A RELEVANCE- THEORETIC ANALYSIS OF DISCOURSE MARKERS IN LULOGOOLI CONVERSATIONS

PRESENTED BY

ASIMBA MUKANYI LETICIA

C50/76732/2014

A RESEARCH PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE AWARD OF MASTER OF ARTS, DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS AND LANGUAGES

THE UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI

2019

DECLARATION

This research project is my original work and has not been presented for examination in any other university.

Signature…………………………… Date…………………………………

ASIMBA MUKANYI LETICIA

C50/76732/2014

This research project has been submitted for review with our approval as university supervisors.

Signature…………………………… Date…………………………………

DR. CATHERINE AGOYA -WOTSUNA

Signature…………………………… Date…………………………………

DR. CLAUDIUS P. KIHARA

DEDICATION

This project is dedicated to the following people for their unmatched contributions towards my academics:

First my sincere and deepest gratitude goes to my dear husband Engineer Sunday Fredrick Oboo for his moral and financial support throughout the entire period of my study. I would have not come this far without you.

My dear parents Japheth Asimba and Jones Mabiala for moral support and educating me to this level. You even struggled to pay part of my master of degree fee which I don't take for granted. You have made me feel loved and encouraged me to value my children's education just as you did. God bless you.

Not forgetting my siblings Joy, Geylord, Velma, Foster and Mercy for encouraging me to press on to the end of my study.

Finally, I dedicate this work to my dear son Dylan Oboo Ortani for giving me a humble time to study having stayed away from me especially during my proposal writing stage. Thanks son for making such a sacrifice.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

DMs- Discourse markers

RT- Relevance Theory

SEG - Segment

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

This study focussed on the analysis of Discourse markers in conversations in Lúlogooli. The focus was particularly on conversations that occurred naturally. Using the characteristics identified by Schruoup (1999); Schifrin (2002) to mention a few were used to pick out DMs in the recorded conversations. It was noted that DMs are used in communication to do the following: enhance cohesion (unity in a discourse). It is important to note that cohesive markers occur in both spoken and written discourse. However, they may be used 'unexpectedly' in spoken discourse; DMs in Lulogooli are also be used to highlight the next discourse, the speaker uses such DMs as utterance initial to seek the hearer's attention; DMs in Lulogooli are used by the speaker to hold a turn before the next speaker speaks: DMs in Lulogooli are used to constrain the way the hearer should interpret the speaker's meaning. DMs are therefore procedural just as noted by earlier researchers such as Blakemore (2002), Yus (2012) among others. During communication, the speaker and the hearer have the same goal of achieving maximum relevance and therefore everyone wants to be understood. Therefore, the speaker makes his or her speech in a manner that is easy to be understood. This is achieved by use of DMs. Therefore, RT accounts for DMs. It was noted that Lúlogooli cohesive markers are not so different from English cohesive markers. However, there are a few different usages where cohesive markers in Lúlogooli can occur utterance initial which is unique in conversations. RT therefore adequately explained the pragmatic functions of Lúlogooli DMS.

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

This chapter introduces the background to the study, statement of the problem, research questions, research objectives, research justification; scope and limitations of the study. Further, the chapter presents the operational definitions of terms used in the study, literature review, theoretical framework and the research methodology used in the study.

1.1 Background to the Study

This section introduces Lúlogooli language and gives a background to Discourse Markers.

1.1.1   Background to Lúlogooli Language

Lúlogooli is a Bantu language with about 62,0000 speakers according to the census conducted in 2009. Lúlogooli speakers reside in western Kenya in Vihiga County and in Nyanza region in Kanyamkago in Migori County. There are some in Tanzania also. According to, Lúlogooli is the second largest in the Luhya community and is a Luhya dialect. Lúlogooli is called 'Logooli,' 'Úlulogooli' or 'Maragoli' (Ethnologue 18th ed, 2015).

1.1.2   Background to Discourse Markers

This section gives the background to discourse markers (hereafter DMs) highlighting the different approaches used in the discussion of DMs. In addition, the section describes various descriptions of DMs.

Words in any language have a function and meaning. In conversations the meaning of words enables interlocutors to interpret what is communicated.

According to Miskovic et al. (2015:23), the interpretation of utterances is a mental activity and therefore words and phrases can be mapped into two categories: concepts and procedures. Concepts include linguistic forms such as verbs, nouns, adverbs and adjectives. Procedures include: pronouns, mood indicators, connectives, particles, interjections, tense markers and word order. Linguistic forms with procedural meaning follow a particular inferential process in coming up with the meaning of concepts. Extending the categories above to DMs, Blakemore (2002) notes that DMs belong to procedures.

Although DMs have received considerable attention in the past, there is no agreement on their definition, classification or what may be pass for a DM. Different terminologies have been used to refer to DMs: For example, they are discourse connectives (Blakemore 1987, 1992, 2002); discourse particles (Schorup 1985); discourse markers (Fraser and Schifrin 1987); connectors (Celle and Huarts, 2007); illocutionary force indicating particles (Brown and Levinson, 1987); pragmatic particles (Furko 2017), to mention a few.

