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

A study of warranting expressions in kirundi discourse

Sasagara, Céline; Sous la direction de : Dr Firmard Sabimana

2000
UB, FLSH
https://repository.ub.edu.bi/handle/123456789/1702

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 STUDY OF WARRANTING EXPRESSIONS IN KIRUNDI DISCOURSE

By

Céline SASAGARA

Supervisor

Dr Firmard SABIMANA

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

Bujumbura, March 2000.

DEDICATION

In great memory of my cherished parents. God did not allow you to see your children growing so as to share joy and happiness with them.

To my brothers and sisters, especially to you Anita BWIGENGE, for your invaluable support to our family in the absence of our parents.

To all my friends in Burundi and elsewhere.

This work is warmly dedicated.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The present work is the achievement of a collective effort and support received from a number of people. It is impossible to acknowledge all of them here, but some of them deserve particular mention.

First and foremost, I am particularly grateful to Dr. Firmard SABIMANA, Head of Department of English Language and Literature and Senior Lecturer in the same department; who in spite of his numerous commitments made himself available whenever I needed his help. His guidance, his encouragement, his knowledge and constructive criticisms have greatly contributed to the shaping of this thesis.

Second, I am thankful to all the teachers of the Faculty of Arts and Social sciences in general and to the teaching staff of the department of English Language and Literature in particular for having deployed much effort to my academic training. I am also thankful to Appollinaire, the "Ninde's?" producer, for his flexibility to let me have access to the documentation.

Third, I sincerely acknowledge my sister Anita BWIGENGE for her everlasting moral and financial support and, above all her incomparable love she has provided me with. May she finds in this work a reward to her endeavor.

Fourth, sincere and deep thanks go straight to the following people: Spès NIBASHA, John GASHIRAHAMWE, Bukas BASUMBANDEK, Jane NSENGIYUMVA and Richard SIRIBA.

Last but not least, I wish to record my gratitude to my classmates and fellow students for the joyful moments we shared at University; and to my colleagues of IRC Burundi for their good cooperation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
CONTENTS	iii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
I.1. Statement of the Problem	2
I.2. Aim of the Study	3
I.3. Motivation	3
I.4. Delimitation	4
I.5. Structure of the Work	4
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	5
II.1. Concept of Discourse	5
II.1.1. Definitions	5
II.1.2. Discourse - Text Distinction	6
II.1.3. Discourse and Pragmatics	8
II.2. Concept of Utterance	9
II.2.1. Grice's Theory of Conversational Implicature	11
II.2.2. Grice's Cooperative Principle	11
II.3. Speech Acts	13
II.4. The Notion of Conversational Analysis	14
II.4.1. Definitions	14
II.4.2. Conversational Structure	15
II.5. Research on Warranting Expressions	16

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY 19

III.1.1. Data Collection 19
III.1.2. Data Analysis Procedures 20

CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS 22

IV.1. Some Expressions Playing the Role of Adverbs 22
IV.2. Some Proverbs Used to Convince 32
IV.3. Some Swearing Expressions used to to Convince 4o
IV.4. Some other Expressions Used to Convince 53

CONCLUSION 62

APPENDIX: Data collected from Ninde? plays and their translation 64

BIBLIOGRAPHY 81

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

In any part of the world, language has always been a constant topic for research. Some researchers have been especially interested in the formal properties of language (grammarians) while others have been concerned with what language is used for (sociolinguistics, philosophical linguists...). The fact that language is studied in all its aspects shows how important it is in the life of mankind.

To account for the importance of language, F.Fowler (1974:19) asserts that "language is so valuable, so critical to the functioning of human societies, and itself so impressively intricate in structure that it is bound to attract a great amount of intellectual attention".

This statement is worthwhile because it is through language that human societies are rendered functional. Moreover, it is mainly through language that human beings establish and maintain their relationships.

The present work will deal with language as conceived by sociolinguists. The latter are particularly concerned with language usage of particular human groups (Gumperz, 1982:21). In other words, they are concerned with the way human beings interact in a given community.

Thus, this research will be directed towards the study of discourse, which is one of the fields within sociolinguistics. Discourse analysis will help in the description of a given linguistic society because the study of discourse is a study of any aspect of language use, argues R. Fasold (1990:3). Indeed, as D. Crystal (1987,116) puts it, "the discourse analysis focuses on naturally spoken language as found in discourses or conversations, interviews, commentaries and speeches".

However, this paper will not deal with all those types of discourses but with conversation, which is a form of communication that human beings use everyday. Fromkin and Rodman (1978:3) affirm it when they say that

> whatever else people may do when they come together ... they talk. We live in a world of words. We talk to our friends, our associates, our wives and husbands, our teachers, our parents and in laws. We talk to busdrivers and strangers...

As conversation has widely been analysed in many of its aspects by several linguists, this study will attempt to analyse warranting expressions in Kirundi Discourse. These expressions are used by the speaker in order to get others to trust him/her while he/she is expressing his/her own point of view.

I.1. Statement of the problem

Warranting expressions are expressions, which are mostly used in spoken language. At first glance, some of them pass without special notice. One may therefore think that they do not deserve to be studied because they are the kind of expressions that are most of the time taken for granted. However, if one undertakes a deep analysis on how and why they are used, things look different because these expressions play a great role in everyday conversation. They are used to give special marking to words or sentiments that one judges convincing to his/her listeners.

e.g: - Muvyukuri ivyo bintu sinzi uwabitwaye

Translation: Frankly, I don't know who took those things.

- Kubinyerekeye, ndazi ko nzobigufashamwo

Translation: As far as I am concerned (personally), I know that I will help you.

Here, the speaker is trying to convince his/her listener to believe in him. He may be telling the truth or not and it is up to the hearer to decide.

Other expressions are consciously used because they are recognised by our society as embodying truth. These are proverbial statements.

E.g.: Yaco usesagura amahera yawe kubintu bidafise akamaro urazi ko agosozi kintahanurwa kahiye abagabo babona.

Translated literally, it means "Do not waste your money for things that are not necessary because you know that A mountain that doesn't listen to advice burnt when men were watching."

The sense of this proverb is a warning to a person refusing to follow a piece of advice. The advisor is telling him that he will have to bear the consequences of his own behaviour while others will be laughing at him. The proverbial utterance shows quite well one's position towards a situation and the person who is using it wants his/her listener to change his mind.

Still other expressions, which may be used to express a warranting behaviour are some swearing expressions. These are also used consciously.

E.g.: Kukwambura nkamukubita ijisho.

Translation: "May I unclothe you", If I saw him.

In the same way the speaker is trying to make his/her addressee to believe in him/her.

In short, warranting expressions are of paramount importance because our daily living requires a considerable trust from others. But, this one has some limits as Wardhaugh (1985:6) observes it:

> We cannot survive without putting trust in others, but it must be a trust tempered with a certain amount of caution.

Trust in other people can then be considered as the cornerstone of social living.

So, in choosing the study of warranting expressions in Kirundi discourse as the subject of my research, I intend to show how these conversational devices are used. In this respect, the problem I am attempting to resolve consists in highlighting the usefulness of warranting expressions in Kirundi discourse especially in conversation.

I.2. Aim of the study

This work seeks to show as problematic what is often taken for granted and what is often used consciously for specific purposes in language use. In this regard, the aim of this study is to identify and describe some warranting expressions in Burundian society and culture. The context of these expressions is to be considered for a better understanding.

I.3. Motivation

Any study has something that pushes the researcher to investigate it. My point of departure was that, after reading books on conversational analysis and discovering how English people express their warranting behaviour through the following expressions: frankly, actually, realistically, personally, between us... the idea came into my mind to make an investigation in Kirundi language in order to analyse how and why they are used.

Another factor, which pushed me to work on this topic, is the fact that there is not any work investigating the uses of warranting expressions in Kirundi discourse. As a matter of fact, some previous authors have made a study on discourse analysis: HAVUGIYAREMYE (1990) dealt with reference in Kirundi Narrative Discourse. He put more emphasis on reference system. As for NISHIMWE (1994), she dealt with ellipsis in Kirundi Turn - Taking Discourse. She concentrated on how Kirundi uses semantic ellipsis. Still other works have been carried out on Kirundi discourse with special emphasis on conversation: NZORIJANA (1990) worked on Kirundi insulting expressions, NDABANEZE (1996) dealt with Rundi topic shifts, which are linguistic devices used to make the interactants tackle a new topic, NYIRUBUTAMA (1996) with on going checks used to check how conversation is kept going on;... However, none of them has dealt with the phenomenon of warranting expressions in Kirundi.

I.4 Delimitations

The delimitations of this study are the following:

First of all, the findings will be mainly interpreted in the light of some spoken texts. Here the use of some already recorded texts is of great importance.

Second, while the field of discourse entails various ways of communication such as speeches, conversations, interviews, commentaries... this study will limit the investigation to conversation which, according to R.Wardhaugh (1985:1), is the most generalised form of talk.

I.5 Structure of the work

This study entitled "The Study of Some Warranting Expressions in Kirundi Discourse" is divided into four chapters.

Chapter one is an introduction, which states the problem of the study. Furthermore, it specifies the aim and states the motivation for choosing the topic under study. Finally, it shows the delimitations of the study.

The Review of Related Literature is the second chapter. It presents the theoretical framework and highlights other studies conducted on related topics.

Chapter three deals with the methods of data collection and provides details on analysis. It also justifies the use of spoken texts, especially "Ninde?" plays, as the main source of Data collection.

Chapter four contains the Data Analysis. It analyses the data collected from "Ninde?".

The work ends with a general conclusion.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

II.0. Introduction

As stated earlier, very few studies on Kirundi discourse have been carried out. And, even among those already carried out, there is none dealing with warranting expressions at discourse level. This chapter reviews then the existing literature on topics closely related to mine.

II.1. Concept of Discourse

II.1.1. Definitions.

It is not easy to provide a satisfactory definition of this concept. So many researchers have put forward different approaches as to the definition of discourse. Among these researchers, we can mention Richards, et al, G. Brown and G. Yule, Havugiyiramye, Li, Crystal, Widdowson, Halliday and Hassan; to name but a few.

Richards, et al. (1983:83) for instance consider discourse as "a general term for language use, i.e., language that has been produced as the result of an act of communication". They also establish a distinction between grammar and discourse. The former refers to rules of language used to form grammatical units such as phrases, clauses and sentences, whereas the latter refers to larger units of language such as paragraphs, conversations, interviews, speeches... In their concept of discourse, Richards, et al. put emphasis on one of the functions of language: communication. Discourse is then one way among others of communicating, i.e., of putting language into use.

In the same way, G. Brown's and Yule's (1983:ix) view about discourse joins that of Richards, et al. They examine the way humans use language to communicate and, in particular, the way addressers construct linguistic messages to interpret them. In this view, the function and value of utterances used in discourse are put forward.

G. Havugiyiramye (1990:8) expresses the same idea as the researchers above, in saying that:

> a piece of discourse is considered to
> be an attempt by a writer to
> communicate his message to a
> reader.

Discourse is also defined by Li (1976) as any sequence of two or more utterances produced by a single speaker or by two or more speakers who are

interacting. He distinguishes between continuous and discontinuous discourse. His distinction runs as follows:

> - Continuous discourse is a set of propositions expressing a sustained topic over a sequence of utterance or two or more.
>
> -Discontinuous discourse is a discourse in which the discourse topics of each utterance are not linked in any obvious way.

As for Crystal (1985), discourse can be defined as a continuous stretch of language larger than a sentence. Widdowson's (1973:66) definition goes in the same sense with that of Crystal. For him discourse will be conceived as the use of sentences in cornbination.

These definitions regard any unit larger than a sentence as discourse. Halliday and Hassan (1976) who use the term discourse to refer to the highest hierachical level of language also share this view. They point out that discourse is made up of paragraphs. The paragraphs are made of sentences and the sentences in turn consist of words.

From these views arises confusion between a Discourse and a text because even a text is formed by more than one sentence. Moreover a text is also viewed in terms of hierarchy. Where is the difference then?

II.1.2. Discourse - Text Distinction

The distinction between text and discourse emerges from a consideration of different approaches to the description of language in use. Here, I refer to H.G. Widdowson's (1979) distinction between the two terms illustrated for him in the work of Harris (1952) and in the work of Labov (1969). The latter look at language as follows:

For Harris (1952:357), "language does not occur in stray words or sentences but in connected discourse." He demonstrates this interconnection of words or sentences by his distributional method, which consists in "establishing equivalence classes of morphemes" and in showing that in many cases two otherwise different sentences contain the same combination of equivalence classes, even though they may contain different combinations of morphemes.

In his approach, Harris (1952) discovers a patterning in the discourse in terms of chains of equivalences. And this is what pushes H.G Widdowson (1979) not to share the same views about the way he looked at language. According to him, what Harris (1952) does is to reduce different message forms to make them correspond to a common code pattern. The fact that the variation in the message form may have some significant value is for him irrelevant. His concern is not to characterise discourse as communication, but use it to exemplify the operation of language code in stretches of text larger than a

sentence. In other words, he ignored the communicative act, which is prior to the understanding of the nature of discourse. This is the reason why H.G Widdowson (1952) qualified Harris's inquiry as having nothing to do with discourse analysis. He therefore proposes to call this investigation into the formal properties of a piece of language **"text analysis"**. In fact, what Harris does corresponds to the purpose of text analysis, which is to discover how a text exemplifies the operation of language code beyond the limit of the sentence.

Contrary to Harris (1952) who conceives discourse in purely formal terms as a series of connected sentences, Labov's (1969: 54-55) thinking is as follows:

> commands and refusals are actions, declaratives, interrogatives, imperatives are linguistic categories - things that are said, rather than things that are done. The rules we need will show how things are done with words and how one interprets these utterances as actions: in other words, relating what is done to what is said and what is said to what is done. This area of linguistics can be called "discourse analysis" but it is not well known or developed.

Here, Labov (1969) is putting emphasis on how language forms are used to perform social actions. And the way he defines the term `Discourse analysis' meets the approbation of H.G Widdowson (1979). It is then on the basis of this definition that he uses the label **"Discourse Analysis"** to refer to the investigation into the way sentences are put to communicative use in the performing of social actions, discourse being roughly defined, therefore, as the use of sentences (H.G. Widdowson, 1979:93).

In short, from the way the two authors attempted to look at language beyond the limit of a sentence, Widdowson (1979) have tried to make a distinction between text and discourse. The former is defined as sentences in combination held together by a pattern of equivalencies whereas the latter is considered as the use of sentences to perform acts of communication. In the present case, discourse will be viewed in the same way as Widdowson (1979).

II.1.3. Discourse and Pragmatics

The analysis of discourse cannot exclude the study of pragmatics as this has been pointed out by Brown and Yule (1983). In their point of view, carrying out discourse analysis includes dealing with pragmatics. In fact, Levinson (1983:27) clearly shows in his definition how pragmatics relates to Discourse analysis. His definition is couched in the following terms:

> Pragmatics is the study of deixis,
> implicature, speech acts and
> aspects of discourse structure.

From this definition, one can conceive discourse structure as being part of what pragmatics is concerned with. By discourse structure, Stubs (1981:1) means:

> the study of organisation of language above the sentence...or above the clause, and therefore the study of larger linguistic units such as conversational exchanges, or written text.

Indeed, discourse structure is very important to our study in that, the main concern of the present study is drawn from an "aspect of discourse structure", which are conversational exchanges.

Another researcher who shows the relationship between discourse and pragmatics is Leech (1981:1). He states that "We cannot understand the nature of language unless we understand pragmatics: how language is used in communication." In fact, Leech's statement about pragmatics is oriented in the same sense as the definition of Richard, et al. (1983), who view discourse as the result of an act of communication. For them then, discourse is a general term for language use.

Still other linguists have defined pragmatics in the way that allows us to see how pragmatics and discourse analysis are related. Morris (1983:18) states that pragmatics is the theory of language taken from the "point of view of users". And B. Fraser (1984:30) on his behalf asserts that pragmatics is the theory of communication.

From all these definitions, the relationship between pragmatics and discourse analysis appears: their main concern is how language is used in everyday communication.

Pragmatics and discourse analysis are also related with regard to the importance of the context that both should take into account.

Fillmore (1977:119) raises the importance of context when he advocates a methodology to which a discourse analyst may often wish to appeal:

> The task is to determine what we know about the meaning and context of an utterance given only the knowledge that the utterance has occurred...

Fillmore's advocation puts emphasis on the meaning and context of an utterance.

As for Brown and Yule (1983:26), any analytic approach in linguistic which involves contextual consideration necessarily belongs to that area called "pragmatics". He goes on saying that, in "Pragmatics" as in "Discourse analysis", we are concerned with what people using a language are doing and accounting for linguistic features employed in the discourse as a means employed in what they are doing.

Briefly, context needs to be discussed because it is an important aspect shared both by pragmatics and discourse analysis. But, before dealing with it, stating their difference is worthwhile since the two terms cannot be used interchangeably. Discourse is prototypical of language use while pragmatics is the empirical kind of investigation of language usage. Here one may wonder if "pragmatics" is the only empirical study that "discourse" analysis may involve. Certainly not, it also involves doing syntax and semantics, but it primarily consists in doing "pragmatics", argues Brown and Yule (1983). These authors are right in arguing this, because discourse is the most basic kind of language use. So, it deserves to be studied pragmatically.

II.2. Context of utterance

There is no simple answer to the question "what is context?" to cite Lyons' (1981:819) words. However, some authors have attempted to explain the term.

According to Hymes (1964) cited in Brown and Yule (1983:37-38), a context can support a range of meanings. He therefore asserts that

> when a form is used in context, it eliminates the meanings possible to that context other than those the form can signal: the context eliminates from consideration the meanings possible to the form other than those the context can support.

In this assertion, Hymes (1964) is emphasising the role of context in the interpretation of an utterance.

As for Brown and Yule (1983:25), context refers to circumstances in which language is used. Here, the emphasis is put on the situation of language

use. This is in fact right because what is uttered in a given situation or circumstance must be contextually interpreted.

Wells (1981:158) also provides a view point as far as context is concerned. He considers context as a source for interpreting problematic or ambiguous utterances. In other words, context helps to remove a number of ambiguities that the utterances may have.

A similar view is held by Wardhaugh (1985:102) who sees context in terms of its role and states also that context helps to remove the multiple ambiguities that the utterances would have in isolation. This is why he suggests not to ignore the context of use in conversation.

