

Article

Textuality in Text: A Discourse Analysis of Nelson Mandela's *I Am the First Accused*

Abudulai Rauf ^{1,*}, Emmanuel Kwesi Asiedu ², Dela Amenyedzi ³¹ Department of Humanities and Social Science Education, University for Development Studies, Tamale, Ghana² Department of Languages, Wesley College of Education, Kumasi, Ghana³ Department of English, Akatsi College of Education Akatsi, Ghana

* Correspondence: Abudulai Rauf(raufabudulai98@gmail.com)

Abstract: The thrust of this paper is to delve into the cohesive devices of political discourse as it pertains to Nelson Mandela's *I Am the First Accused*. The text was codified and the lexicogrammatical resources were examined in terms of semantic ties through the lens of Discourse analysis. The text was analysed based on Halliday and Hasan's, 1976 five major cohesion classification categories: *reference, demonstrative references, substitution, conjunction and lexical cohesion*. The research indicated that there were sufficient phenomenon-example relationships within the text. In other words, there was adequate justification for claim statements within the text. There are also adequate cause-consequential relations in the text. Anaphoric references were commonplace in the text. It was also found out that cataphoric reference was sparingly used in the text. Analysis of the data also revealed that there were 30 instances of personal references, 21 demonstrative references, 3 instances of comparative references, and 6 instances of substitution. There were no instances of ellipsis. There were 7 instances of conjunction as a semantic link. There were 15 instances of repetition, 5 examples of synonyms and 3 instances of antonyms. It is recommended that public speakers and media practitioners take cognisance of cohesive devices and make their write-ups and speeches more cohesive and coherent for their audience and readers to decode meaning. Teachers of English as a second language should give serious attention to the teaching of cohesion as a semantic link within a text since cohesion and coherence aid the readability of a text. Cataphoric references sustain the interest of listeners and readers since they expect information yet to be given. Therefore, it is recommended that teachers of English as a second language should encourage their students to use some cataphors in their essays to create some kind of suspense in their readers. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) could also be used as an analytical tool to examine how power plays within the text.

Keywords: Cohesion, Discourse Analysis, Semantic Ties, Linguistic Features, Political Discourse, Lexico Grammatical Resources

How to cite this paper:

Rauf, A., Asiedu, E. K., & Amenyedzi, D. (2024). Textuality in Text: A Discourse Analysis of Nelson Mandela's *I Am the First Accused*. *Universal Journal of Literature and Linguistics*, 4(1), 7–21. Retrieved from <https://www.scipublications.com/journal/index.php/ujll/article/view/857>

Received: June 14, 2023

Revised: November 25, 2023

Accepted: December 4, 2023

Published: January 7, 2024



Copyright: © 2024 by the authors. Submitted for possible open-access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Life is a constant flow of discourse; of language functioning in one of the many contexts that together make up culture. Of its pervasiveness in life, discourse is studied in several different disciplines, institutions etc. In the field of applied linguistics, the most relevant body of work is that which has come to be known as discourse analysis (ibid.). Discourse analysis (DA), or discourse studies, is a general term for several approaches to analysing written, spoken, and signed language use or any significant semiotic event [1]. The term has been defined in various ways by linguists. A writer sees discourse analysis from three perspectives. He refers to discourse analysis as concerned with language use

beyond the boundaries of a sentence/utterance; concerned with the interrelationships between language and society, as concerned with the interactive or dialogic properties of everyday communication [2]. Discourse analysis as the linguistic analysis of naturally occurring connected speech or written discourse [3]. Discourse analysis is the examination of language use by members of a speech community [4]. It involves looking at both language form and language functions and includes the study of both spoken interaction and written texts [5]. It identifies linguistic features that characterise different genres as well as social and cultural factors that aid in our interpretation and understanding of different texts and types and types of talk [6]. Discourse analysis also goes beyond the linguistic features and looks at *other stuff* as Gee (1999) puts it. In other words, it also examines what is not written in text via the concept of presuppositions, inferences and sometimes the analyst's concept of schemata is brought to bear. A writer adds volume to this assertion when he intimated that:

“it has been remarked several times that natural language discourse is not explicit. That is, there are propositions which are not directly expressed but which may be inferred from other propositions which have been expressed. If such implicit propositions must be postulated for the establishment of coherent interpretations, they are what we call Missing links”.

A discourse analysis of written texts might include a study of topic development and cohesion across the sentences while an analysis of spoken language might focus on these aspects plus turn-taking practices, opening and closing sequences of social encounters, or narrative structure.

