

COHESIVE DEVICES IN SELECT NIGERIAN LEGAL DISCOURSE

Abstract

This study examines the cohesive devices used in the language of affidavits to identify how different types of devices are used in affidavits to portray meaning. The study is limited to twenty affidavits of four different subject matters from two different courts in Anambra State. They are – affidavit of loss, affidavit of personal identification, affidavit as to change of ownership, and statutory declaration of age. The study which has not received much attention in the language study reveals that affidavits are full of anaphoric reference ties. These cohesive devices are used to avoid linguistic redundancy.

Introduction

Language is the inevitable medium of presentation in the various arenas of the law where legal texts, spoken or written, are generated in the service of regulating social behaviour. It has been defined by various linguists as natural phenomena, used as an instrument of thought expression by man in a string of communication (Holsti, 1961; Webb and Sure, 2000). The richness of language resources avails a speaker or writer with a set of system from which he could make a choice to express his ideas or views. This is why it is possible in a language to convey approximately the same information in two or more different linguistic constructs.

Affidavit is defined as “a statement, usually of facts, made in writing, signed by a person and declared by him on oath to be true” (Aguda, 1999:183). Most studies on legal discourse generally deal on the legal language (Mellinkoff, 1963; Crystal and Davy, 1969; Crystal, 1987; Tiersma (1989, 2003). Alabi, (2003) works on the stylistics of legal discourse generally while Onadeko, (1998) examines the discourse analysis of interactions in the courtroom. There are also works on the cohesive structures in legal documents in broad and legislative texts (Kurson, 1984; Bhatia, 1989; 1993). In linguistics and other areas where affidavits have been studied, little effort has been made to exclusively address the discourse devices in them. This singular point however, makes the subject of affidavits and its discourse (cohesive) devices worth studying in the Nigerian context.

Methodology

The data for the study were collected from the High Courts of Nnewi and Onitsha in Anambra State. For an exhaustive analysis, only twenty affidavits of four different subject matters would be studied. These are: affidavit of loss, affidavit of personal identification, affidavit of change of ownership and affidavit of declaration of age. The samples were photocopies of sworn, signed and stamped affidavits from the various courts mentioned above. The data were analysed, using insights from Halliday and Hassan's (1976) framework for cohesive relations in texts. This study intends to focus on these affidavits with the aim of describing their nature via purely linguistic terms by applying cohesive devices. The focus on affidavits is considered relevant because there is an increase on the use of affidavits. The relevance of discourse devices to the language of law would be shown. The subject matters are labelled Text 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively. Each comprises five affidavits labeled 'A, B, C, D and E' respectively.

Table 1: Sub - Categories of Studied Data from the two Courts

Affidavit of loss (Text 1)	Affidavit of Personal Identification (Text 2)	affidavit as to Declaration of Age (Text 3)	Affidavit of change of ownership (Text 4)
A B C D E	A B C D E	A B C D E	A B C D E

Sentence Connective Devices

These are devices that are used to achieve cohesion in a text or discourse. Cohesion is present in a text when the decoding of elements in the text is tied to semantic presupposition. The items of language used to achieve cohesion in a text are called cohesive devices. Two types of these devices that can be identified in affidavits are grammatical cohesive devices and lexical cohesive devices. Grammatical cohesive devices are items of grammar that are engaged in a text to ensure connectedness. Lexical cohesive devices are items of lexicon (lexemes) that are engaged in a text to ensure connectedness in the meaning relations between words.

Grammatical cohesive devices include references, substitution, ellipses and conjunction. Lyons defines reference as the relationship which holds between an expression and what the expression stands for in the outside world (1977: 174). Therefore, the major characteristic of reference is its ability to pick out an item or entity from within or without a text. References can be exophoric (situational) or endophoric (textual).