In this regard, a number of features of context relevant to the disambiguation of an utterance have been suggested by Hymes (1964). For him, the more the analyst knows about the features of context, the more he is able to predict what is likely to be said. And the most important features are: participants, physical context or setting of an utterance, the topic, channel and code.

- Participants: Any communicative situation entails at least two interactants: the addresser and the addressee. Lyons (1977:36) then underlines that the speaker addresses an utterance to another person who is present in the situation. He focuses on the social status of the participants, which determines the term of the address if the speaker is to produce appropriate sentences in various situations. Participants may also include audience, writes Fasold (1990:44). For instance, in the present work, the speaker may address himself to the audience or to a single speaker. In both cases, he may need to put special marking to some words or expressions to attract the hearer's or the audience's attention.

- Physical context or setting of an utterance: This refers to the time and place that determine the situation of an event. Wardhaugh (1985:102) expresses well the importance of setting when he says that "an utterance can make reference to the external world in the way that it names objets and participants and indicates places, positions and times."

A similar view is developed by Fasold (1990:44) who defines a setting as the physical circumstances of a communicative event including time and place. Of both definitions, one can say that, the speaker and the hearer must know the world in which they are operating in.

- Channel and code: these terms refer respectively to the means by which participants have contact and the language or dialect being used.

Generally speaking, context is of unquestionable importance for the appropriate use of language. However, important context may be, the listener still has problems as far as the interpretation of the speaker's meaning is concerned. This is what Grice (1975) has explained in his theory of conversational implicature.

II.2.1.Grice's theory of conversational implicature

Implicature is a term initiated by Grice (1975) to account for the listener's ability to guess the meaning intended by his/her addresser. Therefore, this refers to what the speaker implies rather than what he/she literally means. This view is also supported by Grice (1975) himself when he states that conversational implicature refers to the hearer's assumption to reinterpret messages so as to accord with the presumption that Cooperatiive Principle is observed. In this respect, this activity requires an explicit reasoning in order to grasp the speaker's intended meaning. This is well expressed by Grice (1975), cited in Leech (1983:30), when he says that:

> The presence of conversational implicature must be capable of being worked out by means of reasoning.

As for K.Allan (1986:183), he defines conversational implicature as "a pragmatic inference arising from the speaker's use of a particular language expression in particular context under conventional cooperative conditions".

From this definition, it is clear that the speaker must operate under some conventions, which oblige him/her to be cooperative with his/her listeners. Thus, it is those cooperative conditions that will allow interactants to maintain a good conversation. Such conventions have been referred to as the Cooperative Principle, to use Grice's (1975) own words.

II.2.2. Grice's Cooperative Principle

Speaking to others is a social activity and like other social activities, it can only take place if the people involved (speaker and hearer) mutually recognise that certain conventions govern their actions and their use of language (see K.Allan 1986). The speaker and the hearer have to cooperate one with the other, to join Wardhaugh's (1985:38) opinion about the speaking activity. For him, talk is a "reciprocal undertaking" during which each participant must obey some rules. Such rules constitute, according to Grice (1975), the Cooperative Principle. From this Cooperative Principle, he identifies four categories of maxims that serve as a reference point for language interchange. They are presented as follows (See.K. Allan 1986:30):

1. The maxim of quantity: The speaker should give no more and no less information than is required to make his message clear to the hearer.

2. The maxim of quality: Do not say what you believe to be false. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

3. The maxim of relation: Speaker's utterance should not (in general) be irrelevant to the context in which it is uttered, because that might make it difficult for the hearer to comprehend.

4. The maxim of manner: Where possible, speaker's meaning should be presented in a clear, concise manner that avoid ambiguity, and avoid misleading or confusing the hearer because of stylistic ineptitude.

These four maxims are normally considered as a means for the efficient use of language in conversation. For this reason, they have to be observed. However, Grice (1975) clearly says that the maxims should be seen not so much as rules to be obeyed as grammar rules are - but as a reference point for language interchange.

Thus, the application of maxims of the Cooperative Principle is a matter of preferences. For instance, for this study, the maxim of quality will be sometimes violated because the speaker may lie if he believes that the lies are to his advantage. But, he must assure himself that his addressee will leave without any doubt about what he has been told. In the same way, the maxim of manner may be violated because we most of the time find in a given language expressions which are similar in meanings but which are used under different contexts. And this may creates ambiguities on the part of the language users.

When the Cooperative Principle (C.P) proves to be weak in certain circumstances, it can be associated with what Leech (1983:80) calls the Politeness Principle (P.P.). This complementarity is expressed by Leech (1983) in the following terms:

> (...) it must be admitted that the Cooperative Principle is in a weak position if apparent exceptions to it cannot be satisfactorily explained. It is for that reason that the Politeness Principle can be seen not just as another Principle to be added to Cooperative Principle, but a necessary complement, which rescues the Cooperative Principle from serious trouble.

Thus, the Politeness Principle completes the Cooperative Principle where this one fails.

The following maxims are provided by Leech (1983:132) to support the " Principle of Politeness".

I. Tact maxim:

a. Minimise cost to other.
b. Maximise benefit to other.

II. Generosity maxim:

a. Minimise benefit of self.
b. Maximise cost to self.

III. Approbation Maxim:

a. Minimise dispraise of other.
b. Maximise praise of other.

IV. Modesty Maxim:

a. Minimise disagreement between self and other.
b. Maximise agreement between self and other.

Through all those maxims (the maxims of Cooperative Principle together with the maxims of Politeness Principle), the speaker may imply something quite different from what they say. This leads us to the theory of speech acts.

II.3. Speech acts

Any utterance can be regarded as Speech acts, argues K.Allan (1986:164). Therefore, linguistic communication implies linguistic acts. Austin (1962) cited in Fasold (1990:147) has made the same observation when he says that "The uttering of sentences is, or is part of, the doing of an action".

Searle (1969) is of the same opinion when he says that in talking, the speaker performs an act. Thus, language is used as the basis for an action to be performed.

Levinson (1983:236) distinguishes three kinds of speech acts associated with any utterance:

1. A locutionary act: Performing the act of saying something.

2. An illocutionary act: Performing an act in saying something.

3. A perlocutionary act: Performing an act by saying something.

It is worth mentioning that the speaker has no choice of one or the other among these acts because they are performed at one and the same time. Hence, for the present work, only illocutionary aspect is of much help as far as the interpretation of meaning of warranting expressions is concerned. In fact, it is the only one, which is related to the speaker's communicative goal.

The illocutionary aspect involves an illocutionary act and an illocutionary force or action. And the distinction between the two is made by the utterer. To illustrate this, K. Allan (1986:164) distinguishes the two terms as follows:

> The illocutionary act is performed by the speaker, and the illocutionary force or illocutionary point is a property of an utterance which the speaker issues in performing an illocutionary act.

Therefore, the illocutionary force is perceived through what the speaker is saying. In other words, the illocutionary force is what the utterance indicates that the speaker intends the hearer to recognise as the message bearing of the utterance.

An illocutionary act may be direct or indirect. In direct illocutionary act, the intended effect on the hearer is likely to be automatically deducible from the sense of the utterance, whereas the force of an illocutionary act, which is indirect, is to be inferred from the context.

For the present work, some warranting expressions will be recognised as bearing indirect illocution such as some proverbs and some swearing expressions while others which seem to be directly understood from the sense of an utterance will be termed as direct illocutionary act. But both forces will be inferred from Grice's Cooperative Principle, which constitutes a set of implicatures with regard to the context.

Since it is from conversations that warranting expressions will be drawn, the concept of conversation deserves to be studied carefully. Conversational analysis will then constitute a key to a better understanding of what language is and how it works.

II.4. The notion of conversational analysis

II.4.1. Definitions

The term conversation is very complicated to define because it raises some ambiguities. One may wonder if any kind of talk can be considered as conversation. For instance, is the kind of talk held in a meeting a conversation? Some researchers have tried to overcome those ambiguities by defining the concept of conversation.

For William Edmondson (1981) conversation is used loosely and non-technically to refer to any interactional stretch of talk involving at least two participants and taking place in non-formalised setting, such that no special rules or conventions may be said to operate.

Similarly, Levinson (1983:284) defines a conversation as that "familiar predominant kind of talk in which two or more participants alternate in speaking, which only occurs outside specific institutional setting like religious services, law court, classroom activities and the like".

Those definitions are good in that during a talk, everyone is free to talk, to express his ideas without constraints. Moreover, Edmondson's (1981) and Levinson's (1983) definitions remove in a way or another the ambiguities raised at the beginning. Through them then, are excluded classroom or court room activities...although they display conversational activities. Henceforth, Levinson (1983:318) makes a distinction between a "conversation" and a "conversational activity". He asserts that a conversation is characterizable in terms of local

organisation and especially the turn-taking strategies. E.g.: sermons don't have the turn-taking strategies.

Funk and Wagnell (1967:312) also provide some views about conversation. They see it as a period of "idling felt, to be an end in itself". They also say that the divergence of opinions during that time cannot hamper the continuation of relationship of the parties. This is right because when people are idling and chatting, they are free to talk about what they want.

Although through all those definitions we have the impression that conversation is randomly held, it is naturally structured as it has been pointed out by Garfinkel and Sacks (1970) who were first to focus on conversation as "the simplest instance of naturally organised activity".

II.4.2 Conversational structure

Conversation must have ways of getting started, have topic(s), i.e., what is talked about, and be concludable. Garfinkel and Sacks (1970) also made the same observation. According to them, conversation is formed of the following parts:

- The opening section which usually begins a conversation. This will generally involve an exchange of greetings, which are referred to as "routinized utterances" or "formulaic expressions". For example, a telephone conversation may begin by an exchange of `Hello's' and a meeting between strangers may require an exchange of `how do you do's' followed by some kind of self identification, and meeting between acquaintances may involve an exchange of `how are you's'.

- Series of turn- taking: Here, the speaker A talks and then stops to give the floor to the speaker B who also stops to let the speaker A talk again. This cycle goes on until the end of the conversation. But this turn-taking must involve a topic or topics on which to talk. For instance, the speaker A may have something he wishes to convey to, or discuss with the speaker B. It goes without saying that what constitutes a topic in a conversation is not at all clear. Brown and Yule (1983:89) are also of the same conviction when they say that:

> it is a feature of a lot of conversations that `topics' are not fixed before-hand, but are negotiated in the process of conversing. Each speaker contributes to the conversation in terms of both the existing topic framework and his personal topic.

- The closing section which ends the conversation. This involves an exchange of `Goodbyes'. According to Fasold (1990), an actual closing may involve several steps: the closing down of a topic, e.g.; `So that agreed' or `one o'clock", then' repeated by the other party or acknowledged in some form; then some kind of pre-closing exchange, e.g.; 'okay-okay', a further possible

acknowledgement of the nature of the exchange, e.g; `good to see you', `thanks again', or `See you soon', and finally an exchange of farewells; e.g.; `bye-bye'.

II.5. Research On Warranting Expressions.

The present work aims at studying warranting expressions in Kirundi discourse. Thus, a survey of studies on Warranting expressions is worth of being carried out since it constitutes the corner stone of the whole paper. For this reason, this section will focus on some views by authors about how a Warranting behavior is displayed by some language users.

According to Wardhaugh (1985) a warranting behaviour is most of the time adopted when it seems necessary to give a kind of personal "marking" to words or sentiments that you are expressing, so that those who are listening to you can be left in little or no doubt as to what you believe or feel about what you are saying. This is clearly a warranting behaviour, and a whole variety of expressions exist: between us, frankly, personally, in my opinion, as far as I can tell, to be honest, actually, realistically, in fact, I will be perfectly (or absolutely, quite), frank... Such expressions allow you to show the degree of commitment you have to what you are saying, but, of course, like all such expressions, they can also be used to deceive, since all remarks prefaced by "to be honest" are not offered honestly. From Wardhaugh's view, warranting expressions are the kind of expressions one may have recourse to when he wants to gain trust from others.

To warranting expressions may also be added some swearing expressions. According to C. Kigeme (1990:8), "Swearing expressions are generally used to prove the truthfulness of one's saying but they can also be used if the speaker knows that he is lying". Thus, C.Kigeme's (1990) assertion about swearing expressions accords with Wardhaugh's views about warranting expressions. Both aim at showing one's truthfulness.

Some proverbs can in the same way be used as expressions showing a warranting behaviour. This happens from time to time with the intention of instructing or giving advice. A similar vision is that of R.Finnegan (1970:414), who argues that "proverbs may also be specially suitable even in everyday situation of advice or instruction". Proverbs have also the tendency to attract the imagination of the listeners. This is because they are recognised as "eternal truths", to use Isodore Okpewho (1992:231) terms. It is in this regard that some speakers refer to them to convince or to advise.

Warranting may also be accorded with achieving persuasion. Here, we join what Aristotle (1952: 587) says about rhetorics. He defines it as the faculty of observing in any case the available means of persuasion. Rhetoric can then be regarded as an art of using language skilfully for persuasion.

The achievement of trust and persuasion is not an easy task. It requires some techniques on the part of the speaker. Aristotle (1952: 595) distinguishes three kinds of modes of persuasion furnished by the spoken word:

-The first depends on the personal character of the speaker,
-The second on putting the audience into a certain frame of mind,
-The third on the proof provided by the words of speech itself.

Concerning persuasion achieved by speaker's personal character, the speaker has not only to make himself/herself credible in what he/she is saying, but also his/her character must be the most effective one. Aristotle (1952:595) is then among those who believe into the character's goodness as a means of persuasion. He puts it in the following terms:

> We believe good men more fully and readily
> than others: this is true generally whatever
> the question is, and absolutely true where
> exact certainty is impossible and opinion divided.

Aristotle (1952) is right when he asserts this because people tend to have prejudices about their interlocutor's character before they begin to speak.

Persuasion may also be achieved by taking into account the audience's emotion. This is what Aristotle (1952:) calls " putting the audience into a certain frame of mind". In other words, the speaker will try through what he is saying to stir the hearer's emotion, because our judgements when we are pleased and friendly are not the same as when we are pained and hostile. It is then crucial for the speaker to be emotional in order to persuade the audience or the hearer. In fact an emotional speaker always makes his audience feel with him even when there is nothing in his arguments. While expressing emotion, the orator makes sure that he is impressing his audience by some speech devices, says Aristotle (1952). Some of those devices are: who does not know this? Or it is known to everybody. This pushes the hearer to feel ashamed of his ignorance and agrees with the speaker so as to have a share of knowledge that everybody else expresses.

The last means of persuasion according to Aristotle (1952: 595) is effected through speech itself when we have proved a truth or an apparent truth by means of persuasive arguments to the case in question.

In short, these are the three means of effecting persuasion. According to Aristotle (1952:595), the man who is in command of them must, it is clear, be able:

a) to reason logically,
b) to understand human character and goodness in their various forms.
c) to understand the emotions, to name them, to know their causes and the way in which they are excited.

To sum up, this chapter has been concerned with five main points:

The first section dealt with the concept of discourse. This has put emphasis on the definitions of discourse, discourse-text distinction, discourse and pragmatics, and their relationships led me to the second section.

The latter dealt with the notion of context of utterance together with Grice's theory of conversational implicature and his Cooperative Principle. Moreover it stated the Politeness Principle, which is associated with the Cooperative Principle in case this one fails.

The third section focussed on the three kinds of speech acts associated with any utterrance.

Conversational analysis is what is developed in the fourth section. This section has mainly provided the definitions of conversation and has shown clearly how conversation is naturally organised.

The fifth section has been concerned with what other researchers have said about warranting expressions.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY.

III.1. Data Collection

The collection of data can be accomplished through a variety of sources as it has been singled out by Mikkelsen (1995:74) in the following words:

> No matter what our research topic is, there is almost always a wealth of information hidden in a variety of sources.

Among the various sources, one can use written material, questionnaires, video cassettes or capture information at fresh and note them down... This of course depends on the kind of research one is carrying out. Therefore, one must choose the source which is appropriate to its work. In other words, data collection must be carried out in such a way as to bring good results.

As far as my study is concerned, video cassettes from Burundi National Television have captured my attention. I have collected some already recorded instances of conversation from "Ninde?", a television program. The selection of conversations has been specially based on those containing information relevant to this study. Before giving the reasons why I have operated on this choice, it is important to say in brief what "Ninde?" is about.

"Ninde?" is a Kirundi play, weekly performed both on Burundi National Radio and television. It is played by rural characters and in natural settings. Three reasons motivated my choice: the choice of recorded spoken conversation and the choice of a play especially performed by rural characters.

On the one hand, I lean on Brown's and Yule's (1983) recommendation to use either written text or tape recordings. And hence my choice went to the category of tape recordings which are video cassettes because they both record spoken version. It is then up to the discourse analyst to make a written transcription, annotated according to his interests on a particular occasion (see Brown and Yule, 1983: 9)

On the other hand, spoken language as well as written language are both used for social ends. They can be used to reflect everyday life. A similar vision captures the attention of Fowler (1981:8) who argues that

> speaking or writing in a variety articulates its own view of the world, and that articulation is a social practice, a conscious or unconscious intervention in the organisation of society.

Among the various categories of spoken instances of conversation, the present work has chosen to use plays. The reason of this choice is mostly linked to the fact that in plays, characters act out scenes of everyday life. This view is also shared by Ngowe L.NGOWE cited in S.SINIZEYE (1989:3) when she states that:

> L'essence du théatre est d'être avant tout un dialogue où les interlocuteurs sont le dramaturge et son public.

Translated as: The essence of the play is to be first of all a dialogue where the interactants are the dramatists and his audience.

Therefore, plays can be used to display the language behaviour of a given society in general and in particular, they will be used to sort out how Burundians display their warranting behaviour through appropriate expressions.

Another reason to give is why, among the various Rundi plays, the present study has chosen "Ninde?" plays. As it has already been pointed out earlier, "Ninde?" plays are played by rural characters and performed in natural settings. What mostly interested me is that, the language used is close to natural communication and the conversation held between characters is almost fresh and authentic.

This assertion is valid because as I was asking to "Ninde's?" producer to give me the scripts of the plays, he told me that when the actors are given a topic, they develop it into a play as they perform. There is no written version.

Regarding which "Ninde?" plays to choose, I watched many "Ninde?" television plays, from which I chose five plays that I found most suitable to my work. In each play, I did not use the whole play but concentrated on the chunks of conversation containing elements relevant to the topic under study. And if preference was given to video versions rather than the audio "Ninde?" versions recorded by the Burundi National Radio and Television first channel, it is because the first are more suitable for viewing than the second.

