohesive devices that are used in ensuring coherence for effective communication.
- ii) Examine the morphology-syntax aspect as central to cohesion and coherence in Lubukusu.

II. Theoretical Framework

The analysis in this paper is based on the systemic functional theory that was originally developed by the Australian based linguist Michael Halliday in the 1960’s. Over the years, the theory has been developed and expanded by other scholars like Lemke (1988), Hasan and Martin (1989), Martin (1992) and Colombi (2002).

According to Halliday (1988/94/2004), systemic functional grammar, is mainly concerned with the use of language in social contexts; hence it is used in the analysis of both written and spoken texts, and the contexts in which they are produced. The theory focuses on language function and not necessarily its structure (composition). It concerns how elements effectively pattern together to bring about meaning as well as the choices that are available in language to speakers in making meaningful communication.

With regard to the same, Kress (1976: vii-xxi) says “The core concept of Halliday’s SFL is choice...emphasis is on language as a source of constructing meaning (language as a social semiotic) rather than language as structure...language is seen as expressing meanings that are created through within a social system”.

On the other hand, Achugar and Colombi (2008:36), refer to systemic functional grammar as “a social theory that situates language in its socio-historical context, linking patterns of language use to particular culturally relevant situations; thus, it is a social semiotic approach to language study. This approach is concerned with contextualized, practical uses of language”.

“The principle aim of systemic functional grammar is to represent the grammatical system as a resource for making meaning. The theory sees language as a resource, it focuses on the relative frequencies of choices made in the use of language and assumes that these relative frequencies reflect the probability that particular paths through the available resources will be chosen rather than the other. Systemic functional grammar pays more attention to semantics and pragmatics; and as such, to the proponents of this theory, linguistics is seen as a branch of sociology” (en.wikipedia.org).

Based on this theory, language is seen as a social semiotic system, a resource that human beings use to express meaning in a specific context and since meaning is context bound; language must be studied in context.

In this study, spoken texts and written texts from the Lubukusu Bible translation are analyzed. The analysis of Lubukusu lexico-grammar is done in order to establish how cohesion and coherence is marked in this language. Specifically, this paper analyzes cohesion by considering how syntactic and lexical aspects interact with morphology to bring about coherence in texts. It is observed in the discussion that appropriate choice of linguistic elements in Lubukusu ensures that there is cohesion and coherence in discourses; thereby, fulfilling a communicative purpose. The semantic and pragmatic aspect is considered central because whatever meaning that is communicated in the texts is context bound.

III. Methodology

The methodology adapted in this paper is based on the systemic functional grammar, a model that was developed by Halliday in the 1960's. In this approach, the assumption is that when using language, speakers and writers make meaningful linguistic choices in order to achieve their extra-linguistic goals.

In the present study, 11 (eleven) texts have been analyzed; 6 (six) of them are written texts from the Lubukusu Bible that is a translated version of the English Bible, New International Version (NIV). The remaining 5 (five) are spoken texts from Lubukusu naturally occurring discourses. The written texts were purposively sampled from 1 Bakorinjo (1 Corinthians), chapter 13; while the spoken texts were randomly sampled from tape recorded discourses with the assumption that all Lubukusu spoken texts, bear the morphosyntactic features that mark cohesion and coherence. In the analyses, focus is on the various morphosyntactic cohesive devices that Lubukusu speakers and writers employ in the attempt to communicate meaning in various contexts. The findings have shown that in making various linguistic choices by Lubukusu writers and speakers, the morphosyntactic aspect seems to be the main driving force that triggers cohesion and coherence in Lubukusu. This linguistic behavior derives from the rich morphological structure of the language, which has an implication on its syntax.

IV. Discussion And Analysis

Halliday and Hassan (1976) consider cohesion as a semantic relation. However, though semantic, it is realized through the lexico-grammatical (syntax, morphology and the lexical) system. It is this cohesion that brings about coherence in texts; and coherence is what makes discourses semantically meaningful. In this paper, two categories of cohesion are analyzed; namely:

- i. Grammatical cohesion; which involves both syntactic and morphological cohesion. In this study, the two are treated not distinctively but as levels that interact. The syntactic cohesive devices considered are those of reference, ellipsis, substitution and conjunction, which interact with the morphological elements, especially those of agreement, to mark cohesion and coherence.
- ii. Lexical cohesion, which concerns reiteration and collocation

4.1 Grammatical Cohesion

In this section, grammatical devices that have been used to mark cohesion in the texts are analyzed. These involve both syntactic and morphological elements, which in their cohesive function, interact.

4.1.1 Morphosyntactic Cohesion

Whereas syntactic cohesion involves the appropriate patterning together of words in a systematic way to form larger constructions that effectively communicate, morphological cohesion involves the appropriate patterning together of morphemes to form larger elements; namely, words. Four different types of syntactic cohesive strategies that have implication on morphology are analyzed; these are those involving referencing, ellipsis, substitution and conjunction.

4. 1. 1. 1 Reference

Reference is about the relationship between one expression and another or between an expression and what is spoken of. In Text A, anaphoric referencing is observed. Anaphoric referencing involves referring back to the antecedent in the text in order to avoid repetition. The use of this device in a text brings about coherence as illustrated in the written text below which is drawn from 1 Bakorinjo (1 Corinthians) 13: 1 of the Lubukusu Bible (Bible Society of Kenya, 2007), which is a translation of the English New International Version.