Blakemore (2002:1) notes that because of the term 'discourse', then DMs must be described at the discourse level (a level above sentence), while the notion of 'marker' indicates that meaning must be analysed in terms of what DMs *indicate* or *mark* how utterances are to be interpreted and not what they describe in that discourse.

Different researchers have variously defined DMs differently. Schifrin (1987) cited in Schifrin and Maschler (2015: 189) defined DMs as a set of linguistic items which play a role in the following domains; the cognitive, expression of oneself, social and in text. Schifrin and Maschler noted that a coherent discourse is an interactive process whereby a speaker is supposed to infer a number of communicative knowledge. (p181). This knowledge is supposed to complement grammatical knowledge of sound, meaning and form.

Furko (2017) notes that DMs are a set of many linguistic items in a sentence that are used to express emotions or attitudes.

According to Aijmer (2002:265), DMs help a speaker organize speech in an utterance. DMs comment on or signal how a new utterance fits into already existing utterances and help the speaker indicate relationship with the hearer and the message itself.

From this brief look at DMs, it is notable that definitions and functions of DMs are described differently by scholars using different approaches. However, the different descriptions have some common aspects such as the social aspect of maintaining relations between hearer and speaker and also the aspect of coherence in utterances.

Borrowing from the definitions already presented, this study defines DMs as words or phrases that are used to connect utterances and restrict the hearer's interpretation by providing context and contextual effects for maximum relevance. This is because DMs have been considered to have a procedural meaning.

Most previous studies gave attention to the use of DMs in English, (Blakemore 2002; Schorup 1985; Fraser and Schifrin 1987; Celle and Huarts, 2007; Brown and Levinston, 1987; Furko 2017, Nonetheless there are studies of DMs in other languages. For instance, Chinese Ljungqvist 2010; Wang Tsai 2010; German Barske and Golato 2010; Danish Emmertsen and Heinemann 2010; French Degand and Fagard 2011 but there are fewer in African languages; Kiitharaka Kindiki 2008; Nilotic Dimmendal 2014; Kabras Makuto, Ogutu and Nyamasyo 2014; South African English variety Gauche 2017 to mention but a few.

Approaches used to study DMs include: Pragmatic approach (Fraser 1990, 1999); Brinton, 1996; Li Quanbo, 2016; Alami, 2015; discourse approach Schifrin, 1987, 2012; Functional interactional Linguistics, Maschler, 1994; Sandholtet, 2018; Functional Systematic Linguistics approach Piurko, 2015 to mention a few. The above approaches focussed mainly on form and functions of DMs. Blakemore, 2002 used Relevance Theory by Sperber and Wilson, 2002 to analyse DMs in English and mainly textual DMs.

There is therefore need to analyse DMs in Lúlogooli as an African language so as to determine how they facilitate relevance in Lúlogooli utterances.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

DMs play syntactic, semantic and pragmatic roles in conversations such that the speaker expresses his or her intention to communicate by establishing rapport with the hearer and also leading the hearer towards understanding the message communicated thus enhancing a fruitful conversation.

This study analyses DMs in Lúlogooli using a relevance -theoretic framework. The study aims to describe how DMs in Lúlogooli facilitate achievement of maximum relevance in conversations. In addition, the study also aims to show how DMs provide context for interpretation of message communicated by speakers in Lúlogooli conversations. This study will therefore answer the following questions:

1.3 Research Questions

i.   Which DMs are used in Lúlogooli conversations?

ii.   What are the syntactic and semantic functions of Lúlogooli DMs?

iii.   How can relevance theory account for DMs in Lúlogooli conversations?

1.4 Research Objectives

This study aims at achieving the following objectives.

 i.   To identify DMs in Lúlogooli conversations.
 ii. To describe syntactic and semantic functions of Lúlogooli DMs.
 iii. To establish how relevance theory can account for DMs in Lúlogooli conversations.

1.5 Justification of the Study

This study is essential because it focuses on Lúlogooli language which seems not to have received any attention as far as DMs are concerned. This study adds to the growing literature of the use of Relevance Theory (hereafter RT) in the analysis of DMs. At the same time, it explains how DMs in Lúlogooli help the hearer and speaker achieve maximum relevance of the message communicated which finally leads to effective communication in conversations.

In addition, the analysis undertaken is expected to provide further research of DMs in African languages and the application of RT in the analysis of this phenomena.

This study also contributes to the cross linguistic studies of DMs and to cross –linguistic comparative studies of DMs.

1.6 Scope and Limitations of the Study

In this study, oral Lúlogooli conversations are analysed. The syntactic and semantic functions of the DMs will be considered and the analysis will be based on utterances. The pragmatic functions of DMs will be discussed in relation to RT. This study will not look at how DMs are used by men and women in speech. This study only analyses DMs in Lúlogooli language.

1.7 Definition of Terms

Discourse markers: words or phrases that are used to connect utterances and restrict the hearer's interpretation by providing context and contextual effects for maximum relevance.

Discourse: refers to both spoken and written material.

Cohesion: unity within written or spoken discourse.

Interlocutor: the hearers and speakers in a conversation.

Implicature: Contextual assumption that the hearer needs so as to preserve an assumption that an utterance made is consistent with the relevance principles (Blakemore 1992:137).