Cohesion and coherence as semantic concepts in both written and spoken discourse have been a major concern to linguists. As a result, many studies have been done in literary texts, academic discourse and some in public speeches of iconic leaders of the Western world [8, 9]. Unfortunately, little research has been done to examine the texture and coherence in the speeches of African freedom fighters and the linguistic resources used to realize textuality. The global iconic status of Nelson Mandela is not in doubt. His status is foregrounded by the powerful speeches he delivered in his bid to liberate black South Africans from the vicious claws of apartheid South Africa. Many of these political speeches have not attracted the attention of linguists to examine the texture and cohesive devices that unearth the meaning which caught up and sustained the interest and support of the masses. The thrust of this research is to investigate the existence of cohesive devices and texture and how these devices unearth the meaning in Nelson Mandela's *I Am the First Accused*. The purpose of this study was to delve into the discursive practices of political discourse as it pertains to Nelson Mandela's 'I am the First Accused'. It will ascertain how cohesion and texture reveal both transparent and opaque meanings within the text. Also, it intends to survey the lexico grammatical resources in the text and to show their place in the linguistic system. It also intends to show how lexicogrammatical resources create a context for meaning. The study was guided by these research questions - 1. What cohesive devices does the speaker employ in transmitting his message? 2. What cohesive devices does the speaker favour over others? 3. How do these techniques create context for meaning?

1.1. Theoretical Framework

The model of cohesion is employed as a theoretical framework for this study. Cohesion refers to the *non-structural text-forming relations* [10]. The concept of cohesion is a semantic one; it refers to relations of meaning that exist within the text, and that define it as a text (ibid. 4). They posit that cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another [10]. The one *presupposes* the other, 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 [10]. The concept of cohesion as both a theory and an analytical tool subsumes several linguistic signals such as Reference, Substitution, Ellipsis, and Conjunction and Lexical cohesion. These linguistic signals or strategies operate both within and beyond the sentence level to create a semantic tie which creates a context for meaning.

Writers of the view that “the basic concept that is employed in analysing the cohesion of a text is that of a TIE. A tie is a complex notion because it includes not only the cohesive element itself but also that which is presupposed by it. A tie is best interpreted as a relation between these two elements [10]. Cohesion theory, however, has strongly been criticized that “cohesion is not coherence” [11]. The writer’s criticism which she drew from both theoretical and empirical work in schema theory, attempts to show that text analytical procedures such as Halliday and Hasan’s cohesion concept, encourage the belief that coherence is located in the text and can be defined as a configuration of textual features, and which fail to take the contributions of the text’s reader into account, are incapable of accounting for textual coherence [11]. However, research on cohesion and coherence showed that to be cohesive, an ESL essay did not need to be coherent [12]. Despite this criticism, cohesion theory by Halliday and Hasan has proven to be an effective analytical tool in the analysis of a text. Cohesion theory is relevant in studying how writers encode meaning in texts [10].

1.2. Literature Review

The review of the literature was categorised under the following headings: *texture, cohesion and cohesive devices, coherence, and semantic relations*. Finally, some empirical studies were also reviewed to explore what has been done by drawing on the similarities and differences between the current study and the previous studies.

1.2.1. Texture

The concept of texture is entirely appropriate to express the property of being a text. A text has texture, and this is what distinguishes it from something that is not a text. It derives this texture from the fact that it functions as a unity concerning its environment [10]. A text is best thought of not as a grammatical unit at all, but rather as a unit of a different kind: a semantic unit. The unity that it has is a unity of meaning in context, a texture that expresses the fact that it relates as a whole to the environment in which it is placed [10]. Texture is also seen as any length of text that is coherent and meaningful [13]. A study refers to texture as textuality and emphasis posits that “the phenomenon of sentences belonging together is known as textuality” [14].

1.2.2. Cohesion

Cohesion is a blanket term for a range of linguistic signals and strategies which enable us to know that sentences belong together and in a particular sequence [14]. He opines that cohesion can operate on both a lexical level and a grammatical level and that words and meanings of words can give text cohesion. Cohesion is also viewed as the ties and connections which exist within texts [15]. Analysis of cohesive links within a text gives us some insight into how writers structure what they want to say, and may be crucial factors in our judgment on whether something is well-written or not (Ibid: 141). The writers of the view “that cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. In other words, a text is said to be cohesive when there is some kind of interdependency or connectedness of meaning within a text” [10]. Cohesion connects a string of sentences to form a text rather than a series of unrelated statements. It is pertinent to note that structure in the text is provided by grammar, therefore cohesion is considered to be outside of the structure [10].

The unit of analysis for cohesion is the cohesive ties. Cohesive ties among sentences are those which contribute most strongly to creating a unified text. A study discusses five major types of cohesive ties that occur in text: references, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion [13]. Referencing functions to retrieve presupposed information in the text must be identifiable for it to be considered cohesive. In written text, referencing indicates how the writer introduces participants and keeps track of them throughout the text [13]. There are three general types of referencing: homophoric referencing, which refers to shared information through the context of culture, exophoric referencing which refers to information from the immediate context of the situation, and endophoric referencing, which refers to information that can be "retrieved" from within the text [10, 13-14]. Writers asserted "that it is the endophoric referencing which is the focus of Cohesion theory. They intimated that Endophoric referencing can be divided into three areas: anaphoric reference, cataphoric reference and esphoric reference. Anaphoric refers to any reference that 'points backwards' to previously mentioned information in the text" [10]. Cataphoric refers to any reference that "points forward" to information that will be presented later in the text. Euphoric refers to any reference within the same nominal group or phrase which follows the presupposed item [10, 13]. For cohesion purposes, anaphoric referencing is the most relevant as it "provides a link with a preceding portion of the text" [10].