Text A: **13** ¹Nyala naloma chinomo che babaandu nende che bamalaika boosi, nekakhali **ese** ne khali ne busiime tawe, lilomaloma liase se likhila luyoka lwe sibia namwe bibiindu bie khu khuupaniakho mu mienya tawe.

¹'If I speak in the tongues of men and angels but have not love, I am only a resounding gong or a clanging cymbal.'

The pronoun **ese** 'I' in (i) above refers back to the person that has already been mentioned in the text (as much as his/ her name is withheld). Here, the two, co-refer. Likewise, the pronoun **ese** and the antecedent (the person being referred back to) agree with regard to person and number, which is marked using the morpheme **-se**; that is, both are marked for 1st person singular; the feature on the pronoun being dependant on that of the antecedent. The same referring pronoun **ese** determines the elements that follow in the structure; they all agree with the pronoun in terms of person and number; thus:

i) ...nekakhali **ese** ne khali ne busiime tawe, lilomaloma **liase** se...

The negation form **ne** is only used with either first or third person, so here it agrees with the preceding pronoun **ese** 'I'. Likewise, the possessive pronoun **liase** 'my/mine', is also marked for first person singular, hence there is agreement. Here we see both syntax and morphology interacting as cohesion is marked. The use of **ese** ensures that elements hold together and meaning is constructed.

The same strategy is used to mark cohesion in the following discourse which concerns a mother who is supposed to visit her niece:

Text B: Jane: Mayi alomile ali alikhucha khubona omwisengechana nekakhali salomile chiisa nicho alachila ta. Abanga akhubolele andi fyesi kwirekekhe khwacha **naye**. Chisa chindala se buli bulayi khulondana nende omundu okhakhwirekekhele tawe. Lino libechanga lisiro ne bandu bakali baliria.

Jane: 'Mother said that she will go to see her niece but she didn't say at what time she was to leave. If she had specified the time at which she was to leave, we would have prepared and gone with her. Sometimes it is not good to accompany somebody who is not ready for you. This is normally difficult and most people fear doing that'.

In Text B above, the pronoun marker **-ye** 'her/ him' is used to refer back to the antecedent noun phrase **mayi** 'mother'. The two agree in terms of person and number; the pronoun marked indicates third person singular (3sg), hence agrees with the preceding noun phrase. Likewise, the pronoun marker **-ye** agree with all the other elements in the entire structure. In the above text, the morpheme **a-** that is marked in bold and italicized refers to third person singular. Consequently, reference as a cohesive device is not only syntactic but morphosyntactic as it has consequences on the morphology of the entire structure.

Lubukusu also makes use of cataphoric referencing in marking cohesion in texts. Cataphoric referencing refers forward in the text; that is, an entity is introduced before it is identified. This is illustrated in the following text, extracted from 1 Bakorinjo (1 Corinthians) 13: 11:

Text C **13**¹¹Nga ne naba omwana, lilomaloma liase, khukhwiulila, ne kamebaasio kase biaba bie lulwana, ne luno ndi omundu omukhulu, se mbona **nisio** kholela **bibiindu** bie lulwana tawe.

¹¹'When I was a child I talked like a child, I thought like a child, I reasoned like a child. When I became a man, I put childish ways behind me.'

In Text C, the pronoun **nisio** 'that' refers forward to the noun **bibiindu** 'things'; it is used to introduce the noun **bibiindu** and as such it serves to link the elements together in the text. The morphological features of number that are marked on the noun **bibiindu** (from Class 8), determines those that occur on its modifier **bie** 'of' in the text. Thus, cataphoric reference as a cohesive device interact with morphological cohesion to bring about coherence in the text; thereby making possible the communication of the intended meaning.

4. 1. 1. 2 Ellipsis

This is the omission of a word or phrase (either from speech or writing), whose meaning can be understood (by the hearer or reader) from the context of usage. In formal writing or speech, words are often grammatically recovered from the text either through anaphoric or cataphoric ellipsis and Lubukusu is not an exception. In this language, omission is a cohesive device that is used in a text in order to avoid repetition of what has already been mentioned. In **Text B** above, several elements have been omitted from the text for purposes of coherence. The same Text B is repeated below as Text B₁:

Text B₁: **Jane: Mayi** alomile ali alikhucha khubona omwisengechana nekakhali [1] salomile chiisa nicho alachila ta. Abanga [1] akhubolele [2] andi fwesi kwirekekhe mala khwacha naye. Chisa chindala se buli bulayi khulondana nende omundu okhakhwirekekehele tawe. [3] Lino libechanga lisiro ne bandu bakali baliria [3]. 'Mother said that she will go to see her niece but she didn't say at what time she was to leave. If she had specified the time at which she was to leave, we would have prepared and gone with her. Sometimes it is not good to accompany somebody who is not ready for you. This is normally difficult and most people fear doing that'.

In Text B₁, the noun phrase **mayi** 'mother' has been omitted twice, marked as [1]. The adverbial phrase **chisa chindala** 'sometimes' has also been omitted; this is marked as [2]; and finally, the noun phrase **likhuwa** 'literally, issue' has also been omitted; this is marked as [3].

The use of the cohesive strategy of omission interacts with the morphological cohesive device, which is realized through morphological agreement markers that are shown in the text. For instance, the omission of the noun phrase **likhuwa** 'literally, issue' makes it possible for the occurrence of the agreement markers on the following words as shown in the example below:

ii) [3] Lino libechanga [3] lisiro ne bandu bakali baliria.

