UNIVERSITÉ DU BURUNDI
GRENIER DU SAVOIR DU BURUNDI
Dépôt institutionnel officiel
https://repository.ub.edu.bi

A pragmatic study of some Kirundi proverbs related to hatred

Nahimana, Scholastique; Supervisor: Dr. Sabimana Firmard

2000
UB, FLSH
https://repository.ub.edu.bi/handle/123456789/1540

Document téléchargé depuis le **Grenier du Savoir du Burundi** — https://repository.ub.edu.bi

UNIVERSITY OF BURUNDI
FACULTY OF ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

A PRAGMATIC STUDY OF SOME KIRUNDI PROVERBS RELATED TO HATRED

by

Scholastique NAHIMANA

Supervisor :

Dr. SABIMANA Firmard

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree "**Licence en Langue et Littérature Anglaises** »

Bujumbura, December 2000

DEDICATION

To my dear Husband,

To you my late Mother, you made me what I am,

To you my father,

To you my brothers and sisters,

with love and respect

I dedicate these few pages.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express heartiest gratitude to all people whose joint efforts have brought this work at its completion.

I am mostly grateful to Dr. Firmard SABIMANA, Senior Lecturer at the University of Burundi, department of English Language and Literature, for his valuable guidance. His supportive suggestions, criticisms, detailed and careful comments brought this work to its present shape. I really appreciate his availability in spite of his many academic obligations. My sincere and deepest gratitude is addressed to him.

It would be ungrateful not to be indebted to the English Department staff of the University of Burundi who have been teaching and upbringing me at the University.

Last but not least, my heartiest thanks to my parents, husband, my parents in-law, sisters and relatives who, in one way or another supported me morally and materially during my stydies.

NAHIMANA Scholastique

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS iii

CHAPTER I. THE PROBLEM 1
I.0. Introduction 1
I.1. Background to the problem 1
I.2. Statement of the problem 3
I.3. What is a proverb ? 3
I.4. Motivation 8
I.5. Aims of the study 8
I.6. Scope and delimitation of the study 9
I.7. Structure of the work 9

CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW 10
II.1. Definitions: Pragmatics 10
II.2. Pragmatics Vs semantics 11
II.3. Speech situations 13
II.3.1. Addresser and addressee 13
II.3.2. The context 14
II.3.3. The goal(s) of utterance 15
II.3.4. Setting 15
II.4. Notion of speech act 16
II.5. Meaning 18
II.6. Intentionality 20

CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY 24

III.0. Introduction 24

III.1. Data collection procedures 24

III.2. Encountered difficulties 25

III.2.a. Difficulties related to data collection 25

III.2.b. Difficulties related to translation 25

III.3. Data analysis procedures 26

CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS 28

IV.0. Introduction 28

IV.1. Discord 28

IV.2. Public malignity 30

IV.3. Unhealthy curiosity 32

IV.4. Spreading of malvolence 34

IV.5. The Enemy 36

IV.6. Hypocrisy and duplicity 37

IV.7. Cruelty 40

IV.8. Rancor 42

IV.9. Irreducible wickedness 44

IV.10. To live with one's enemies 46

GENERAL CONCLUSION 49

BIBLIOGRAPHY 51

APPENDIX 55

CHAPTER I: THE PROBLEM

I.O. INTRODUCTION

Proverbs are one of the most important constituents of Burundian literature. Unfortunately, this part of Burundian culture is disappearing because of the expansion of Western literature. Proverbs are means of communication that people use to transmit messages, ideas, thoughts, suggestions, etc. Their shortness make them convincing tools in every day communication.

People use proverbs such as those related to hatred to show some realities about misunderstanding, animosity, rancour, etc. A pragmatic study of Kirundi proverbs related to hatred has to focus on the important values of proverbs such as the sense of knowing who is one's enemy and how he or she behaves, the sense of knowing how to manage one's enemy, etc. These values show how to react in whatever situation related to hatred.

I.1. BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM

Burundians have invented proverbs to reflect their sense of creation, their ability to observe, to think and to solve some of their problems in their daily experiences. For Dzobo (1973), proverbs "*are statements about all aspects of life, its success and failures and its sufferings*"

In whatever situation, Burundians find appropriate proverbs to express their feelings, their suggestions, their pieces of advice, etc. One has to notice that the message transmitted through those proverbs may be bad or good in respect to the "*moral behaviour and the collective character of a people*" (Dzobo, 1973). For our case, the message will be bad if those proverbs advise

us to hate our enemies. The message will be good when those proverbs related to hatred show us how to manage our enemy, how to react in a way contrary to his.

In fact, one knows that proverbs have their characteristics that confer them the quality of being convincing tools, the quality of embodying wisdom. This is so because their accuracy and their concision make them convincing tools. They embody wisdom because they are born from wisemen.

The Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs definies a proverb as "*a popular short saying with words of advice or warning.*" Its important characteristics are conciseness and shortness and it is recognized by its truth, its precision, its advice, etc. They are used in everyday life, in everyday conversation and in all circumstances. Those qualities of proverbs have interested many researchers through different themes related to human behaviours. This is the case of V. MUREKAMBANZE who, in 1989, wrote a thesis entitled "A Pragmatic Analysis of some Kirundi Proverbs". She wrote on proverbs found in a book written by a Murundi playwright named Candide NIYONZIMA. The latter wrote in 1980 a collection of plays which has been published by Imprimerie Nationale du Burundi in 1980 under the title of "UBUNTU MU BANTU".

The proverbs analysed by V. MUREKAMBANZE (1989) suggest people to be faithful, to be stable in their decisions, to maintain their honour. Another person who treated a topic which is related to ours is Edouard NTAMATUNGIRO. He wrote a thesis on "Le thème de la vengeance à travers les contes rundi." Through different Burundian folktales, he shows how Burundians put forward revenge. Something bad done by one person equals another bad thing against him or her.

Another person to mention is Sylvestre NDAYIZEYE who, in 1982, wrote a thesis on "Le concept d'Umwana w'Uwundi ou Absence de solidarité d'après les proverbs rundi". His proverbs show how in Burundian society help is given only to someone whom one is related to for one or another reason. For our case, our proverbs show hatred, animosity, misunderstanding, rancour and spite in Burundian society.

I.2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Man's life is made of both good and bad experiences. Every human being experiences these two things during his or her life. Our interest is centered on ones which show bad experiences. And no one can ignore that hatred is a part of bad experiences in one's life.

Our problem is to find Kirundi proverbs that provide Burundian people with the sense of differentiating one's enemies from friends, the sense of knowing how to manage one's enemies, etc. One has to learn those proverbs, understand them and apply some of them.

I.3. WHAT IS A PROVERB?

The exact meaning of a proverb is not straightforward since it is not easy to differenciate it with some forms of oral literature such as maxims, riddles, etc. However, we have some important writers who have tried to define what a proverb is. This is the case of R. Finnegan (1970 : 393) who says that a proverb is " *a saying in more or less fixed form marked by shortness, sense and salt and distinguished by the popular acceptance of the truth tersely expressed in it.*"

A proverb must be a short sentence which is true and accepted in a given society. For the Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs, a proverb is "*a popular short saying with words of advice or warning.*"

In general, proverbs are probably the most effective and concise way to express the popular wisdom. Dzobo (1973) says that every race or nation has its own proverbs or wise sayings which, in some cases, were collected into writing as its wisdom litrature. They provide means of studying a people, i.e to know how they live, the different relationships between them, their reactions to different situations, etc. They point to some behaviours that are considered as good in society and to others which are considered as bad behaviours. Dzobo (1973) emphasizes the functional aspects of proverbs in saying that.

Proverbs are short meaningful statements about all aspects of life, its successes and failures and its trials and sufferings. They create in us the desire to discover what life does mean in this earthly existence as they express " *long experiences in short sentences.*" They deal with every topic of everyday living, business, dealings, family relations, vice and virtue, poverty and richness, joy and sorrow.

From Dzobo's assertion, one may say that proverbs are a mirror of all domains of life. Through them, every human being, according to his nature, his behaviours, his everday life, must find his appropriate place in a given society.