Functionally speaking, there are three main types of cohesive references: personal, demonstrative and comparative. Personal reference keeps track of function through the speech situation using nouns, pronouns like *he, him, she, her* etc. and possessive determiners like "mine, yours, his, hers", etc. Demonstrative reference keeps track of information through location using proximity references like "this, those, that, here, there, then, and the". Comparatively, reference keeps track of identity and similarity through indirect references using adjectives like "*same, equally, similar, different, else, better, more*" etc and adverbs like *so, such, similarly, otherwise, so, more, etc.* [10]. Whereas referencing functions to link semantic meanings within text, substitution and ellipsis differ in that they operate as a linguistic link at the lexicogrammatical level. Substitution and ellipsis are used when "a speaker or writer wishes to avoid the repetition of a lexical item and can draw on one of the grammatical resources of the language to replace the item". The three types of classification for substitution and ellipsis: nominal, verbal and clausal, reflect its grammatical function. When something in text is being substituted, it follows that the substituted item maintains the same structural function as the presupposed item [10]. In nominal substitution, the most typical substitution words are "*one and ones*" and they substitute nouns. In verbal substitution, the most common substitute is the verb "do" and is sometimes used in conjunction with *so* as in *doing so* and substitute verbs [13]. Writers posit that *do* often operates with the reference items but still has the main function as a verbal substitute because of its grammatical role. In clausal substitution, an entire clause is substituted and though it may seem to be similar to either nominal or verbal substitution, the difference is the presupposed anaphoric reference [10].

Though substitution and ellipsis are similar in their function as the linguistic link for cohesion, ellipsis differs in that it is "substitution by zero" [10]. Ellipsis refers to a presupposed anaphoric item although the reference is not through a "place-marker" like in substitution. The presupposed item is understood through its structural link. As it is a structural link, ellipsis operates through nominal, verbal and clausal levels [13]. Writers further classify ellipsis in systemic linguistic terminology as deictic, numerative, epithet, classifier and qualifier [10]. A conjunction is described as a "cohesive tie between clauses or sections of text in such a way as to demonstrate a meaning pattern between them" [13]. Other writers indicate that "conjunctive relations are not tied to any particular sequence in the expression [10]. Therefore, amongst the cohesion-forming devices within the text, conjunction is the least directly identifiable relation. Conjunction acts as a semantic cohesive tie within text in four categories: additive, adversative, causal and temporal [10].

Additive conjunction acts to structurally coordinate or link by adding to the presupposed item and is signalled through *and, also, too, furthermore, additionally* etc. Additive conjunction may also act to negate the presupposed item and is signalled by *nor, and ... not, either, neither* etc. Adversative conjunctions act to indicate "contrary to expectation" and are signalled by "yet, though, only, but, in fact, rather" etc. Causal conjunction expresses *results, reason and purpose* and is signalled by *go, then, for, because, for this reason, as a result, in this respect*, etc. The last conjunctive category is temporal and linked by signalling sequence or time. Some sample temporal conjunctive signals are *then, next, after that, next day, until then, at the same time, at this point* etc. [10].

Lexical cohesion differs from the other cohesive elements in text in that it is non-grammatical [13]. Lexical cohesion refers to the "cohesive effect achieved by the selection of vocabulary" [10]. The two basic categories of lexical cohesion are *reiteration* and *collocation*. Reiteration pertains to the repetition of a lexical item, either directly or through the use of a synonym, a superordinate or a generally related word. Collocation pertains to lexical items that are likely to be found together within the same text [10]. Collocation occurs when a pair of words is not necessarily dependent upon the same semantic relationship but rather they tend to occur within the same lexical environment. The closer lexical items are to each other between sentences, the stronger the cohesive effect [10].

1.2.3. Coherence

Contextual meaning, at the paragraph level, is referred to as "coherence" while the internal properties of meaning are referred to as "cohesion" [13]. Coherence refers to how the parts of a piece of writing are linked together to form a whole. While cohesion pertains chiefly to links among sentences and within them, coherence is the broader characteristic of the unity of the text as a whole. Other writers add to this discussion by arguing that:

"Cohesion is only one component of coherence. In addition to cohesion, at least one other factor like situational consistency adds coherence to the text.... Cohesion exists within the text and adds to the coherence of the text.

It may be useful to think of coherence as something the reader establishes – or hopes to establish in the process of reading connected discourse...

Coherence is both a text-related and a reader-related phenomenon" [16].

Other hand, intimated that coherence is not something which exists in the language, but something which exists in people. It is people who make sense of what they read and hear. They try to arrive at an interpretation which is in line with their experience of the way the world is [15].