Inference: is any conclusion that one is reasonably entailed to draw from an utterance.

Maximum relevance: is the total activation of thought that is initiated to interpret an utterance (Wilson and Sperber 1995).

Processing effort: is a mind searching device that is psychological.

Relevance: is the activation of thought that is initiated to interpret an utterance. (Wilson and Sperber 1995).

Speaker's meaning: is the intended meaning.

Sentence meaning: is the grammatical meaning of words in a sentence.

Segment: refers to a discourse unit that serves as a clause can also be called a discourse unit.

Utterance: is the actual speech sequence in a specific situation.

1.8 Literature Review

This section discusses existing literature related to Lúlogooli language, DMs and Relevance theory. Materials used here are books, papers and thesis written in the past. Different approaches used by different researchers will be identified.

1.8.1 Literature on Lúlogooli Language

In this section I will not describe the grammatical details of Lúlogooli, which may not be very relevant to the present study. However, I will present some linguistic studies of the language. Lúlogooli does not lack linguistic attention. Manyora (1992) studied relations between NPs of Lúlogooli sentences using Government and Binding theory. He established that NPs in Lúlogooli could consist of a head noun and its modifiers where the head noun could be modified by more than one modifier and in most cases the modifiers are placed to the right of the head noun. Manyora concluded that Lúlogooli is a head initial language.

Jumba (2007) analysed relative clauses in Lúlogooli. She looked at morpho-syntactic roles in the grammar of Lúlogooli Language. According to this study Lúlogooli takes a post nominal relative clause.

Apart from looking at the sentence level, there is need to go beyond and look at a discourse level in utterances within a conversation in Lúlogooli to determine effectiveness of discourse markers.

Malande (2011) investigated the semantics of Lúlogooli personal names. He found out that Lúlogooli personal names have both semantic and connotative meaning, the study used a theory of semiotics as an approach for analysis.

Anindo (2016) investigated Lúlogooli toponyms using a morphosemantic approach. In her study she discussed the meanings and morphology of Lúlogooli place names. She studied the morphological processes involved in forming Lúlogooli names. The study concludes that Lúlogooli typonyms follow inflection and compounding as morphological processes in their formation.

Besides Malande (2011) and Anindo (2016) studies, it is important to study different aspects such as DMs in conversations from a relevance perspective in the same language.

This section has presented few researches carried out in Lúlogooli which clearly indicates that there is need to carry out more research in Lúlogooli language.

1.8.2 Literature on Discourse Markers

This section focusses on studies related to DMs. The section establishes work already covered on DMs using different data and approaches. This section is divided into international and African literature on DMs. International literature (studies outside Africa) on DMs include the following:

Maschler & Schifrin (2015), cited the following approaches used to study DMs These approaches are: discourse perspective by Schifrin (1987), pragmatic approach by Fraser and Functional interactional linguistics by Maschler (2009).

To begin with Schifrin's (1987:31) whose work is very influential in DMs. Schifrin (1987), defined DMs as those that bracket units of talk and they are sequentially dependant elements. According to Schifrin (1987), DMs are not obligatory, they occupy

initial position in an utterance and function in relation to a talk that is progressing or a given text. DMs contribute to building local coherence between interlocutors in the structure of discourse, meaning and context during interaction. They connect what is being said and what has already been said.

Schifrin (1987) proposed a discourse model that has got several planes. Such as: Framework of participation marks interlocutor's roles and how they relate (interpersonal relation) during conversation; state of information involves interlocutor's knowledge and meta-knowledge concerning discourse in progress; ideational level is the propositional speech content; action level is how speech events coordinate; Exchange structure involves turn taking in an exchange. In Schifrin's analysis, DMs operate at various levels of discourse. That is, connecting utterances on one plane or across various planes. DMs also display local relationships between adjacent utterances and/or across wider spans structures of discourse. In conclusion, Schifrin (1987) argued that DMs have multiple functions functioning at different plane levels which help in integration of different simultaneous processes in discourse thus creating coherence.

Schiffrin (1987:328) came up with the following characteristics of DMs; they are syntactically detachable; have a range of prosodic contours; initial position; operate on local and global level; operate on different levels of plane. Schifrin (1987) identified that the studied DMs in English appear sentence initially, and most of DMs work on different planes. Therefore, using a different approach, relevance approach. This current study seeks find out what are the functions of DMs in Lúlogooli and how can DMs be identified in Lúlogooli using the general characteristics mentioned by Schiffrin and other researchers on DMs.

Another influential approach to DMs is Fraser's pragmatic approach. Fraser (1990, 2009) argued that pragmatic markers have a procedural meaning (these markers provide information for interpretation). In interpretation of these markers both linguistic and conceptual contexts play a role. Pragmatic markers therefore specify relationship between two segments of discourse. Fraser (1990) investigated how a pragmatic marker within a sentence relates to the information communicated by that sentence and other previous sentences. In this study, content and pragmatic meaning is differentiated. Fraser (1990: 385) refers content to "a more or less explicit representation of some state of the world that the speaker intends to bring to the hearer's attention by means of literal

interpretation of the sentences". While pragmatic meaning is what is intended to be communicated by the speaker.