Being part of literature, proverbs have some appropriate characteristics which differentiate them from other genres of oral literature like folktales, riddles, songs, etc. This is why F.M. Rodegem (1981:47) states that:

Pour être authentique, le proverbe doit répondre à certaines caractéristiques: c'est une sentence populaire, une vérité imagée, concise, parfois rimée qui contient souvent des allitérations, renferme parfois des jeux de mots, toujours elle est rythmée et s'exprime généralement sous forme métaphorique.

In order to be authentic, a proverb must fulfill some caracteristics: It is a popular sentence, a truth transmitted through images, concise, sometimes rimed which often contains alliterations, sometimes with words puzzling, it is always rythmic and generally in metaphoric form

After reading these characteristics of proverb mentioned by F.M Rodegem, the reader or the hearer may notice that a proverb is different from an ordinary sentence. Not all sentences may be accepted as proverbs. Dalfovo (1984) has specified and defined those characteritics:

It may not be possible to establish a universal definition or description of a proverb. Nevertheless a researcher needs at least temporary and relative definition or description to guide him in his survey of this aspect of oral literature.

Dalfovo (1984) proceeds by showing what he takes as characteristics of proverbs.

In compiling this collection, the following understanding of proverb has been adopted: "*a proverb is a short, pithy, fixed, popular, experiential, prescriptive and usually allegorical sentence.*"

And he defines each of the terms:

1° short : A proverb is constituted by a short sentence

2° pithy : The proverbial sentence is pithy, namely, it contains a deeper and vaster meaning than its few words appear at first glance to convey.

3° fixed : A proverb is structured to some extent in fixed linguistic form. More than any other form of oral literature, proverbs are handed down from the past and transmitted into the future in the moving current of tradition.

4° popular: Proverbs are popular, namely, they are known, understood, accepted and used by the people in general.

5° experimental: Proverbs are experimental as they are a collection of the experiences of a people.

6° prescriptive: They are not merely reporting a fact or an experience. Such reporting is a means to relate some truth in a prescriptive way, namely, a guideline for human behaviour and for character formation.

7° allegorical: A proverb develops a metaphor, namely, a meaning that differs from the literal meaning of the words used.

Through those characteristics, we say that proverbs are these well-formed short sentences which are considered as means of expressing a people's wisdom. They usually come from wisemen who find them in people's experiences. These proverbs also refer to different situations.

From the general point of view to the particular one about the studies of proverbs, one may notice that studies on Kirundi proverbs before 1989 are mostly limited. They were centered on the description of proverbs, giving the

main characteritics and explanations of their meaning. They forgot to analyse proverbs in their contexts of use.

As an illustration, Rodegem (1961) and BEPES (1984) have given a French translation of Kirundi proverbs and an explanation of their meaning out of context. The main objective of Rodegem (1961) was only to collect those proverbs according to their alphabetical order and translating them. He mentioned that the uttering of proverbs makes remember dramatic or humorous circumstances and makes allusion to fables. He recognizes also the force of proverbs in setting up order or putting an end to a discussion:

> *Si l'on veut suggérer une ligne de conduite, employer une formule élégante et délicate pour faire un reproche ou avertir discrètement les intéressés, il suffit de citer les premiers mots du proverbe pour clore une discussion, arrêter un différend.*

If one wants to suggest a line of conduct, to use an elegant and delicate formula in making a reproach or discretly warn the beneficiaries, what is necessary is simply to pronounce the first words of the proverb to close the discussion or stop a dispute.

Proverbs are well formed utterances provided by wisemen to advise, to request, to command, etc. They summarize the whole experience of a community. These utterances embody wisedom since they are created by wisemen. They refer to various situations of the society's everyday life. They are introduced in speeches and are very influential on the context despite their shortness. They are convincing in any kind of conversation.

I.4. MOTIVATION

The first reason for choosing this topic: "A pragmatic study of some kirundi proverbs related to hatred" is that, according to my observations, little pragmatic research about Kirundi proverbs related to hatred has been carried out. Everyone knows that the social relationships between Burundians have been destroyed by hatred based on many reasons. These include, for example, the problem of ethnic group, regionalism, problems related to sharing inheritance, etc. Then our motivation is to put forward a deep study of some Kirundi proverbs which show everybody his or her enemy, the degree of hatred and how to manage him.

It is also a favorable occasion of exploring our own culture particularly in the field of social relationships using linguistics and pragmatics. By using the theory of pragmatics, our analysis of selected proverbs within their contextual situation will be a contribution to the study of our culture.

I.5. AIMS OF THE STUDY

The aims of our study are to collect some Kirundi proverbs related to hatred and to study their meaning in the context of burundian society in general and in social relationships in particular. In dealing with this analysis, we need to find an appropriate situation to each proverb that will be present in our research. By doing so, the meaning of that proverb will be somehow clear and easy to understand. We will have to analyse the context and try to interpret the images mentioned in some Kirundi proverbs related to hatred in order to facilitate the understanding.

I.6. SCOPE AND DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

As far as our topic is concerned, this work is mainly centered on some Kirundi proverbs related to hatred. Therefore, we will limit our study to twenty proverbs. But only ten (10) proverbs have been selected to be put in appropriate situations while other ten (10) are in preliminaries. The functions and the meaning embedded by the proverbs dependent upon their respective situations.

In addition, the analysis of selected proverbs related to hatred must be made exclusively in respect to pragmatic principles.

I.7. STRUCTURE OF THE WORK

The study is divided into four chapters: Chapter one presents the research problems. In this chapter, we tried to define each of those research problems. The chapter contains also the motivation for the choice of the topic, its aims, and its scope and delimitation.

Chapter two concerns the literature review, which contains different theories related to linguistics in general and to pragmatics in particular.

Chapter three states the way we have proceeded in collecting and analysing the data.

Chapter four is the pillar of this research. It applies the theories mentioned in literature review to the analysis and interpretation of some Rundi proverbs related to hatred.

The study ends with a general conclusion which summarizes the whole work.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

II.1. DEFINITIONS: PRAGMATICS

Many researchers have attempted to define the term "pragmatics". Although, they did not completely agree on some points, they did not totally disagree either. They have found some common features to this domain. These researchers share the view that, to understand the nature of language, pragmatics is "*a start point*". To illustrate this view, Leech (1981:1) said that "*we can not really understand the nature of language unless we understand pragmatics: how language is used in communication.*"

Some researchers relate pragmatics to the study of meaning of utterances in a relation with contexts or situations. Fasold (1990 : 254) showed it by claiming that pragmatics is the study of the use of context to make inferences about meaning. For him, in order to determine the exact meaning of an utterance, we have to place the utterance in the appropriate context.

Contrary to those who emphasize context or situation in getting the meaning of an utterance, others put emphasis on the relations of signs to interpreters.

Another definition of pragmatics is the one given by Levinson (1983 : 24), who relates pragmatics to appropriateness or felicity; according to him, "*pragmatics is the study of the ability of language users to pair sentences with the contexts in which they would be appropriate.*" In other words, a pragmatic theory must be applied to a well-formed sentence uttered in appropriate context of communication. Pragmatics is a branch of linguistics which deals mainly with the meaning in use, rather than meaning in the abstract.

Coming back to our topic, the utterance of proverbs depends upon the situation and accompanying actions for its interpretation, i.e. when a speaker says a proverb, he communicates his attitudes and his intentions toward a known event, an action or a fact. A hearer has then the opportunity to react against or for the saying. From this point of view, our main concern in this study is then the analysis of the relationship between what is said in communication and what is done in communication. In the field of linguistics in general and pragmatics in particular, a hearer does not have a role of a passive listener. He has to react to the speaker's utterance. He has to be an active participant in the conversation. The uttered sentence has to be also situated in an adequate and precise context. In this case, the illocutionary force contained in the utterance will push the listener to react. Pragmatics has a great importance in the understanding and interpretation of proverbs which constitute the data to be analyzed in this work.

II.2. PRAGMATICS Vs SEMANTICS

Our thesis is a pragmatic analysis of some Kirundi proverbs related to hatred. But, in linguistics pragmatics and semantics are close theories so that there is a problem to make a clear distinction between them. They both deal with MEANING. Syntax, semantics and pragmatics are branches of the same field "semiotics". But in this field, only semantics and pragmatics are theories of meaning.