1.2.4. Semantic relations

The approach to text analysis that emphasizes the interpretative acts involved in relationships such as *phenomenon-reason, cause-consequence, instrument – achievement* and such like is *clause-relational* [17]. When segments of a text are compared or contrasted with one another, then we may talk of matching relations, which are also extremely common. *Logical sequencing* and *"matching* are the two basic categories of the clause-relational approach [17]. Cohesive markers create links across sentence boundaries and pair and chain together items that are related: we have to interpret the ties and make sense of them [17]. Making sense of a text is an act of interpretation that depends as much on what we as readers bring to a text as what the author puts into it [17]. Certain patterns in text reoccur time and time again and become deeply ingrained as part of our cultural knowledge. These patterns as 'textual patterns'. These patterns are manifested in regularly occurring functional relationships between bits of the text. These bits may be phrases,

clauses, sentences or groups of sentences. He refers to these bits as "textual segments" to avoid confusion with grammatical elements and syntactic relations within clauses and sentences. A segment may sometimes be a clause, a sentence, or sometimes a whole paragraph [17].

1.3. Empirical studies

Cohesion and coherence in ESL Students' writing compared with the writing of native English speakers [12]. A writer analysed six (6) essays on argumentative text using Halliday and Hasan's (1976) cohesion Theory. He measured the coherence in the essays using holistic ratings and interactive text analysis based on Austin's Speech Act Theory. The results revealed that for a text to be coherent, an ESL essay did not need to be coherent. He also found that general cohesion density was not found to be a discriminating factor between native speakers and ESL writers. The study also revealed that ESL writers were found, however, to lack the variety of lexical cohesive devices used by the native speakers. Finally, the findings also showed that inadequate justification for claim statements, and insufficient linking of concluding statements to preceding subtopics of the problem characterised ESL writers. Despite the invaluable insights this study has contributed to the literature, the use of only six (6) essays on argumentation by both native speakers' writings and ESL writings is not representative enough to make such a generalisation. Such a small sample size does not justify such findings. Besides, given the small sample size, the sampling procedure could have also settled on ESL writers who have poor entry behaviour and that could have imparted the findings [12].

A similar study analysed comparatively English and Persian research articles (Linguistics, Literature, and Library and Information disciplines) in terms of the number and degree of utilization of sub-types of lexical cohesion to appreciate textualization processes in the two languages concerned. The study analysed sixty (60) research articles (30 articles in each language) in terms of lexical cohesion. The findings of the study revealed that there are variations in the order of occurrence of these sub-types of lexical cohesion. However, in both data, the study revealed that the most frequent sub-types are repetition, collocation and synonymy. Besides, the results also showed that in the English data, the general tendency is towards the use of repetition and collocation, but the Persian data showed the general tendency is towards the use of repetition and synonymy. The findings of this study underscore the relevance of these cohesive devices and the sense of relations to students of ESL, and practitioners involved in communicative practices and research [18].

Writers asserted that the variations at the cultural level between the Arabic-speaking and the English-speaking communities have a direct effect on the rhetorical organization of Arabic and English texts as evident in the different ways in which cohesive devices are used. To test the influence of these cultural differences on the use of cohesive devices on written texts produced in the two languages, translationally- equivalent parallel texts comprising three Arabic short stories and their English translations as well as contextually-equivalent parallel texts consisting of three Arabic short stories were analysed in terms of the cohesive devices that they used [19]. The analysis revealed that Arabic and English used different cohesive patterns. Arabic cohesion is characterised as context-based, generalized, repetition oriented and additive. In contrast, English cohesion is described as text-based, specified, change-oriented and non-additive. This study therefore presupposes that the cultural differences between the two speech communities are directly responsible for the different use of cohesive devices in the two languages [19].

Cohesion Theory and discourse analysis techniques are structured via semantic ties to create a texture which creates a context for meaning [10]. Cohesion in text creates one kind of texture through the ties that coordinate ideas and experiences, and texture is one of the three meta-functions for creating meaning within language. This study is similar to the current study since both studies used the same theoretical and conceptual framework.

They also differ in the sense that the studies used different data from different contexts. It will be intriguing to see how the findings will differ or will be similar [13].

2. Methodology

This study draws on Discourse Analysis and Halliday and Hasan's Cohesion Theory in 1976 as analytical tools [10]. The text sample for analysis was chosen from one of Nelson Mandela's speeches which he delivered in his defence at his trial for sabotage and attempting violent overthrow of the South African State in 1964. The text was numbered and codified in terms of cohesive categories. The text was then analysed based on the cohesive devices, and how these techniques create a semantic relation within the text. The summaries of the cohesive categories were then arranged in tabular form. The recurrent themes were codified according to the following abbreviations: PR=Personal reference, CON= Conjunction, COMR=Comparative reference, DR= Demonstrative Reference, SUB=Substitution, LC=Lexical Cohesion, R= Repetition, SYNO=Synonyms, ANTO=Antonyms, and E=Ellipsis.

2.1. Description and Treatment of Data

This section of the research described the data as a political discourse and showed the procedures of how the data was processed before the analysis.