The morpheme **li** is an agreement morpheme that is based on the omitted noun phrase **likhuwa** 'issue'; that is found in Class 5. All the other elements in the ii) are marked with the same agreement feature.

So in marking cohesion, which motivates coherence in the text, syntax and morphology interact as observed above. Most important is the fact that as much as some elements have been omitted in Text B₁, no semantics has either been reduced or lost; the meaning of the omitted elements is understood from the context. Thus, meaning is effectively communicated using the cohesive strategy of ellipsis.

4. 1. 1. 3 Substitution

This is the use of words or pro-forms (as cohesive devices) in the place of lexical items. This can involve the replacement of a word, phrase or a clause in a construction. When substitution of elements take place, the meaning of the replaced element is retained; that is, no semantics is changed or lost. In Lubukusu, substitution is a cohesive device that interacts with the morphological cohesive device to contribute to coherence in discourses. An illustration is provided through the discourse below, where some ladies are conversing about a friend of theirs who has not been able to give birth:

Text D: Nambuye: Nangekhe lisaye liamulumiile. **Omwana** kekhalilikhe khu miiko kumi nekakhali sali nende ekhahi ta. Omusakhulu **wewe** elumisya ekhalilikha khu miiko ekio kiosi. Niye **omwana oyo** kolile buli bulume. Kenyekhana khusalile **omukhana wa Petero**.

'It has become difficult for Nagekhe to get children. She has persevered for ten years but she has not been lucky enough. The husband has persevered for all those years but in vain. The way things are, we need to pray for God to help her'.

In Text D above, the noun phrase **Nangekhe** has been substituted by other noun phrases in order to avoid repetition. The noun phrases used for substitution include; **omwana** 'child', **wewe** 'her', **omwana oyo** 'that child' and **omukhana wa petero** 'Peter's daughter'. In using substitution to mark cohesion, this strategy interacts with the morphological device as appropriate morphemes (those that are underlined in the text) that agree with the various noun phrases are used for cohesion and coherence purposes. Consequently, the desired message is effectively communicated without lose or change in the intended semantics.

The same is observed in the written text below from the Lubukusu Bible; 1 Bakorinjo (1 Corinthians) 13: 9- 10.

Text E:13⁹Sikila **biianwa** biefwe bje bukesi nende bje burume bubwama khu Wele bilio khu siise sitiiti busa,¹⁰ ne kakhali **bili** bibiichufu ne bikheeche, biiikhali bibiichufu tawe, bikhaweo.

⁹For we know in part and we prophesy in part, ¹⁰but when perfection comes, the imperfect disappears'.

In Text E above, the discourse in the Lubukusu version is about the gift of knowledge and prophecy that shall cease. In this text, instead of repeating the noun phrase **biianwa** 'gifts' that is in verse 9, the proform **bili** 'those' (lit. those that are) is used in verse 10. The two; that is, the noun phrase **biianwa** (Class 8) and the proform **bili**, co-refer and they agree in number. Likewise as substitution is done, the same cohesive device has implication on morphology as specific agreement morphemes are used to ensure coherence in the text; in this case, those that are italicized and underlined. For instance, the noun phrase **biianwa** 'gifts' bears the class marker **bi**, which is taken up by the following elements; thus, biefwe bje bukesi nende bje burume bubwama khu Wele bilio... Likewise, the pro-form **bili**, (lit. those that are) is followed by elements that bear agreement features that are used with nouns from the same Class 8; thus,...kakhali **bili** bibiichufu ne bikheeche, biiikhali bibiichufu tawe, bikhaweo... Every Lubukusu native speaker is able to appropriately interpret the meaning in

the text as much as the initial noun phrase has been substituted by a pro-form. Here syntax interacts with morphology to mark cohesion and subsequently coherence in the text.

4. 1. 1. 4 Conjunction

These are words that are used to conjoin other words, phrases, clauses and even sentences. While coordinating conjunctions are used to conjoin elements or units of the same status, subordinating conjunctions are used to conjoin units of unequal status; the main and the subordinate clause. In Lubukusu, this is one of the cohesive devices that are used to mark and enhance coherence in the discourse. Conjunctions interact with other morphological elements to bring about cohesiveness in the discourses that eventually results into coherence. Using this strategy, elements in texts systematically hold together and in them, meaning is derived. This is illustrated in Text A, repeated as Text A₁ below; where co-coordinating conjunctions interact with other morphological cohesive devices:

Text A₁ : 13 ¹Nyala naloma chinomo che babaandu **nende** che bamalaika boosi , **nekakhali** ese ne khali ne busiime tawe, lilomaloma liase se likhila luyoka lwe sibia **namwe** bibiindu bie khu khuupaniakho mu mienya tawe.

¹'If I speak in the tongues of men and angels but have not love, I am only a resounding gong or a clanging cymbal.'

Conjunction as a cohesive device has interacted with the agreement morphemes, which are also cohesive devices for coherence in Text A₁ above. Three different coordinating conjunctions have been used to conjoin elements in the discourse; these are: **nende** 'and', **nekakhali** 'but' and **namwe** 'or'. The three have been used to conjoin elements that are of equal status and that bear appropriate agreement features that are determined by the class from which the head noun belongs (as shown in the underlined and italicized elements). Consequently, meaning is communicated. For instance:

iii) **Nende** 'and'; this coordinating conjunction has been used to conjoin two noun phrases of equal status; that is:

- a. chinomo che babaandu (boosi) 'the tongues of men' (though boosi is omitted)
- b. (chinomo) che bamalaika boosi 'the tongues of all angels' (though chinomo is omitted).