III.2. Data Analysis Procedures

Data analysis will be based on warranting expressions drawn from "Ninde?" plays. They will be analysed by taking into account their context of use. This is to mean that, the analysis will be based on the whole utterances including warranting expressions because the meaning of an utterance derives from its context. And as it can be seen, the analysis of data will take a pragmatic approach. Pragmatics in Levinson's view (1981:24) is " the study of the ability of language users to pair sentences with the context in which they would be appropriate". Thus, while analysing the collected data, I will interpret it in the light of some sets of context in which sentences would be appropriately used. In doing so, I will determine the function of warranting expressions and thereby

their illocutionary force in particular situations. Moreover, I will try to see if Grice's theory of implicature is relevant to those situations and if not I will try to see if it can be completed by Leech's Politeness Principle.

CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS

As noted earlier, the analysis of data will be based on warranting expressions drawn from conversation selected from" Ninde?" plays. While analyzing them, I classify them into four groups: expressions playing the role of adverbs, some swearing expressions, some proverbs and some other expressions.

IV.1. Some Expressions Playing the Role of Adverbs

In the conversations selected from "Ninde?" plays, some expressions used to display a warranting behavior have been recognized as playing the role of adverbs. In fact, these expressions take the place of adverbs in a given sentence. For instance in these sentences:

-Kubinyerekeye, ndazi ingene vyagenze.	- As far as I am concerned, I know how it happened.
- Nivyo naravyiboneye.	- Really, I have seen it.
- Vyukuri, ivyo bintu ntubikure ngaho	- Really, do not take those things away

These kind of expressions have been referred to as "discourse markers"by Michael Swan (1980:24). According to the same author, they are expressions, which show our attitude to what we are saying, or which connect it with what came before. They can then be used by a speaker when he wants to put emphasis on some words or expressions that he thinks can persuade his listeners.

The following situations contain some selected examples that are going to be analyzed contextually.

Situation 1

BAKUNDUKIZE: Mbega yemwe ko uno munsi utugendeye sasita, bikugendeye gute ko mbona wahora uza ku mugoroba? N'amahoro?

VYITEYIMANZA: Mbega wewe aka kanya wibagiye ivyo twavuganye ejo? Ntakubesha, ga kiyago, ubuho bija kuja muburyo ivya twe na wamugore wanje, azokwibonerako sha!

Translation

BAKUNDUKIZE: How come you visit us at noon? What is the matter since you used to come in the evening? Is it okay?

VYITEYIMANZA: Have you forgotten so early what we talked about Yesterday? To tell the truth, my dear, the problem between my wife and me is going to be solved. She will suffer, dear!

In this situation, VYITEYIMANZA goes to see BAKUNDUKIZE at noon. The latter is worried about this visit because she was used to see him in the evening. BAKUNDUKIZE's turn expresses anxiety. She seems to have forgotten what they have been talking about the day before. But, in reality, she is eager to know if he has fulfilled the promise. This was a round about way to express it. VYITEYIMANZA's reply is a kind of remedy to the situation. He understands BAKUNDUKIZE's worries, that is why he is trying to reassure her about what he has promised. To say it, he uses a discourse marker "ntakubesha" meaning "to tell you the truth".

In general, this expression is used to display one's truth. Here VYITEYIMANZA utters it to make BAKUNDUKIZE believe him because he has realized that she is doubtful. This is in fact why he looks for an expression which could give strength to what he is saying. To reinforce this, he also adds a term of endearment, "ga kiyago" meaning "my dear". This sweet word is used in the same way to express a warranting behavior. The addressee will feel flattered and therefore will tend to believe in his addresser though this one may be lying. Through this expression then, the speaker (here VYITEYIMANZA) is expressing emotion. In other words he is putting the hearer into a certain frame of mind. He wants her to realize how much he cares about her and for this reason, he can't in any case tell her lies.

Other expressions, which may be used in the same way as "ntakubesha", are "sivyimbeshere", "ntakabeshere karimwo".

Here, the goal expected by VYITEYIMANZA is not achieved as illustrated in the conversation that immediately follows, BAKUNDUKIZE is still reluctant. This is the reason why, VYITEYIMANZA goes on trying to persuade her.

BAKUNDUKIZE: Uti rero vyagenze gute? Ubwo vyukuri vyashobotse?

VYITEYIMANZA: Yewe gaye! Kandi wewe bwabundi ntunyemera, ntiwemera ivyo ndakubwiye! Ivyo nakubwiye n'ibirya nyene, n'ivyo nibibe vyo nikuye umukoshi. Narakubwiye ko nshaka kwibanira nawewe umbona ugatwenga, nayo karya kagore kangaburira ibitozo vyimbwa, sha...

Translation

BAKUNDUKIZE: How did it happen? Did it really happen?

VYITEYIMANZA: What a surprise! But you don't believe what I tell you! What I told is really true. It is true and I am glad it is. I told you I want to live with you who see me and laugh, but that small woman who gives me dog's food...

In this part of conversation, BAKUNDUKIZE wants a full explanation of how it happened, as for her it is too good to be true. It is in this respect that she asks the following question: " Vyukuri vyashobotse?" meaning " Is it true that it happened?" She needs more reassurance. VYITEYIMANZA's first utterance is rather a surprise. He does not understand why his interlocutor does not believe in him. For him BAKUNDUKIZE should not have any doubt in what she has been told. To prove this, he uses the discourse marker "ni vyo" meaning " it is true", followed by another convincing expression "nibibe vyo", meaning "may it be true". This shows that an explanation of why it is true is going to be given. The aim of the expression is also to grant force to what the speaker is saying.

Consider also the following warranting expression drawn from the same situation.

BAKUNDUKIZE: Oya niko mugabo ntiwanyiganiye ingene vyagenze.

VYITEYIMANZA: Ngirango uranzi jewe VYITEYIMANZA ko ico nitumye ndagikora. Neza na neza, namubwiye ko abwirizwa kuva mukazi akaza arantekera indya. Ngasanga rero atavyemeye, kandi ndazi ko atavyemera, nca ndamwirukana ajane n'abana kuko ntabo yansanganye.

BAKUNDUKIZE: Ugerageze uko ushoboye kwose ubirukane, naho atari ivyo ntaco tuvugana.

Translation

BAKUNDUKIZA: Yes, but you didn't tell me how it happened.

VYITEYIMANZA: It think you know that me, VYITEYIMANZA, I always accomplish my will. Well, I told her to leave her job and prepare me food instead. If she doesn't accept and, and I know she won't, I will chase her away with her children because she didn't find me with them.

BAKUNDUKIZE: Try to do your best in order to chase them away, otherwise don't tell me anything.

In these chunks of conversation, BAKUNDUKIZE begins to believe in her interlocutor (VYITEYIMANZA). This is expressed through 'oya niko' meaning 'yes'. This shows that VYITEYIMANZA's sayings are having effect on BAKUNDUKIZE. But, the latter still needs details of how things happened. It is in this respect that VYITEYIMANZA has recourse to the expression 'neza na neza' meanig 'well' to make his explanation more understandable than before. In fact, 'neza na neza' is a discourse marker mostly used when one wants to recount events by providing complete details of how things occurred. Its function may also be that of assuring someone about the truth of one's sayings. In other words, it may be used to support one's ideas, as in the present case.

Although BAKUNDIKIZE has expressed a kind agreement in her previous move, she still insists on what she has been promised in the next move. She wants it to be fulfilled at all cost, that is why she is threatening VYITEYIMANZA to break their relationship if he does not happen to chase his family away.

From the beginning of this situation to the above part of conversation, BAKUNDUKIZE flouts the "Politeness Principle" because she does not agree with what VYITEYIMANZA is telling her. Thus, she has violated the agreement maxim which consists of minimizing disagreement between self and other and maximizing agreement between self and other.

Let us analyze the last part of this situation.

VYITEYIMANZA: Ariko mwiza wa bantu hari uwutokora wewe ivyo ushaka vyose? Muvyukuri sindakubesha uno munsi ku mugoroba nyene ivyo twifuza twe nawe birashoboka ndagapfa.

BAKUNDUKIZE: Oya ntiwirirwe urarahira gutyo numvise.

Translation

VYITEYIMANZA: Who wouldn't do whatever you want him to do, best of all people? In reality, I am not lying to you, what you and I want will happen this night, otherwise I should die.

BAKUNDUKIZE: Do not swear like that, I have understood.

Here, VYITEYIMANZA goes on persuading BAKUNDUKIZE as she still has doubt. He therefore needs more convincing arguments than before. It is for this reason that he specifies the time at which he will accomplish the promise. For him, the latest will be this night. To reinforce his arguments, he uses "muvyukuri" meaning " in reality". This expression like others such as " nivyukuri", "ni ukuri" embody the idea of truth. They can then be used to warrant since they indicate one's feeling of sincerity about what to follow. And the illocutionary act is to make a promise like all the expressions used in situation 1. As for their illocutionary force, it is the speaker's wish to be trusted.

Regarding this last interaction, cooperation is achieved as far as persuasion is concerned. BAKUNDUKIZE finally believes VYITEYIMANZA. So, there is the compliance with the Cooperative Principle.

Situation 4

BISESAGU: Zana twaduhera rero turabe ingene tuzodukoresha, turabe ibiro vy'umuceri tuzogura, amasuguru, amakaziye y' ibiyeri, eka n'ibindi bikenewe.

BIRAHINDUKA: Ariko uriyibagiye ntu, jewe mbona yuko ivyo bintu vyose uriko uradondagora, mbona bidakenewe, ntagusesagurira abatazobigushimira.

Translation

BISESAGU: Bring the money then so that we see how we will spend it, and see the quantity of rice we will buy, the number of he-goats, parks of beer, and other things which are needed.

BIRAHINDUKA: But you forget yourself, personally I see that, all those things you are enumerating are not necessary. It isn't worth giving to people who will not be grateful.

BISESAGU and his wife BIRAHINDUKA are talking about preparing a feast for the inauguration of a new house. BISESAGU wants to spend a lot of money and his wife is trying to convince him about the way they could reduce the expenses.

The first move is that of BISESAGU who is ordering his wife to bring money in order to plan how they will spend it. According to him, the feast should be great, that is why he is enumerating what should be bought. The second move is that of his wife. Through this move, she is expressing a refusal to what her husband wants to do. For her, such expenses are not necessary for those who will not be grateful. To give a personal marking to what she is saying, she uses the expression "jewe mbona yuko" meaning, "personally, I see that". In general, this discourse marker is most of the time used by a speaker to indicate to his listeners the intent of his utterances and his attitude towards his subject matter.

Consider also the example of discourse marker in the same situation:

BISESAGU: Ariko abagore namwe, erega mukuzimu ntibanezerwa.

BIRAHINDUKA: Oya nyumviriza ndakubwire uko ndavyibaza, urabona twahitiye twubaka iyo inzu, kandi urabona amafaranga yadutwaye ingene ari menshi. Reka tugure bikeyi nk'ikaziye imwe y'ibiyeri, n' ibiro bikeyi vy'umuceri, inyama nazo tuzogura izo kukiro, ntamasuguru ngaho. Ico nzi co, eka nakubwiye ko abo bose ushaka kubiha atavyo bazogushimira, bazosigara baritwengera wikeneye.

BISESAGU: Namba ari wewe uzoca ubitanga, jewe utwo tungana gutyo nokubahuka ngahamagara abantu?

Translation

BISESAGU: But you women...! There is no joy in the grave.

BIRAHINDUKA: No, instead listen to me so that I tell you what I think about: as you see, we used to build that house and you know that it is costly. Let's buy few things such as one park of beer, some kilos of rice, and for meat we will buy by kilos, no he-goats are needed. What I know is that, all those you want to give those things will not be grateful, they will laugh at you when you will be poor.

BISESAGU: In that case, it will be you who will serve them, for me I can't invite people for such a small quantity.

Here, it is the conversation between BISESAGU and his wife, which is going on. The former's utterance is a refusal of his wife's advice. This is expressed through the way he undermines what women say in general. For him women do not know what is right. Indeed he is determined to spend a lot of money pretending that he will not have fun in the grave. His wife goes on seeking ways of reasoning him. In this regard, she uses the discourse marker "uko ndavyibaza" meaning "I think that" to state her opinions.

Expressions used in this situation are the kind of expressions the speaker uses when he does not want to impose on the others. What he wants is only to show what is right and it is up to hearer to make a decision on what to do. One may therefore say that when a speaker accompanies his sayings with these kinds of expressions, he is indirectly inviting his listener to change his mind. In fact, they add a further dimension to one's sayings, a dimension which at least is intended to help the listener interpret the remarks addressed to him. And this is BIRAHINDUKA's intention in the present situation when she is showing to her husband how she conceives the matter. In doing so, she wants to make her husband understand that what he is intending to do is wrong. In other words, she is inviting him to think about the situation so as to decide on the appropriate thing to do. The illocutionary act is then that of giving advice whereas its force is the advice to be followed.

The warranting expressions in situation 4 do not lead BISESAGU to join his wife's suggestions as far as spending for the feast is concerned. From the way BISESAGU replies to his wife, one can say that, the expressions have less force because they are said by a woman. BISESAGU is then the kind of man who believes in the traditional Burundian statement which says that "Ntajambo ry'umugore", meaning "women have nothing to say". Thus, he violates two maxims: the approbation maxim and the agreement maxim. The first tells us to minimize dispraise of other and maximize praise of other. As for the second, it tells us to minimize disagreement between self and other and maximize agreement between self and other. So, the Cooperative Principle has not been complied with.

The following situation illustrates devices which are rather similar where one tries to convince others by showing one's point of view.

Situation 5

BISESAGU: Mba ndaguhamagaye ugasubira ugasoma ariko n'uko wihuta,mugabo ntaco ndafise urundi rubanza rwo kunezereza umwana azogenda mw'ishule yisumbuye.

Umugenzi wa
BISESAGU: Mugenzi, kubwanje mbona ari ugusesagura, urwo rubanza naho woba urarureka ntaco vyoba bitwaye.

BISESAGU: Eheee! Ntanejereje umwana wanje, n'abaryango bakabonerwaho!

Translation

BISESAGU: I would like to invite you to drink again but you are in a hurry; but there is no problem because I have another feast: the celebration of my daughter's success to the national test.

BISESAGU's friend: My friend, as far as I am concerned, I think that it is squandering, even if you don't do it , it will not be a big deal.

BISESAGU: Yes! I must please my child and the family must benefit from it.

The conversation is between BISESAGU and his friend just after the feast of the inauguration of the house. Everything went well and now he wants to invite his friend for another feast: the celebration of his daughter's success to the national test. This is not appreciated by his friend. That is why the latter is advising him to give up that idea. The expression used to show his position is "kubwanje" meaning "personally". Like in the preceding situation, the illocutionary act is to give advice while its force is to influence the hearer. Moreover, it is the kind of expression used by a speaker who does not want to offend his/her listener by imposing on him/her what to do. The former wants the latter to realize what is right through the remarks being given to him.

In this situation, there is no cooperation because no agreement has been achieved between the interactants. So, the agreement maxim which consists of minimizing disagreement between 'self and other' and maximize agreement between 'self and other' has been violated.

Situation 6

Umugenzi
wa BISESAGU: Reka tuje kurondera agatoke tuzoterere BISESAGU.

Umugore
w'umugenzi
wa BISESAGU: Aho nyene wishizemwo kumuterera? Wibaza ko izo nzoga zose tumuha, n'umunsi mubi akazozidusubisa.

Umugenzi
wa BISESAGU: Uti rero kubwawe tuvyihoze?

Umugore
w'umugenzi
wa BISESAGU: Emwe niko ndabibona pe! Wewe ntubona ingene asesagura, wibaza ko mu minsi iri imbere azoba akironka n'ico afungura?...

Umugenzi
Wa BISESAGU: Mugabo ndaguye ndagarutse, mama ntoba ndiko ndasesagura.

Translation

BISESAGU's friend: Let us go to look for banana to prepare beer for BISESAGU.

The wife of
BISESAGU's friend: Must you really give him beer? Do you believe that all those pots of beer we are giving him will be returned to us? The bad day he will not reimburse it.

BISESAGU's friend: Is your opinion then to ignore it?

The wife of
BISESAGU's friend: Yes, that is how I really see it. Don't you see how he spends too much? Do you think that he will have even have something to eat in coming days?...

BISESAGU's friend: I change my mind, I swear on my mother's name I will be spending for nothing.

BISESAGU's friend and his wife are talking about giving another pot of beer to BISESAGU for the celebration of his daughter's success to the national test. The husband's position is to give beer to BISESAGU. His wife sees things differently. For her, there is no use of giving a pot of beer again because BISESAGU will not be able to reciprocate. To show her personal opinion, she uses the expression "niko ndabibona" meaning this "how I see it". She also adds the expression "pe" which can be translated as "really" to give strength to what she is saying. In adding the word "pe", she wants to mean that, not only what she is saying is her personal view but also she is showing how confident she is of what she is suggesting.

Like the above expressions, the illocutionary act is to state one's opinions whereas its force is to leave the listener with little or no doubt. And this situation is a good illustration of the observance of the Cooperative Principle as far as persuasion is concerned. BISESAGU's friend and his wife have both agreed on what to do.

Situation 7

SINDIHEBURA: Urazi ingorane wewe ufise?

BIRAHINDUKA: Oya...

SINDIHEBURA: Nizo kuvyara intahekana, erega navyo nyene birakonya.

BIRAHINDUKA: Oya inda zubu sinzi ingene zimeze.

SINDIHEBURA: Jewe kubinyerekeye, kenyera wegere muganga agusigurire neza ingene izo ngorane zitosubira kugushikira.

BIRAHINDUKA: Emwe imana yompa iyi nkayiva imbere, noca ndabibaza muganga

Translation

SINDIHEBURA: Do you know what kind of problems you have?

BIRAHINDUKA: No...

SINDIHEBURA: They are related to giving birth without interruption. This also hurts.

BIRAHINDUKA: No, nowadays pregnancies are complicated.

SINDIHEBURA: As far as I am concerned, you have to go to see a doctor, so that he can explain to you how you can overcome your problems.

BIRAHINDUKA: If God can help me to give birth without any problem, I will go and ask about it.