2.1.1. Description of Data

The text is an extract from Nelson Mandela's speech which he delivered in his defence at his trial for sabotage and attempting violent overthrow of the South African State in 1964. Since 1960, Mandela has been the leader of *Umkhonto we sizwe (spear of the nation)*, the armed wing of the political party the African National Congress [20]. The ANC had been banned for its opposition to the South African government's system of apartheid, a strict policy of racial segregation that repressed the black South African majority [20]. In his defence, Mandela spoke both as an experienced lawyer and a political activist. He and his co-accused *Umkhonto we Sizwe* members received life sentences and Mandela was imprisoned from 1964 to 1990 [20].

2.1.2. Treatment of Data

The researcher first extracted Nelson Mandela's speech from Montefiore's book in 2007 entitled *Speeches That Changed the World* [20]. The text was then closely read to determine whether or not there were cohesive devices. If there were, how do they help create semantic ties within and beyond the boundaries of the paragraph to ensure coherence and textuality? The speech was then typed and given line numbers. These line numbers were the basis of the reference points for the analysis of the text (see below for illustration of the line numbers).

I am the First Accused

By Nelson Mandela

- 1. I hold a Bachelor's Degree in Arts and practised as an attorney in Johannesburg for a number*
- 2. years in partnership with Oliver Tambo. I am a convicted prisoner serving five years for*
- 3. leaving the country without a permit and inciting people to go on strike at the end of May*

4. 1961.

5. ...*The lack of human dignity experienced by Africans is the direct result of the policy of white*

6. *supremacy. White supremacy implies black inferiority.*

7 *Legislation designed to preserve white supremacy entrenches this notion. Menial tasks in South*

8 *Africans are invariably performed by Africans. When anything has to be carried or cleaned the*

9 *white men will look around for an African to do it for him, whether the African is employed by*

10 *him or not. Because of this sort of attitude, whites tend to regard Africans as a separate breed.*

11 *They do not look upon them as people with families of their own; they do not realize that*

12 *They have emotions – that they fall in love like white people do; that they want to be*

'Africans want to be paid a living wage.'

13 *with their wives and children like white people want to be with theirs; they want to earn*

14 *enough money to support their families properly, to feed and clothe them and send them to school.*

15 *And what 'house-boy' or 'garden-boy' or labourer can ever hope to do this?*

16 *Pass laws, which to the Africans are among the most hated bits of legislation in South Africa,*

17 *render any African liable to police surveillance at any time. I doubt whether there is a single*

18 *African male in South Africa who has not at some stage had a brush with the police over his*

19 *pass. Hundreds and thousands of Africans are thrown into jail each year under pass laws.*

20 *Even worse than this is the fact that passing laws keeps husband and wife apart and leads to the*

21 *breakdown of family life.*

22 *Poverty and the breakdown of family life have secondary effects. Children wander about the*

23 streets of the townships because they have no schools to go to, or no money to enable them to

24 go to school, or no parents at home to see that they go to school, because both parents

25 (if there are two) have to work to keep the family alive. This leads to a breakdown in moral

26 standards, to an alarming rise in illegitimacy, and to growing violence which erupts not only

27 politically, but everywhere. Life in the townships is dangerous. There is not a day that goes by

28 without somebody being stabbed or assaulted. Violence is carried out in the townships in

29 the white living areas. People are afraid to walk alone in the streets after dark.

30 Housebreakings and robberies are increasing, even though the death sentence can now

31 be imposed for such offences. Death sentences cannot cure the festering sore.

32 Africans want to be paid a living wage. Africans want to perform work which they are

33 capable of doing, and not working which the Government declares them to be capable of.

34 Africans want to be allowed to live where they obtain work, and not be endorsed out of an

35 area because they were not born there. Africans want to be allowed to own land in places

36 where they work, and not to be obliged to live in rented houses which they can never call their

37 own. Africans want to be part of the general population, and not confined.

38 Above all, we want equal political rights, because without them our disabilities will be

39 permanent. I know this sounds revolutionary to the whites in this country because the

40 majority of voters will be Africans. This makes the white man fear democracy.

41 But this fear cannot be allowed to stand in the way of the only solution which will guarantee

42 racial harmony and freedom for all. It is not true that the enfranchisement of all will result in

43 racial domination. Political division, based on colour, is entirely artificial and, when it

44 disappears, and so will the domination of one colour group by another. The ANC has spent half a

45 century fighting against racialism. When it triumphs it will not change that policy.

'It is an ideal for which I am prepared to die'

46 This then is what the ANC is fighting. Their struggle is a truly national one. It is a struggle of

47 the African people, inspired by their suffering and their own experience. It is a struggle

48 for the right to live.

49 During my lifetime I have dedicated myself to this struggle of the African people. I have

50 fought against white domination, and I have fought against black domination. Have cherished

51 the ideal of a democratic free society in which all persons live together in harmony and with

52 equal opportunities. It is an ideal which I hope to live for and to achieve. But if needs be, it is

53 an ideal for which I am prepared to die [20].