Though the head noun in the second phrase in the text is omitted, every native speaker of Lubukusu knows that it is present (implied) though not overtly realized. So in this text, an additive conjunction is used to fit elements together. This interacts with the morphological aspect for effective communication of intended meaning in the discourse.

iv) **Nekakhali** 'but': The adversative conjunction **nekakhali** has been used to conjoin two equal clauses (as shown below), hence bringing about comprehensible meaning in the text.

- a. Nyala naloma chinomo che babaandu **nende** che bamalaika boosi.
'If I speak in the tongues of men and angels'.
- b) b)Ese ne khali ne busiime tawe ...

'If I have not love...'

v) **Namwe** 'or': The contrasting conjunction **namwe** is used to conjoin two noun phrases; namely:

- a) luyoka lwe sibia 'a resounding gong'
- b) bibiindu bie khu khuupaniakho 'a clanging cymbal'

If structures of unequal status and/ or with morphological elements that do not agree were conjoined, then the structures would have been ungrammatical. This would have negatively affected the communication of meaning as illustrated below from the same Text A₁:

vi) *Chinomo sye babaandu **nende** **soma**.

The illustration in vi) is ungrammatical because apart from elements of unequal status being conjoined (a noun phrase and a verb), there is no agreement between the elements. The head noun **chinomo** 'tongues' is from Class 10 hence it requires that the connective morpheme (possessive connective) also bears the agreement features of the same class and not those of Class 7 as above. So, the use of the conjoining conjunction determines what other elements to occur in the discourse and how they should occur. This ensures both cohesion and coherence in the text and thus effective communication of meaning.

Apart from the above, the other type of conjunctive that interacts with the morphological cohesive device is the causal. Causal conjunctives function to put elements together in a coherent manner; hence ensuring

that the text makes sense. Below is an illustration from the Lubukusu Bible; 1 Bakorinjo (1 Corinthians) 13: 9-10:

Text F ⁹**Sikila** bjianwa biefwe bje bukesi nende bje burume bubwama khu Wele bilio khu siise sitiiti busa, ¹⁰ ne kakhabli bili bibijichufu ne bikheeche, bijkhali bibijichufu tawe, bikhaweo.

⁹For we know in part and we prophesy in part, ¹⁰but when perfection comes, the imperfect disappears' (New International Version).

The conjunctive **sikila** 'because' in Text F is causal. This conjunctive marks the relationship of reason, consequence and purpose. It links the preceding clause with the one that follows by giving the reason as to why all that has been mentioned before in verse 8 of the same chapter shall cease. The various elements in the structure agree because of the appropriate morphological markings (underlined and italicized in the text) that have been used. This interacts with the conjunctive cohesive element to ensure that the two clauses cohere and the entire text is semantically meaningful.

The temporal conjunctive also functions as a marker of cohesion. The conjunction **luno** 'today' specifies the time sequence relationship between elements; and in this case, it has been used to contrast behavior at two different time frames. The temporal conjunctive interacts with the morphological cohesive elements (underlined and italicized in the text) for coherence purposes. This is captured in the Text C from the Lubukusu Bible; 1 Bakorinjo (1 Corinthians) 13: 11, which is repeated below, as Text C₁:

Text C₁ ¹¹**Nga** ne naba omwana, lilomaloma liase, khukhwiulila, ne kamebaasio kase biaba bje lulwana, ne **luno** ndi omundu omukhulu, se mbona nisio kholela bibiindu bje lulwana tawe.

¹¹'When I was a child I talked like a child, I thought like a child, I reasoned like a child. When I became a man, I put childish ways behind me.'

In Text C₁; the temporal conjunction **luno** 'today' is used to link events together with regard to the time as to when they occurred; hence, it is a cohesive element that triggers coherence.

The same text; that is, (C₁) above, has the comparative conjunction **nga** 'as'/'like' that functions as a cohesive device. The comparative conjunction **nga** in this text is also used to compare behavior at two different time frames; so this element links together the two; thereby ensuring that the text is comprehensible to the reader.

4. 1. 2 Lexical Cohesion

Apart from grammatical cohesion, lexical cohesion can also be observed in the discourse above. According to Halliday and Hassan (1976: 276), lexical cohesion is "the cohesive effect achieved by the selection of vocabulary". Halliday (1994: 274) further defines lexical cohesion as "a linguistic device which helps create unity of text and discourse. It is a cohesive effect achieved by selection of vocabulary". In this case, a writer or speaker has to make a choice of lexical items that have some connection or bearing to each other; hence bringing about coherence in discourse. The lexical cohesive devices used in the selected discourses are reiteration and collocation. These devices have contributed to the existing coherence in the text as analyzed below.

4. 1. 2. 1 Reiteration

Halliday and Hassan (1976: 278) define reiteration as "a form of lexical cohesion which involves the repetition of a lexical item, at one end of the scale; the use of a general word to refer back to a lexical item, at the other end of the scale; and a number of things in between-the use of synonym, near synonym or superordinate". In the Lubukusu discourse below, this strategy has been used for cohesion and as such, it has contributed to the comprehensibility in the text.