Exophoric reference is a form of context dependence, since without the context, we cannot interpret what is said (Halliday and Hassan, *ibid.*). Endophoric reference points at the items within a text in a forward or backward fashion. Only endophoric reference is cohesive. Exophoric reference contributes to the creation of text; it links the language with the context of situation; it does not integrate one passage with another so that the two form part of the same text (Halliday and Hassan, *ibid.*). Endophoric reference is classified into two; anaphoric and cataphoric references. Anaphoric reference is achieved largely with personal pronouns and demonstratives but is sometimes done with any other element that simply establishes an anaphoric link. Cataphoric references could be made with the following: third person pronouns, third person pronouns with delayed referents, a special use of it, usually working in conjunction with nominal uses and demonstratives.

Substitution is the relation between linguistic items, such as words or phrases (Halliday and Hassan, 1976: 89). It could be nominal, verbal or clausal. Nominal substitution always functions as head of a nominal group and can substitute only for an item which is head of a nominal group (Halliday and Hassan, 1976: 91). Verbal substitution operates as the head of a verbal group in the place that is occupied by the lexical verb. In clausal substitution, what is presupposed is not an element within the clause but an entire clause (Halliday and Hassan, 1976: 130). The words used mostly as substitutes are 'so' (positive) and 'not' (negative).

Ellipsis is the substitution by zero. It simply means the omission of an item. It is something that is left unsaid but understood. The characteristic function of ellipsis is that of cohesion by presupposition (Halliday and Hassan, 1976: 177). It is normally an anaphoric relation, because most of the presupposed items are found in the preceding text. There are nominal, verbal and clausal ellipses. Nominal ellipsis involves the upgrading of a word functioning as deitic, numerative, epithet or classifier from the status of modifier to the status of head (Halliday and Hassan, 1976: 148). The deitic is normally a determiner; the numerative - a numeral or other quantifier; the epithet - an adjective; and the classifier - a noun. Verbal ellipsis could be lexical or operator while clausal ellipsis could be modal or propositional.

Conjunctions express certain meaning which presupposes the presence of another component in a discourse (Halliday and Hassan, 1976: 226). They refer to the connection of sentences into units of meaning in a discourse. Conjunctions like; and, but or conjuncts such as; however, yet, so, etc. are used to make explicit the meaning relationship between the sentences (Aremo, 1997: 241). Lexical cohesive devices are items of lexicon that are engaged in a text to ensure connectedness in the meaning relations between words. They include; synonym, antonym, hyponym, homonymy, polysemy and collocation. Synonym describes the relations that exist between words, which express similarity in meaning. Antonym refers to the notion of oppositeness in meaning. Odebunmi (2006:66-67) classifies antonym into gradable and non-gradable. Gradable antonyms show oppositeness in terms of degree, since they can express comparative and superlative ideas. The non-gradable antonyms reveal polar contrast. Hyponym is used for the notion of inclusion between words. The general term that encompasses all other subordinate terms is referred to as superordinate upper term while the entire subordinate terms are called co-hyponyms.

Homonym is the relationship that exists between words that have the same structure/form but different meanings. Polysemy refers to the relation of multiple senses. Polysemic words can generate several meanings which may be ambiguous if not properly contexted. Collocations are words that come together through common usage. Two main categories of collocation are fixed and free collocations. Fixed collocation is a group of words, which behave semantically as an individual unit like; idiomis, which have meaning beyond the ordinary meaning of words. Free collocation is a group of words which behave as an individual unit. It is otherwise called suffixed collocation. It is pertinent to state that it is only when the cohesive (discourse) devices are successfully interpreted that the text can be properly understood.