According to Fraser (2009), pragmatic meaning is communicated by the following pragmatic markers; basic pragmatic markers; Commentary pragmatic markers; parallel pragmatic markers. Fraser (2009) categorised markers into three functional classes: those that show contrast; give elaboration and those that show inference.

The present study uses a similar approach to Fraser's. However, the data used is different. Fraser (2009) identified pragmatic functions of DMs in English and therefore this current study justifies that the same approach that is, pragmatic approach, can be used to study DMs in Lúlogooli.

A third approach to the study of DMs is Functional Interactional Linguistics by Maschler (2009). Maschler analysed function of a particular DM in the context it occurs. For a word to be considered a DM, it must have a metalingual interpretation in the context it occurs and not refer to an extra lingual realm. DMs must refer to the text, interpersonal relations between its participants that is, speaker and text and/or cognitive processes. According to Maschler, metalanguage involves frame shifts interlocutors are about to involve in during interaction. DMs are therefore used in utterances to enable one develop frame shifts that are used throughout a conversation. DMs mostly occur in the initial position thus begin turns or in the middle of utterances. According to Maschler (2009), DMs form a system which show three types of patterning which include; distributional, functional and structural.

Maschler (2009) and Schiffrin (1987) agreed that English DMs appear at sentence initial position. Maschler (2009) discussed frame shifts in conversations which is context. There is therefore agreement that context is important in interpretation of DMs in utterances. In this current study therefore DMs will be discussed in relation to context used by the speaker and the syntactic position of DMs in Lúlogooli.

Bayer and Obenauer (2011) studied the functions of discourse particles in German constituent questions. The study reveals that discourse particles appear before verb phrases as heads. The study also highlights the functions of discourse particles in questions that are 'special', those that are not interpreted as simply asking for

information. The syntactic properties of these particles are also discussed. It will be interesting to investigate the syntactic position of DMs in Lúlogooli and their nature.

Wang (2011) studied the use of DMs *ano* in Japanese and *nage* in Chinese in conversational discourse using a discourse –pragmatic approach. According to him, this DM does not just act as a verbal 'filler' but have different functions in utterances in various social contexts. Wang (2011) justifies that DMs are not just fillers but play important roles in sentences and utterances. Therefore, this current study looks at pragmatic functions of DMs in Lúlogooli.

Pragmatic functions of *ano* and *nage* include the following; introduction of new topic or referent in a way less imposing; mitigate face threatening act and indicate speaker's hesitation to give or share certain personal information.

Piurko (2015) analysed function and distribution of DMs used in media and legal discourse both in spoken and written genres in English. The study reveals that distribution of DMs varies in media, legal, written and spoken genres. DMs are frequently used in spoken genres than in written genres. According to Piuko, there is a high distribution of DMs in interviews than in conventions. In the analysed genres, media and legal discourse use many forms of DMs. Piurko's study justifies that DMs are more commonly used in spoken conversations than in written forms. This argument justifies the researcher's drive to study DMs in Lúlogooli and specifically in conversations.

Quianbo (2016) analysed use of DMs to establish pragmatic competence in conversations. The focus here is on American people. According to Quianbo, a good number of referential markers are commonly used in speech to avoid vagueness. It is noted that English DMs commonly occur at the beginning of sentences before the subject and are also used at the end of sentences. However, a small number of DMs are used in the middle of a sentence. Quianbo (2016) argued that position of DMs is very important in analysing DMs because according to Blakemore (2002) initial position DMs influence the whole utterance. It is therefore important to identify positions that DMs in Lúlogooli occupy and which DMs are used in Lúlogooli.

From the literature available, there are some common characteristics or functions of DMs. For instance, Fraser (1990) and Schifrin (1987) agree that DMs are used to relate

what is being said and has been already said. Therefore, creates cohesion in utterances. Fraser (1990) and Blakemore (2002) agree that DMs do not have a contextual meaning rather procedural and operate at discourse level.

1.8.3 Literature on DMS in African Languages

Kindiki (2008) analysed pragmatic functions of attitude markers in Kiitharaka. According to Kindiki, DMs can also be called discourse particles, discourse or speech modifiers, pragmatic particles or discourse operators. According to him, attitude markers are in the broad category of DMs because they all have procedural meaning rather than conceptual meaning. The only difference between attitude markers and DMs is that attitude markers do not act as connectives while DMs do (Kindiki, 2008:12).

According to Kindiki (2008) therefore said that attitude markers as those number of expressions contained in language that are used by a speaker for clarity of feelings, emotions or views within an utterance being made. Attitude markers "amplify" the meaning intended by the speaker. Kiitharaka attitude markers can appear at either initial or final position.

According Kindiki (2008), attitude markers are used by a speaker to ensure clarity of emotions in ongoing conversations. This helps to minimize ambiguity or misinterpretation of information by the hearer. Attitude markers are used to either increase the strength of hearer's assumption or weaken the assumption by clarifying the speaker's attitude.

Lúlogooli DMs is an area of interest as an African language, to establish how relevance is achieved by use of DMs. However, the approach used varies. Kindiki looked specifically on DMs that mark attitude only.