The context of these turns is a conversation between SINDIHEBURA and BIRAHINDUKA. The latter has always had health problems and she does not know what causes them. This is what she is talking about with her friend SINDIHEBURA. She seems to know what disturbs her friend's health. According to her, the problems BIRAHINDUKA is facing are due to her way of not limiting birth. It is for this reason that she proposes her to go to see a doctor so as to help her. To introduce her suggestion, SINDIHEBURA uses the expression "jewe mbona yuko", meaning "in my opinion". This expression is in the same way used to show one's standing and most of the time uttered to get others influenced. Here, it is used to make leave BIRAHINDUKA with no doubt about the advice of going to consult a doctor.

Situation 7 is an example of the compliance with the Cooperative Principle. In fact, the interactants are satisfied with the outcome of the talk.

In short, all those expressions are used directly, for their intended effect is immediately perceived from the sense of the main verb of the utterance. Moreover, they have the effect of attracting the listener's attention to his interlocutor's utterance. This is because after such kind of expressions, what follows is an explanation of the speaker's views. And the hearer has therefore to decide whether he has to join his addresser's point of view or not.

IV.2. SOME PROVERBS USED TO CONVINCE

In Burundian society, proverbs occupy a very important place in discourse. They can be said whenever people are engaged in conversation, that is, they can be used in everyday situations. The same observation is made by R. Finnegan (1970:418) when she says that:

> we can then sum up the various situations
> in which proverbs are used in Africa by
> saying that they really occur on all occasions
> when language is used for communication
> either as art or as tool, that is, on every sort of
> occasion imaginable.

As the functions of proverbs are numerous, the speaker who uses them has to take into account the goals he wishes to achieve or the effect he wants to impact on the audience or the listener. He may want to educate, to flatter, to impress, to warn, to convince....

For the present work, the analysis is based on the proverbs used to convince. In fact, such kinds of proverbs carry truth and advice. People may use them to give strength and power to what they are saying wherever they are: in family, in court, on the road, at the market.... This view is also shared by Tuzagi (1985:51) when he says that a proverb possesses a persuasive force. Moreover, Murekambaze (1998:9) recognizes that when one uses a proverb, one supports his ideas, his arguments or opinions through the wisdom of our elders.

It goes without saying that proverbs are closely related to tradition because they are inherited from our elders and are transmitted from generation to generation. Therefore, they embody the wisdom of our ancestors. Thus, to abstract the cultural context from the analysis would be erroneous because the images used are culturally based.

The following situations from "Ninde?" plays are to be analyzed contextually.

Situation 3

VYITEYIMANZA: Neza na neza ndafise ikintu ndakwiganira...

KIRAHUGANA: Eheee...

VYITEYIMANZA: Urazi mu Kirundi ko bavuga ngo "umugenzi aganyira uwundi"kandi ngo "ibigora bigora abagabo", jewe ndafise ingorane...

KIRAHUGANA: Nyabaki ga ntu?

Translation.

VYITEYIMANZA: Well, I have something to tell you…

KIRAHUGANA: Yeah…

VYITEYIMANZA: As a Kirundi proverb says "we tell our problems to our friends" and "men face hardship", I have problems…

KIRAHUGANA: Problems of what kind?

The conversation is between VYITEYIMANZA and his friend KIRAHUGANA. The former has problems: he has been fired from work because he used office money to satisfy his lover's needs. Moreover, the latter has chased him because he has no more money to give her. These are the reasons why he goes to see his friend for help.

VYITEYIMANZA's first move introduces the reason why he comes to see his friend. But he does not go straight to the point. He starts by reminding him of facts he is already aware of: "umugenzi aganyira uwundi" and" ibigora bigora abagabo" respectively meaning, "a friend tells his problems to another friend" and "men face hardship". By uttering these proverbs, VYITEYIMANZA's intention is to put KIRAHUGANA in the right frame of mind. Through the first proverb, he is reminding his friend how close they are, other wise he would not be telling him his problems. One can say that he is looking for sympathy. The second proverb is used to create some kind of solidarity. Through it, he is meaning that they can both face hardship as they are both men. In other words, he wants him to find quite normal what happened to him by making him understand that what he underwent may also happen to him. In this situation, the illocutionary act is to seek understanding from KIRAHUGANA and its force is VYITEYIMANZA's wish to be understood and consequently to be helped.

In this part of dialogue, the Cooperative Principle is complied with. KIRAHUGANA seems to be concerned with what his addresser is telling. He is listening attentively in order to hear if he will tell the truth because from what is said in the following interactions, one deduces that KIRAHUGANA already knows what happened to his friend.

VYITEYIMANZA: Wibagiye ko atawukundwa na bose? Barandodobereje kwa chef.

KIRAHUGANA: Umugabo ntahisha uwundi sha! Ubwo kumbure umbwire neza ivyagushikiye utambesha, arivyo kugufasha tugufashe, ari ivyo kuguhanura tuguhanure kuko burya ntawuhisha imyotsi inzu iriko irasha.

Translation

VYITEYIMANZA: Have you forgotten that no one is liked by every body? They lied about me to the chief.

KIRAHUGANA: A man does not hide his problems to another! Tell me the truth about what happened to you so that I can help you or advise you if I have to because no one can hide the smoke of a burning house.

Here, VYITEYIMANZA is telling his friend KIRAHUGANA that he has been fired from his work unjustly because others have lied about him to the chief. Unfortunately, KIRAHUGANA knows what exactly happens to his friend. And for this reason, he refuses to believe in him. He is then trying to push him to say the truth by showing him that he knows what he is hiding. This is expressed through the proverbial statements: "umugabo ntahisha uwundi "and "ntawuhisha imyotsi inzu iriko irasha", literally meaning "a man does not hide his problems to another " "and no one can hide smoke when a house is burning".

In the first proverb, KIRAHUGANA is in the same way expressing a kind of solidarity. He is inviting VYITEYIMANZA to tell him truth because both are men.

The second proverb reveals that part of the truth is known even though he is hiding it. The proverb is generally uttered when someone is being accused of having done something wrong or having committed a crime. The person wants to hide it although signs have already betrayed him. In this context, VYITEYIMANZA has made mistakes and he is denying them. To make him accept it, that is, to convince him to say the truth, KIRAHUGANA is informing him that signs of his guilt are already apparent.

The illocutionary act of both proverbs is to bring KIRAHUGANA to say the truth and its illocutionary force is the truth to be revealed. Regarding the Cooperative Principle, it is not complied with. In fact, the maxim of quality that tells us to make our contribution one that is true is not respected. This is because VYITEYIMANZA is lying to KIRAHUGANA in order to gain sympathy. Another maxim, which is likely to be violated, is the maxim of manner as the illocutions of the second proverb are indirectly performed. So, the referents must be guessed and this is against this maxim which tells us to avoid the obscurity of expression and to be perspicuous. To interpret this proverb "ntawuhisha imyotsi inzu iriko irasha", and other proverbs in general, one has to go beyond the literal meaning as they are figurative in a way or another. This is to mean that their meanings are conveyed through another picture. For instance here, "Imyotsi", "smoke" stands for the bad consequences that VYITEYIMANZA is undergoing and "inzu iriko irasha", "burning house" is VYITEYIMANZA who is suffering. Then, it is up to the listener to interpret the picture portrayed in this proverb in order to guess the realy meaning.

Situation 4

BISESAGU: Namba ari wewe uzoca ubitanga, jewe utwo tungana gutyo nokubahuka guhamagara abantu.

BIRAHINDUKA: Mushingantahe wibagiye ko wanka kugarura impene utaronerwa yamara kurenga imiturnba ukabira nkayo. Ivyo bintu ndakubwiye nivyo kandi n'uwo wese agukunda yoguhanura gutyo. Kandi hari n' ikindi naco, ntuzi ko twaterereje bazonywa izo bizaniye.

BISESAGU: Ni ukuzobiraba ariko numva bitoroshe.

Translation

BISESAGU: If this is the case, it is you who will give it to them. As for me, I cannot call people for such a small quantity.

BIRAHINDUKA: Wise man, have you forgotten that if you refuse to prevent a goat from destroying crops before time, you start bleating like it when it is already over the mountains. I tell you the truth and whoever loves you would give you that piece of advice. In addition, don't you know that we sent them invitations? They will drink beer they will have brought.

BISESAGU: I will try but it is not easy.

In this conversation, BISESAGU is saying that it is a shame to invite people when one does not have enough to give them. But, his wife is against that idea and goes on suggesting him to reduce the expenses. In order to convice him, she uses the proverb "wanka kugarura impene utaronerwa yamara kurenga imitumba ukabira nkayo", which literally means that "when you do not keep your goat near you, you start bleating like it when it is far from you".

In general, this proverb is said to someone acting contrary to an advice given to him, especially when he thinks that he is more reasonable than his advisors. This is a kind of warning to the addressee (here BISESAGU) against the bad outcomes he may get. Normally when someone sees a goat destroying crops, what he/she immediately does is to prevent from doing it, otherwise it may graze all the crops and therefore he/she will have nothing to harvest. However in this context, there is no goat destroying crops. This is an image which stands for acting wrongly, and bleating like a goat symbolizes the bad consequences which may happen to the one who refuses to follow good advice. Here the proverbial meaning is simply "Do not act wrongly, correct yourself before it is too late, otherwise you will run risks". By uttering the proverbial statement, BIRAHINDUKA wishes her husband to give up his thoughts so as to join hers. The illocutionary act is then that of giving advice to BISESAGU and its force is the advice to be followed.

In this situation, the Cooperative Principle is likely to be violated. In fact, the maxim of manner seems not to be respected due the obscurity of expression in the proverb. But contextually the submaxim, which tells us to be perspicuous and to avoid obscurity of expression is no more violated because it is cleared up.

Situation 5

BISESAGU: Ahubwo urandonderera akandi kabindi.

Umugenzi
wa BISESAGU: Emwe sindabizi, ariko nibaza ko ntazoronka. Urabona imanza zabaye nyinshi. Ariko sha mugenzi, reka ndabisubiremwo, uranakumbure uvyihoze kuko urazi ko "agasozi kintahanurwa kahiye abagabo babona "

BISESAGU: Urubanza rwo ruzoba, kandi naho ataco uzoronka urapfa kuza.

Translation

BISESAGU: Instead, find me another pot of beer.

BISESAGU's friend: I don't know, but I think that I will not have it because there have been so many feasts. But my friend, it is better to listen to me and ignore it because as you know "the mountains that didn't listen to advice burnt when men were watching".

BISESAGU: The feast will take place. Come even though you don't have any beer to bring.

BISESAGU is asking for another pot of beer to his friend for the celebration of his daughter's success to the national test. The latter is not sure he will get one because there have been so many feasts. But for him, even though he can give him beer if he happens to get it, he sees as useless what BISESAGU wants to do. It is for this reason he is advising his friend to change his position. And the piece of advice is strengthened by the following proverbial statement: "agasozi kintahanurwa kahiye abagabo babona"; literally meaning "the mountain that doesn't listen to advice burnt when men were watching".

When used in this context, it means that it is better for the addressee (here BISESAGU) to listen to advice given by the addresser (here BISESAGU's friend), otherwise he will be disappointed. The mountains stands for BISESAGU who is refusing what is being suggested to him and a

warning is being addressed to him that no one will intervene when he will have to face problems.

Consider also the following situation.

Situation 8

Muyaga: Reka sha reka, nagira ngo muramfasha muyo ngowe, none nawe utanguye kumbwira ivyo umbwira.

Mwenewabo: Uri mukurwanje, none sivyo? Mugabo siniganwa ijambo. Ivyo mbona bibereye ndabikubwira, kandi uribuka shahu ko wanka guhanurwa ukibonerako

Muyaga: Reka kuntega iminsi, impa utwo duhera gusa.

Translation

Muyaga: Stop there, I was thinking that you would help me overcoming my problems, but you start by telling stupidities.

His brother: You are my elder brother, aren't you? But I have to say something about what I judge necessary, and remember that whoever refuses advice regrets later.

Muyaga: Do not count days for me, just give me that money.

MUYAGA has problems. He cannot pay his children's school fees because he has many. His brother has several times told him to seek ways of limiting birth but he has refused. Now he is facing problems, he comes to see him for help. His brother takes this opportunity to repeat what he has always told him: to go to see a doctor in order to receive advice on how he and his wife can limit birth. But for MUYAGA this is not what bothers him much. What he wants is someone to give him money. As for his brother, he cannot let him act wrongly because even though he is his young brother, he is able to see what is good or not. And therefore no one can forbid him to say what he judges as helpful. This is why he is exhorting him to listen to advice, lest he will get bad outcomes. This is expressed through the proverb "wanka guhanurwa ukibonerako", meaning, "if you refuse to be advised, one day you will face difficulties". Through this expression, MUYAGA's brother wants MUYAGA to think about the problem in order to correct himself. In other words, he wants him to be convinced on the question of birth limitation.

The function of these proverbs in situation 5 and 8 is to support the illocutionary act, which is to give advice. And by using these proverbial statements, the speakers want to arouse an emotional fear on the part of the hearers, which is a strategy among others to reinforce one's arguments. In

both situations the speakers wants their hearers to be aware of the misfortunes they are going to face in the future. Thus, they want them to be afraid of what may happen to them.

Situation 5 and 8 do not comply with the Cooperative Principle because the hearers do not withdraw their standings, as they do not adhere to their interlocutors' wish. So, the agreement maxim, which consists of minimizing disagreement between self and other, is violated. Moreover, the maxim of manner seems to be spoiled in situation 5 where the obscurity of expressions is encountered. But once matched with the context and understood by the hearer, the obscurity is removed.

Situation 13

NTAHONKIRIYE: Cane cane igikuru singorane nje kugutura. Ico nifuza...

MARAGARITA: eee...

NTAHONKIRIYE: Urazi ko nyarucamwo rwaje.

MARAGARITA: Ego ndazi ko wapfakaye, ndazi ko umutamakazi Yahwereye.

NTAHONKIRIYE: Ego hanyuma nkaba nzi nawe ivyanciyeko ko Vyaguciyeko.

MARAGARITA: Ha, jewe nanje ubwatsi bwarapfutse umunwa!

NTAHONKIRIYE: Hanyuma ukaba uzi ko inyakamwe inyaga imwe, kamwe nubusa. Nashaka ndakubaze yuko wewe woshobora kunyemerera ko dushobora gufashanya.

MARAGARITA: Nyunviriza rero mutama ndakubwire, jewe kuvyukuri sindakwemereye kandi sindaguhakaniye, kuko nawewe urazi ko ntigaba, genda uzogaruka mpanuje.

NTAHONKIRIYE: Ivyo nivyo ariko wibuke ko ubu ukuze atawukugaba kandi ntawe ukeneye ko aguhanura.

MARAGARITA: Oya mutware wanje ndafise ico mpanuza, mugabo ndagusize mumuhango, uzogaruke kubaza kuko uwubandwa ariwe abandwa urugi.

NTAHONKIRIYE: Ubivuze nk'uwubizi, ejo inkoko niyo ngoma.

Translation

NTAHONKIRIYE: What seems to be especially important is not the problem I bring to you, my wish is …

MARAGARITA: What?

NTAHONKIRIYE: You know that death came,

MARAGARITA: Yes, I know that you are a widower, I know that the old woman died.

NTAHONKIRIYE: Yes, I also know that what happened to me happened to You.

MARAGARITA: As for me it is a catastrophe!

NTAHONKIRIYE: And you know that loneliness hurts, one person is nothing. I would like to ask you if we could help one another .

MARAGARITA: Listen to me, old man, so that I can tell you: frankly speaking I neither accept nor deny because you yourself knows that I am not free. Go and you will come back when I will have asked for piece of advice.

NTAHONKIRIYE: That is true but remember that, now you are a grown up and that nobody has responsibility over you; this is to say that you do not need any piece of advice whatsoever.

MARAGARITA: No sir, I have to ask for advice but I promise you, come back to ask because "the one in need has to persevere in action".

NTAHONKIRIYE: You talk like the one who knows it, tomorrow I will wake up early in the morning.

NTAHONKIRIYE, a widower goes to see MARAGARITA, a widow. The former wants the latter as a wife. Before NTAHONKIRIYE tells the reasons why he comes to visit MARAGARITA, he first reminds her what happened to both of them. This is to make sure that she shares the same opinions as him, that is, to check if the situation has had the same impact on her as on him. After he gets the expected answer, he in the same way recalls the bad consequences of being lonely. This is expressed through the proverbial utterances "inyakamwe inyaga imwe", "kamwe n'ubusa", meaning "loneliness hurts" and "one person is nothing". In other words, it means that someone who is alone is incapable of solving problems or a person needs the help of another person.

In this situation, a man needs a woman to complete him. When NTAHONKIRIYE asserts these proverbs, he is making MARAGARITA understand that the situation they have both undergone is dramatic. He is then putting her into the required frame of mind. He wants her to be aware of what is generally believed: loneliness as being a harming state. Thus, the proverb is used to make MARAGARITA feel like the speaker (here NTAHONKIRIYE) and its illocutionary act is to strengthen the request whereas its force is the request to be accepted.

Although MARAGARITA neither accepts nor refuses NTAHONKIRIYE's request, this is a promising sign because in Burundian traditional culture, when a man pops the question, it is unusual for women or girls to accept immediately. They have first to inquire about the man's past. MARAGARITA's reply does not please NTAHONKIRIYE because for him, she should decide for herself as she is a grown up person and responsible for herself. For this reason, she must learn to rely on herself. MARAGARITA does not change her mind but she is inviting NTAHONKIRIYE not to give up, that is, she wants him to come again in order to receive the answer. It is in this respect that she utters the expression"uwubandwa niwe abanda urugi", which means, "the one in need must pass through all ways to reach his aim".

Contextually, the proverb means that, it is up to NTAHONKIRIYE to come back to inquire about MARAGARITA's decision. The illocutionary act of these proverbial statements is then to give courage to NTAHONKIRIYE to continue to come because she has realized that he did think she should not rely on someone else to take a decision.

Concerning the Cooperative Principle, it is complied with because the interactants have achieved a common agreement. NTAHONKIRIYE will come again to see if MARAGARITA has finally accepted his request.

To conclude this point on proverbs, one can say that the goal of the speaker is to convince the hearer to alter his opinions in order to conform to that of the speaker. This one uses these proverbs to support his arguments because they display the ability to influence the hearer's behavior through the wisdom of our ancestors. And most of these proverbs have indirect illocutions because their meaning are culturally conveyed.