Table 2. Frequency Distribution of the Types of Discourse Devices and the sub – Devices in the Studied Data

S\N	Cohesive Devices	Affidavit of loss	Affidavit as to Declaration of Age	Affidavit as to change of Ownership	Affidavit of Personal Identification	Total	%
A	Grammatical Category						
i	Reference	85	73	104	85	347	40.4
	Anaphoric	69	55	79	74	277	32.2
	Cataphoric	16	18	25	11	70	8.1
ii	Ellipsis	10	12	8	7	37	4.3
iii	Substitution	26	29	28	33	116	13.5
iv	Conjunction	30	18	27	19	94	10.9
	And	30	18	26	19	93	10.8
	Or			1		1	0.1
b	Lexical Category						
i	Synonymy	23	14	22	11	70	8.1
ii	Antonymy	2	1	2		5	0.6
iii	Hyponym	3	1	2	1	7	0.8
iv	Collocation	14	18	26	16	74	8.6
v	Repetition	30	29	28	22	109	12.7
	Total	223	195	247	194	859	99.9

Our study reveals that the occurrences of the discourse marker, 'reference' (anaphoric) were on the high side compared to the other discourse markers. The lexical category 'antonym' on the other hand, has the lowest percentage in the studied data.

Data Analysis

This analysis is guided by the discussion on cohesion as presented in Halliday and Hassan (1976), Arua (1987), Palmer (1996) and Aremo (1997).

Grammatical Cohesive Category

Grammatical cohesive devices involve reference, ellipses, substitution and conjunction.

Reference – In the affidavit, two classes of reference are evident; cataphoric and anaphoric. There are 594 grammatical devices and 347 references (277 anaphoric and 70 cataphoric) in the affidavits studied.

Anaphoric Reference – Some of the examples are shown below –

That I was issued with *Certificate No. 156887 of 1978* by the Authority concern.

That *the said document* got lost as a result of misplacement and every effort made to recover same proved abortive, hence this Sworn Declaration. **(Text 1C)**

That I am desirous of opening a personal Savings Account with *Skye Bank Plc Onitsha Branch*, Anambra State of Nigeria hereinafter called 'The Bank'.

That *the Bank* required this affidavit for personal identification and record purposes. **(Text 2E)**

That *I. U. K.* is my *biological son*.

That *his* birth was not officially registered hence this affidavit. **(Text 3A)**

That my late father bought a plot of land for and on behalf of my elder brothers – *S. A. and M. A.*

That *my elder brothers* authorized me to erect batches (containers) for the time being. **(Text 4D)**

In **Text 1C** above, 'the said document' is used to refer back to the 'certificate No. 156887 of 1978' mentioned earlier. It is used to connect the two statements and to avoid unnecessary repetition of the lexical item being referred to.

In **Text 2E**, 'the Bank' makes backward reference to *Skye Bank Plc Onitsha Branch*. It is used to make the statements coherent for fast reading and understanding.

In **Text 3A** above, the statement, 'his' points back to the speaker's son 'I. U. K.' whose name was mentioned in the previous statement. Also, 'biological son' refers back to the speaker's son 'I. U. K.'. The cohesion holds the texts together.

In **Text 4D**, 'my elder brothers' refers back to the two earlier mentioned names 'S. A. and M. A.'. The anaphoric reference is used to connect the two statements together for a better comprehension. In essence, those reference words above show that readers cannot make complete sense of the structures they are looking at if they do not look elsewhere in the text, maybe forward or backward.

Cataphoric References – A number of statements in the sampled data that contain cataphoric reference are shown below:

I, C. A., male, a Christian and a true citizen of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, of Bengen Investment Limited, New Market Road, Onitsha Anambra State, do hereby make oath and declare as follows – **(Text 1A)**

That I am desirous of opening a personal Savings Account with *Skye Bank Plc Onitsha Branch*, Anambra State of Nigeria hereinafter called '*The Bank*'. **(Text 2E)**

That *my son O.C.S.* was born on the 29th day of September, 1983 at General Hospital Onitsha North L.G.A, Anambra State. **(Text 3D)**

That the aforementioned Motor Vehicle developed a major mechanical fault which affected the *Old Engine Number A12-663225E*. **(Text 4A)**

In **Text 1A**, the first person pronoun *I* points to the later person '*C. A.*'. Other words in that example are used to give the readers more information about the pronoun *I*.