Dimmendal (2014) Analysed attitude markers in Nilotic languages (Luo, Nandi and Turkana) using a cross-linguistic approach. He looked at the pragmatics and semantics of attitude markers as well as syntactic properties of DMs. According to him markers may occur in different syntactic position or may combine with each other. Dimmendaal (2014) argued that the position of attitude markers helps to come up with a thematic structure such as topicalization of constituents or may give focus or emphasis on specific elements in a sentence. He said that the structure of attitude markers in a sentence affects the structure of information. Attitude markers involve intended effect

of what a speaker says thus perlocutionary speech acts. Attitude markers therefore play a role in interpersonal communication and also introduce contextual implications through an inferential process.

Dimmendal analysed syntactic properties of attitude markers and compared them within Nilotic languages. He agreed that this position affects meaning of sentences. Therefore, it is important to look at the position occupied by DMs in Lúlogooli and whether meaning is affected or not.

Makuto, Ogutu and Nyamasyo (2014) analysed forms and functions of DMs in conversation among speakers of Kabras which is a Luhya dialect. They say that Kabras DMs are divided into word, phrase and non-phrase markers. According to Makuto et al. (2014), word and phrasal markers are used as routine to convey information concerning the structure of discourse.

According to Makuto et al. (2014) DMs in Kabras play the following roles: They are used to start a topic in a conversation therefore occur at initial position in this case, Secondly, DMs are used to interrupt politely in conversations, the markers are produced with falling intonation to indicate politeness. DMs are also be used to highlight a proposition that comes immediately. DMs are used when seeking the listener's attention. DMs are used when one needs to hold the floor and keeping ones turn and to disagree politely. Women used DMs more than men especially in marking politeness.

Makuto et al. (2014) analysed DMs in Kabras which is a Bantu language though using a discourse analysis approach. Therefore, this current study analyses DMs using a relevance approach as opposed to discourse analysis. The position of DMs in Kabras appear at initial position according to Makuto et al. (2014) therefore, Lúlogooli being a dialect of Luhya is studied to find out if DMs behave the same or are different.

Gauche (2017) studied pragmatic markers in South African English using a Relevance theory framework. In this study, the contemporary functions and the development of pragmatic markers are analysed. The markers analysed include: *shame, is it* and *hey*. The three markers were found to have pragmatic meanings and functions that are similar in use in other varieties of English. Gauche proves that the relevance theoretical framework can be used in the analysis of DMs in South African English variety.

Therefore, it will be interesting to study Lúlogooli DMs using the Relevance theoretical framework.

1.8.4 Literature on DMS in Relevance Theory

Blass (1990) analysed discourse in Sissala which is a dialect of Gur language spoken in Ghana. Blass uses RT in analysing DMs. Blass' concern was to describe how discourse is governed by relevance. Blass analysed utterances and not sentences. According to Blass, understanding of utterances depend on the process of inference and relations of relevance. Blass noted that for one to understand what is communicated, a pragmatic perspective is required. Blass discussed the particle *re* in Sissala. According to her, the particle has an interpretive use where an utterance is used to represent the other that resembles it. Blass analysed how relevance is constrained by semantics. These semantic constraints according to Blakemore (1987) as cited by Blass (1990) are expressions that help in guiding the interpretation process however they do not contribute to the process of representation during the process of interpretation of utterance. According to Blass (1990) some Sissala particles contribute to the truth-condition while others do not.

In this current study, Lúlogooli DMs will be discussed based on the characteristics of DMs such as those that contribute to a non- truth condition.

Blakemore (2002) used relevance theory to analyse discourse connectives which I call DMs. According to Blakemore (2002), discourse connectives signal how a given discourse segment is relevant to the other segment. She said that discourse connectives do have a procedural meaning whereby they constrain utterance interpretation. She focussed on connectives according to Blakemore, discourse connectives determine the context under which utterances that contain them are relevant.

According to Blakemore (1992:138 -141) Information communicated by utterances can be relevant in the following ways: May lead to derivation of contextual implication*;* may strengthen existing assumption by giving evidence*;* may contradict an existing assumption*;* may also specify the role of an utterance.

Using Blakemore's approach to study discourse connectives in English shows that DMs in different languages can also be analysed using the same approach. Therefore, using

a similar approach, this current study seeks to find out how relevance is achieved in Lúlogooli conversation when DMs are used.

Matsui (2002) analysed the semantic and pragmatics of *dakara* as a Japanese DM. Matsui argued that the basic function of this connective is to mark the utterance that comes after therefore interpretively represent another set of utterance or assumption by providing contextual implications. *Dakara* has a procedural meaning because it provides instruction for the hearer to identify representation of the previously stated utterance. According to Matsui (2002) *dakara* constrains derivation of a higher-level explicature and implicatures.

According to Matsui (2002), DMs constrain relevance in different ways in utterances in different languages studied. Using RT, it is of interest to study DMs in Lúlogooli using RT to determine how DMs constrain utterance interpretation in utterances.

Ran (2003) described DMs from a pragmatic perspective using RT. Ran (2003) noted that DMs are the same as pragmatic markers. Ran's focus is on Chinese conversations. Ran (2003) accounts for how DMs help the hearer achieve pragmatic understanding of utterances and how DMs are used to constrain the hearer's interpretation of utterances by reducing the processing effort to get contextual implications.