There are many authors who define and contrast pragmatics and semantics in terms of utterances and sentences respectively. Fasold associates semantics with the truth conditions of sentences, the latter being independent of their use. According to him, pragmatics is, on its part, associated with various

implicatures that arise once utterances occur in context. Levinson (1983 : 18) tries to find that difference through different questions:" *Are they bounds to define pragmatics as the complement of, or the residue left by, semantics in the field of meaning? Is there no conceptual integrity to the scope of pragmatics itself?*"

Many among these researchers make a distinction between semantics and pragmatics by stating a distinction between what have been called "sentence - meaning" and "utterance - meaning". That means that semantics is identified with the study of sentence - meaning and pragmatics with the study of utterance - meaning. But, then, our task is to distinguish "sentence" from "utterance".

According to some linguists, a "sentence" means an abstract theoretical entity defined within a theory of grammar, whereas an "utterance" is the issuance of a sentence in actual, appropriate context or situation. Hurford and Heasley (1983 : 16) have tried also to make a distinction between a "sentence" and "an utterance" in stating that "*a sentence is neither a physical event nor an object. It is conceived abstractly, as a string of words put together by the grammatical rules of language.*"

Stating the definition of an utterance, Hurford and Heasley (1983 : 15) say that:

> *an utterance is the USE by a particular speaker, on a particular occasion of a piece of language, such as a sequence of sentences or sentence or a single phrase, or even a single word.*

Through the difference between "semantics" and "pragmatics" arises the problem of distinguishing "language (langue)" and "language use" (parole). Relating the distinction between "language" understood as "langue" and

"language use" understood as "parole" to the distinction between semantics and pragmatics, we have to state the difference as following: meaning in semantics is defined purely as a property of expressions in a given language, in abstraction from particular situation, speaker or hearer. Pragmatics, however, is defined as relative to a speaker or user of the language. Leech (1983 : 6) has also illustrated it in stating that pragmatics is the study of meaning in relation to speech situations such as :

* Addresser and addressee
* The context of an utterance
* The illocutionary act of an utterance
* Setting, etc.

II.3. SPEECH SITUATIONS

As it has been stated by Dijk (1977 : 1983), we distinguish two functions in a communicative situation. There are the speaking - function and hearing - function. The persons fulfilling the two functions are called "participants": an "addresser" and an "addressee". The field in which they operate is the "context" of the utterance and this utterance delivered by the speaker in an appropriate context and an appropriate setting has a precise goal.

II.3.1. Addresser and Addressee

In any communication system, we have an addresser, who can be either a "speaker" or a "writer". These send a message to an addressee who can be either a "hearer" or a "reader". An addresser is to deliver, to give a meaningful message, in order to be well-understood by the hearer or the reader. Any form of complication on the side of the message will make its interpretation difficult

or even impossible. This is why, for any communicative situation, the addresser has to send a clear and meaningful message so that the addressee will be able to interpret it.

But, there are also other terms in communicative situations that may be confused with the aforementioned terms and for which there is a clear distinction. This is the case of "receiver" and "addressee". Lyons (1977 : 34) has tried to make a clear distinction between these terms.

According to him;

> *a significant distinction can be made between a receiver (a person who receives and interprets the message) and an addressee (a person who is an intended receiver of the message)*

The addresser and the addressee are not sufficient conditions in speech situations. We have also to take into account the context in which the utterance is uttered.

II.3.2. The context

In order to be understood by either the hearer or the reader, any message must be uttered or transmitted in its appropriate and adequate context. As has been stated by Geoffrey N. Leech in his Principles of Pragmatics (1983 : 13),

context is any background knowledge assumed to be shared by speaker and hearer and which contributes to hearer's interpretation of what speaker means by a given utterance.

So, the context has a big contribution in the understanding of any given message. If a speaker utters an utterance in a context which is not appropriate, it will be difficult even impossible to the hearer to get the message. In the case of our proverbs, in order to make them meaningful, we have to find an appropriate and adequate context in which we utter them. Since our topic concerns exclusively proverbs related to the context of hatred, any speaker or writer who wants to show or to give an advice related to hatred must respect and stay in the context of hatred in uttering or writing his proverbs. Also any linguistic communication has a goal or aim.

II.3.3. The goal(s) of utterance.

Before uttering a sentence, one must have a purpose. A reasonable human being cannot deliver an utterance only to utter it. The speaker must have an intention. If one's goal is to show how to avoid his enemy, obligatorily the utterance has to be directed to that goal. Here, to illustrate it, we take the proverb "Iyibize nabi uyima ifu"(to that that boils abnormally, you don't give flour). The utterance of this proverb suggests that if the beginning is bad, you should not continue; you should stop where you are because the following conversation or action may be dangerous to you.

II.3.4. Setting

To talk about setting is to talk about time and place in any communicative situation. A complete and meaningful message has to indicate time and place. Hymes (1964 : 60) gives clarification on setting, both in terms of where and when the event is situated as well as in terms of the physical relations of the interactions with respect to posture and gesture and facial expression, your

expectation will be well fulfilled. To sum up, any speech performance needs these speech situations in order to be well performed. Beside this notion of speech situations, there is another linguistic tool which is of a considerable help in the interpretation of any utterance. This is the notion of speech act.

II.4. NOTION OF SPEECH ACT

The main concern of our topic is linguistic communication. So, all linguistic communications involve linguistic acts or speech acts. When one utters a sentence with a precise goal, that utterance must have a force which pushes the hearer to react for or against it.

Some linguists have worked on this notion. This is the case of Austin (1962) who distinguishes three different types of action involved in or caused by uttering a sentence.

1° Locutionary act: the act of uttering a certain sentence with sense and reference, that is, something which is meaningful, clear and which can be heard and understood by the hearer.

2° Illocutionary act : the act of intending an utterance to perform an act of, for example, agreement, congratulations, praise, etc. In other words, it is an act of using a sentence in order to perform a function.

3° Perlocutionary act: what one brings about or achieves by saying something. In other words, it is the act of uttering a sentence to achieve a certain consequent response from the hearer, for example, to amuse him, to get him to do something, to make him unhappy, to irritate, to inspire, impress, get the hearer to think about, etc.

These speech acts are the "key" of any speech performance. They help in transmitting a meaningful utterance, in intending an utterance to perform an act by saying something.

The main reason for mentioning this theme of speech acts is that in our topic, we are mainly concerned with linguistic communication. So, all linguistic communications involve linguistics acts.

According to searle in his Speech Acts (1969), "*the speech act or acts performed in the utterance of a sentence are in general a function of the meaning of the sentence*".

In our pragmatic analysis of some Kirundi proverbs related to hatred, the notion of speech acts is very important. A proverb, when one delivers it, must have a sense and reference in order to be well-understood and decoded. This is the locutionary act of the proverb. Then when a proverb is meaningful with recognized reference, it is used to perform an act; it has a force, a function. This is the illocutionary act or force of the proverb. For example, we have the following proverb: "Inzoka yakuriye ntiba incuti" (a snake which has bitten you will never become your friend), the illocutionary force is an advice to be always careful with one's enemy. Even if this one pretends to become your friend, do not forget that he used to be your enemy. Be aware of that and try to be careful, because he may harm you in one form or another. The utterer of a proverb with a specific illocutionary force achieves something and expects a certain response from the hearer. This is the perlocutionary act.

The study of meanings of sentences and the study of speech acts are not two independent studies but one study from two different points of view, i.e.

sentence meanings and speech acts are very close. So the notion of speech act is interesting with respect to our topic.

The notion of speech act is very complex to be mentioned as a whole here. The main task in our analysis is to know how to relate these proverbs about hatred to these different speech acts, to know how to utter a meaningful sentence which has a certain force, and function in order to push the hearer to react.

II.5. MEANING

The study of "meaning" is the most important point in our research. In this field of meaning the illocutionary acts are characteristically performed in the utterance of sounds or the making of marks. Now, one may ask himself such question as what is the difference between just uttering sounds or making marks and performing an illocutionary act?

As an answer, one difference is that the sounds or marks one makes in the performance of an illocutionary act are characteristically said to have "meaning" and a second related difference is that one is characteristically said to mean something by the utterance of those sounds or marks. For example, when one speaks, he means something by what he says and what one says, the group of sounds that he produces, is characteristically said to have a meaning. According to Paul Grice (1957 : 377-88) a speaker S means something by X when S intends the utterance of X to produce some effects in a hearer H by means of the recognition of his "intention". This point is very important in the achievement of our work because it makes a connection between "meaning" and "intention" which are the basic tools in the understanding of our proverbs.