In **Text 2E** above, '*Skye Bank Plc, Onitsha Branch*' refers to the later lexical item '*The Bank*'. Meanwhile, it informs the readers that 'the bank' in question is '*Skye Bank Plc, Onitsha Branch*'.

The cataphoric reference in **Text 3D** above, 'my son' points forward to 'O.C.S.' which is the name of the speaker's son. It gives the readers more information about the speaker's son. It also helps in making the statement coherent.

Text 4A contains the lexical items 'Old Engine Number' which points forward to the number 'A12-663225E'. It gives clear information about the old engine no of the vehicle. The reference connects the old and new engines of the car.

Ellipsis - From the studied data, below are the examples of ellipsis:

That I sat and passed for the First School Leaving Certificate Examination in the year 1978 at the said school. (**Text 1C**)

That the said bank, said that I should get an affidavit from High Court. (**Text 2D**)

That I replaced same with another **Engine Block in use is A78 – 675448F** which I removed from my vehicle, with Registration Number **LT 765 - KIP**.

That the **Correct Engine Block in use is A78 – 675448F**. (**Text 4A**)

In **Text 1C** above, two sentences can be generated from it. The first one 'That I sat for the First School Leaving Certificate Examination in the year 1978 at the said school' is omitted. But, the meaning still remains because the two clauses are joined together with the co-ordinating conjunction 'and'.

The statement in **Text 2D** contains ellipsis. The reason why the bank requested for the affidavit is not stated, but it is implied; 'That the said bank, said that I should get an affidavit from High court'; probably, for identification purposes.

There is no instance of ellipsis in **Text 3 (Affidavit of Declaration of Age)**.

In **Text 4A** above, something is omitted. When one says 'the correct engine block in use', one asks questions like '...in use, where and how?' If the omitted item is included, the statement becomes 'That the **Correct Engine Block in use** 'in my new vehicle' is **A78 – 675448F**. It is implied in the second statement but is explicitly stated in the first one.

Substitution – Here, explicit counters like 'one', 'do', 'so' or 'same' are used as place markers for what is replaced. Below are some of the examples of substitution in the data:

That the said document got lost as a result of misplacement and every effort made to replace *same* proved abortive, hence this sworn declaration. (**Text 1C**)

That I make '*this solemn affidavit*' in good faith, believing '*same*' to be true and correct by virtue of Oaths Act of 1990. (**Text 2E**)

Due to the absence of the Registry, the birth on the 25th September, 1989 of A. D. E. was not registered and he has no birth certificate.

I know of *the fact in No. 5 above* because I was already an adult at the time of the birth of A.D.E. (**Text 3E**)

That I shall be willing and ready to remove the batches (containers) whenever told to do *so* by my brothers in order to develop the land or for any other reason. (**Text 4D**)

In **Text 1C** above, the statement, 'same' is used to substitute another thing – 'the said document'. This is an example of nominal substitution because the substituted item is a noun. The substitute is used to prevent repetition of the noun, 'document'.

In **Text 2E**, 'same' is used to replace the lexical item 'this solemn affidavit'. In the statement, the speaker still believes that 'this solemn affidavit is true and correct'. Therefore, the readers should understand that the second item 'same' is seen as a substitute for the first item 'this

solemn affidavit' in that statement. The substitute and the substituted perform the same function, making the statements more pleasant. In essence, it is an example of nominal substitution.

In **Text 3E**, there is an example of a clausal substitution. The lexical items 'the fact in No. 5 above' is used as a substitute for the clause, 'the birth on the 25th September, 1989 of A. D. E. was not registered and he has no birth certificate due to the absence of the Registry'.

An example of substitution in **Text 4D** above, 'so' is used to replace the clause, 'to remove the batches (containers)'. This is an example of clausal substitution. The speaker, instead of repeating the clause, 'to remove the batches', uses 'so' to avoid a clumsy statement. This substitution is relevant to a legal document like affidavit because legal language is based on total grammaticality. And cohesive devices like substitutions are used to achieve that.