Text G: **Festo**: **Ese** senenya khukula **bulime** bwa **Matayo** khangu khangu ta. Likhola **ese** endobe **bulime** bwewe lili mbo **Matayo** ali **omundu** we kamaya ne **ese** omwene senanala khulomana namwe khubirana nende **babantu** khu sindu **siosi** **siosi** tawe.

'I don't want to buy Matayo's land in a hurry. The reason for this is that Matayo is a trouble maker and yet personally I don't like quarrelling or disagreeing with people over anything whatsoever'.

In Text G, there is the use of repetition as a strategy for cohesion; and because of this, coherence in the entire text is achieved. The adverbial **khangu** 'fast' has been repeated for emphasis; hence forming the adverbial compound **khangu khangu** (lit. fast fast). Likewise, the adverbial **siosi** 'anything' in the same text has been repeated for emphasis; forming the adverbial compound **siosi siosi** (lit. anything anything). Similarly, the use of the first person pronoun **ese** 'I' thrice in the text has contributed to the ultimate coherence in the text. In the same text, there is also the repetition of the noun **bulime** 'land' as well as **Matayo**; this has enhanced coherence in the text.

Apart from repetition, the speaker has also used superordinates to achieve cohesion in the same Text G. The speaker has used **omundu** 'person' as a general form to refer back to **Matayo**, which is a specific personal noun that is found in the same Class 1. The cohesive elements that are used in the discourse interact with

morphology in a way that brings about coherence in the text. Basically, these elements emphasize what the speaker is communicating. For instance, the linguistic elements that follow the nouns **Matayo**; that is, **omundu** 'person' and **bulime** 'land'; all agree with the preceding nouns with regard to number. Similarly, the linguistic elements that come after the pronoun **ese** 'I' (which is marked for 1st person singular), agree with it with regard to number and person. In this text, the speaker emphasizes that he/ she wouldn't want to hurriedly engage in buying Matayo's land because he/ she doesn't like quarrelling or disagreeing with people.

The same strategy of repetition is observed in Text H, which is drawn from 1 Bakorinjo (1 Corinthians) 13: 1 of the Lubukusu Bible, where linguistic elements are repeated for purposes of coherence in the text.

Text H ²**Nyaala naaba ne** siianwa sie bung'oosi, **nyala naaba ne** bukesi **bwoosi**, **nyala naaba ne** lisuubila **lioosi**, lilienyekha khuuyisia bikulu, ne kakhali ne khali ne busiime **tawe**, aba se ndi siindu **tawe**....

²If I have the gift of prophecy and can fathom all mysteries and all knowledge, and if I have a faith that can move mountains, but have not love, I am nothing.'

The occurrence of the three clauses **nyala naaba ne** 'I can have' has been used in Text H in order to ensure coherence in the text. The occurrence of these elements shows some connection and dependence relationship, which has been used to achieve the intended communicative purpose. The same applies to the use of the determiner **bwoosi** 'all', which is repeated and the negation marker **tawe** 'no', which has also been repeated twice. These linguistic elements agree with the other elements that they occur with. For instance the clause **nyala** 'I can' has the pronoun marked in it and this pronoun has the features 1st person singular; the same features are marked on the clause **naba** 'I have'. Similarly, the number features born by the determiners **bwoosi** 'all' and **lioosi** 'all', are based on those that are marked on the preceding head nouns; that is, **bukesi** 'wisdom' and **lisuubila** 'faith' respectively. The writer has succeeded in communicating the fact that regardless of what one has or does, without love, it is all meaningless. This has been achieved by the use of repetition as a cohesive device that has appropriately interacted with morphological cohesion. Another instance of the use of repetition is observed in Text J, which is from 1 Bakorinjo (1 Corinthians) 13: 4- 7 of the Lubukusu Bible:

Text J ⁴**Busiime** buli khukhwifwiilisia ne kumwoyo kumulayi. (-)Se buli ne likhendekha, namwe khukhwiniinia, namwe ekibonio tawe, ⁵**busiime** se buli ne kimiima kimibi, namwe chinge tawe, (-) se bubiililwanga tawe, **busime** se buloondelesianga kamabi tawe, ⁶**busime** se busaangalilanga bubwoni tawe, nekakhali (-) busangaalilanga bung'ali, ⁷**busime** bwefwiililisia mu biindu bioosi, (-) bububila koosi, (-) bweyikina koosi, lundi (-) bwekhaliilikha mu koosi.

⁴Love is patient, love is kind. It does not envy, it does not boast, it is not proud. ⁵It is not rude, it is not self-seeking, it is not easily angered, it keeps no record of wrongs. ⁶Love does not delight in evil but rejoices with the truth. ⁷It always protects, always trusts, always hopes, always perseveres.'

Text J above has eleven occurrences of the noun **busime** 'love'. Whereas six are overtly marked, five are not; that is, they have been omitted, but their semantics is understood from the context of usage. The sequential occurrence of all these nouns interacts with morphology to ensure that the text coheres. In Text J, the morphological features that are marked on the head noun **busime** 'love', which is in Class 14 determines the features that are taken by other linguistic elements at the syntactic level. For instance in this text, all the underlined are morphological elements that agree with those that are marked on the noun **busime** 'love'. Consequently, the intended meaning is communicated because there is coherence in the text.

Likewise, the repetition of the negation form **tawe** 'not', has contributed to coherence in the same text that is represented below as Text J₁.