In fact, when one is speaking, he attempts to communicate certain things to his hearer by getting him to recognize his intention to communicate just those things. The goal of the speaker is reached when he achieves the intended effect on the hearer by getting him to recognize his intention to achieve that effect. As an illustration, if I utter the proverb "Uwuja kwa mukeba ntakebera" (She who goes to her rival's place does not look aside), my goal will be reached if and only if my hearer recognizes my intention to achieve the effect of my utterance.

My intention is to tell hearer to be careful when he is with his rival. My goal will be reached when my hearer recognizes my intention and when the proverb achieves its intended effect, i.e when the hearer understands that he must be careful while he is with his rival.

However, meaning is more than a matter of "intention". It is also at least sometimes a matter of "convention". To illustrate this, we take for example the following proverb : "Uwuguheneye ntumuhenere akwita ikibura nyo" (He who shows you his ass and you do not do the same for him will say that you do not have an ass).

In other words, this proverb means "Eye for eye, tooth for tooth." In this proverb, the verb "guhena" does not mean to take off one's clothes and show his ass, but, by convention, or as it is known in Burundian culture, the verb "guhena" means to do something bad to someone. That means that, in our analysis of meaning, we must capture both the intentional and the conventional aspects and especially the relationship between them. This is why before dealing with pragmatic analysis we have to say a word on the notion of intentionality, which is an important element in the understanding of the meaning of a well-formed utterance.

II.6. INTENTIONALITY

Searle uses the structure of speech acts as a guide in order to elucidate the structure of linguistic intentional states. However, according to him, he does not mean that intentional states are basically linguistic. His standpoint will rather be the opposite: "Language is derived from intentionality and not conversely". Here, Searle wants "to explain language in terms of intentionality" and show that there is a relation of "logical dependence between intentionality and language" (1983 : 5). This is so because, whether speaking or using whatever linguistic skill, one has a certain intention in his mind. That intention may be for example, a request, a command, suggestion, etc. which may have effects on the hearer.

One has now to notice the relationship between speech acts and linguistic intentional states. In using our language, we have to respect some or all of the speech acts and this is in close relation to the notion of intentionality to achieve the function of a linguistic communication. Joachim Leilich (1993 : 156) illustrates this by saying that:

> each speech act which has a propositional content expresses an intentional state with the same content, and that intentional state is the sincerity condition of the speech act.

This view shows clearly that there is a connection between speech acts and intentional states. A few examples have to be given to illustrate this situation. If I promise to present my thesis in two weeks, the intention of presenting the thesis in two weeks must first exist in my mind if my promise is sincere. Or if you ask someone to read Searle, you must want him to read Searle. So, there is a kind of parallelism which is such that the psychological modes are the sincerity conditions of the speech acts.

Also, the concept of intentionality is somehow connected to the notion of representation. Leilich quoted Searle's theory of intentionality and states that *this point of connection deals with conditions of success or condition of satisfaction, and this notion is a kind of generalization of the notion of truth conditions for all types of speech acts.*

The conditions of success of an order, for example are fulfilled if, and only if, the order is carried out. We may also have conditions of success for a promise, which consists in carrying out the promised action. The conditions of success, or satisfaction on an assertion are fulfilled if, and only if, reality conforms to what the speaker asserted.

Now, one may say that intentional states can be characterized by conditions of success too. As a point in case, the conditions of success of a wish are realized if what is wished for happens, or the conditions of satisfaction of the intention to do something are fulfilled if one does it.

In the same field of intentionality, Leilich (1993 : 157) asserts that "*each intentional state has a representative content in a psychological mode.*" For example, my order to someone to leave the house represents a certain action of a certain person (who is ordered to leave the house) and so does my wish that a given person leaves the house. This is to say that a belief or a wish, a statement or an order is a representation of one's psychological modes or one's intentional states.

To show this important place of intentions in the understanding of meaning LEILICH (1993 : 172) stated that "*intentions are prior to conventional meanings.*" We have to notice that meaning may change according to the intention of the speaker, which may be different from the intended meaning on the side of the hearer .

However, this theme of intentionality in linguistic communication has brought some confusion. We have the case of Searle who states the problem as follows " *How do we get from the physics to the semantics*"? Or, in other terms, how do we get (for example) "*from the sounds that come out of my mouth to the illocutionary act?*"

Searle quoted by LEILICH (1993 : 172) answers saying that:

> "*a physical action becomes intentional because the speaker intentionally superimposes the conditions of satisfaction of an intentional state on the physical action.*"

For the speaker, if he utters his sentence, he has a precise intention in his mind. The conditions of satisfaction of the intentional state here imply the understanding of this intention on the part of the hearer. This full understanding will depend upon the full sharing of intention between the speaker and the hearer.

But, even here, a problem remains: If I happen to utter a sentence, how can another person get to know my intentional states? As an answer to this question, we have to refer ourselves to Grice's analysis of conventional meaning as a "conventionalization" of intentional (speaker's) meaning (of Leilich (1993 : 176)).

> *A speaker S meant something by X means that S intended the utterance of X to produce some effect in a hearer H by means of the recognition of this intention.*

From this point of view, we may say that meaning is just the speaker's intention, which does not necessarily have to be recognized via conventional

linguistic meaning. For example, if I raise my hand to greet my friend who is passing, this one will get the meaning of my gesture if and only if he happens to understand my intention of greeting him.

In few words, performing a given speech act is not an easy task. The satisfaction of both the speaker and hearer comes from many linguistic features such as different speech situations, different speech acts, the notion of meaning the notion of intentionality, which bring the hearer to a full understanding and the speaker to be understood.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

III.0. Introduction

This chapter deals with data collection and data analysis procedures. The first section will present different sources from which we collected data. The second will present some difficulties encountered in collecting data. And the third section will deal with data analysis procedures.

III.1. Data collection procedures

Our research concerns only Kirundi proverbs related to hatred. And we know that most studies rely on written materials. But writing, which is the main means used in all domains to transmit and preserve knowledge, was unknown in traditional Burundi. There were no written materials on Kirundi proverbs in general and Kirundi proverbs related to hatred in particularly till recently. The only materials which are written and that we have found are from Rodegem (1961 : 237-265), some books written by B.E.P.E.S (1984) and Ntahokaja(1979). Beside written materials I got other proverbs from 5 informants.

The collection of these proverbs is based on their meaning which helps each human being to make a distinction between a friend and an enemy, to know how to manage his enemy, in one word, how to behave in a situation of hatred. In this way, I sampled a total of twenty proverbs. They are presented in Kirundi and each proverb is followed by an English translation.

III.2. Encountered difficulties

III.2.a. Difficulties related to data collection

The situation which prevails in Burundi does not facilitate researchers'task easy. As has been suggested by Labov (1971 : 152), "sufficient good data from speech are provided by tape - recorder interviews"
It would have been better for us to use that way in collecting data, but this has been very difficult, even impossible because, to use a tape-recorder or any sophisticated instrument would look like a radio interview and considering the prevailing political situation, it would be suspicious .

In addition Burundians's manners prevent them to tell whoever comes what they know. First, they must know who you are, where you come from, what you are going to do with these data. All these questions then make the task of collecting data difficult. This is the reason why we have limited ourselves to the written sources mentioned above.

III.2.b. Difficulties related to translation

Another big problem to our work has been that of translation. First and foremost, our topic concerns a pragmatic analysis of some Kirundi proverbs related to hatred. And in collecting our data the materials we used were written in Kirundi. So, we had to translate these Kirundi proverbs from Kirundi to English. There is then an obstacle due to the fact that Kirundi and English are two different languages belonging to "*different cultural backgrounds and different families.*" Concerning linguistic families, Kirundi is a Bantu language whereas English is an Indo-European language.

Because of this, we may have a word in Kirundi for which we do not have an equivalent in English. About cultural backgrounds, anyone has to notice that proverbs used by a given people are very closed to the culture of that people. Now, Kirundi proverbs are very related to Burundian culture. And this one is very different from English culture. For example, in Burundi the place given to a cow, a dog, etc. is not the same as the one given to these animals in English culture. The translation is somehow difficult because of different cultures which bring different cultural references.