Conjunction – In the studied data, the types of conjunction that are evident are mainly; 'and', and 'or'. The conjunction, 'or' occurs in few places while 'and' is very common. The examples are below -

That I deposed to these facts for official *and* record purposes *and* for the information of the authorities concerned to take note. (**Text 1A**)

That the Bank required this affidavit for personal identification *and* record purposes. (**Text 2E**)

And that I make this solemn declaration in good faith *and* in accordance with the oath Law of 1990. (**Text 3D**)

That I swear this affidavit for record/reference purposes, *and* to avoid any embarrassment from any Law enforcement agents when operating on the road. (**Text 4B**)

In **Text 1A** above, the conjunction 'and' is used to join the clauses together. Without the conjunction, the statement would have been three, thereby involving many repetitions –

That I depose to these facts for official purpose.

That I depose to these facts for record purpose.

That I depose to these facts for the information of the authorities concerned to take note.

Another instance of the conjunction 'and' is seen in the statement from **Text 2E** where two clauses are joined together with 'and'. The joined clauses have the same grammatical status. The conjunction is also used to include additional information to the existing one.

In **Text 3D**, the conjunction 'and' is used to join two clauses together. The conjunction is also used to show a semantic relation, in a way that what is to follow is systematically connected to what has gone before. It is also used at the beginning of the statement to introduce or emphasize an additional point. Two possible clauses of the same grammatical class that can be derived from the above construction (**Text 3D**) are –

And that I make this solemn declaration in good faith.

And that I make this solemn declaration in accordance with the oath Law of 1990.

Text 4B contains constructions that are joined together with the coordinating conjunction 'and'. The conjunction is used to include additional information. Without the conjunction, the construction would be;

That I swear this affidavit for record/reference purposes.

That I swear this affidavit to avoid any embarrassment from any Law enforcement agents when operating on the road.

In essence, the above clauses that are joined together are indirectly cohesive. They are used to make explicit the meaning relationship between the clauses or sentences (Aremo, 1997:241).

Lexical Cohesive Category

The lexical devices that are evident in the studied data are: repetition, synonym, antonym, hyponym and collocation.

Repetition – The repetition of lexical items within a text could be exact or with a similar word as shown in the examples below:

That I am the deponent in *this affidavit*.

That I have not received year 2000 Bonus issue quoted Certificate which was lost in transit, hence *this affidavit*.

That every effort made to trace the said Share Certificate No. 161236 with 372 units proved abortive hence *this affidavit*.

And that I make *this affidavit* in good faith, believing the content to be true and correct in accordance with the provision of the Oaths Act of 1990. (**Text 1A**)

That I am the owner of *stall* at zone 5 No. 102 – 16C main market, Nnewi in Nnewi north local government area of Anambra.

That I purchased the said *stall* from **MR. J.A.U.** of Obiagu Nnewi in the Nnewi North Local Government Area of Anambrs State.

That an agreement for the transfer of the said *stall* was prepared, signed and executed between me and **MR. J.A.U.** (**Text 4C**)

In **Text 1A** above, the item ‘this affidavit’ is repeated four times to show that it is important and needs to be given special attention.

Also, in **Text 4C**, the lexical item, ‘stall’ occurs in three places. The repetition of ‘stall’ is also to make it more noticeable to the readers to understand that it is because of the said stall that the ‘affidavit for change of ownership’ is constructed.

The significance of the above repetitions is to emphasize the subject matter very well so that the readers will take cognizance of it and to prevent any form of mistake. This is to create special effect and draw the attention of the readers to it.

Synonym – The language context determines the most appropriate lexical items that are synonyms. Examples are shown below:

That I am the declarant in *this affidavit*.

That the said document got lost as a result of misplacement and every effort made to recover same proved abortive, hence *this sworn declaration*. (**Text 1C**)

That I am desirous of opening a personal Savings Account with *Skye Bank Plc Onitsha Branch*, Anambra State of Nigeria hereinafter called ‘*The Bank*’. (**Text 2E**)

That I have no *interest* in the said plot of land.