Text J₁ ⁴Busiime buli khukhwifwiilisia ne kumwoyo kumulayi. Se buli ne likhendekha, namwe khukhwiniinia, namwe ekibonio **tawe**, ⁵busiime se buli ne kimiima kimibi namwe chinge **tawe**, se bubiililwanga **tawe**, busime se buloondelesianga kamabi **tawe**, ⁶busime se busaangalilanga bubwoni **tawe**, nekakhali busangaalilanga bung'ali...

⁴Love is patient, love is kind. It does not envy, it does not boast, it is not proud. ⁵It is not rude, it is not self-seeking, it is not easily angered, it keeps no record of wrongs. ⁶Love does not delight in evil but rejoices with the truth.'

In Text J₁ above, there is a dependence relationship between the various forms of the negation word **tawe** 'not'. The writer has successfully used this strategy to communicate the intended meaning; which is, what love is not. Emphasis is brought out clearly through repetition.

Apart from the use of repetition and the superordinate as lexical cohesive devices, sense relations in Lubukusu also function as cohesive devices. Two types of sense relations are identified in the text; that is, synonymy and antonymy.

According to Yule (1996:118), "Synonymy is the use of two or more forms with closely related meanings, which are often but not always intersubstitutable in sentences". This is a relationship of sameness which has been used in the text to mark cohesion; thereby facilitating coherence, which enables the writer and the reader to satisfy their communicative needs effectively. This is exemplified in the following conversation where one of the speakers is complaining about the current education system:

Text K: Sefania: Kamasomo kalelo kamamayanu khukhila ka kakhale. Babana sebabakho nende siise sye khuoolakho tawe. Ngebarura asibui mbaka ekoloba nye bayukhe. Nge bola munju, khana bali chihomuwaka. Omwana aolakho saa ngapi? Namwe ata akholakho kimilimo kikiindi chiisa sii? Ese mbukakho busa kamasomo kalelo kano kamabii.

‘The current education system is bad as compared to what we had before. As it is, children have no time to relax right from the time they leave for school in the morning until they return in the evening. The moment they arrive home, they have homework to do. With all these, when does a child rest or even do some other work. For sure, current education system is bad.’

In Text K above, synonymy has been used twice as a cohesive device. Instead of the speaker repeating the adjective **kamamayanu** ‘bad’ in the two syntactic positions, a different adjective that bears the same meaning is used; that is, **kamabii** ‘bad’. These two are synonyms that are used to mark cohesion in the text and at the same time they have contributed to the comprehensibility of meaning in the discourse. These synonyms, which morphologically agree with the other elements in the structures (as underlined above) determine the grammaticality of the syntactic structures in which they are found; thereby resulting into the coherence of the entire discourse. The fact that the adjectival root **-mayanu** ‘bad’ and **-bii** ‘bad’ modify the head noun **kamasomo** ‘education’ from Class 6, it is required that all the other elements in the structures bear morphological features that agree with those of the head noun. The speaker has also used the synonyms **saa ngapi** ‘what time’ and **chiisa sii** ‘what time’. Therefore, the interface between morphology and syntax that is realized through synonymy has successfully been used to make explicit the fact that to some people, the current education system is not good. Thus, the intended information in the discourse has been successfully communicated by the speaker.

Besides synonymy, the writer in Text K has also used antonymic expressions to mark cohesion. Antonym is a word that has opposite meaning to the other. In the above discourse, the speaker uses two different antonyms; these are i) **kalelo** ‘current’ and **kakhale** ‘previous’/ ‘old’, ii) **asibui** ‘morning’ and **ekoloba** ‘evening’ In using antonymy as a cohesive strategy, the morphological strategy also comes to bear as the specific morphological elements that agree with those that are marked on the preceding nouns are taken up by the antonyms for coherence purposes in the text. For instance, the use of the number and class morpheme **ka-** that is marked on **kalelo** ‘current’ and **kakhale** ‘previous’ is derived from the morphological feature that is marked on the noun **kamasomo** ‘education’, which belongs to Class 6. The speaker has successfully used this strategy to mark cohesion in the text. Basically, the speaker compares the previous system of education and the current one. He seems to appreciate the former more than the later. The use of this strategy has contributed to the comprehensibility of the text.

4. 1. 2. 2 Collocation

Collocation is the habitual juxtaposition of a particular word with other particular words. It is a kind of syntagmatic relationship; which, according to McCarthy and O’Dell (2005:4), it is “a natural combination of words, it refers to the way words are closely associated with each other”. On the other hand, Halliday and Hasan (1976: 284 define collocation as “the cohesion that is achieved through the association of lexical items that regularly co-occur...these are words that have a systematic relationship. In Text L below, while Nelima is complaining about her younger brother who hates work, she uses this strategy the conversation:

Text L: Nelima: Wafula kasiima **khunina kimisala** ata bakhamukania saulila ta. Mayi kenyle khuucha naye asibui **bakese buulo** mala kaloba sikila **kabiila khukhola kimilimo** ta. Sileka sya Wafula sesili silai tawe. Khu kasi choosi, Wafula **asiimakho** busa **khufuna kamaindi**, mala **akoloba**, seli **asibui** ta. Ata **khukhwala sitanda** syewe sekenya ta. Khane khukhakhole khurie nye akalukhane.

‘Wafula likes climbing trees and even if he’s cautioned, he doesn’t stop. In the morning mother wanted to go with him so that they harvest sorghum but he refused because he hates working. His stubbornness is not good. Wafula only loves harvesting maize but in the evening, not in the morning. He even doesn’t like spreading his own bed. I don’t know what we will do in order for him to change’.