Anyway, we did our best to keep close to the original meaning, putting to use different speech situations in general and the context in particular, as it has been suggested by Newmark (1982 : 113) "*Context is the overriding factor in all translations and is primary over any rule (...).*"

In brief, despite the difficulties encountered in this task of collecting data and translating them, we have done our best to present this work.

III.3. Data analysis procedures

To analyse the data collected, I gave a context which is appropriate for each proverb. To be more specific, we know that hatred, as it is known, has different stages. We may have misunderstanding, spite, rancour, animosity, etc. In analysing those proverbs, I had to take into account the quality of proverbs to express more than they say, to be convincing tools by their shorteness and their truth. I had to analyse them according to context, the participants, the setting, the significance of the statement, etc.

Our analysis focuses on the speaker's intention or goal and the illocutionary force of the proverbs. Then, while analysing the data collected, we will take our cue from Ronald (1985). According to him, one has to look at the text as a sequence of speech acts. This will allow us to deal with illocutionary forces as used by Austin and Searle.

In few words, we will analyse the situation in which Kirundi proverbs related to hatred occur and see how the speaker invents the expression to be considered. So, the analysis mostly concerns more the pragmatic interpretation of the proverbs than anything else.

CHAPTER IV: FINDINGS

IV.0. Introduction

This work is mainly concerned with Kirundi proverbs related to hatred. The analysis of this topic has shown that there are different levels and different kinds of hatred such as: discord, malevolence, public malignity, curiosity, the spreading of malvolence, enemity, hypocrisy and duplicity, cruelty, rancor, irreducible wickedness, etc. So, the proverbs analysed in this chapter have been put under the title of their respective functions. However, we chose only the most convenient proverbs to adapt them to contextual situation, since a function may be fulfilled by many proverbs.

IV.1. Discord

Discord is defined as lack of agreement among persons, groups or things. Discord has also different dimensions like strife, contention, dissension, conflict, clash, dissonance. Each word has its appropriate meaning:

1°) Strife: It means outright fighting, of a destructive struggle between rivals or factions.

2°) Contention: It is largely limited to dispute in the form of heated debate or quarreling.

3°) Dissension: It is the act of pointing at rebellious unrest that disrupts unity within a group.

4°) Conflict: It suggests antagonism of ideas or interests that results in open hostility or divisiveness

5°) Clash: The meaning of this word is somehow close to the meaning of conflict. However, clash suggests sharp conflict involving ideas or interests that are irreconciliable. It is also in the same line as dissonance.

6°) Dissonance: It implies harsh disagreement between strongly opposed or incongruous positions.

However, all these terms mean a condition marked by disagreement, which is discord that implies, in general, opposing positions within a group, preventing unity.

"Ubucuti butariho buteranywa n'inyama".

T: Weak friendship is disrupted by unimportant things.

This proverb shows us a situation in which two discordant wives have quarelled because of the misunderstanding between their sons.

Situation

Two women named respectively Rose and Ruth were neighbours and one day, their sons fought. The two women quarelled because of this. Another woman Mary came and asked them if the main reason of their conflict had been the "fighting" of their sons. From this, Mary concluded that Rose and Ruth were not really friends. And she uttered this proverb: "ubucuti butariho buteranywa n'inyama (Weak friendship is disrupted by unimportant things).

In the nature of young people, to fight is quite normal. Some parents may be surprised if they see their children staying home the whole day without

movement. They can think that the children are either ill or have other problems. Now, Mary, the neighbour who said that 'Weak friendship is disrupted by unimportant things' had not understood the reason of the quarrelling between Rose and Ruth. According to Mary, the reason was too simple to cause hatred between persons. It means that even before this event, they were not friends. And the quarelling of their sons became for them an adequate occasion to show their hatred.

In traditional Burundi 'meat' was something with a very small value. It could not be a reason of conflict between people. If we try to associate the situation with the proverb, the quarel of the young boys can be called "inyama". This is so because the image of 'meat' refers to something without value in Burundian culture. No one can become an enemy of another because of a piece of meat. Similary, no reasonable parent can become the enemy of another because of the fighting of their sons. It is known that in the nature of children, fighting is a very simple thing. It is current and, above all, they do it without bad intentions.

The illocutionary force of this proverb is to advise members of the society not to take unimportant things as convincing reason for becoming enemies. To discriminate between what can push someone to become an enemy of another and what can be ignored or simplified.

IV.2. Public malignity

The key word in this expression is the term 'malignity'. According to The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English, malignity is a deep-rooted ill will; it is a character of harmig others in a hidden way. However, even if a

malignant person hides himself in harming others, this finishes to be discovered by the victim of this ill will.

Talking about 'public malignity' is to say that society is malignant. Society is a group of persons who are not all kind. Some among them are wicked and, in harming others, they do it secretly , and with hypocrisy. The example below illustrates a situation in which a mother utters a proverb to invite her daughter to be careful in society .

"Igihugu ni imanga"
T.: Others are like a gulf.

Situation

A girl named Lydia was about to get married and her mother warned her by saying "Uragabe igihugu ni imanga" (Try to pay much attention, others are like a gulf).

In Burundian culture, the word "igihugu" does not mean only 'country'. It means also 'others' or 'society'. The word "igihugu" suggests persons who are not members of one's proper family.

The term "imanga" (chasm) means a deep crack in the earth's surface. In Burundian culture, the term "imanga" refers to any dangerous situation. It suggests something or someone that one has to be afraid of, someone or something that is frightening. This situation is illustrated in particular by a pregnant wife who is about to give birth to a child. Everyone says in Kirundi: "Muramuraba neza ari kumanga" (look after her carefully she is in a danger).

This means that if they do not pay much attention, she may die. Pregnancy is something which is very dangerous. This is to show how heavy or dangerous is the thing referred to by the term "imanga".

If we try to analyse the advice of that mother, she wants to show her daughter that others are not her parents. Society is not her proper family. This means that others are dangerous. They are not ready to tolerate what one's family can tolerate; the way that they treat a given person is not similar to the way that his or her family treats him or her. Many times, others are there to calumniate. So, one has to pay much attention in order to live in a given society. One is no more in his family where he is understood in almost all circumstances.

The illocutionary force of the proverb "igihugu ni imanga(others are like a gulf) is to advise someone to be careful in a given society. To pay much attention in his sayings and doings in order to adapt himself to the society in which he lives.

IV.3. Unhealthy curiosity

This expression implies a desire to know about people or things that do not concern you directly. The key word of the expression is curiosity, which means in this case unwarranted and unwelcome concern with another's affairs. This unhealthy curiosity is totally different from what is called 'intellectual curiosity'. The former is there to harm other persons. One is interested in others'affairs not to help them but to ruin them. While the latter is there to increase one's knowledge. But, our topic is mainly concerned with the first sense.

As far as an unhealthy curiosity trait is concerned, one may take the following proverb:

"Ntawurinda umurinda"

T. It is diffucult to keep watching on someone who is watching you.

Situation

Mary tries to keep her husband's money in a secret place in order not to lose it. Unfortunately, her rival Kathy sees her and steals it so that she can separate Mary from her husband. In laughing at her silently, Kathy says: "ntawurinda umurinda" (it is difficult to keep watching on someone who is watching you).

Mary has tried to hide the money she got from her husband. However, because she wants to harm her, Kathy, her rival, does her best in order to get all the information about where the money is kept. Kathy has got all this information secretly: This is then what one may call 'Unhealthy curiosity'. She decides to steal the money, not because she is in need of it, but because she wants to cause trouble to Mary. Kathy knows in advance that the disappearence of that amount of money will be a good reason of discord between Mary and her husband.

As a matter of fact, this unhealthy curiosity has brought in Burundian manners a tendency to hide one's own business. If someone asks another some information about him or about his relatives, Burundian culture does not allow one to deliver this information immediately. One has to pay much attention about the one who is asking the questions, i.e. one has to know who he is, where he comes from, where he works, what relations he has with that person.

In one word, one has to know why he is asking this information. All these questions are to avoid to run into trouble. The one who is asking information may do it in order to harm the other and not to do something beneficial to him.