That I hereby denounce my earlier *claim* to the said land. (**Text 4D**)

In **Text 1C**, the two italicised lexical items; ‘this affidavit’ and ‘this sworn declaration’ are synonymous. They portray the same thing. Affidavit is an oath; therefore, ‘sworn declaration’

is used to replace it, to create special effect in the text. The two synonyms result from mere closeness of meaning of words.

In **Text 2E**, there are examples of synonyms. The item 'Skye Bank Plc, Onitsha Branch' is synonymous with the later lexical item 'The Bank'. Meanwhile, the two lexical items can be substituted for each other in the above linguistic contexts. 'The Bank' is more general whereas 'Skye Bank Plc, Onitsha Branch' is specific.

There are no instances of synonyms in **Text 3 (Affidavit of Declaration of Age)**.

In **Text 4D** above, 'interest' and 'claim' are synonymous. Those words can be mutually interchanged in the two contexts above. The above synonyms are got through stylistic differences, which depend on the subject matter of discourse and purpose of communication.

Antonym – This cohesive tie is used to avoid indirect repetition. Here also, the linguistic context of usage dictates the appropriateness of an opposite word. In **Text 1D**, 'got lost' and 'made to recover' are used as antonyms;

That the underlisted particulars that cover the said vehicle *got lost* on November, 2006 at Umuoji Road as a result of theft and all efforts *made to recover* same proved abortive, hence this sworn declaration.

The above lexical items are relational opposites. 'Got lost' as used in the statement above is in contrast to 'made to recover'. The degree of the quality that is described is seen in each pair. In essence, if something is not lost, there would not be any need for making efforts to recover it. Therefore, the above lexical items are used in that linguistic context to refer to a reversal of relationship between a pair of related items.

In **Text 2 (Affidavit of Personal Identification)**, there is no instance of antonym.

In **Text 3 (Affidavit of Declaration of Age)**, there are instances of antonyms. For example, in **Text 3E**, there are relationships of oppositeness across sentences;

I am the *elder brother* of **A. D. E.**

My *younger brother* was born on the 25th September, 1989 at our village at Akpuere, Amaigbo.

In the above statements, 'elder brother' and 'younger brother' are antonyms. The lexical items 'elder' and 'younger' are used to show the relationship between the two brothers – the speaker and the person he is taking the oath for. Therefore, the two lexical items are adjectives and gradable antonyms. They are marked because they reflect features of being graded.

In **Text 4A**, there are cases of antonyms within a statement. For instance, we have the following –

That I *replaced* same with another **Engine Block Number E1234-7865U** which I *removed* from my vehicle with Registration Number **BL 764-YTR**.

In the above construction, 'replaced' and 'removed' are relational opposites. The two lexical items are contrasting and distinguishing between the actions performed by the speaker. However, 'to replace something' means 'to substitute for something' while 'to remove' means 'to take something away from a place'. From the above statement, we understand, through the help of those ties (antonyms) that, the speaker puts away his old car engine and fixes another one.

Hyponym – This type of cohesive device involves entailment. However, there are few hyponyms in the studied data. In **Text 1C**, for example, hyponym is seen in the statement below –

I, **S.N. O.**, a native of Uruagu Nnewi in Nnewi North Local Government Area of Anambra State of Nigeria, female, Christian, citizen of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, *teacher by profession*, do hereby make oath and declare as follows –

In the above statement, the lexical item, ‘teacher’ is a hyponym of the larger item, ‘profession’. Teaching is a profession, and so for an individual to be a teacher entails that the individual is specially trained (professional) for teaching. Therefore, hyponym is the relationship between general lexical items.

In **Text 2A**, there is an example of hyponym;

That I have interest to open an account with *Skye Bank Plc* at No. 42 Port-Harcourt Road, Fegge, Onitsha.