3. Findings and Discussion

The speaker commences by portraying a contrasting two identities in the opening paragraph. This was not just done in jest, but to chronicle the true state of affairs in the town of Johannesburg. He does this remarkably by the use of the first person pronoun, *I*. One, he identified himself not just as a holder of a Bachelor's Degree in Arts, but also a lawyer of no mean standing (an attorney in Johannesburg in partnership with Oliver Tambo). Two, we see a sharp contradiction between his status as a renowned lawyer on one hand, and as a convicted prisoner on the other hand. The reason for his conviction leaves much to be desired; he left his own country without a permit and also for inciting people to go on strike at the end of May 1961. What this presupposes is that the fundamental human right of movement which is inalienable is restricted. Besides, the rights to demonstrate against any act of injustice are curtailed within the town of Johannesburg.

In the second paragraph, the speaker chronicles the true state of power relations between the black South Africans on one hand and the whites on the other hand. The exophoric reference of *...The lack of human dignity...* suffered by the Africans as seen in line 5 echoes the fact that blacks are cruelly oppressed and the whites on the other hand are

the oppressors. We see this through the use of the semantic field of antonyms and the repetition of lexical items and phrases in lines 5 to 6 respectively. The antonyms are seen in *white supremacy* as against *black inferiority*. The phrase *white supremacy* is repeated thrice in lines 5, 6 and 7 respectively. We are also told that this inhuman treatment of the blacks is the direct handiwork of the whites through their *policy* in line 5. In line 7, the use of the lexical item *legislation* which sought to legitimise white supremacy is apparent. The concept of *legislation* that serves the interest of the whites presupposes that the legislative arm of government in South Africa is dominated and controlled by the whites who make laws to serve their whims and caprices at the expense of the blacks. Also, the use of lexical cohesion within this sentence is apparent. The lexical item *preserved* in line 7 is semantically linked to the lexeme *entrenches*. The idea of *this notion* is related to its immediate referent (via anaphoric reference) *white supremacy*.

We also see a phenomenon-example relationship between *the lack of human dignity* in line 5 and *the menial tasks performed by Africans* in lines 7 to 8. This phenomenon-example relationship is further elaborated in lines 9 and 10 when the Africans are reduced to potters and cleaners in their land. This clausal relationship creates a kind of logical sequence which creates a semantic tie beyond the boundaries of the sentences. This therefore creates a context for meaning. Apart from the fact that the cohesive conjunction, in line 10 relates to the previous clauses through a semantic tie, it also demonstrates a cause-consequence relationship between black South Africans doing menial jobs and them being referred to as *separate breeds*. A further consequence of this phenomenon is that black South Africans are at the beck and call of the whites. We see instances of this state of affairs in lines 9 and 10 when the blacks are always at the service of the whites whether they (the blacks) are employed by the whites or not. This re-echoes the superiority and dominance of the whites over the blacks in South Africa. There is also a semantic relation between the lexical item *attitude* (of the whites) in line 10 and its direct consequence of negative perception towards the blacks expressed in lines 11 to 13. There is also a superordinate-homonymous relationship between the lexeme's *emotions* and *love* in line 13. Also, the desire for the Africans to be with *their wives* and the desire *to support, feed and clothe their families* in 13 and 14 are semantically related to the concept of *emotions*. There is also an extra concept of semantic distance between the clauses in lines 14 to 17 and the concept of *emotions* in line 13. This lexical cohesion creates coherence within this paragraph and therefore unearths the meaning of prejudices, inequality and abuse of the Africans by the whites in South Africa. These concepts of abuse, inequality and prejudices are seen in line 15 when the blacks are seen and used as, *house boys, garden boys or labourers*. These concepts are also semantically related to the *menial tasks* performed by the South Africans in line 7.

It is also significant to note that the concept of social injustices and inequality is further elaborated by the use of *pass laws* in lines 16 and 19. The blacks are supposed to hold *passes* to permit them to move about in their motherland. The lexical cohesion in this paragraph is apparent. The lexis: *pass, laws, legislation, and police* belong to the same semantic field of enacting and implementing the laws of a state. There is also an extra concept of semantic distance between the lexeme *police* and *laws*. We also see a causal relationship between lines 18 and 19 in terms of semantic relationship. There is an extra-concept of semantic distance between the clauses.... *had a brush with the police...*, in line 18 and *...Africans are thrown into jail each year...* in line 19. The lexis *hundreds and thousands...* in line 19 also gives us a vivid picture of the mass incarceration of black South Africans. We are also told in line 19 that this degree of incarceration is not only done once in a blue moon but *each year*.

It is also pertinent to observe that from lines 18 to 21 the speaker bemoans a bleak picture of the state of affairs among the people of South Africa through the clausal relationship in the text. For instance, the phrases *a brush with the police, thrown into jail,*

husband and wife apart, and *breakdown of family life* all belong to the same semantic domain of pain and agony of the South Africans.