IV.3. SOME SWEARING EXPRESSIONS USED TO CONVICE

In Kirundi, swearing expressions are highly valued. In fact, they are prominently uttered in daily life communication. This is because they are intended to prove one's innocence or truthfulness. Moreover when used in a given discourse, they make it expressive. F.Kazungu (1985:65) is of the same opinion when he asserts that:

> le juron est utilisé dans ces circonstances d'une part pour rendre le discours expressif, d'autre

part pour donner l'impression que ses dires ,
même les mensonges évidents, sont vrais.

Translation: Swearings are used in these
circumstances on the one hand to render
the discourse expressive, and on the other
hand to give the impression that one's sayings,
even obvious lies, are true.

In this section, the analysis mainly focuses on the second function which is that of giving credit to one's saying even when one may be lying. It will depend on the hearer to believe or not.

Here are some swearing expressions used as convincing devices to be analyzed contextually. Needless to say that their analysis will take into account cultural context because Sapir cited in S. Bassnett (1980: 14) argues that "no language can exist unless it is steeped in the context of culture, and no culture can exist which does not have at its center, the structure of its natural language". Then, in order to get their meaning, one has to analyze swearing expressions in the context of Burundian culture.

Situation 1

BAKUNDUKIZE: Ugerageze uko ushoboye kwose ubirukane, naho atarivyo Ntaco tuvugana.

VYITEYIMANZA: Ariko mwiza wa bantu hari uwutokora wewe ivyo ushaka vyose? Muvyukuri sindakubesha uno munsi ku mugoroba nyene ivyo twifuza twe nawe birashoboka ndagapfa.

BAKUNDUKIZE: Oya ntiwirirwe urarahira gutyo nunvise.

Translation: See situation 1 on page 23

In addition to the convincing devices he has already used in this situation, VYITEYIMANZA also utters a swearing expression "ndagapfa", meaning, "may I die". This swearing expression reinforces a promise. It shows that he cares more about what he has promised than anything else. For him, he wishes to die instead of failing to fulfill a promise.

Normally death is feared because it destroys the lives of human beings. Therefore it is the least thing to wish for. So, no one would like it to come early. This is the reason why Burundians most of the time refer to it in order to show that they are very serious about what they are saying. And when one is swearing like in the present situation, he wants to show that he really means what he is saying. He wants to remove any doubt from the

listerner's mind. Here the swearing indicates the commitment of the speaker to his illocutionary act, which is a promise.

Regarding the Cooperative Principle, it has been followed as BAKUNDUKIZE finally believes in VYITEYIMANZA.

Situation 2

VYITEYIMANZA: Bakunda mwamikazi, nyakuramba, uraho wiriwe ga rukundo? (atwenga)
BAKUNDUKIZE: Niriwe ariko n'uko nari ndagukumbuye gusa. Ntaribagira ivyatwe na wa mugore wawe vyashobotse?

VYITEYIMANZA: Ni mama mbere ivyo twapfunditse vyashobotse, n'abana bajanye

BAKUNDUKIZE: Oya ni vyo vyagira rero urisanze.

Translation

VYITEYIMANZA: Queen Bakunda, may you live long, are you okay my love? (laughing)

BAKUNDUKIZE: I am okay, but I missed you too much. Before I forget, is your problem with your wife resolved now?

VYITEYIMANZA: I swear on my mother, the promise has been fulfilled, she left with the children.

BAKUNDUKIZE: Yes, that is true, have a seat then and feel at home.

After he has accomplished what he has promised to BAKUNDUKIZE, VYITEYIMANZA goes to see her in order to inform her about the good news. The opening move is a greeting accompanied with a smile. This is a sign that he brings good news to BAKUNDUKIZE. The latter's move is a return of the greeting, expressing that she misses him very much. But, she does not wait for VYITEYIMANZA to announce the outcome of his plan. After the greeting, she just asks him if he has fulfilled the promise, that is, if he has chased his wife and children away so as to live with her. This shows that he eagerly wants it to happen. In order to convince her that the promise has been realized VYITEYIMANZA uses the expression "mama mbere", meaning "may I have sex with my mother". This expression refers to incestuous relations with one's mother. And no one ignores that this is universally forbidden. Then, when one swears like that, it implies that it is a serious matter especially in Burundian culture where such a relation is considered as too harmful and the swearing expression is so bold that it cannot be demanded even in law court (see Kazungu, 1985: 119).

In uttering such an expression, VYITEYIMANZA's intention is to end with BAKUNDUKIZE's worries. That is why he looks for an expression that is not usually used when joking. The effect of this is to strengthen the illocutionary force of the following utterance, which is a statement.

In this situation, the Grice's Cooperative Principle is respected as well although the maxim of manner is likely to be violated. This is due to the elliptical form "mama mbere". The longer expressions may be "ndakambura mama", meaning, " may I unclothe my mother"; "ndakenda mama", meaning "may I have sex with my mother". But the latter is commonly used because it is considered as a taboo.

Situation 5

BISESAGU: Eheee...ntanejereje umwana wanje, n'abaryango bakabonerwaho!

Umugenzi wa BISESAGU: Wewe ubone wagize urubanza uno munsi, hama muyindi minsi ugire urundi, umukobwanje ivyo bintu ndakubwiye vyari vyo ukwiye kuvyiyumvira.

BISESAGU: Ahubwo urandonderera akandi kabindi.

Translation

BISESAGU: Yes...I must please my child and the family must benefit from that.

BISESAGU's friend: You see that you had a feast today and you want to organize another feast in coming days, I swear on my daughter, I tell you the truth, it is necessary to think about it.

BISESAGU: Find me another pot of beer instead.

In this context, BISESAGU's friend uses the swearing expression "umukobwanje", litterally meaning "my daughter" to support pieces of advice being given to him. This expression also refers to incestuous relations. It generally refers to having sex with one's daughter, which is as in the previous situation taken as taboo. It is an elliptical form whose longer expressions are:

-Ndakinjira munzu y' umukobwanje, translated as "May I enter my daughter's house".
-Ndakambura umukobwanje translated as "May I unclothe my daughter".
-Ndakenda umukobwanje translated as "May have sex with my daughter".

In swearing like this, BISESAGU's friend wants him to realize that what he is saying is very important. For him, his advice is reliable if not, may he have sex with his own daughter, which is considered as violating a taboo. In other words what he is telling is true or he would not have said it. The effect of swearing is then uttered to reinforce the illocutionary force that is an advice. Yet, the utterance of the expression has not achieved its goal because BISESAGU ignores the piece of advice and asks instead for assistance.

Situation 5 does not comply with the Cooperative Principle. In fact, the maxim of relation, which tells us to be relevant, is violated by BISESAGU. The latter seems not to have heard what his friend has said to him and chooses to talk about other things. This is introduced by the topic shift "ahubwo", meaning "instead". He reacts like this to avoid reason or by lack of interest in the piece of advice he is receiving.

Situation 9

MUYAGA: Jewe rero sha birangoye n'ukuri, ntakuntu nobivuga, nokubwira ko ivyago vyose vyagize umurwa mukuru i wanje.

Umugenzi wiwe: Erega biracakugora n'ubu.

MUYAGA: Ubona none nzotinda nkabigira gute? Ehe raba umugore nawe aheruka kuvyara umwana yapfuye!

Umugenzi wiwe: Ubwo ga MUYAGA we sinakubwiye kuva kera! Erega n'ubu abapfa baracapfa.

MUYAGA: Aho,

Umugenzi wiwe: Ubwo weho ntubona ko uri mu kugenda, wewe aho nakubaririye ngo uzonyegere, ndakubwire ga sha, oya mugabo wewe uguma wica amatwi. Iyo utaba uri umugenzi ndagatsindwa aho hepfo ntokwihojeje. Uzoze ndakujane hahandi, kwa wa mupfumu, ahubwo uze kuza ubu nyene ku kumugoroba.

MUYAGA: Bashobora kumfasha ayo mabi yose akamvako?

Translation

MUYAGA: Frankly, it is hard for me, I don't know how to say it. Problems of all kinds have come to me.

His friend: It is still going to be hard for you.

MUYAGA: What do you advise me to do? Even my wife has delivered a dead child.

His friend: Please, MUYAGA, haven't I told you for ever since? Your people are still dying.

MUYAGA: Tell me,

His friend: Don't you see that you are also dying? I told you to approach me, let me tell you that, -but the problem is that you don't want to open your ears. If you weren't my friend, may I be killed, I would keep silence. Come so that I bring you to the place, to the witch doctor, you should even come this afternoon.

MUYAGA: Can they help me to overcome all those problems?

The conversation is between MUYAGA and his friend. The former opens the conversation by complaining about his family problems. It seems to him that he is facing misfortunes of all kinds. This is what he is telling his friend. The latter's reply is rather discouraging because, according to him, MUYAGA will always have such kind of problems. This pushes MUYAGA to ask what he can do in order to overcome them. MUYAGA's friend answers that people in his family will go on dying as long as he does not listen to the advice given to him. Indeed even MUYAGA himself will die if he does not change his mind and accept his suggestion. He also says that he would not have insisted if MUYAGA were not his best friend. So, he cannot help telling him what is good for him. To strengthen this, he utters the swearing expression "ndagatsindwa aho hepho", meaning "may I be killed". This swearing expression is related to fate and specifically refers to death. And as stated before, death is feared although no one can prevent it to happen.

Thus, by uttering this expression, MUYAGA' s friend wants to show him how friendly he is to him. And for this reason, he will choose to be killed instead of not helping him. The goal of this expression is then to provide assurance to the addressee so that he accepts to go to see a witch doctor.

The following conversation shows that MUYAGA is still reluctant, that is why his interlocutor goes on trying to persuade him.

Umugenzi wa MUYAGA: Emwe basha niwangamburukira, ntamuntu uzosubira kubura, ntamuntu azosubira gupfa i wawe ndakamanurwa n'iyo hejuru, erega na wewe ntuzopha.

MUYAGA : N'indwara zihave? Indwara zarikiye i wanje zose?

Translation

MUYAGA: Can they help me to overcome all these problems?

MUYAGA's friend: If you obey me, you will not lose yours anymore, nobody will die again in your house, may I be killed by a thunder; you will never die either.

MUYAGA: Even diseases are going to disappear? All diseases that are in my family?

MUYAGA's question is rather a surprise. He cannot believe that anyone can find a solution to his problems. This is beyond his understanding because he has many problems. To convince him more than before, he tells him that if he accepts to go with him to see a witch doctor, no one will ever die again, even MUYAGA himself. These arguments are accompanied with the swearing expression "ndakamanurwa n'iyo hejuru", meaning "may I be killed by a thunder". This is to strengthen what he is saying.

The swearing expression is also related to fate and refers to death. In Burundian traditional culture, to be killed by a thunder was considered as a curse on the whole family. This kind of death was not taken as other ways of dying, for instance dying of malaria, flu, diarrhea, ect. So, no one would wish to die like that although death is death.

In this context, the speaker is saying that he would rather die hit by thunder than tell lies. Thus, he is showing that if what he is suggesting were not true, he would not have said it because such kind of death is undesirable. Again here, the goal of the expression is to avoid any doubt. But for MUYAGA, it is unbelievable to find someone who can cure all the diseases. It is in this respect that his friend continues to seek ways of eliminating all doubts in the conversation that follows.

Umugenzi wa MUYAGA: Ahahahaha, ubwo bujuju bwo kwirirwa uraharira nibwo bwatumye abantu b'iwawe baguherako ndagasara

MUYAGA: Oya jewe numvise umuntu agomba kunkurako ivyago, emwe sinobura kumuja inyuma.

Translation.

MUYAGA's friend: Your stupidity of arguing is at the origin of all your people's death, may I be mad.

MUYAGA's friend: No, I am ready to follow whoever wants to overcome my problems.

In this part of conversation, MUYAGA's friend is blaming him as being responsible of all the persons who died in his family. According to him, MUYAGA's stupidity has prevented him from accepting without arguing. These arguments are also to make MUYAGA more convinced than before. To reinforce this, he uses the expression "ndagasara", meaning "may I be mad"

In general, this swearing is related to fate and is derived from the word "umusazi", meaning "a mad man". a mad man is abnormal because he has lost reason and intelligence. So, no one in the world would like to be mad. In Burundian culture, it has become an ill wish and people use it when swearing to show how they are involved in what they are saying.

The utterance of this expression by MUYAGA's friend is meant to lead MUYAGA to realize that what his friend is saying is true because he would not wish to be mad.

From the beginning of situation 9 to the above part of conversation, the swearing expressions used support the illocutionary act which is to take off all the hearer's doubts. And this goal is finally achieved as MUYAGA accepts to go with his friend to see a witch doctor. But MUYAGA's friend does not believe in MUYAGA, that is why in the conversation that follows, he wants to be sure that his friend is totally committed to go with him.

Umugenzi wa MUYAGA: Va ibuzumu uje ibuntu

MUYAGA: Oya sha aho ngereye, oya n'izina ry'Imana sinosubira kwica amatwi.

Translation

MUYAGA's friend: Leave the death world for the people's world.

MUYAGA: No, in the conditions I am now, I swear on the name of God that I cannot close my ears again.

Although MUYAGA has already accepted his friend's help, this one is ordering him to leave the world of death for the world of life. This is what the expression "va ibuzimu uje ibuntu" literally means. Contextually, he is pushing him to abandon the ideas that prevent him from accepting what he has been suggesting to him for a long time. In other words, he wants him to completely change his mind. To show him that he is of his opinions, MUYAGA swears like this: "N'izina ry'Imana", meaning "it is God's name". This expression is related to religion and refers to God. In Burudian culture, God's name is highly considered and not played with. It is considered as "the source of everything rather than their ends", argues Zuure (1932:132). Moreover, Ntahokaja (1978:150) says that "all things that exist have been created by

God". So, people have to act according to God's wishes and its name cannot be invoked for blasphemy for fear of punishment.

When swearing like that, MUYAGA is showing to his friend that he is not joking for God's name cannot be used for futile matters. It is then a way of giving credit to his sayings so that his friend cannot consider him as a liar. But what is expected by the addresser (MUYAGA) is not achieved. In fact, the addressee (MUYAGA's friend) is not satisfied as he goes on displaying doubt in the following conversation.

Umugenzi wa MUYAGA: Ntituyage amasigara cicaro, ngo ikinyoma kibe ikinyoma uvugishe ukuri MUYAGA.

MUYAGA: Nduva ko uri imvugakuri, kandi ubwo ndakumva, ivyo vyose umbwiye nzobikurikiza.

Umugenzi wa MUYAGA: Rahira ga sha,

MUYAGA: Imana impane ni ukuri.

Umugenzi wa MUYAGA: Aho, uhave uza rero ku mugoroba ndakujane.

Translation

MUYAGA's friend: Let's put this into practice to avoid telling lies, tell the truth MUYAGA.

MUYAGA: I hear that you are a truth teller, and I hear you, I will comply with all that you have told me.

MUYAGA's friend: Can you swear?

MUYAGA: May I be punished by God if I am not telling the truth.

MUYAGA's friend: Okay, come then this afternoon so that I take you there.

Here MUYAGA's friend wants him to say the truth. He wants him to take seriously what they have been talking about and not just ignore it or forget it. Although MUYAGA says that he believes in his friend, and that he is ready to follow out whatever he has told him to do, his friend still insists that he should swear. He says: "Rahira ga sha", meaning "swear". This is to bring MUYAGA to assume the responsibility of what he is saying. It is in this regard MUYAGA utters the expression "Imana impane ni ukuri", meaning "may God really punishes me".

This swearing expression is also related to religion and refers to God. The idea carried out by the expression is to be punished for one's faults. Thus, as punishment is not a good thing, it has become a swearing

expression in Burundian culture. The speaker would not like to be punished by God. In the present use, the expression is intended to strengthen the illocutionary force, which is an agreement.

The Cooperative Principle is spoiled in this situation though the interactants leave in common agreement. In fact, the maxim of quality, which says "Do not say what you believe to be false", is not obeyed all along the situation. This is because MUYAGA's friend is lying when he says to MUYAGA that if he accepts to see a witch doctor, no one in his family will ever die. He ignores the truth according to which no one can escape from death, that is, each person will have to die one day.

Situation 11

Umupfumu: Rugajo wa Rugajo, muhe urya muti w'igufa agende yikingire hanyuma azobibona ndakambura abawuseye.

MUYAGA: Ego basi uri imvugakuri, ndashimye gose.

Translation

Witch doctor: Rugajo son of Rugajo, give him that medicine so that he can protect himself, and he will see it tomorrow when it will be time, may I unclothe those who ground it if I tell lies.

MUYAGA: Yes, you are a truth-teller, I am very grateful.

The context of this situation is a conversation between a witch doctor and MUYAGA. The former is offering some medicine to the latter. In order to show that this medicine is effective, the witch doctor swears in the following terms: "Ndakambura abuwuseye', meaning "may I unclothe those who ground it".

The swearing expression is related to incestuous relations and refers to having sex with those who prepare medicine for witch doctors. Those persons are very respected by witch doctors and are called by them "abavyeyi", meaning "parents". They are invisible to other persons and the latter call them "ibisigo", meaning "bad spirits". But they are highly considered by witch doctors because according to them, the medicine is effective due to their power. This is the reason why they call them their parents. And no one ignores that, to have sex with one's parent is forbidden universally and is in particular taken as a taboo in our society.

By saying "ndakambura abawuseye", the witch doctor wants MUYAGA to believe that the medicine being given to him is the best, otherwise, he would not be swearing like that. The swearing expression then gives force to the illocutionary force, which is a statement.

Situation 11 is an example of the compliance of the Cooperative Principle since both interactants have achieved a common agreement.

Situation 12

MAKURATA: Mbega burya bwose wari unjanye mubapfumu? Urihenda sha!

MUYAGA: Eka sinihenda ndakarenzwa ivu, burya wewe hari ico utazi kandi ukenemeye kumenya, yambariye yuko barya bana, barya bana bacu ko bagwara ibitega bahindiwemwo na murumuna wanje.

MAKURATA: None ivyo wavyemeye?

MUYAGA: Aho ntavyemera, ndakambura mwishwanje atampora ko Ndonka abana benshi, akaja araduhenda ngo nukutavyara kurugero. Naho shwi! We hari uworeka gukurikiza umwana w'imyaka ibiri?

MAKURATA: Birabisha nakazi kavyo, ntamwana wanje nzojana mubapfumu.