The illocutionary force of this proverb is to let society's members know that one can never be careful enough with his or her enemies. However, it is necessary to add that one has to pay much attention towards his enemy even if this does not garantee his success.

IV.4. Spreading of malvolence

Malvolence is defined as an ill will. It is an intention to harm others. It is that manner of some wicked persons which pushes them to cause others problems. If we try to explain the whole expression 'spreading of malvolence' one has to hear that it is a transmission of hatred from one's enemy to others.

The following situation illustrates the idea that the spreading of malvolence is dangerous.

"Uwanka uwundi aramwanduza"
T. He who hates his fellow tarnishes his reputation"

Situation

Peter sees a very beautiful girl on the road and shows her to Beatrice her sister, saying 'Look how beautiful that girl is!'
And Beatrice to reply 'stop saying so, she is the most impolite girl of the world'. Peter refuses by telling her sister that: "uwanka

uwundi aramwanduza" (he who hates his fellow tarnishes his reputation) because he knows that Beatrice and Martha are enemies.

Peter has known Martha for a long time. He knows even her behaviour. To say that she is the most impolite girl of the world is to go too far. By telling these lies, Peter's sister wants to prevent him from asking Martha's hand. In any human society, if a person X wants to be associated with a person Y for any given reason, X has the tendency to stop the relation when he is told that Y is somehow impossible.

About our situation, Beatrice knows that Peter admires Martha, and that one day Peter may ask her hand. Beatrice does all what she is able to do in order to denigrate Martha because they were enemies. She blames her in front of Peter. She says all bad things about Martha even if they are lies. Beatrice knows that if she tries to prevent her brother from entertaining relations with Martha by saying that they are only enemies, he cannot be influenced. Now, she tries to find a strong reason to convince him. No conscious person can take a risk to entertain relations with a girl who is known as impolite.

The illocutionary force of the proverb included in this situation is an advice adressed to a hearer to try to double check, to examine attentively what he is told. This is so since many persons like to calumniate others especially when they are enemies.

IV.5. The enemy

The enemy means one that feels malice or hostility towards another. Or, the term 'enemy' is explained as referring to something destructive or injurious in its effects. In human life, one may have a person as an enemy or something which can be taken as an enemy. Whoever or whatever it is, if it is already a matter of enemy, it is just a problem, a danger. This is so because one's enemy is there to harm, to injure him. The example below illustrates a case where from an enemy, nothing good can be expected.

"Ntaciza ku mwansi".

T. There is nothing good from one's enemy.

Situation.

> John was Richard's enemy. Richard went to ask John medecine for his child who was ill. John gave Richard an out-of-date medecine. And Richard to conclude: "ntaciza kumwansi" (there is nothing good from one's enemy).

According to Richard, if a child is ill, it is normal that one can go to his neighbour to ask for help whatever relations they have. He thinks that hatred between him and John cannot be reflected in their families. Richard has asked that help innocently. However, John bears a grudge against Richard. According to him, it is not good to believe in one's enemy. Whenever one finds an occasion to do something bad to his enemy he has to do it. But, Richard had underestimated the bad relations he had with John.

The meaning of this proverb is that one has always to be afraid of his enemy. Even if one is in great need of something and that thing is held only by his enemy, one should not go there because, instead of being helped, he may be led into trouble.

Now, the proverb "Ntaciza ku mwansi" stands for the fact that nothing good can be expected from one's enemy. Even if it is an advice to ask him or her, one should try to double check if what the enemy tells him is meant to help or to mislead. One has then to be attentive towards his enemy. One's enemy cannot be a friend, one's enemy cannot be one's sister, or brother or any other person who may wish joy and happiness. If you have an enemy, his satisfaction relies in your sufferings.

The illocutionary force of this proverb is to warn each one to be careful about his enemy because he is always there to harm, to mislead, to destroy, etc.

IV.6. Hypocrisy and duplicity

We have two key words to be explained: 'hypocrisy' and 'duplicity'. 'Hypocrisy' means the practice of professing beliefs, feelings or virtues that one does not hold or possess. In other words, it is the act of pretending to be what one is not really or the act of hiding one's character.

About 'duplicity', it is explained as deliberate deceptiveness in behaviour or speech. In other words, it is what may be called 'double-dealing'. It is the state of being two fold or double.

These two expressions are very close in meaning. They both express the act of pretending to be what one is not really. Duplicity is a kind of hypocrisy. A person who is hypocrite or duplicitous may kill someone pretending to be his or her friend. In order to reach his goal, he tries to show the false side. It is a sort of game that he is playing in order to reach his purpose.

The following situation illustrates a case where a girl has been hypocrite and duplicitous towards a boy in order to steal money from him.

"Umurozi ntagira ibara"

T. A wicked person does not have any distinctive sign.

Situation.

Fidele met a beautiful girl called Nadia in a shop. He liked her, proposed her to be friends and to pay visits to each other regularly. Even if Nadia did not love Fidele, she accepted the proposition because she knew that Fidele was a rich man and she wanted to steal money from him. After she stole the money, Fidele concluded in telling himself that "umurozi ntagira ibara"(a wicked person does not have any distinctive sign), I didn't think that Nadia could steal from me".

Human beings are not like animals. A human being can hide what he needs according to the situation in which he is. A human being can hide character because he wants to reach a certain purpose. In few words, a human being has the ability to react according to the situation in which he is. That means: A human being, in normal conditions, must be conscious when reacting, performing a certain action, etc. This does not exist in animals. If an animal

wants something to eat or to drink, it reacts immediately without considering the situation in which it is.

Our example shows that Nadia knows that Fidele is a richman. Nadia is in need of money. In addition, it happens incidentally that Fidele wants to be friends with Nadia because he has been attracted by her physically. Helped by her hypocrisy and duplicity, she accepted that friendship even if she did not love him. Nadia has then been hypocrite since she has forced herself to be friend with Fidele in order to steal from him after.

In Burundian culture, the term "umurozi " means someone who kills with traditional medecine. With an extended sense, it refers to any wicked person, i.e. someone who is there to do bad or wicked actions. In the proverb, we have also the term "ibara". This term means not only 'a colour' but also 'any distinctive sign'. If we try to analyse the meaning of the whole proverb "Umurozi ntagira ibara"(a wicked person does not have any distinctive sign), we see that it means that "even towards one who has the appearance of a kind person, try to pay much attention. Do not confide in him or her because he/she may be what you do not expect him/her to be". In other words, by appearances, you cannot distinguish kind people from wicked ones.

The illocutionary force of this proverb is a warning to anyone to be careful in society since a wicked person does not have any specific colour.

IV.7. Cruelty

Cruelty means the act of inflicting pain or suffering. This term implies both disposition to harm and satisfaction in or indifference to suffering. In the same field, one may include ferocity, barbarity, inhumanity, sadism, viciousness, pitilessness, ruthlessness. Ferocity is the act of stressing rough physical treatment and savagery. Barbarity is a harsh or cruel conduct. Inhumanity means lack of pity or compassion. It is an act markedly deficient in such qualities as tolerance and sympathy for one's fellow man. Sadism implies the state of being delighted in cruelty. It means extreme cruelty. Viciousness means a native disposition to malicious and destructive behaviour and is sometimes associated with moral depravity. In the same line, we have also pitilessness. Pitilessness is the character of being totally uncompromising and unmitigating. Ruthless implies the state of having no compassion or pity. All these expressions mean the act of being predisposed to inflict violence, pain or hardship or to find satisfaction in the suffering of others.

The following case illustrates a situation where George has kept for himself the money belonging to his brother's children instead of using it to help them.

"Uwariye uwiwe ntiyoreka murundi"

T One who has made a relative suffer will not spare others.

Situation

John had let money for children to his brother George before he died. George, instead of using the money to help the children, used

it in his business and decided to kick out the children. When he was quarelling with his wife, this one told him this: "I am not surprised: "Uwariye uwiwe ntiyoreka murundi" (one who has made a relative suffer will not spare others".

When someone is about to die, he tries to find a confident to whom he shows his children, his richness and this is for the security of his children. The one who is called for this help may be honest or dishonest. To be dishonest in this case is cruelty because one is thinking, and being convinced, that he will not be accountable to any one. He knows that the person with whom he has had the affair has died and will never come to ask him those things.