That the said *Bank* said that I should get an affidavit from the High Court.

From the above example, the item ‘Skye Bank Plc’ is a subordinate item to the superordinate item, ‘bank’. The general name ‘bank’ entails different banks in which ‘Skye Bank’ is inclusive. Therefore, the smaller element ‘Skye Bank’ is included in the larger element ‘bank’.

In **Text 3D**, there is an example of hyponym;

I, **O. E. A.**, *male*, Christian, Nigerian and a native of Mgbele in Oguta Local Government Area of Imo State and now residing at No. 7 Yahaya Street, Fegge, Onitsha South Local Government Area of Anambra State do hereby make an oath and declare as follows:

That O. C.S. is my *son*.

In the above statements, ‘son’ is a subordinate item to the superordinate item ‘male’. To say that someone is a ‘male’ entails that the person is a ‘boy, son, husband and father’. Therefore, the smaller item ‘son’ includes ‘male’ and so ‘son’ is a hyponym of ‘male’.

Text 4A has hyponyms across the statements;

That I am the rightful owner of one *Nissan Cherry Saloon Car* with Registration Number AL 654HDS, Engine Number E76- 564334E and Chassis Number MNOTUR128800123P.

That I bought the aforementioned *Motor Vehicle* from MR. J. A. of No. 15, Abagana Lane, Cable Point, Asaba on the 21st day of September, 2007, at the cost of N65, 000.00K (Sixty Five Thousand Naira) only.

The ‘Nissan Cherry Saloon Car’ mentioned in the first statement is a subordinate item to the superordinate item ‘Motor Vehicle’ mentioned in the second statement. Therefore, ‘Motor Vehicle’ is a general item that includes ‘Nissan Cherry Saloon Car’. When you say that somebody has a ‘Nissan Cherry Saloon Car’, it entails that the person has a ‘Motor Vehicle’.

Collocation – Collocation is seen in the statement below–

That I am *bona fide owner* of a Share Certificate No. 765231 with 532 units issued to me by UACN PLC (**Text 1A**)

In the above example, the italicised items are collocates. They move together in sentences. The above group of lexical items are free collocates. They are free in the sense that some other structural words can be added to them and still make sentences containing them well formed.

Collocation is also evident in **Text 2C**;

That I attached *herewith* my personal *passport photograph* duly signed by me.

There are two collocations in the above statement. The first one is 'herewith' while the second one is 'passport photograph'. The first one is a fixed collocation. It passes special message across that need not be changed. It is a combination of an adverb 'here' and a preposition 'with'. The second collocation above is an example of a free one. The word 'passport' must not necessarily go with 'photograph' and vice versa. Therefore, other structural words can be added into them in sentences without making the construction ill formed.

In **Text 3A**, collocations occurred in the statement below –

And that I make this *solemn declaration in good faith* and *in accordance with* the Oath Law of 1990.

In the above statement, there are three collocations – 'solemn declaration', 'in good faith' and 'in accordance with'. In the first lexical item, 'solemn declaration' is a free collocation. The statement can still be well formed if another structural item is added to it. The second and third lexical items, 'in good faith' and 'in accordance with' are fixed collocates. They are phrasal verbs but function like idioms in the sentences where they occur. They are structurally in form of verbs combined with prepositions. 'In good faith', for example means 'the intention to be honest and helpful' while 'in accordance with' something means 'in agreement or harmony with something'.

Also, in **Text 4B**, there are instances of collocation;

That I bought the above mentioned vehicles *second-hand* from one JUKKY INT. NIG. LTD. OF No. 2 Samoja Faola Street Ikeja Lagos on the 31st May, 2006.

The italicised lexical item is an example of collocation. The co-occurrence of the two lexical items, 'second' and 'hand' are not fixed but they habitually move together in sentences. The above is an example of free collocation. Something is said to be 'second-hand' when that thing is 'not new, but was owned by somebody else before'.