In lines 22 to 23, the speaker illustrates a cause-consequential relation *between the breakdown of family life* and its *secondary effects*. The African children do not go to school because of poverty and family breakdown which eventually results in the *breakdown of moral standards* and *illegitimacy*.

The text is riddled with lexical density which belongs to the same lexical domain. This semantically knits the sentences together into a unified whole. For instance, the phrase *breakdown in moral standards* in line 25 shares the same componential features with *illegitimacy* and *growing violence* in line 26. Also, the idea of danger as seen in *dangerous* in line 27 belongs to the same semantic field as *stabbing*, *assault* and *violence* in line 28. This renaming of words within the text makes it lexically cohesive and coherent. This lexical cohesion therefore aids in unearthing the meaning of fear and insecurity among the South Africans. In lines 30-31, we see a phenomenon-reason relation between the idea of *housebreaking and robberies* and the imposition of a *death sentence*.

The speaker concluded by sounding a clarion call to his object of oppression to head to the tenets of democracy and observe equal rights for all. He noted it is an ideal which he hopes *to live for* and *to die for*. The use of the antonyms, *to live for* and *to die for* in lines 52 and 53 respectively, illustrate a grave picture of the seriousness of which the speaker attaches to these principles of equity and social justice in South Africa. In other words, the interpretation one may arrive at is that fighting for these rights is a do-or-die affair on the part of the speaker.

Table 1. Summaries of the Cohesive Devices

Summary of Personal/ Demonstrative References		
<i>Referencing Summary</i>		
Personal Reference	Line Reference	Referenced Item
I (hold	1-2	The speaker (via exophoric reference)
him	8-10	The white man
they	11	The white man
Them/their	10-12	Africans
they	10-12	Africans
Their/they	10-13	Africans
their	13	White people
Their/them	10-14	African
I	17	The speaker (via exophoric)
his	18-19	African male
They/them	22-23	Children
They/them	32-33	Africans
they	34-36	Africans
We/our	37-38	Political rights
it	42 (cataphoric)	Africans
it	43-44	Political division
It/their	45-46	The ANC
My/i/Myself	46-49	The speaker(exophoric)
It/i	51-52	Live in harmony
<i>Demonstrative Reference</i>		
Demonstrative reference	Line reference	Referenced item
The (country)	1-3 (exophoric)	South Africa
The (lack of human)	5 (cataphoric)	Africans
this	6-7	White supremacy

the	7-9	White supremacy
This	13-15	Support their families
The (most hated bits of)	16	Pass laws
There (is a single)	17-18	Africans
These (worse than)	19-20	African are thrown into jail
The	20-22	Breakdown of family life
The (school)	23-24	School
This (leads)	23-25	Have to work
The (township)	18-28	In south Africa
The (fact that the death)	30-31	Death sentence
The (festering sore)	25-31	A breakdown in morale
The (general population)	32-37	African want to be....
This (makes)	39-40	The majority of voters
This (fear)	40-41	Fear democracy
The (enfranchisement)	38-42	Equal political right
That (policy)	44-45	Fighting against racialism
This (then)	45-46	That policy
The (African people)	46-47	The ANC
<i>Comparative reference</i>		
Comparative reference	Line reference	Referenced item
Most (hated)	16	Pass law
Worse than (this)	19-20	Africans are thrown into jail
Equal political rights	37-38	Black south Africans

Table 2. Summary of Substitution/Conjunction

<i>Substitution</i>		
Substitution reference	Line reference	Substituted information
This notion	5-7	The policy of white supremacy
To do it (an African)	8	When anything has to be carried
This sort of attitude	8-9	An African to work for a white man
Like white people	11-12	That they fall in love
An area	34-35	There
Their own	36-37	House
<i>Conjunction</i>		
Conjunction	Line Reference	Conjunction Reference
Because (of this sort of)	9-10	To do it for him whether he is.....
Because (they have no schools)	22-23	Children wander about the streets
But (everywhere)	26-27	Which erupts not only politically
Even though	30	House breakings and robberies
Because (without them)	38	We want equal political rights
Because (the majority of voters)	39-40	This sounds revolutionary
But (this fear)	40-41	The white man fears democracy

Table 3. Lexical Cohesion Summary

Summary of Repetition/Synonyms/Anonyms		
<i>Repetition</i>		
Repetition Reference	Line Reference	Referenced Item
I (hold)	1-2 io (am)	The speaker
White supremacy	5-7white supremacy	The white
Africans	5-10 Africans	Blacks
Pass laws	16-20 pass laws	Legislation
Police	17-18 police	General
Family life	22-25 family life	Africans
Schools	23-24 school	Children
Violence	26-28 violence	Rise in illegitimacy
Death sentence	30-31 death sentence	Robberies
Colour	43-44 colour	General
Fighting	45-46 fighting	Racialism
It is a struggle	46-47 it is a struggle	The African people
The African people	47-49 African people	South Africans
I have fought against	49-50 I have fought against	The speaker
Ideal	51-53 ideal	Free society
<i>Synonyms</i>		
Synonyms	Line reference	Referenced items
Emotions	12 love (hyponym)	Africans
House boy	15 garden boy	Africans
Husband and wife apart	20-21 Breakdown of family life	Africans
Poverty	22-23 no money	Africans
Breakdown of family life	22-24 no parents at home	The African child
<i>Antonyms</i>		
Antonyms	Line reference	Referenced item
White supremacy	5-6 (black inferiority)	Africans
White domination	50- (black domination)	General
To live	52-53 (to die)	The speaker