Translation

MAKURATA: Is it true that you were taking me to witch doctor? You are mistaken!

MUYAGA: No, if I am mistaken may earth be thrown on me, but as for you, there is something that you don't know and that you should know. He told me that those children, our children are suffering from demons coming from my younger brother.

MAKURATA: And do you believe that?

MUYAGA: Why not, may I unclothe my niece if he does not victimize me because I have many children. He lies in saying that we must plan the births. No, who wouldn't give birth to a second child when the first has already two years?

MAKURATA: I do not care, I would not bring my child to witch doctors.

The situation involves two interactants: MUYAGA and his wife MAKURATA. The former has taken his wife to a witch doctor without telling her where they were going. Now, they are discussing it at home.

The first move is that of MAKURATA who does not appreciate her husband's action. For her, it is a mistake to have acted like that. Her

husband's move justifies why he is not mistaken. According to him, he is convinced that their children suffer from bad spirits coming from his younger brother. To show to his wife that he believes in what he is telling, MUYAGA reinforces it with the swearing expression: "ndakarenzwa ivu", literally meaning, "may earth be thrown on me".

The swearing expression is related to fate and refers to death. It illustrates how Burundians are buried. They are put in a grave and covered with earth. As pointed out earlier, death is an ill wish and feared. So, the speaker would not like it to happen to him. This is in fact why MUYAGA utters it to sustain his position. Moreover, he wants his wife to be of the same opinion. The illocutionary force is therefore that of removing doubt from the second interactant (MAKURATA).

MAKURATA's second move shows that she does not believe in what the witch doctor told her husband. This can be seen through her question: "none ivyo wavyemeye?" meaning "and you believe that"? This shows that she undermines what she is being told. MUYAGA's answer is an assertion accompanied with the reasons why his younger brother hates them: it is because they have many children while he (the younger brother) has only one child. He supports this with the swearing: "ndakambura mwishwanje", literally meaning "may I unclothe my niece ".

The swearing expression is related to incestuous relations and refers to having sex with one's niece. In our society, to do such a thing is taken as a crime and therefore in the past the person who was accused of it was banished from the society. And no one would like to experience that punishment.

In this situation, MUYAGA swears like that to show to his friend that what he is saying is true otherwise he would be considered as being commiting an incestuous act with his niece. Here, the swearing reinforces the illocutionary force, which is an assertion. In fact, Muyaga is showing how he is sure of what he is saying.

Regarding the Cooperative Principle, it is not complied with because the agreement maxim, which tells us to minimize disagreement between self and other and maximize agreement between self and other, is not respected. There is no common agreement between MUYAGA and MAKURATA.

Situation 14

REMEJIYO: MARAGARI, urazi urwo ndagukunda ingene rungana? Kandi narukweretse kuva kera. Ndagukunda ga kirezi!

MARAGARITA: Oya nawe nu reka gushikuza.

REMEJIYO: MARAGARI ntakubesha, mbe bashahu norahira ngw'iki kugirango uvyemere udakekeranya? Eheee... ndakabura wewe nyene kuko ni wewe mfise ku mutima.

MARAGARITA: Oya geza ayo ndazi ko unkunda .

Translation

REMEJIYO: MARAGARI, do you know how much I love you? And I showed it to you ever since. I love you, dear …

MARAGARITA: No do not exaggerate.

REMEJIYO: MARAGARI, without telling you lies, how can I swear so that you can accept it without any doubt? Oh… may I lose you, because it is only you that I have in my heart.

MARAGARITA: Do not say too much, I know that you love me.

REMEJIYO is telling MARAGARITA how much he loves her. This one sees it as a joke. That is why REMEJIYO is trying to prove her that he is not joking. He therefore uses the expression "ndakabura wewe nyene", meaning "may I loose you" in order to convince her. This expression is related to death and it is derived from the verb "kubura", meaning "to loose". Here to loose someone embodies the idea of death. Through this expression, the speaker's (REMEJIYO) intention is to show to the hearer (MARAGARITA) how much she counts for him. So, he cannot tell lies to her because he would not wish her to die.

Although MARAGARITA agrees with REMEJIYO, he goes on telling her how much he loves her. This is what is displayed in the following conversation.

REMEJIYO: Mbere ga rukundo hari ico naringiye ntakubariye. Urabona uyu mushatsi uri ku mutwe?

MARAGARITA: Egome,

REMEJIYO: Urukundo ndagukunda ni ukuri kw'Imana rutangana uyu mushatsi wanje.

MARAGARITA: Emwe nawe urarengeje (atwenga). Oya reka ngende burije.

Translation

REMEJIYO: My love, I was going to leave without telling something. Do you see the hair on my head?

MARAGARITA: Yes,

REMEJIYO: The love I have for you equals my hair, I swear on God.

MARAGARITA: But you exaggerate (laughing)! Let me go because it is getting dark.

Here REMEJIYO has something to add to what he said before. He is informing her that his love for her is comparable to his hair. Again this is to make her believe that he is so much in love with her. To give force to what he says, he swears like this "Ni ukuri kw'Imana", meaning "It is God's truth". He is comparing what he is saying to God's truth. In other words, God will say similar things in the same circumstances.

Situation 14 complies with the Cooperative Principle. The two interlocutors are happy with the outcome of the conversation though one of them (MARAGARITA) says at the end that REMEJIYO is exaggerating. She says it while laughing and this shows that she is amused by what is being said to her.

In short, the swearing expressions analyzed in this section are uttered to give warrant and strength to what the speaker is saying or has said before. By doing so, he is trying to remove all possible doubts so that the listener can be certain and believe in him.

IV.4. SOME OTHER EXPRESSIONS USED TO CONVINCE

Situation 1

BAKUNDUKIZE: Oya niko, mugabo ntiwanyiganiye neza ingene vyagenze.

VYITEYIMANZA: Ngirango uranzi jewe VYITEYIMANZA ko ico nitumye ndagikora. Neza na neza namubwiye ko abwirizwa kuva mu kazi akaza arantekera ivyokurya, ngasanga rero atavyemeye, kandi ndazi ko atavyemera, nca ndamwirukana ajane n'abana kuko ntaboyansanganye.

BAKUNDUKIZE: Ugerageze uko ushoboye kwose ubirukane , naho atarivyo, ntaco tuvugana.

Translation: see situation 1: page 23

Having realized that his addressee (BAKUNDUKIZE) still has doubts in what he has promised her, VYITEYIMANZA decides to remind her about his moral character, that he always accomplishes his will. In other words, he is trying to make her understand that he never fails to do what he wants to do.

To support this, he utters the expression "ngirango uranzi", meaning "I think you know me". This expression is generally used between people who know each other, especially when one of them shows lack of trust or disbelief. It is then used as a reminder of what a person really is and what he is capable of doing.

In uttering this expression, VYITEYIMANZA is inviting BAKUNDUKIZE to think about what he has done in similar cases. He is informing her that he is not going to deceive her since he has never acted so. Here, the expression reinforces the illocutionary force, which is a promise.

As for the Cooperative Principle, the situation does not comply with it. BAKUNDUKIZE does not agree with what VYITEYIMANZA is saying. So, the agreement maxim is violated.

Situation 3

VYITEYIMANZA: Muvyukuri ubu ndi shomé.

KIRAHUGANA: Kuva ryari?

VYITEYIMANZA: Emwe, ngirango ni wewe wenyene utari ubizi! Nyumvirize rero ndakwiganire ayo ngowe, ubishoboye ubimfashemwo. Nashaka rero mugenzi mfise ku mutima, ungurane udufaranga dukeyi, nzoheza ndagusubize ninaronka akandi kazi kuko hari aho ndakaziga.

KIRAHUGANA: Nkangahe ga?

Translation

VYITEYIMANZA: In reality, I am jobless.

KIRAHUGANA: Since when?

VYITEYIMANZA: I think you are the only one not to know it! Listen so that I tell you about my hardship; and help me if you can. My dear friend, I would like you to lend me some money, and I will reimburse it when I get a new job, because I expect one.

KIRAHUGANA: How much?

VYITEYIMANZA is jobless. This is what he is telling his friend KIRAHUGANA. The latter does not know how long his friend has been jobless. Instead of telling him since when he has been laid off, VYITEYIMANZA says that everybody knows it except him. He expresses it in the following terms: "ngirango niwewe wenyene utarubizi" meaning, "I think you are the only one not to know it".

In general, this expression is used when a speaker wants to prove to the hearer that something really happened. By doing so, the former points out the latter's ignorance about what they are saying and in the same way invites him to believe in what is commonly known. In other words, if everybody knows what happened, this implies that it is true. And this is what is displayed by VYITEYIMANZA in this context.

Another expression used by VYITEYIMANZA to get help from his friend is "mugenzi mfise ku mutima", meaning "my dear friend". This expression is normally said to a best friend to show him how close you are to him. Here, VYITEYIMANZA utters it to put KIRAHUGANA in the required frame of mind. He is making him understand that he must lend him money because a friend is always ready to help.

The expressions used in this situation support the illocutionary act, which is to seek help, and its force is the speaker's wish to get help. For the Cooperative Principle, it is complied with in this part of conversation. The interlocutors are in good terms and nothing shows us that VYITEYIMANZA is lying for the time being. This will be discovered in the following conversation.

VYITEYIMANZA: Ewe mugenzi, we ntaco noguhisha, bagiye kumpagarika mukazi, umugore wanje nawe acaranta aromoka.

KIRAHUGANA: Eka shake wivugire make, ivyawe vyaramenyekanye, bose baremeza ko wahevye umugore wawe ukaja gushumbira BAKUNDUKIZE Mbe sha ubu ko yakwirukanye, uza kubigenza gute?

VYITEYIMANZA: Bose barabizi?

Translation

VYITEYIMANZA: My friend, I cannot hide you anything. I was laid off and my wife left me and went away.

KIRAHUGANA: Don't say too much, all what concerns you is known, everybody affirms that you abandoned your wife and went to live with BAKUNDUKIZE. Now that, she no more needs you, what are you going to do?

VYITEYIMANZA: Everybody knows it?

Here, VYITEYIMANZA is telling to KIRAHUGANA what happened to him. But he is lying and unfortunately KIRAHUGANA knows the truth. He has been hiding this in order to see if his friend is sincere with him. To prove him that there is no need of lying, he uses the following expression: "bose baremeza ko", meaning "everybody affirms that". Through this expression,

KIRAHUGANA wants VYITEYIMANZA to feel ashamed of telling lies. He wants him to have a share of knowledge that everybody else has. Thus, the illocutionary force is to inform the hearer (VYITEYIMANZA) that the speaker (KIRAHUGANA) knows the truth.

In these chunks of conversation, VYITEYIMANZA is lying to his friend KIRAHUGANA in order to get help. So, the Cooperative Principle is not observed. It is the maxim of quality, which is violated, especially the first submaxim that says: "Do not say what you believe to be false".

Situation 6

Umugenzi
wa BISESAGU: Uti wewe rero ku bwawe tuvyihoze?

Umugore wiwe: Emwe ni ko ndabibona pe. Wewe ubone ingene asesagura, wibaza ko mu minsi iri mbere azoba akironka nico afungura? Ni ukuri uzoba umbwira. Nayo amayoga ashika amajana atatu, emwe oya batazomwirahira abazimuhaye bose nihagera ko bagira imanza. Kandi ikindi naco, menya neza ko uterera umuntu nawe azoheza akayigusubiza, none ntuzi ko ariko biri? None umuntu afise inzoga amajana angahe azogusubiza izo akuye hehe?

Umugenzi
wa BISESAGU: Mugabo ndaguye ndagarutse, mama ntoba ndiko ndasesagura.

Translation

BISESAGU's friend: Is your opinion then to ignore it?

His wife: That is how I really see it. Don't you see how he spends too much, do you think that he will even have something in coming days? Frankly you will tell me. Speaking of 300 pots of beer, all those who gave him beer will kill him when it will be their turn to prepare feasts. Furthermore, know well that you give something so that you can also get something else in return, don't you know that it is like that? Someone who has hundreds of pots to reimburse, where is he going to find them?

Bisesagu's friend: I have just made up my mind, I swear on my mother, it will be a waste.

BISESAGU's friend is asking suggestions to his wife: If they give another pot of beer to BISESAGU who is preparing another feast. According to BISESAGU's friend's wife, it is not necessary to give BISESAGU another pot of beer because he will not be able to give it back, as he owes many pots

of beer to many people. To reinforce what he is saying, he uses the expression "none ntuzi wewe ko ariko biri?", meaning "don't you know that it is like that?". This expression is uttered with the intention of making her husband remember what they are accustomed to.

Normally, in Burundian culture, when someone celebrates a feast and his friends or relatives provides him assistance, he is expected to do the same, otherwise he can no more receive help of such a kind. Then, in uttering the expression, the wife of Bisesagu's friend is inviting her husband to act according to what is generally believed.

Consider also the following situation.

Situation 10

Uwaje mu nama: None ko hariho abavyeyi nko mu kuronka akandi kana bibagora avyaye nk'umwana agashikana nk'imyaka cumi ataramukurikiza ubwo uwo muntu akoresheje burya buryo muhejeje kutwigisha, ntivyoca vyunyuka? Ubwo yosubira kuvyara?

Umuforoma: Ivyo ntibigoye, kandi ngirango musanzwe muzi ko umuntu akurikiza haheze imyaka cumi atariwe abishatse aba afise ingorane. Kuri uwo muntu rero ubwo buryo ntibukenewe.

Uwaje mu nama: Egome murakoze.

Translation

One of the participants: But, there are some parents who have problems to get a child. When she delivers and ten years pass without having another child, if that person follows the instructions you have given us, wouldn'it be much more difficult for her than before? Can she still have a child?

A nurse: That is not difficult and I think you already know that when a person delivers after ten years when she does not want it, she has already problems. Then, for that person, there is no need to follow the instructions given above.

The participant: Yes, thank you.

The context of this situation is a conversation between a nurse and people who come to listen to what is said about birth control. One of the participants has a question: she wants to know if the methods used to limit

birth can be applied to those who have problems of becoming pregnant. The nurse answers that, this should not really be a big concern for that person because no one ignores that a person who gives birth after ten years when she does not wish it has obviously a problem of conceiving. To express it, she uses the convincing device "ngirango musanzwe muzi ko", meaning I think you already know that".

In general, this expression is used when a person wants to single out the hearer's ignorance. This is so in this context. The addresser (the nurse) utters it to show to her interlocutor (the participant) that this case should not raise questions because it is quite simple. She is then reminding her that this is already a problematic case and no one needs to reinforce it by following birth limitation methods. By so doing, she wants her to be aware of her ignorance and therefore to adhere to what is commonly known.

In situation 6 and 10, the expressions used to convince support the illocutionary force, which is to raise the hearer's attention to what is normally accepted. For what regards Grice's Cooperative Principle, it is respected in both cases. The interactants of each situation have achieved a common agreement.

Situation 9

MUYAGA: Ubona nzotinda nkabigira gute? Ehe raba umugore nawe aheruka kuvyara umwana yapfuye!

Umugenzi wa:
MUYAGA: Ubwo ga Muyaga we sinakubwiye kuva kera? Erega n'ubu abapfa baracapfa

MUYAGA: Aho,

Umugenzi wa
MUYAGA: Ubwo weho ntubona ko uri mu kugenda? Wewe aho nakubaririye ngo uzonyegere…

Translation: see situation 9 on page 44-45

MUYAGA's friend is reminding MUYAGA that he has been telling him what to do to protect his family against illness and death. And if his children are dying, it is his own fault because it would not have happened if he had listened to him earlier. The expression he uses to blame him for what happened is "sinakubwiye kuva kera?" meaning "haven't I been telling you this?". The role of this expression is to bring MUYAGA to change his mind and accept what his friend has been suggesting for a long time. He wants MUYAGA to regret having refused his advice and at the same time he is inviting him to join his position.

Persuasion goes on in the same situation where MUYAGA's friend is telling MUYAGA that he is at the point of dying if he does not accept to do what he has been suggesting him. The expression used is "ubwo weho ntubona ko", meaning "don't you see that".

The above expressions are used as a threatening tool. The speaker (MUYAGA'friend) is trying to put the hearer (MUYAGA) in the right frame of mind. He wants him to be aware of the danger and consequently believe in him. The illocutionary force of the expressions is then to arouse fear.

The same situation contains another convincing device:

MUYAGA: Oya jewe numvise umuntu agomba kunkurako ibi vyago, emwe sinobura kumuja inyuma.

UMUGENZI wa MUYAGA: Va i buzimu uje i buntu.

MUYAGA: Oya sha, aho ngereye, oya n'izina ry' Imana sinosubira kwica amatwi.

See situation 9 on pages 46-47

In this part of the conversation, MUYAGA's friend is issuing an order so as to persuade MUYAGA. He is ordering him to do what is right instead of acting wrongly. This is expressed as follows: "Va ibuzimu uje ibuntu", literally meaning "leave the world of death for the world of people". Contextually, MUYAGA's friend is urging him to leave darkness (grave) to go where there is light (earth). Here, darkness is what characterizes ignorance whereas light symbolizes knowledge or wisdom. Thus, MUYAGA cannot see clearly as long as he stays in the darkness. The illocutionary force of the expression is then to give guidelines to the hearer (MUYAGA).

In situation 9, MUYAGA's friend is lying to MUYAGA when he is saying that he will show him someone to prevent him from dying. And this is not true because we will all have to die one day. No one can escape from death. The Cooperative Principle is not respected especially the maxim of quality according to which we must not say what we believe to be false.

Situation 10

Umuntu yaje mu nama: Egome na jewe nari mfise akabazo gatoyi nashaka kukubaza. None nk'iyo umuvyeyi yibugenze, hanyuma ntashobore kuja kwa muganga, none arashobora kuvyara umwana yapfuye ngo n'uko atagiye kuyipimisha?

Umuforoma: Ivyo n'ivyo birashika nakubwiye ko bikenewe ko umuvyeyi afise inda yokwama aza araza kwa muganga kugirango bamusuzumire ko imbanyi afise yoba imeze neza. Iyo rero bishitse imbanyi ufise ikaba itameze neza, hanyuma ukibarukira muhira, kuko ndazi neza ko mwene abo bantu benshi bataza kwibarukira kwa muganga ntibavyibuka, ntikibuza rero ko bashobora kuvyara umwana adakomeye.

Umuntu yaje mu nama: Murakoze gwose.

Translation.