Conclusion

The study shows that the cohesive links help to connect words and sentences in a text and that linking in cohesion is achieved through relations in meaning. The analysis, therefore, has drawn attention to the types of sentence connections (cohesion) that characterise affidavits. The study also helps us to account for most of the functions in which language is used for and how they cohere in a legal context. The findings of this study should, therefore, properly increase the linguistic awareness of researchers and also help them to create better and more effective affidavits. The study therefore, concludes that the discourse makers among

sentences in affidavits are full of anaphoric references and that the declarant avoids linguistic redundancy by making use of cohesive (discourse) ties.

References

- Adedeji, E.O. 'Grammatical Ties in English' in Olateju and Oyeleye (eds.) *Discourse in Perspectives on Language and Literature*. Ile-Ife: Obafemi Awolowo University Press Ltd, 2005.
- Aguda, A. *The Law of Evidence* (4th edition). Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd, 1999.
- Akindele, F. 'Coherence and Conversational Implicatures in Casual Discourse' in *Ife Studies in English Language* (ISEL). Department of English; Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile Ife, Nigeria, 1988.
- Alabi, V.A. "Stylistic Features of the Legal Discourse" in Lawal, A. (ed) *Stylistic Theory and Practice*. Ilorin: Paragon Books, 2003. pp. 106-118.
- Asiyanbola, A.A. 'Sentence Connective Devices as Linguistic Tools for English Reading Tasks in a Nigerian ESL Classroom' in Olateju and Oyeleye (eds.) *Perspective on Language and Literature*. Ife: Obafemi Awolowo University Press Ltd, 2005.
- Cherly, S. *What is Really Wrong with Legal Language?* Remarks delivered to the Wills and Estates Section Canadian Bar Association Vancouver, British Columbia. Retrieved on 01/12/2009 from <http://www.plainlanguagenetwork.org/legal/wills.html>, 1990.
- Crystal, D. *The language of the Law. The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- , and Davy, D. *Investigating English Style*, New York: Longman, 1969.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Hassan, R. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman, 1976.
- Kozin, A. *Unsettled Facts: On the Transformational Dynamism of Evidence In the Legal Discourse*. Retrieved on 09/11/2009 from www.plainlanguagenetwork.org/legal/wills.html, 2007.
- Lyons, J. *Language and Linguistics: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Maley, Y. *The Language of the Law, Language and the Law*. London: Longman, 1994.
- Mellinkoff, D. *The Language of the Law*, Boston: Little Brown, 1963.
- Moe, A.J and Irwin, J.W. 'Cohesion, Coherence and Comprehension' in Irwin, J.W. (ed.) *Understanding and Teaching Cohesion Comprehension*. Newark Delaware: International Reading Association, 1986.

- Nwokeocha, N.I. *Fundamentals of Evidence in Nigeria*. Lagos: Bendona and Associates Publishers, 2003.
- Obilande, A.O. *Obilande: The Nigerian Legal System*. Ibadan: Spectrum Law Publishing Company, 1979.
- Olakanmi and Lamikanra, *Evidence Act (Law of the Federation of Nigeria)*. Lagos: Law Lords Publications, 2004.
- Olowe, J.O. 'Cohesion in English of News Paper Reporting' in *Ife Studies in English Language (ISEL)*. Department of English; Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile Ife, 1988.
- Onadeko, T. *Patterns of magistrate court discourse in Nigeria*. *Gege: Ogun Studies in English III*. 121-138, 1998.
- Shaw, G.F. 'Affidavits' – *Dublin: Journal of the Statistical and Social Inquiry Society of Ireland*. Retrieved on 14\01\08 from http://www.nyulaw_global.org/globalex/nigeria.htm. Vol. v, Part xxxv, 1868\1869, pp 13 – 22.
- Tiersma, P. M. *Linguistic Aspects of Legislative Expression*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1989.
- . *The Nature of Legal Language*. Retrieved on 09/11/2009 from www.languageandlaw.org/NATURE.HTM, 2007.