The discourse in Text L has five collocations; all of them being made up of a verb and a noun. These are words in Lubukusu that always co-occur. For instance, in **khunina kimisala** ‘climb trees’, there is a combination of a verb and a noun, where the occurrence of the noun depends on the semantics of the preceding verb, hence, the two regularly occur together. Essentially, the noun that follows the verb **nina** ‘climb’ in this language must be one that refers to an entity that can be climbed. The same applies to the other pairs; where the occurrence of the noun is determined by the semantics of the preceding verb. For instance, in Lubukusu the verb **-ala** ‘spread’ can only occur with nouns that refer to entities that can be spread, opened out, stretched or extended as far as they can go. Consequently, this verb has to occur in such restricted contexts; and when this happens, coherence is achieved in the text in which the pair occurs.

Apart from to the pairs mentioned above, collocation in the Text L is also marked through linguistic elements that occur in complementarity. There is cohesion between such words as they stand in some lexico-

semantic relationship and as such they contribute to the coherence in the entire text. These clauses are; **kabiila** 'he hates' and **asiimakho** 'he loves'. Here, the adjectives **-biila** 'hate' and **-siima** 'love' have a relationship systematic and they regularly co-occur in texts; and when they do, they motivate cohesion and coherence in the discourse. The other example of collocation is the use of **akoloba** 'evening' and **asibui** 'morning'. So the coherence in Text L is partly (as other strategies also come to play) attributed to the use of collocation as a strategy for cohesion and subsequent coherence in the discourse. This ensures that meaning is effectively communicated as intended by the speaker.

4. 1. 3 Interface of Cohesive Devices

Though the interface between morphology and syntax is observed throughout the texts that have been discussed above, it is not true to say that these are the only areas of interaction marking cohesion in Lubukusu. Basically, there are other cohesive devices that co-occur in this language as observed in the various texts that have been analyzed in this paper; and this has contributed to coherence as illustrated in Text A, repeated as Text A₂ below:

Text A₂ ¹Nyala naloma **chinomo che babaandu nende (-) che bamalaika** boosi...

¹'If I speak in the tongues of men and of angels...' (NIV).

In Text A₂, four cohesive devices have been used; these are, i) the comparative as a cohesive device, where **chinomo che babaandu nende (-) che bamalaika** 'the tongues of men and those of angels' are compared; ii) the coordinating conjunction **nende** 'and', which is used to conjoin two noun phrases; that is, **chinomo che babaandu nende (-) che bamalaika** 'tongues of men and of angels' and iii) ellipsis (-) as a cohesive device, where the noun **chinomo** 'tongues' has been omitted in the second noun phrase position in the discourse; iv) the morphological cohesive device, which has been applied appropriately by ensuring that the suitable morphological elements have been used in the texts. For instance, in **chinomo che** 'tongues of', the number morpheme marked on the connective morpheme (possessive connective), agrees with the morpheme that is marked on the preceding noun (as underlined). Likewise, there is morphological agreement between **babaandu** 'people', **bamalaika** and **boosi**. The writer has successfully used the four devices at a go for coherence purposes. Any native speaker of Lubukusu reading the text will understand that the writer is trying to compare the value of love and being able to speak either in tongues of men or of angels. According to the writer, none of the two is as valuable and as important as love. Likewise, cohesive devices of ellipsis, substitution, the conjunction as well as morphological marking co-occur in the Text B, which is repeated as Text B₂ below:

Text B₂: **Jane: Mayi alomile ali alikhucha** khubona omwisengechana **nekakhali** [1] salomile chiisa nicho alachila ta. Abanga [1] **akhubolele** [2] andi fyesi kwirekekhe **mala** khwacha **naye**. Chisa chindala se buli bulayi khulondana **nende omuundu okhakhwirekekhele** tawe. [3] **Lino libechanga** [3] lisiro **ne babaandu bakali baliria**.

'Mother said that she will go to see her niece but she didn't say at what time she was to leave. If she had specified the time at which she was to leave, we would have prepared and gone with her. Sometimes it is not good to accompany somebody who is not ready for you. This is normally difficult and most people fear doing that'.

In Text B₂ above, ellipsis as a cohesive device is observed where three elements are omitted without negatively affecting the discourse; that is, [1], the noun phrase **mayi** 'mother', [2] the noun phrase **chiisa** 'the time' has been omitted and finally, in [3], the noun phrase **likhuwa** 'issue' has also been omitted. Despite this, no semantics has been lost or reduced. In the same discourse, the pronoun **naye** 'her', lit. 'with her' has been used to substitute the noun phrase **mayi** 'mother'. Three conjunctions have been used; namely, **mala** 'then', **nekakhali** 'but' and **ne/ nende** 'and', for coherence purposes. Finally, morphological marking has been accomplished through the use of appropriate morphemes that are triggered by the class of the respective head nouns as illustrated below:

- Mayi** alomile **ali** alikhucha ...**alachila**...**akhubolele**
- omuundu** **okhakhwirekekhele**
- lino** **libechanga** **lisiro**
- babaandu** **bakali** **baliria**.

All the underlined are morphological elements that agree; and they have interacted with the cohesive devices of ellipsis, substitution and conjunction to trigger coherence in the discourse. Lack of such coherence in the text affects the grammaticality of structures as well as the comprehensibility of the intended meaning.