One of the participant: Yes, I have also a small question: if a women is pregnant and does not go to the hospital, can she deliver a baby that is dead because she does not go to the hospital for control?

A nurse: That is true, it happens. I told you that it is wiser for a pregnant woman to go to the hospital very often for control to see if she does not have any problem. If it happens that she has a problem and delivers at home, because "I know well that", most of women who do not go to the hospital for control don't remember to go to deliver in a hospital, it is posssible for them to deliver an abnormal child.

The participant: Thank you very much.

A participant to a meeting concerning birth limitation and other problems faced by a pregnant woman is asking a question to a nurse. She wants to know if a woman who has never been at hospital to check if her pregnancy is evolving in normal conditions may give birth to a dead child. The nurse answers that it may happen, especially to women whose pregnancy shows problems. Because of their ignorance, these persons who prefer to deliver at home never think of the danger they may face, says the nurse. To show the participants that she is sure of what she is saying, she uses the assertion "kuko ndazi neza ko" meaning "because I know well".

In uttering this expression, she intends to inform them that there are no doubt such cases exist and at the same time she is inviting them to give up such kind of habit. The illocutionary force is then that of making the assertion stronger as she wants the participants to do what she has taught them.

The compliance with the Cooperative Principle is obvious in this situation because there is no controversy between the interlocutors. The nurse and the participant who asked a question have achieved a common agreement.

In short, all the expressions used in this section have direct illocution, which functions are to convice. But situation 9 constitutes an exception. In fact, the expression used "va i buzimu uje i buntu" is indirectly uttered, because its meaning cannot be automatically perceived from the sense of the utterance.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The whole discussion has been an attempt to analyze pragmatically some warranting expressions in Kirundi discourse. This analysis has been motivated by what Crystal (1987: 128) says about pragmatics. He summarizes the scope of pragmatics in the following points:

1. how the interpretation and the use of utterances depend on the knowledge of the real world.
2. how the speakers use and understand speech acts
3. how the structure of the sentences is influenced by the relationship between the speaker and the hearer.

The present study has been in general concerned with the first and the second points. As a matter of fact studying warranting expressions is a part of dealing with how the real world functions, that is, how people behave or reacts after such kinds of utterances. And this is what this study tried to demonstrate. Moreover, warranting expressions have been used as a basis for performing acts. The interpretation of why speakers use warranting expressions has been studied in the framework of principles (Grice and Leech's Principles) that govern the every day use of language.

The data analyzed were selected from "Ni nde?" plays borrowed from the National Television of Burundi. In fact, those kinds of plays represent samples of conversations. The analyzed expressions were classified into four groups: expressions playing the role of adverbs, some swearing expressions, some proverbs and some other expressions.

The analysis of data was conducted so as to allow me to sort out the illocutionary forces of the expressions under study. Through the analysis then, I observed that warranting expressions were used with different illocutionary acts on the side of the speakers and listeners in conversation. Most of them were used either directly or indirectly to strengthen the illocutionary forces of the speaker's utterances. The speaker can utter them in order to give advice, to inform, to make a promise, to encourage, to threaten, etc. In all cases, the speaker's main goal was to win the hearer over his own point of view. It is at this step that I applied the Grice's Cooperative Principle together with the Leech's Politeness Principle to interpret the chosen expressions in their context of use.

The application of Grice's and Leech's principles showed that though the speaker used warranting expressions with the intention of getting the hearer influenced, some circumstances obliged the latter not to adhere to his interlocutor's expectations. It is in this case that some maxims of the principles were not respected. And this occurs when one of the co-participants has doubt or lacks interest in what he is being told. In some situations, the hearer also disagrees because he/she is stubborn or he/she undermines his/her addressee. In some other situations, the maxim of manner was likely to be violated due to the obscurity of expressions. But this

did not hamper the interactants' cooperation because this ambiguity was removed as soon as the interpretation of the expressions was matched with the context.

This work has been carried out mainly with the assumption that the existence of warranting expressions is not at all questionable but rather its purpose was to investigate how to account for their analysis in order to show how they embody particular socio-linguistic behaviors worthy of being studied. However I cannot pretend to have carried out an exhaustive investigation on warranting expressions. The investigation has been limited to examining these expressions in conversations through recorded plays (Ninde? plays) whose communication is likely to be transmitted naturally. There are actually other types of discourses opened for further investigation such as the types of discourses used in law courts or conversations recorded at fresh. So, other studies could focus on these.

APPENDIX: SITUATIONS ANALYSED AND THEIR TRANSLATION

Situation 1

BAKUNDUKIZE: Mbega yemwe ko uno munsi utugendeye sasita, bikugendeye gute ko mbona wahora uza ku mugoroba? N'amahoro?

VYITEYIMANZA: Mbega wewe aka kanya wibagiye ivyo twavuganye ejo? Ntakubesha, ga kiyago, ubuho bija kuja muburyo ivya twe na wamugore wanje, azokwibonerako sha!

BAKUNDUKIZE: Uti rero vyagenze gute? Ubwo vyukuri vyashobotse?

VYITEYIMANZA: yewe gaye! Kandi wewe bwabundi ntunyemera, ntiwemera ivyo ndakubwiye! Ivyo nakubwiye n'ibirya nyene, n'ivyo nibibe vyo nikuye umukoshi. Narakubwiye ko nshaka kwibanira nawewe umbona ugatwenga, nayo karya kagore kangaburira ibitozo vyimbwa, sha…

BAKUNDUKIZE: Oya niko mugabo ntiwanyiganiye ingene vyagenze.

VYITEYIMANZA: Ngirango uranzi jewe VYITEYIMANZA ko ico nitumye ndagikora. Neza na neza, namubwiye ko abwirizwa kuva mukazi akaza arantekera indya. Ngasanga rero atavyemeye, kandi ndazi ko atavyemera, nca ndamwirukana ajane n'abana kuko ntabo yansanganye.

BAKUNDUKIZE: Ugerageze uko ushoboye kwose ubirukane, naho atari ivyo ntaco tuvugana.

VYITEYIMANZA: Ariko mwiza wa bantu hari uwutokora wewe ivyo ushaka vyose? Muvyukuri sindakubesha uno munsi ku mugoroba nyene ivyo twifuza twe nawe birashoboka ndagapfa.

BAKUNDUKIZE: Oya ntiwirirwe urarahira gutyo numvise.

Translation

BAKUNDUKIZE: How come you visit us at noon? What is the matter since you used to come in the evening? Is it okay?

VYITEYIMANZA: Have you forgotten so early what we talked about Yesterday? To tell the truth, my dear, the problem between my wife and me is going to be solved. She will suffer, dear!

BAKUNDUKIZE: How did it happen? Did it really happen?

VYITEYIMANZA: What a surprise! But you don't believe what I tell you! What I told is really true. It is true and I am glad it is. I told you I want to live with you who see me and laugh, but that small woman who gives me dog's food…

BAKUNDUKIZA: Yes, but you didn't tell me how it happened.

VYITEYIMANZA: It think you know that me, VYITEYIMANZA, I always accomplish my will. Well, I told her that she leave her job and prepare me food instead. If she doesn't accept and, and I know she won't, I chase her away with her children because she didn't find me with them.

BAKUNDUKIZE: Try to do your best in order to chase them away, otherwise don't tell me anything.

VYITEYIMANZA: Who wouldn't do whatever you want him to do, best of all people? In reality, I am not lying to you, what you and I want will happen this night, otherwise I should die.

BAKUNDUKIZE: Do not swear like that, I have understood.

Situation 2

VYITEYIMANZA: Bakunda mwamikazi, nyakuramba, uraho wiriwe ga rukundo? (atwenga)
BAKUNDUKIZE: Niriwe ariko n'uko nari ndagukumbuye gusa. Ntaribagira ivyatwe na wa mugore wawe vyashobotse?

VYITEYIMANZA: Ni mama mbere ivyo twapfunditse vyashobotse, n'abana bajanye

BAKUNDUKIZE: Oya ni vyo vyagira rero urisanze.

Translation

VYITEYIMANZA: Queen Bakunda, may you live long, are you okay my love? (laughing)

BAKUNDUKIZE: I am okay, but I missed you too much. Before I forget, is your problem with your wife resolved now?

VYITEYIMANZA: I swear on my mother, the promise has been fulfilled, she left with the children.

BAKUNDUKIZE: Yes, that is true, have a seat then and feel at home.

Situation 3

VYITEYIMANZA: Neza na neza ndafise ikintu ndakwiganira…

KIRAHUGANA: Eheee…

VYITEYIMANZA: Urazi mu kirundi ko bavuga ngo "umugenzi aganyira uwundi"kandi ngo "ibigora bigora abagabo", jewe ndafise ingorane…

KIRAHUGANA: Nyabaki ga ntu?

VYITEYIMANZA: Muvyukuri ubu ndi shomé.

KIRAHUGANA: Kuva ryari?

VYITEYIMANZA: Emwe, ngirango ni wewe wenyene utari ubizi! Nyumvirize rero ndakwiganire ayo ngowe, ubishoboye ubimfashemwo. Nashaka rero mugenzi mfise ku mutima, ungurane udufaranga dukeyi, nzoheza ndagusubize ninaronka akandi kazi kuko hari aho ndakaziga.

KIRAHUGANA: Nkangahe ga?

VYITEYIMANZA: Nkabitatu gusa.

KIRAHUGANA: Oya amafaranga yoyo uraronka, mugabo ubanje kumbwira neza ingene vyagenze, cane cane ivyo bagukuriye.

VYITEYIMANZA: Wibagiye ko atawukundwa na bose? Barandodobereje kwa chef.

KIRAHUGANA: Umugabo ntahisha uwundi sha! Ubwo kumbure umbwire neza ivyagushikiye utambesha, arivyo kugufasha tugufashe, ari ivyo kuguhanura tuguhanure kuko burya ntawuhisha imyotsi inzu iriko irasha.

VYITEYIMANZA: Ewe mugenzi, we ntaco noguhisha, bagiye kumpagarika mukazi, umugore wanje nawe acaranta aromoka.

KIRAHUGANA: Eka shake wivugire make, ivyawe vyaramenyekanye, bose baremeza ko wahevye umugore wawe ukaja gushumbira BAKUNDUKIZE Mbe sha ubu ko yakwirukanye, uza kubigenza gute?

VYITEYIMANZA: Bose barabizi?

Translation.

VYITEYIMANZA: Well, I have something to tell you…

KIRAHUGANA: Yeah…

VYITEYIMANZA: As a Kirundi proverb says "we tell our problems to our friends" and "men face hardship", I have problems…

KIRAHUGANA: Problems of what kind?

VYITEYIMANZA: In reality, I am jobless.

KIRAHUGANA: Since when?

VYITEYIMANZA: I think you are the only one not to know it! Listen so that I tell you about my hardship; and help me if you can. My dear friend, I would like you to lend me some money, and I will reimburse it when I get a new job, because I expect one.

KIRAHUGANA: How much?

VYITEYIMANZA: Only three thousands.

KIRAHUGANA: I will give you that money but you have first to tell me how it happened, especially the reasons why you were dismissed.

VYITEYIMANZA: Have you forgotten that no one is liked by every body? They lied about me to the chief.

KIRAHUGANA: A man does not hide his problems to another! Tell me the truth about what happened to you so that I can help you or advise you if I have to because no one can hide the smoke of a burning house.

VYITEYIMANZA: My friend, I cannot hide you anything. I was laid off and my wife left me and went away.

KIRAHUGANA: Don't say too much, all what concerns you is known, everybody affirms that you abandoned your wife and went to live with BAKUNDUKIZE. Now that, she no more needs you, what are you going to do?

VYITEYIMANZA: Everybody knows it?

Situation 4

BISESAGU: Zana twaduhera rero turabe ingene tuzodukoresha, turabe ibiro vy'umuceri tuzogura, amasuguru, amakaziye y' ibiyeri, eka n'ibindi bikenewe.

BIRAHINDUKA: Ariko uriyibagiye ntu, jewe mbona yuko ivyo bintu vyose uriko uradondagora, mbona bidakenewe, ntagusesagurira abatazobigushimira.

BISESAGU: Ariko abagore namwe, erega mukuzimu ntibanezerwa.

BIRAHINDUKA: Oya nyumviriza ndakubwire uko ndavyibaza, urabona twahitiye twubaka iyo inzu, kandi urabona amafaranga yadutwaye ingene ari menshi. Reka tugure bikeyi nk'ikaziye imwe y'ibiyeri, n' ibiro bikeyi vy'umuceri, inyama nazo tuzogura izo kukiro, ntamasuguru ngaho. Ico nzi co, eka nakubwiye ko abo bose ushaka kubiha atavyo bazogushimira, bazosigara baritwengera wikeneye.

BISESAGU: Namba ari wewe uzoca ubitanga, jewe utwo tungana gutyo nokubahuka guhamagara abantu.

BIRAHINDUKA: Mushingantahe wibagiye ko wanka kugarura impene utaronerwa yamara kurenga imitumba ukabira nkayo. Ivyo bintu ndakubwiye nivyo kandi n'uwo wese agukunda yoguhanura gutyo. Kandi hari n' ikindi naco, ntuzi ko twaterereje bazonywa izo bizaniye.

BISESAGU: Ni ukuzobiraba ariko numva bitoroshe.

Translation

BISESAGU: Bring the money then so that we see how we will spend it, and see the quantity of rice we will buy, the number of he-goats, parks of beer, and other things which are needed.

BIRAHINDUKA: But you forget yourself, personally I see that, all those things you are enumerating are not necessary. It isn't worth giving to people who will not be grateful.

BISESAGU: But you women...! There is no joy in the grave.

BIRAHINDUKA: No, instead listen to me so that I tell you what I think about: as you see, we used to build that house and you know that it is costly. Let's buy few things such as one park of beer, some kilos of rice, and for meat we will buy by kilos, no he-goats are needed. What I know is that, all those you want to give those things will not be grateful, they will laugh at you when you will be poor.

BISESAGU: In that case, it will be you who will serve them, for me I can't invite people for such a small quantity.

BIRAHINDUKA: Wise man, have you forgotten that if you refuse to prevent a goat from destroying crops before time, you start bleating like it when it is already over the mountains. I tell you the truth and whoever loves you would give you that piece of advice. In addition, don't you know that we sent them invitations? They will drink beer they will have brought.

BISESAGU: I will try but it is not easy.

Situation 5

BISESAGU: Mba ndaguhamagaye ugasubira ugasoma ariko n'uko wihuta,mugabo ntaco ndafise urundi rubanza rwo kunezereza umwana azogenda mw'ishule yisumbuye.

Umugenzi wa
BISESAGU: Mugenzi, kubwanje mbona ari ugusesagura, urwo rubanza naho woba urarureka ntaco vyoba bitwaye.

BISESAGU: Eheee…ntanejereje umwana wanje, n'abaryango bakabonerwaho!

Umugenzi wa
BISESAGU: Wewe ubone wagize urubanza uno munsi, hama muyindi minsi ugire urundi, umukobwanje ivyo bintu ndakubwiye vyari vyo ukwiye kuvyiyumvira.

BISESAGU: Ahubwo urandonderera akandi kabindi.

Umugenzi
wa BISESAGU: Emwe sindabizi, ariko nibaza ko ntazoronka. Urabona imanza zabaye nyinshi. Ariko sha mugenzi, reka ndabisubiremwo, uranakumbure uvyihoze kuko urazi ko "agasozi kintahanurwa kahiye abagabo babona "

BISESAGU: Urubanza rwo ruzoba, kandi naho ataco uzoronka urapfa kuza.

Translation

BISESAGU: I would like to invite you to drink again but you are in a hurry; but there is no problem because I have another feast: the celebration of my daughter's success to the national test.

BISESAGU's friend: My friend, as far as I am concerned, I think that it is squandering, even if you don't do it , it will not be a big deal.

BISESAGU: Yes! I must please my child and the family must benefit from it.

BISESAGU's friend: You see that you had a feast today and you want to organize another feast in coming days, I swear on my daughter, I tell you the truth, it is necessary to think about it.

BISESAGU: Find me another pot of beer instead.

BISESAGU's friend: I don't know, but I think that I will not have it because there have been so many feasts. But my friend, it is better to listen to me and ignore it because as you know "the mountains that didn't listen to advice burnt when men were watching".

BISESAGU: The feast will take place. Come even though you don't have any beer to bring.

Situation 6

Umugenzi
wa BISESAGU: Reka tuje kurondera agatoke tuzoterere BISESAGU.

Umugore
w'umugenzi
wa BISESAGU: Aho nyene wishizemwo kumuterera? Wibaza ko izo nzoga zose tumuha, n'umunsi mubi akazozidusubisa.

Umugenzi
wa BISESAGU: Uti rero kubwawe tuvyihoze?

Umugore
w'umugenzi
wa BISESAGU: Emwe niko ndabibona pe! Wewe ntubona ingene asesagura, wibaza ko mu minsi iri imbere azoba akironka n'ico afungura? Ni ukuri uzoba umbwira. Nayo amayoga ashika amajana atatu, emwe oya batazomwirahira abazimuhaye bose nihagera ko bagira imanza. Kandi ikindi naco, menya neza ko uterera umuntu nawe azoheza akayigusubiza, none ntuzi ko ariko biri? None umuntu afise inzoga amajana angahe azogusubiza izo akuye hehe?

Umugenzi
Wa BISESAGU: Mugabo ndaguye ndagarutse, mama ntoba ndiko ndasesagura.

Translation

BISESAGU's friend: Let us go to look for banana to prepare beer for BISESAGU.

The wife of
BISESAGU's friend: Must you really give him beer? Do you believe that all those pots of beer we are giving him will be returned to us? The bad day he will not reimburse it.

BISESAGU's friend: Is your opinion then to ignore it?

The wife of
BISESAGU's friend: Yes, that is how I really see it. Don't you see how he spends too much? Do you think that he will have even have something to eat in coming days? Frankly you will tell me. Speaking of 300 pots of beer, all those who gave him beer will kill him when it will be their turn to prepare feasts. Furthermore, know well that you give something so that you can also get something else in return, don't you know that it is like that? Someone who has hundreds of pots to reimburse, where is he going to find them?

BISESAGU's friend: I change my mind, I swear on my mother's name I will be spending for nothing.

Situation 7

SINDIHEBURA: Urazi ingorane wewe ufise?

BIRAHINDUKA: Oya…

SINDIHEBURA: Nizo kuvyara intahekana, erega navyo nyene birakonya.