Ran (2003) classified DMs as follows; markers related to topic; markers of reference; evidence markers; markers that mark the way one speaks; markers of contrast; markers of reformulation; own assessment markers; locutionary performatives.

Ran (2003) used RT approach of analysing DMs although the data of analysis will be different in Lulogooli. It will be interesting to apply RT in analysing DMs in Lúlogooli to find out how DMs constrain interpretation of utterances.

Johnsson (2013) analysed the two DMs (*kind of* and *sort of*) in London teenage conversations using RT. According to this study, the two DMs function as delaying tactics, compromising, show politeness and mitigating face threatening acts. Johnsson argued that the use of the two DMs provide the listener a clue of how the discourse can be processed, and how background knowledge shared between the speaker and the hearer can be understood. Using the two markers gives the relevant background of an utterance which should be negotiated.

Zhao (2014) discussed the functions of textual DMs using RT. He analysed how DMs enhance coherence and influence interpretation of utterances cognitively in search of relevance. According to Zhao, DMs provide the hearer with a procedural guideline and constrains the hearer's interpretation. Utterances achieve optimal relevance through DMs.

Alshamari (2015) analysed DMs that are frequently used in South Hail Arabic. This study applies an RT approach. According to Alshamari, DMs are used to maximize speaker's contextual effects and minimize the hearer's processing effort for easy interaction. In this study only three DMs are analysed; jamar, maar, and al-muhim.

Zhao (2014) and Alshamari (2015) used RT concepts in the analysis of DMs. It is of interest to analyse DMs in Lúlogooli using RT so as to determine how optimal relevance is achieved in utterance interpretation.

Miskovic et al. (2015) analysed meaning and interpretation of the Serbian DM *bre*. This study uses relevance theory as a tool for analysis. He looks at the uses of the marker and how it facilitates the hearer's interpretation of meaning. In this study, several uses of the marker *bre* such as getting attention signalling the speaker's intention to communicate among others. This study only focussed on one marker and its multiple functions generally in Serbian language not specifying in written or oral context. These functions include the following: Introduction of new topic or referent in a way less imposing, mitigate face threatening act and indicating speaker's hesitation to give or share certain personal information.

Blakemore (2002) and Miskovic et al. (2015) used RT to analyse data in English and Serbian respectively. There is need to use the same approach to analyse DMs in Lúlogooli to find out how DMs facilitates interpretation of utterances.

Context plays a key role in interpretation of what is communicated by a speaker. Relevance is therefore an important aspect in communication. DMs make content more explicit to the hearer thus provide context for easier interpretation.

In the studies done using RT it is clear that DMs are used to constrain the hearer's interpretation. However, Lúlogooli data has not been studied. It is therefore important to carry out this current study.

1.9 Theoretical Framework

Relevance theory will be used to analyse the data obtained by describing how DMs are used to maximize relevance between the speaker and hearer.

1.9.1 Relevance Theory

This theory was proposed and advanced by Sperber and Wilson (1986, 1995, 2006, 2010).

Relevance theory claims that the expectations of relevance raised by an utterance should be predictable and precise so as to guide the hearer towards the intended speaker's meaning.

Relevance theory according to Sperber and Wilson (1986, 1995, 1998, 2002 and Wilson and Sperber (2002) is based on the following two principles: Communicative principle that states that expressions of optimal relevance are created by utterances produced; Cognitive principle which states that the human mind tends to maximize relevance.

1.9.2   The Cognitive Principle

The principle states that human cognition is geared towards maximizing relevance. (Sperber and Wilson 1995: 260). Relevance is defined as a potential property of input which makes input worth processing. (Wilson and Sperber 2002: 230). An input can either be internal such as (thoughts, conclusions, memories, and inference) or external such as (utterances, action, sounds, and sights).

According to Wilson and Sperber (2004: 251) an input is only relevant if it can relate already existing background information available to the hearer to the following purposes: if it improves the hearer's knowledge on a topic, answers a question in the hearer's mind, confirms suspicion or corrects an impression that is mistaken by the hearer.

Yus (2012) says that there are thoughts that are more accessible or manifest, which are more likely to be inferred than others. Therefore, choice of thoughts is usually constrained by context. DMs in this case are used to constrain the context to be supplied by the hearer.

1.9.3 Communicative principle

According to Sperber and Wilson (1995: 256) any stimulus that is ostensive provides a presumption of optimal relevance. Therefore, an ostensive stimulus is relevant only when it is worth being processed by the hearer and it should be compatible with the communicator's choices and abilities.

A speaker who wishes to be understood should try to make an ostensive stimulus much easier for the hearer to understand. The speaker should also provide cognitive effects and hold the hearer's attention to achieve a goal, for instance, DMs that enhance cohesion in a text.

An ostensive stimulus that is most relevant should yield the greatest effects and use the smallest processing effort.

1.9.4 Positive Cognitive Effects

According to Sperber and Wilson (1995: 252), cognitive effects are three; Strengthen contextual assumption; Contradict and eliminate contextual assumptions; combine with contextual assumption so as to come up with contextual implication.