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

The research indicated that there were sufficient phenomenon-example relationships within the text. In other words, there was adequate justification for claim statements within the text. There are also adequate cause-consequential relations in the text. Anaphoric references were commonplace in the text. It was also found out that cataphoric reference was sparingly used in the text. Analysis of the data also revealed that there were 30 instances of personal references, 21 demonstrative references, 3 instances of comparative references, and 6 instances of substitution. There were no instances of ellipsis. There were 7 instances of conjunction as a semantic link. There were 15 instances of repetition, 5 examples of synonyms and 3 instances of antonyms. It is recommended that public speakers and media practitioners take cognisance of cohesive devices and make their write-ups and speeches more cohesive and coherent for their audience and readers to decode meaning. Teachers of English as a second language should give serious attention to the teaching of cohesion as a semantic link within a text since cohesion and coherence aid the readability of a text. Cataphoric references sustain the interest of listeners and readers since they expect information yet to be given. Therefore, it is recommended that teachers of English as a second language should encourage their students to use some cataphors in their essays to create some kind of suspense in their

readers. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) could also be used as an analytical tool to examine how power plays within the text.

Author's Contributions: Conceptualization - AR, EKA and DA; methodology - AR, EKA and DA; validation AR, EKA and DA; formal analysis - AR, EKA and DA; investigation; resources - AR, EKA and DA; data curation - AR, EKA and DA; writing—original draft preparation - AR, EKA and DA; writing—review and editing - ER; visualization - AR, EKA and DA; supervision - AR, EKA and DA; project administration - AR, EKA and DA. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: "This research received no external funding"

Data Availability Statement: Data is available on request from the corresponding author.

Acknowledgement: We acknowledge the respondents for their time and patience.

Conflicts of Interest: "The authors declare no conflict of interest." "No funders had any role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript, or in the decision to publish the results".

References

- [1] Schmitt, N. (2008). Review article: Instructed second language vocabulary learning. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(3), 329-363. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168808089921>
- [2] Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- [3] Sarangi, S., & Slembrouck, S. (1996). *Language, bureaucracy, and social control*.
- [4] Celce-Murcia, M., Olshtain E. (2000) *Discourse and Context in language teaching*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [5] Hatch, E. (1992) *Discourse and language education*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [6] Lucy, J. A. (1992). *Language diversity and thought: A reformulation of the linguistic relativity hypothesis*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620843>
- [7] Van Dijk, A. (1989). *Text and Context, Explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse*. New York: Longman Group Ltd.
- [8] Peña, E. D., Bedore, L. M., & Kester, E. S (2015). Assessment of language impairment in bilingual children using semantic tasks: two languages classify better than one. *Int J Lang Commun Disord*. 51(2), 192-202. doi: 10.1111/1460-6984.12199. Epub 2015 Nov 6. PMID: 26541642; PMCID: PMC5902179.
- [9] Mirzapour, F. (2011). *Study on Lexical Cohesion in English and Persian Research Articles: A Comparative Study*. "Journal of English Teaching". Vol.: 4(4), 245-254.
- [10] Halliday, M. A. K., Hasan R. (1976) *Cohesion in English*, Longman Group Ltd. New York.
- [11] Carrell, P. (1982) *Cohesion is not Coherence*, "TESOL Quarterly", 16(4): 470-88
- [12] Connor, U. (1984) *A study of cohesion in English as a second language students' writing*, "Research on Language and Social interaction", 17(3): 301-316
- [13] Renkema, J. (2004). *Introduction to Discourse Studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [14] Ballard, K. (2001). *The Frameworks of English*, Palgrave, New York.
- [15] Yule, G. (1996). *The study of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [16] Irwin, J. W. (1980). The Effect of Linguistic Cohesion on Prose Comprehension. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 12(4), 325-332. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10862968009547385>
- [17] McCarthy, M. J. (1991). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [18] Gilakjani, A., & Ahmadi, M. (2011). A Study of Factors Affecting EFL Learners' Comprehension and Strategies for Improvement. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2, 977-988. <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.2.5.977-988>
- [19] Mohammed, H. A. & Omer, R. M. (2000). *Texture and Culture: Cohesion as a Marker of Rhetorical Organisation in Arabic and English Narrative Texts*. "RELC Journal". Vol. 31(2), 45-75.
- [20] Montefiore, S. S. (2007). *Speeches that changed the world*. London: Quercus Publishing Ltd.