BIRAHINDUKA: Oya inda zubu sinzi ingene zimeze.

SINDIHEBURA: Jewe kubinyerekeye, kenyera wegere muganga agusigurire neza ingene izo ngorane zitosubira kugushikira.

BIRAHINDUKA: Emwe imana yompa iyi nkayiva imbere, noca ndabibaza Muganga.

Translation

SINDIHEBURA: Do you know what kind of problems you have?

BIRAHINDUKA: No...

SINDIHEBURA: They are related to giving birth without interruption. This also hurts.

BIRAHINDUKA: No, nowadays pregnancies are complicated.

SINDIHEBURA: As far as I am concerned, you have to go to see a doctor, so that he can explain to you how you can overcome your problems.

BIRAHINDUKA: If God can help me to give birth without any problem, I will go and ask about it.

Situation 8

Muyaga: Reka sha reka, nagira ngo muramfasha muyo ngowe, none nawe utanguye kumbwira ivyo umbwira.

Mwenewabo: Uri mukurwanje, none sivyo? Mugabo siniganwa ijambo. Ivyo mbona bibereye ndabikubwira, kandi uribuka shahu ko wanka guhanurwa ukibonerako

Muyaga: Reka kuntega iminsi, impa utwo duhera gusa.

Translation

Muyaga: Stop there, I was thinking that you would help me overcoming my problems, but you start by telling stupidities.

His brother: You are my elder brother, aren't you? But I have to say something about what I judge necessary, and remember that whoever refuses advice regrets later.

Muyaga: Do not count days for me, just give me that money.

Situation 9

MUYAGA: Jewe rero sha birangoye n'ukuri, ntakuntu nobivuga, nokubwira ko ivyago vyose vyagize umurwa mukuru i wanje.

Umugenzi wiwe: Erega biracakugora n'ubu.

MUYAGA: Ubona none nzotinda nkabigira gute? Ehe raba umugore nawe aheruka kuvyara umwana yapfuye!

Umugenzi wiwe: Ubwo ga MUYAGA we sinakubwiye kuva kera! Erega n'ubu abapfa baracapfa.

MUYAGA: Aho,

Umugenzi wiwe: Ubwo weho ntubona ko uri mu kugenda, wewe aho nakubaririye ngo uzonyegere, ndakubwire ga sha, oya mugabo wewe uguma wica amatwi. Iyo utaba uri umugenzi ndagatsindwa aho hepfo ntokwihojeje. Uzoze ndakujane hahandi, kwa wa mupfumu, ahubwo uze kuza ubu nyene ku kumugoroba.

MUYAGA: Bashobora kumfasha ayo mabi yose akamvako?

Umugenzi wiwe: Emwe basha niwangamburukira, ntamuntu uzosubira kubura, ntamuntu azosubira gupfa i wawe ndakamanurwa n'iyo hejuru, erega na wewe ntuzopha.

MUYAGA : N'indwara zihave? Indwara zarikiye i wanje zose?

Umugenzi wiwe: Ahahahaha, ubwo bujuju bwo kwirirwa uraharira nibwo bwatumye abantu b'iwawe baguherako ndagasara

MUYAGA: Oya jewe numvise umuntu agomba kunkurako ivyago, emwe sinobura kumuja inyuma.

Umugenzi wiwe: Va ibuzumu uje ibuntu.

MUYAGA: Oya sha aho ngereye, oya n'izina ry'Imana sinosubira kwica amatwi.

Umugenzi wiwe: Ntituyage amasigara cicaro, ngo ikinyoma kibe ikinyoma uvugishe ukuri MUYAGA.

MUYAGA: Nduva ko uri imvugakuri, kandi ubwo ndakumva, ivyo vyose umbwiye nzobikurikiza.

Umugenzi wiwe: Rahira ga sha,

MUYAGA: Imana impane ni ukuri.

Umugenzi wiwe: Aho, uhave uza rero ku mugoroba ndakujane.

Translation

MUYAGA: Frankly, it is hard for me, I don't know how to say it. Problems of all kinds have come to me.

His friend: It is still going to be hard for you.

MUYAGA: What do you advise me to do? Even my wife has delivered a dead child.

His friend: Please, MUYAGA, haven't I told you for ever since? Your people are still dying.

MUYAGA: Tell me,

His friend: Don't you see that you are also dying? I told you to approach me, let me tell you that, -but the problem is that you don't want to open your ears. If you weren't my friend, may I be killed, I would keep silence. Come so that I bring you to the place, to the witch doctor, you should even come this afternoon.

MUYAGA: Can they help me to overcome all those problems?

His friend: If you obey me, you will not lose yours anymore, nobody will die again in your house, may I be killed by a thunder; you will never die either.

MUYAGA: Even diseases are going to disappear? All diseases that are in my family?

His friend: Your stupidity of arguing is at the origin of all your people's death, may I be mad.

Muyaga: No, I am ready to follow whoever wants to overcome my problems.

His friend: Leave the death world for the people's world.

MUYAGA: No, in the conditions I am now, I swear on the name of God that I cannot close my ears again.

His friend: Let's put this into practice to avoid telling lies, tell the truth MUYAGA.

MUYAGA: I hear that you are a truth teller, and I hear you, I will comply with all that you have told me.

His friend: Can you swear?

MUYAGA: May I be punished by God if I am not telling the truth.

His friend: Okay, come then this afternoon so that I take you there.

Situation 10

Uwaje mu nama: None ko hariho abavyeyi nko mu kuronka akandi kana bibagora avyaye nk'umwana agashikana nk'imyaka cumi ataramukurikiza ubwo uwo muntu akoresheje burya buryo muhejeje kutwigisha, ntivyoca vyunyuka? Ubwo yosubiira kuvyara?

Umuforoma: Ivyo ntibigoye, kandi ngirango musanzwe muzi ko umuntu akurikiza haheze imyaka cumi atariwe abishatse aba afise ingorane. Kuri uwo muntu rero ubwo buryo ntibukenewe.

Uwaje mu nama: Egome murakoze.

Uwundi yaje mu nama: Egome na jewe nari mfise akabazo gatoyi nashaka kukubaza. None nk'iyo umuvyeyi yibugenze, hanyuma ntashobore kuja kwa muganga, none arashobora kuvyara umwana yapfuye ngo n'uko atagiye kuyipimisha?

Umuforoma: Ivyo n'ivyo birashika nakubwiye ko bikenewe ko umuvyeyi afise inda yokwama aza araza kwa muganga kugirango bamusuzumire ko imbanyi afise yoba imeze neza. Iyo rero bishitse imbanyi ufise ikaba itameze neza, hanyuma ukibarukira muhira, kuko ndazi neza ko mwene abo bantu benshi bataza kwibarukira kwa muganga ntibavyibuka, ntikibuza rero ko bashobora kuvyara umwana adakomeye.

Uwundi yaje mu nama: Murakoze gwose.

Translation

One of the participants: But, there are some parents who have problems to get a child. When she delivers and ten years pass without having another child, if that person follows the instructions you have given us, wouldn'it be much more difficult for her than before? Can she still have a child?

A nurse: That is not difficult and I think you already know that when a person delivers after ten years when she does not want it, she has already problems. Then, for that person, there is no need to follow the instructions given above.

The participant: Yes, thank you.

Another participant: Yes, I have also a small question: if a women is pregnant and does not go to the hospital, can she deliver a baby that is dead because she does not go to the hospital for control?

A nurse: That is true, it happens. I told you that it is wiser for a pregnant woman to go to the hospital very often for control to see if she does not have any problem. If it happens that she has a problem and delivers at home, because "I know well that", most of women who do not go to the hospital for control don't remember to go to deliver in a hospital, it is posssible for them to deliver an abnormal child.

The same participant: Thank you very much.

Situation 11

Umupfumu: Rugajo wa Rugajo, muhe urya muti w'igufa agende yikingire hanyuma azobibona ndakambura abawuseye.

MUYAGA: Ego basi uri imvugakuri, ndashimye gose.

Translation

Witch doctor: Rugajo son of Rugajo, give him that medicine so that he can protect himself, and he will see it tomorrow when it will be time, may I unclothe those who ground it if I tell lies.

Situation 12

MAKURATA: Mbega burya bwose wari unjanye mubapfumu? Urihenda sha!

MUYAGA: Eka sinihenda ndakarenzwa ivu, burya wewe hari ico utazi kandi ukenemeye kumenya, yambariye yuko barya bana, barya bana bacu ko bagwara ibitega bahindiwemwo na murumuna wanje.

MAKURATA: None ivyo wavyemeye?

MUYAGA: Aho ntavyemera, ndakambura mwishwanje atampora ko Ndonka abana benshi, akaja araduhenda ngo nukutavyara kurugero. Naho shwi! We hari uworeka gukurikiza umwana w'imyaka ibiri?

MAKURATA: Birabisha nakazi kavyo, ntamwana wanje nzojana mubapfumu.

Translation

MAKURATA: Is it true that you were taking me to witch doctor? You are mistaken!

MUYAGA: No, if I am mistaken may earth be thrown on me, but as for you, there is something that you don't know and that you should know. He told me that those children, our children are suffering from demons coming from my younger brother.

MAKURATA: And do you believe that?

MUYAGA: Why not, may I unclothe my niece if he does not victimize me because I have many children. He lies in saying that we must plan the births. No, who wouldn't give birth to a second child when the first has already two years?

MAKURATA: I do not care, I would not bring my child to witch doctors.

Situation 13

NTAHONKIRIYE: Cane cane igikuru singorane nje kugutura. Ico nifuza...

MARAGARITA: eee...

NTAHONKIRIYE: Urazi ko nyarucamwo rwaje.

MARAGARITA: Ego ndazi ko wapfakaye, ndazi ko umutamakazi yahwereye.

NTAHONKIRIYE: Ego hanyuma nkaba nzi nawe ivyanciyeko ko vyaguciyeko.

MARAGARITA: Ha, jewe nanje ubwatsi bwarapfutse umunwa!

NTAHONKIRIYE: Hanyuma ukaba uzi ko inyakamwe inyaga imwe, kamwe nubusa. Nashaka ndakubaze yuko wewe woshobora kunyemerera ko dushobora gufashanya.

MARAGARITA: Nyunviriza rero mutama ndakubwire, jewe kuvyukuri sindakwemereye kandi sindaguhakaniye, kuko nawewe urazi ko ntigaba, genda uzogaruka mpanuje.

NTAHONKIRIYE: Ivyo nivyo ariko wibuke ko ubu ukuze atawukugaba kandi kandi ntawe ukeneye ko aguhanura.

MARAGARITA: Oya mutware wanje ndafise ico mpanuza, mugabo ndagusize mumuhango, uzogaruke kubaza kuko uwubandwa ariwe abandwa urugi.

NTAHONKIRIYE: Ubivuze nk'uwubizi, ejo inkoko niyo ngoma.

Translation

NTAHONKIRIYE: What seems to be especially important is not the problem I bring to you, my wish is …

MARAGARITA: What?

NTAHONKIRIYE: You know that death came,

MARAGARITA: Yes, I know that you are a widower, I know that the old woman died.

NTAHONKIRIYE: Yes, I also know that what happened to me happened to You.

MARAGARITA: As for me it is a catastrophe!

NTAHONKIRIYE: And you know that loneliness hurts, one person is nothing. I would like to ask you if we could help one another .

MARAGARITA: Listen to me, old man, so that I can tell you: frankly speaking I neither accept nor deny because you yourself knows that I am not free. Go and you will come back when I will have asked for piece of advice.

NTAHONKIRIYE: That's true but remember that, now you are a grown up and that nobody has responsibility over you; this is to say that you do not need any piece of advice whatsoever.

MARAGARITA: No sir, I have to ask for advice but I promise you, come back to ask because "the one in need has to persevere in action".

NTAHONKIRIYE: You talk like the one who knows it, tomorrow I will wake up early in the morning.

Situation 14

REMEJIYO: MARAGARI, urazi urwo ndagukunda ingene rungana? Kandi narukweretse kuva kera. Ndagukunda ga kirezi!

MARAGARITA: Oya nawe nu reka gushikuza.

REMEJIYO: MARAGARI ntakubesha, mbe bashahu norahira ngw'iki kugirango uvyemere udakekeranya? Eheee… ndakabura wewe nyene kuko ni wewe mfise ku mutima.

MARAGARITA: Oya geza ayo ndazi ko unkunda.

REMEJIYO: Mbere ga rukundo hari ico naringiye ntakubariye. Urabona uyu mushatsi uri ku mutwe?

MARAGARITA: Egome,

REMEJIYO: Urukundo ndagukunda ni ukuri kw'Imana rutangana uyu mushatsi wanje.

MARAGARITA: Emwe nawe urarengeje (atwenga). Oya reka ngende burije.

Translation

REMEJIYO: MARAGARI, do you know how much I love you? And I showed it to you ever since. I love you, dear…

MARAGARITA: No do not exaggerate.

REMEJIYO: MARAGARI, without telling you lies, how can I swear so that you can accept it without any doubt? Oh… may I lose you, because it is only you that I have in my heart.

MARAGARITA: Do not say too much, I know that you love me.

REMEJIYO: My love, I was going to leave without telling something. Do you see the hair on my head?

MARAGARITA: Yes,

REMEJIYO: The love I have for you equals my hair, I swear on God.

MARAGARITA: But you exaggerate (laughing)! Let me go because it is getting dark.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allan, K. 1986. *Linguistic Meaning.* Volume 1. London: Routledge and Kegan.

Aristotle, 1952. *Great Books of Western World.* Chicago. London. Toronto. Volume II.

Austin, J.L. 1962. *How to Do Things with Words.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brown, G. & Yule, G. 1983. *Discourse Analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Basnett, S. 1980. *Translation studies.* London: Metner.

Crystal, D. 1987. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. 1985. *Dictionary of Linguistics and phonetics.* London: Oxford University Press.

Edmondson, W. 1981. *Spoken Discourse: A Model for Analysis.* Longman House. Burnt Mill, Harlow.

Fasold, R. 1990. *The Sociolinguistics of Language.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Filmore, C.J. 1977. Topics in Lexical Semantics in P. Cole (ed.) R.W. *Current Issues in Linguitic Theory.* Bloomingtonn: Indiana University Press

Finnegan, R. 1970. *Oral Literature in Africa.* Oxford: at the Clarendon Press.

Fowler, R. 1974. *Understanding Language.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd, London.

Fowler, R. 1981. *Literature as Social Discourse.* London: Bastford Academic and Educational Ltd.

Fraser, B. 1984. The Domain of Pragmatics in Richard, J.C. and Schmidt (eds), *Language and Communication.* Essex: Longman

Fromkin and Rodman. 1978. *An Introduction to Language.* New York. Chicago: Reinhart and Winston

Funk and Wagnell, 1967. Standard Dictionary of English Language. In R.Hayakawa, 1968. *Language in Though and Action.*

Garfinkel, H. and Sacks, H. 1970. "On Formal Structures of Practical Actions". In J.C.Mc Kinney and E. Teryakian (eds) *Theoretical Sociology*. New York: Appleton- Century-Crofts.

Grice, H.P. 1975. Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole and J.M. Morgan (eds) *Syntax and semantics*. Vol 3: Speech Acts. New York: Academic Press.

Gumperz, J.J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. and Hassan,R. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Havugiyaremye, G. 1990. A study of Reference in Kirundi Discourse. Thesis. University of Burundi.

Hymes, D. 1964. *Language in Culture and Society*. New York: Harper and Row.

Kazungu, F. 1985. Messages à Travers Quelques Souhaits en Kirundi. Mémoire, Université du Burundi.

Kigeme, C. 1990. A Pragmatic Analysis of Some Kirundi Swearing Expressions. Thesis: University of Burundi.

Labov, W. 1969. "The Study of Non-Standard English". In *Linguistics and the Teaching of Standard English*. Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistcs, No.22. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Leech, G.N. 1983. *Principle of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Levinson, S. 1983. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Li, C. (ed.). 1976. *Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press Inc.

Lyons, J. 1977. *Semantics*. 2. Vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Lyons, J. 1981. *Language and Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Mikkelsen, B.1995. *Methods for Development Work and Research: A Guide for Practioners*. New Delhi: Sage Publications, cop. 1995-296p.

Morris, C.W. 1983. *Foundations of the theory of signs*. The Hague: Mouton.

Murekambaze, V. 1989. A Pragmatic Analysis of Some Rundi Proverbs. Thesis, University of Burundi.

Ndabaneze, E. 1996. A Pragmatic Analysis of Some Kirundi Topic - Shifts. Thesis, University of Burundi.

Nishimwe, E. 1994. A Study of Ellipsis in Kirundi Turn-taking Discourse. Thesis, University of Burundi.

Ntahokaja, J.B. 1978. *Imigenzo y'Ikirundi.* Université du Burundi.

Nyirubutama, M. 1996. A pragmatic Analysis of Some Ongoing Checks. Thesis, University of Burundi.

Nzorijana, G. 1990. A pragmatic Analysis of Some Kirundi Insulting Expressions. Thesis, University of Burundi.

Okpewho, I. 1992. *African Oral Literature: Backgrounds, Characters, and Continuity*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.

Richards *et al.* 1985. *The Longman Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. London: Longman.

Sapir, E.1956. *Culture, Language, and Personality.* Los Angeles: Calfornia University Press.

Searle, J.R. 1969. *Speech acts. An Essay in Philosophy of Language* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Sinizeye, S. 1989. Etude de la Forme Théâtrale d'un Nouveau Genre Littéraire Rund*i: "Ninde*?". Mémoire. Université du Burundi.

Stubbs, M. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*: *the Sociolinguitic of Natural Language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell/ Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Swan, M. 1980. *Practical English Usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tuzagi, H. 1985. La Conception Traditionnelle de la Mort à Travers les Proverbes Rund*i*. Mémoire, Université du Burundi.

Wardhaugh, R. 1985. *How Conversation Works.* Oxford: Oxford Basil Blackwell.

Wells, G. 1981. *Learning Through Interaction*: *The Study of Language Development*. With contribution by Allyne Bridges, Peter French, Margaret Maclure, Chris Sinha, Valerie Walkerdine, and Bencie Woll. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Widdowson, H.G. 1973. *Directions in the Teaching of Discourses*, in Corder and Roulet (eds). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Widdowson, H.G. 1979. *Exploration in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zuure, B. 1932. *L'Ame du Murundi.* Paris: Beauchesne et ses fils.