In order to achieve efficiency in cognition, one needs to allocate processing resources, which will maximize cognitive effects. An input is worth processing and can easily be considered from many other stimuli that compete, is the positive cognitive effects. Therefore, when the positive effect is greater the more relevant the input is. The smaller the processing effort required to derive positive effects the greater the relevance. (Sperber and Wilson 1995: 257).

An input is represented by processing effort. The processing effort is a mental effort. When information reinforces previous assumption, it strengthens contextual assumption. Information can contradict and eliminate previous assumption or can combine with previous accessible assumption (Sperber and Wilson 1995: 252).

DMs help the hearer generate positive cognitive effects which yield desirable goals such as getting intended interpretation of what is communicated by the speaker to the hearer. Positive cognitive effects lead to maximization of relevance.

1.9.5 Processing Effort

According to Sperber and Wilson (2002), processing effort is a mental effort needed to process a given input to a point cognitive effects are derived. The effort represents an input that helps one access contextual information and deriving effects.

Wilson (2009) says that processing effort is the sum of effort in memory, perception and inferring process.

According to Sperber and Wilson (2004:252) when other things are equal, the greater the positive cognitive effects achieved in processing an input, the greater the relevance, to an individual at the time of input. The greater the processing effort when all things are equal the lower the relevance to an individual at that time an input is produced.

According to Sperber and Wilson (2002) every utterance gives an expectation which will be optimally relevant because an utterance is an ostensive stimulus.

DMs reduce the hearer's processing effort because they make speaker's content explicit thus maximizing relevance in utterances within conversations. Less processing effort leads to maximization of relevance.

1.9.6 Explicatures and Implicatures

According to Blakemore (1992: 137) an implicature is a contextual assumption that the hearer needs so as to preserve an assumption that an utterance made is consistent with relevance principle.

According to Blakemore (1992: 58) meaning of words uttered by a speaker often give a clue of what is intended to be conveyed by a speaker. DMs make content explicit thus yielding adequate contextual effects required for processing of an utterance by the hearer.

Explicatures are the first inferential enrichment of the encoded meaning that generate cognitive effects that satisfies the hearer's expectations of relevance.

An utterance can be more explicit when further linguistic material that fully encodes the speaker's meaning is added. Degree of explicitness is therefore derived: The greater the relative contribution of decoding, and the smaller the relative contribution of pragmatic inference, the more explicit and implicature will be (and inversely) (Wilson 1986:18)

Implicatures are logic forms that are derived on activation of contextual implications. For example, there are implicated premises and implicated conclusions. Implicated premises are considerations in the mind. Contextual assumptions are produced in the mind.

DMs aid in the inferential process of meaning having said that they have a procedural meaning. They make utterances explicit by relating already existing information to oncoming information in an ongoing conversation.

1.9.7 Conceptual and Procedural Distinction

According to Blakemore (2002:82) an expression that has got a procedural meaning should have the following attributes: elusive in nature (not easy to paraphrase nor translate and should be controversial in describing them) unlike expressions with conceptual meaning; there are no synonym counterparts for Verb phrase adverbials such as '*well*' in English as opposed to expressions with conceptual meaning; (elements that have a conceptual meaning can be complex in their semantics while procedural expressions are not.)

Wilson and Sperber (1995:10) noted that the process of inference constructs and manipulates conceptual representation. Constructions in linguistics may be expected to encode two basic kinds of information: conceptual and procedural representation. Devices that are procedural in nature constrain utterances by indicating the cognitive process the hearer is supposed to follow during the inferential process. On the other hand, conceptual words do have synonyms counterparts. They encode a specific meaning.

DMs are procedural in nature and help the hearer in the inferential process of interpreting the speaker's message.

This section has highlighted the tenets of RT as far as DMs are concerned.

1.10 Methodology

This section comprises techniques used to collect data and to analyse it. A qualitative approach was used to describe the nature of DMs in Lúlogooli.

1.10.1 Data Collection

In this study, qualitative research technique was used. Data was collected in South Kanyamkago, Mukuyu village among respondents who are fluent native speakers of Lúlogooli. Purposive and convenient sampling techniques were used in selection of respondents. These two techniques were used so as to get the appropriate respondents whose mother tongue has not been influenced by other neighbouring languages. The researcher used own judgement to determine the respondents. 5 conversations were recorded during story telling sessions in Lúlogooli and natural conversations among respondents on different topics in Lúlogooli of their choice.

The respondents were informed earlier, for ethical purposes that they were being recorded and the data obtained would be used in a linguistic study. Supplementary data was obtained from interviews recorded from Vuka FM which is a radio station that broadcasts in Lúlogooli.

1.10.2 Data Analysis

After recording, the data was transcribed orthographically on paper and both a word for word translation and an English translation done. The researcher then identified lexical items that potentially appear to be DMs then decided which ones were DMs according to the common characteristics of DMs by Schourup (1999); Schifrin (1987, 2002); Fraser (1996, 1999) to mention a few. These characteristics include DMs as initial words, optional, act as connectors, are non - truth condition, occur in different categories, are common in oral utterances. After identification, the researcher analysed the sequence and nature, syntactic and semantic functions of DMs in Lúlogooli and finally how RT accounts for DMs in Lúlogooli.