In our situation then, John knew that George was the uncle of his children. He was sure that in any case, George could not think about stealing the property of his nieces and nephews. Surprisingly, George did so. Instead of managing in a good way the children's money, he used it as his. When there was no more money, he kicked out his nieces and nephews. This reaction pushed George's wife to conclude that her husband was not a human being; that he was like an animal. The adequate occasion to tell him the truth came when they were quarelling. She told him that she was not surprised about the insults. A Conscious man who does not care about his real nieces and nephews cannot care about a wife. When someone does not care about his own relatives, he cannot care about others.

In Burundian tradition, the verb "kurya" does not have the only meaning of "eating", "taking food". It implies also in some cases the idea of harming, doing a very bad thing to someone. And if one tries to interpret the whole proverb "Uwariye uwiwe ntiyoreka murundi"(one who has made a relative

suffer will not spare others) one may give the following interpretation :
One has to protect, to help, to love one's family more than he can do to others. So, if one permits himself to harm a member of his family (something which is not expected), it is not surprising to hear that he has done a very bad thing to others. Now, in our situation, it was not a surprise to hear that George illtreats his wife while he does not care about his children (the children of his brother).

The illocutionary force of this proverb is a warning against a person who is crual to his own family's members.

IV.8. Rancor

The Webster's Third New International Dictionary defines rancor as hatred or ill will; intense malignity or spite ; deep-steated enemity; inveterate malevolence. Rancor means bitter, long-lasting resentment or ill will. Normally, if someone does something bad to another, the latter is advised to forgive the former. However, in many cases, the victim of the bad act usually holds a grudge against the author of this bad act. In this case, then, these persons become enemies. They hate each other.

The following situation shows someone who has an excessive rancor and finds himself an enemy of everyone.

"Inzigo ya cane ntigira incuti"
T. There can be no friendship where there is excessive rancor.

Situation

Marc is a man who has an excessive rancor. Whoever does something wrong to him is immediately his enemy. He remains with just one friend Evariste. One day, Marc asked Evariste a lift. Unfortunately there was no place. Since that day, Marc decided not to speak to Evariste. They also became enemies. Evariste, as a reasonable man, advised Marc by telling him that he has to change because there can be no friendship where there is excessive rancor.

Normally, human life is characterized by good and bad actions, good experiences and bad experiences, good relations and bad ones with others. For these good actions and relations towards others the author is sometimes thanked. For bad actions or bad relations, the author is not always punished, there are some accasions on which he may be excused. To be in good terms with society, one has to forgive, to excuse others for their faults. If one has the habit to exclude whoever does something wrong to him, he usually finds himself alone, i.e. without friends. This is so because even one's father or mother may do something wrong towards their children.

In Burundian tradition, the term "incuti" does not mean only one's family, i.e. persons linked by blood relationship. One's friend is also called "incuti", that person who always wishes one joy and happiness. This expression is somehow deeper, meaningful in terms of good relatioship between human beings.

If we come back to our situation, Evariste has refused a lift to Marc because there was no place. Marc, because of his bad relationships with others,

thought immediately that he refused him a lift by bad will. For a kind man, that could not be a reason of hatred. Even if Marc and Evariste were friends, Evariste could not kick out a person who was already in the car. All what Marc had to do was to wait for another car. But, unfortunately, because of his bad nature, he has kept a grudge against Evariste and they had became enemies since that day.

The illocutionary force of this proverb is that of an advice to the human society not to keep rancor against others for nothing. It advises a human being to tolerate, to forgive, to understand others.

IV.9. Irreducible wickedness

Here, we have two words to be explained, wickedness and irreducible. Wickedness means the state of someone who is ready to harm others, who is vicious, who is always ready to do or wish bad things. A wicked person cannot be happy about another person's success. Irreducible means incapable of being reduced to a desired, simpler or smaller form. Now, if one tries to explain the whole expression irreducible wickedness, one has to say that it is the state of being incapable of being transformed from a wicked person to a kind one. The expression "a desired form" is then in our situation kindness. To talk about irreducible wickedness is to mean that the wicked person will stay like this. He cannot be changed to a kind one. He has decided to stay for ever naughty.

The following situation illustrates the case of a wicked wife who has done her best in order to put her rival in trouble.

"Uhongera umwansi amara inka"

T The one who attempts to lessen enmity through cow giving ends by ruining himself.

Situation

Yvone has a rival, Fifi. They are enemies. But Yvone, tired with this hatred, wants to end it. So, she does all possible things to show Fifi that they may be friends instead of staying enemies. Since Fifi is a wicked wife, she does not care about this advice and her rival's good actions. So, Yvone decides to stop by telling herself that "uhongera umwansi amara inka" (the one who attempts to lessen enemity through cow giving ends by ruining himself".

In human society, if one pays a visit to another, it means that the former is a friend to the latter. If he comes one time, two times, three times, it is expected that the one who is visited has one day to answer. When he does not answer it means that he does not want this friendship. In our situation, Yvone is a kind woman. She wants to live in friendship. She does all she is able to do in order to correct, to put her rival in the right way. However, this one is a wicked woman. She does not want it.

In Burundian culture, a cow "inka" is something with a very high value. It is highly respected, estimated and consequently expensive. So, giving a cow to another person is a sign of close relationship. It is a "gift" mixed with honor. Coming back to the verb "guhonga", one has to understand that it is not only to give something to someone. But, it is to give many and expensive things to someone in order to convice him/her to accept a certain proposition. Even if this proposition frightened him / her before, there is no more fear or shame

because of the quantity and quality of these things that one gives. For example, this verb "guhonga" is usually used for a man who wants to convince a wife who is not his and make her his 'lover' by giving her many and expensive things.

If we take the whole proverb, "uhongera umwansi amara inka", we have to understand that from one's enemy, one cannot change his or her decision whatever one does or gives. It will be very difficult to change him from an enemy to a friend. In addition, a person with irreducible wickedness cannot be changed to a kind person no matter what someone does. It is unnecessary to waste one's time or to loose one's things attempting to change a person with this character.

The illocutionary force of this proverb is to inform society's members that, from one's true enemy, one cannot change his or her decision whatever one does or gives.

IV.10. To live with one's enemies

This expression "to live with one's enemies" means to know how to manage one's enemies. If one does not know how to manage them, it becomes impossible or difficult to live with them. Even if that happens, one is obliged to live in bad conditions. This sentence means to know how to bear one's enemies, their bad actions, their bad speeches, their bad relations, etc.

The following situation illustrates a case where a man wants to kill another during their journey. Fortunately, the one who was to be killed discovered it before and refused the journey.

"Iyikuburiye ntikurya"

T One who is informed about some enmity will not be harmed by it.

Situation

Nicolas and Emmanuel are enemies. They are both tradesmen. Nicolas, in order to kill Emmanuel, asks him to go together to Naïrobi. For Emmanuel, Naïrobi is an unknown place, something which will make easy the task of harming him. Fortunately, Emmanuel knows in advance that Nicolas hates him and refuses the journey by telling him that "one who is informed about some enmity will not be harmed by it".

In an adventure, it is better to be with someone in whom one trusts. Human nature is somehow difficult. A human being is not like an animal which always shows the true face. A person may tell someone the opposite of what he thinks according to different circumstances. In many cases, the speeches, the actions of a person are conditionned by his/her goals. In normal conditions, one proposes another to go together in business when they are friends. But, in our situation, Nocolas is not Emmanuel's friend. Since this one is aware of their hatred, he cannot trust Nicolas.

If one knows that a person hates him, he has to know how to behave in front of him. The one who is hated has to pay much attention, to know what to accept or refuse. The one who hates another may do his best in order to reach his enemy by hypocrisy.

Then the illocutionary force of this proverb is an advice to any conscious human being to know how to distinguish his enemies from his friends and how to treat them according to different relations and different circumstances.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

This work is concerned with a pragmatic study of some Kirundi proverbs related to hatred. As Dalfovo (1984) pointed out, proverbs are a reflexion of the philosophy of a people and its culture, the proverbs analyzed here show all levels of hatred in the life of the Burundian people. Let us summarize briefly the major points of this work.

In the first chapter, we have an introduction to the problem and some preliminaries related to our study, i.e. motivation, aims, etc.