Besides the above, there is still interface between various cohesive devices in Lubukusu, where the application of one implies the other. For instance in Text D, substitution is seen as a cohesive device in Lubukusu and from the illustrations given, it is observed that while discussing substitution, we are at the same time discussing reiteration that is marked through synonymy as a cohesive device (as seen in Text K). Thus,

synonymy and substitution as cohesive devices interact. This being the case, we cannot draw a straight line between grammatical and lexical cohesion in this language; the two interact for coherence purposes.

Likewise, there is interaction between collocation as a cohesive device and reiteration that is marked through antonymy such that the application of one ideally implies the other. For instance in Text K, while discussing antonymy as a cohesive device in Lubukusu, collocation is at the same time discussed as illustrated in Text L, where the examples of antonymy and some of the examples of collocation are similar. This interface brings about coherence in texts in Lubukusu; which results into effective communication of the intended meaning.

V. Conclusion

From the analyses of Lubukusu written and spoken texts above, it is evident that there are cohesive devices that are used in this language that makes it possible for texts to cohere, thereby ensuring that meaning is appropriately communicated. As observed, the various cohesive devices interact in the sense that it is not possible to discuss syntactic or lexical cohesion, without considering morphological cohesion. Consequently, the paper has argued that cohesion and coherence in Lubukusu is morphosyntactic. It is this interface between the various cohesive devices that motivates coherence in Lubukusu discourses; and this is what makes it possible for Lubukusu speakers to effectively communicate the intended meaning.

References

- [1]. M. Achugar and M. C. Colombi, Systemic Functional Linguistic Explorations into the Longitudinal Study of the Advanced Capacities. The Case of Spanish Heritage Language Learners. In: L. Ortego, H. Byrnes (ed.), *The Longitudinal Study of Advanced L2 Capacities*. New York: Taylor & Francis, 2008, 36–57.
- [2]. M. Baker, *In other words. A course book of Translation*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- [3]. G. Brown and G. Yule, *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- [4]. M. C. Colombi, Academic Language Development in Latino Students' Writing in Spanish. In M. J. Schleppegrell, M. C. Colombi (eds.), *Developing Advanced Literacy in First and Second Languages*. Mahwah NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2002, 67–86.
- [5]. Ebibilia Endakatifu, Endakaano Ekhale Ne Embia. Elimo Bitabu Bia Deturokanoni. The Bible Society of Kenya: Nairobi (2007).
- [6]. N. E. Enkvist, Coherence, Pseudo-coherence and Non-coherence. In: Ostman JO (ed.), *Cohesion and Semantics*. Abo: Akademia: Foundations, 1978, 109–128.
- [7]. en.wikipedia.org. Retrieved on 10th 2014
- [8]. M. Guthrie, *Comparative Bantu: an Introduction to the Comparative Linguistics and Pre-history of the Bantu Languages*. Farnborough. Gregg Press, 1967-71.
- [9]. W. Grabe and R. B. Kaplan. *Theory and Practice of Writing: An Applied Linguistic Perspective*. London: Longman, 1996.
- [10]. M. A. K. Halliday and R. Hasan, *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman, 1976.
- [11]. M. A. K. Halliday, Language and the Order of nature. In: M. A. K. Halliday and J. R. Martin (eds), *Reading science: Literacy and Discursive Power*. Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1993, 106–123.
- [12]. M. A. K. Halliday, *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold, 1994.
- [13]. M. A. K. Halliday, Things and Relations. In: J. R. Martin and R. Veel (eds.), *Reading Science*. New York: Routledge, 1998, 183–235.
- [14]. M. A. K. Halliday, *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. (3rd ed.) London: Edward Arnold, 2004.
- [15]. M. A. K. Halliday, Meaning as Choice. In L. Frontain, T. Bartlett and G. O'Grandy, (ed): *Systemic Functional Linguistics: Exploring Choice*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press page, 2013.
- [16]. R. Hasan and J. R. Martin, *Language Development: Learning Language, Learning Culture*. Norwood, N.J: Ablex, 1989.
- [17]. Holy Bible, New International Version. International Bible Society: Nairobi, 1984.
- [18]. S. Z. Hu, *Comparative Studies in English and Chinese Rhetoric*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 1993.
- [19]. R. Jakobson, Linguistics and Poetics. In: Sebeok T (ed.), *Style in Language*. Cambridge, Mass: M.I.T Press, 1960, 350–377.
- [20]. G. Kress, Introduction. In G. Kress, Halliday's System and Function in Language. London. Oxford University Press, 1976
- [21]. J. Lemke, Genres, Semantics and Classroom Education. In *Linguistic and education*, 1 (1) 1988.
- [22]. M. P. Lewis, (ed), *Ethnologue: Language of the World, Sixteenth Edition*. Dallas, Texas: SIL International, 2009:
- [23]. J. Maho, <http://goto.glocalnet.net/maho/bantusurvey.html>, 2008.
- [24]. J. R. Martin, *English text: System and Structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1992.
- [25]. M. McCarthy and F. O'Dell, *English Collocation in Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005
- [26]. R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech and J. Svartvik, *A comprehensive Grammar of English Language*. London: Longman, 1985.
- [27]. Schiffrin D. 1987. *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- [28]. G. Thompson, *Introducing Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold, 1996.
- [29]. H. G. Widdowson, *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- [30]. Y. Xi, Cohesion Studies in the past 30 years: Development, Application and Chaos. *The International Journal of Language, Society and Culture*. 2010, 31:139– 147.
- [31]. G. Yule, (2nd ed.). *The Study of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996b.