The second chapter deals with literature review. In this chapter, we focus first on one branch of linguistics which has been chosen as the framework of our study: pragmatics. Pragmatics helps us to understand the difference between saying something and meaning it. It helps us to understand how do words stand for things (by conventions), how to distinguish an appropriate utterance from an inappropriate one, etc.

In studying proverbs pragmatically, we have to put them in context. In addition, we have to make use of the notions of speech act and intentionality (cfr Austin (1962) and Searle (1983)).

It has been also judged necessary in our study to undertake with a short research on meaning. The sounds or marks that one makes in the performance of an illocutionary act are characteristically said to have a meaning.

The third part of our study is the Methodology chapter. In this part, we describe the different ways we have used in collecting, transcribing, and analyzing data and the difficulties we encountered.

In the fourth chapter, we analyse some Kirundi proverbs related to hatred at the pragmatic level. In this analysis, we have tried to find some appropriate situations in which to put our proverbs. Considering their different meanings, they all refer to negative values, i.e. different degrees of hatred, such as discord, public malignity, unhealthy curiosity, spreading of malvolence, partiality, perfidy, cruelty, etc. In our analysis, each proverb has its illocutionary force, which is the act of intending these proverbs to perform an act of, for example, advice, warning, etc.

However, we cannot say that we have exhausted the subject. The constraint of means and time did not allow us to push the study further. If we had means and more time, we would like to continue our research about proverbs related to hatred. I wish a further investigation shall be a deep study of stylistic strategies like figures of speech, presuposition principles etc. which contribute to the full understanding of proverbs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AUSTIN, J.L. (1962). How to Do Things with Words, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

B.E.P.E.S. (1984). Inyigisho y'imyibutsa. Bujumbura: B.E.P.E.S.

BROWN, G. & YULE, G. (1983). Discourse Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CAUVIN, J. (1980). L'image, la langue et la pensée. L'exemple des proverbes (Mali). Anthropos 1980: 704 - Comprendre la Parole Traditionnelle- les classiques africains. Editions Saint Augustin, 88p.

CRYSTAL, D. (1987). The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DALFOVO, A.T. (1984). Lögbara Proverbs. The Hague: Mouton.

DIJK, T.A. VAN (1977). Text and Context. Exploration in Semantic and Pragmatics of Dicourse. London: Longman.

DZOBO, N. K. (1973). The Moral Value of Ewe Proverbs. Cape Coast: University of Cape Coast.

FINNEGAN, R. (1970) Oral Literature in Africa. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

GAZDAR, G. (1979). Pragmatics: Implicature, Presupposition and Logical Form. New York, London, Toronto: Academic Press.

GREEN, G. (1975). How to Get People to Do Things with Words. In P. COLE and J. MORGAN (eds), Syntax and Semantics, vol. 3. Speech Acts (pp: 107-142). New-York: Academic Press.

GRICE, H.P. (1975). "Logic and Conversation" in (eds) P. COLE & J. MORGAN. Syntax and semantics speech Acts. New-York: Academic Press.

GUMPERZ., J. (1978), Language in Social Groups. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

HUDSON, R.A. (1970). Sociolinguistics: Cambridge. Cambridge University Press

HURTFORD, J.R. and HEASLEY, B. (1983). Semantic: A Coursebook. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

JEFFERSON, G. and LEE, J.R.E. (1981). The Rejection of Advice: Managing the Problematic Convergence of a Trouble - telling and a service encounter. Journal of Pragmatics 5: 399-412.

KIGEME, Cl. (1992). A Pragmatic Analysis of Some Kirundi Swearing Expressions. Mémoire, Université du Burundi.

LEECH, G. (1983). Principles of Pragmatics. London and New York: Longman.

LEECH, G. (1981). Semantics: The Study of Meaning. Second Edition revised and Updated. Harmonsworth: Penguin Books.

LEVINSON, S. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge University Press.

LYONS, J. (1981). Language, Meaning and Context. Cambridge: Fontana.

LYONS, J. (1981). Language and Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MANANDA, R. Cl. (1996). A Pragmatic Analysis of Some Kirundi Wellrisms (Imyigovyoro). Mémoire, Université du Burundi.

MUREKAMBANZE, V. (1989). A Pragmatic Analysis of Some Kirundi Proverbs. Mémoire, Université du Burundi.

NDAYIZEYE, S. (1982). Le Concept d'"Umwana w'Uwundi" - ou Absence de Solidarité - d'après les Proverbes Rundi. Mémoire, Université du Burundi.

NDIKURYAYO, J.B. (1989). Proverbes et Contre Proverbes Kirundi: "une illustration du mécanisme de signification du genre

parémiologique. Mémoire, Université du Burundi.

NKUNDWANABAKE, E. (1987). An Analysis of Kirundi Speech Acts: Maternity Congratulations. Mémoire, Université du Burundi.

NTAHOKAJA, J.B. (1979). Imigenzo y'Ikirundi. Université du Burundi. Bujumbura.

NTAHOMVUKIYE, H. (1981). La Fonction du Proverbe dans la Communication de la Pensée au Burundi. Mémoire. Université Catholique de Louvain.

NYEMBEZI C.L.S. (1963). Zulu Proverbs. Johannesburg: Witwaterstand. University press.

RICHARD, J. et al. (1985). The Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics. London: Longman.

RODEGEM, F.M. (1970). Dictionnaire Rundi-Français. Tervuren: Musée Royal de l'Afrique Centrale.

RODEGEM, F.M. (1961): Sagesse Kirundi: Proverbes, Dictons, locutions usités au Burundi. Tervuren: Musée Royal de l'Afrique Centrale.

SEARLE, J.R. (1969). Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SEARLE, J.R. (1976). Expressions and Meaning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SINDAYIKENGERA, M. (1997). A Pragmatic Analysis of Some Kirundi Proverbs Expressing Negative Wisdom. Mémoire, Université du Burundi.

WARDHAUGH, R. (1985). How Conversation Works. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

WIDDOWSON, H.G. (1979). Explorations in Applied linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

WILSON, F.P. et al. (ed) (1975). The Oxford Dictionary of English Proverbs. Oxford: Marendom Press.

APPENDIX

PROVERBS

1. Abakundanye barankana

T: Best friends may become enemies

2. Aho imbwa ikubitiwe ntihasubira

T: A dog cannot return where it has been beaten

3. Igihugu ni imanga

T: Others are like a gulf

4. Intango ntitangira urwanko

T: It is not the offered beer which prevents hatred

5. Intwengo y'umukeba si ikiyago

T: The laugh of an enemy is not a chat

6. Inzigo ya cane ntigira incuti

T: There can be no friendship where there is excessive rancor

7. Inzoka yakuriye ntiba incuti

T: A snake which has bitten you will never become your friend

8. Iyibize nabi uyima ifu

T: To that that boils abnormally, you don't give flour

9. Iyikuburiye ntikurya

T: One who is informed about some enmity will not be harmed by it

10. Ntaciza kumwansi

T: There is nothing good from one's enemy

11. Ntawurinda umurinda

T: It is difficult to keep watching on someone who is watching you

12. Ubucuti butariho buteranywa n'inyama

T: Weak friendship is disrupted by unimportant things

13. Ukwanka akwankana n'utwawe

T: He who hates you hates even your belongings

14. Uhongera umwansi amara inka

T: The one who attempts to lesten enmity through cow giving ends by ruining himself

15. Umuntu aguhisha ko akwanka ukamuhisha ko ubizi

T: He who does not want you to know that he hates you, do not show him that you know it

16. Umurozi ntagira ibara

T: A wicked person does not have any distinctive sign

17. Uwanka uwundi aramwanduza

T: He who hates his fellow tarnishes his reputation

18. Uwariye uwiwe ntiyoreka murundi

T: One who has made a relative suffer will not spare others

19. Uwuguheneye ntumuhenere akwita ikiburanyo

T: He who shows you his ass and you do not do the same for him, will say that you don't have an ass.

20. Uwuja kwa mukeba ntakebera

T: She who goes to her rival does not look aside

Informants.

- NDIBUTATU
- MATUNU Jean Claude
- NDABEMEYE Bernard
- Evariste NZEYIMANA
- KABWA Antoine