1.11 Conclusion

This chapter forms a basis of the whole study and it is critical. It determined how the objectives of the study were met, related literature to the study gives a gap to be filled by the researcher and methodologies to be employed to carry out the research.

CHAPTER TWO
DISCOURSE MARKERS IN LULOGOOLI.

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the general characteristics of DMS as characterized by different researchers on DMs in English and other languages. It also describes the DMs that are in Lúlogooli and how they are used in natural conversations.

2.2 Characteristics of DMs

Different researchers came up with different characteristics of DMS. These characteristics include the following:

a. DMs as connectors

Schifrin (1985) argued that DMs enhance coherence within the same speaker turn or they can show the relationship between the speaker's and the hearer's turn. In Schifrin's argument DMs are described as cohesive markers because they show unity of linguistic elements within an utterance. In a discourse, DMs are used to enhance coherence.

According to Schourup (1990:230), DMs signal the relationship that occur between discourse units. In a discourse there are several units and the units are linked by connectors which help in achieving cohesion within a discourse.

Maschler (1994) noted that DMs are used to show the relationship between two text units. Maschler dealt with textual discourse. According to Maschler DMs relate units within a text. DMs therefore serve as connectors.

Fraser (1996) noted that a DM is an expression that is used to show the relationship of the message communicated to an ongoing discourse. According to Fraser (1996) there is a relationship between segments within a discourse. The relationship is described using DMs. In this case DMs act as connectors.

Hansen (1997) argued that DMs are linguistic items of different scope and their major purpose is to connect ideas within a discourse. Milagros (2007) stated that DMs are used to connect utterances within a discourse.

From the above researchers' arguments, it is evident that DMs act as connectors in discourse units. Therefore, for a word to qualify as a DM it has to exhibit this characteristic.

b. DMs as optional words.

Schifrin (1985) argued that DMs can be left out in an utterance. This is because DMs are not content words therefore do not contribute to the meaning of the utterances.

Fraser (1988) noted that DMs are syntactically optional elements. According to Fraser, DMs can be omitted in a sentence and the meaning of the sentence does not change. Therefore, DMs are seen as optional elements in utterances.

Brinton (1996) also argued that DMs are linguistic elements that can be omitted. However, Brinton noted that DMs guide the hearer to easily interpret the message communicated by the speaker. According to Brinton, being that DMs are optional elements it does not mean that they are not necessary in a discourse. Brinton further argued that when DMs are omitted the process of interpretation becomes more 'delicate'. This means that, there are many possible interpretations accessible to the hearer and therefore when DMs are used relevance is maximized and the chances of misinterpretation of information by the hearer are limited. The hearer can easily access the speaker's meaning.

Schourup (1999:230) also noted that DMs are optional elements because they cannot be explained semantically. However, DMs signal the relationship between segments. According to Schourup when DMs are omitted, the relationship signaled remains to be there though it is not explicit. Implicit content may be easily misinterpreted by the hearer and therefore when the speaker makes content explicit the easier it will be for the hearer to interpret information.

Even though DMs are optional elements, they play a role in utterances within a discourse.

c. DMs used commonly in Oral Communication

DMs are widely used in oral rather than in written communication. However, connective DMs can also occur in written discourse to enhance coherence as discussed in (d).

Orality as a characteristic is noted by Brinton (1996:33) who argued that, DMs are commonly used in oral discourse as opposed to written discourse. According to Brinton

DMs indicate informality. A speaker uses DMs at some point to indicate the informal relationship with the hearer.

Schourup (1999:234) noted that DMs are commonly associated with speech. This is because DMs establish rapport between the speaker and the hearer. However, some DMs are used written forms to enhance coherence within a text. Schuorup also agreed with Brinton (1996) that DMs are less formal in conversations.

Jarra (2013) noted that DMs are commonly used in oral conversations to facilitate the communication process. As the researcher noted earlier in this current paper, DMs are explicit therefore guide the hearer in the interpretation process.

d. DMs Lack Truth Condition

Fraser (1996) argued that DMs are procedural words and therefore have no conceptual meaning. This implies that DMs do not contribute to the truth condition of expressed propositions in an utterance. Schuorup (1999) also concurred with Fraser that DMs lack truth condition.

Blakemore (2002) also noted that DMs do not contribute to the truth condition as they are procedural in nature. The same is noted by Milagros (2007:65). According to the researchers mentioned above, it is clear that for a lexical item to serve as a DM it has to exhibit the characteristic discussed.

e. DMs occur in the Initial Position

The position of words in an utterance may influence interpretation. For instance, utterance initial words may influence prominence such that when a DM comes first then it influences interpretation of the whole utterance. Schourup (1999:230) noted that DMs occur at the initial position in utterances in most cases. However, in some cases they occur in the middle or final position. When they occur in the initial position, they act as 'superordinate,' meaning they restrict utterance contextual interpretation of the whole sentence or utterance before meaning is misinterpreted.

f. DMs Occur in Multiple Categories

DMs are lexical items that can be grouped in different categories. For instance, Schourup (1999) noted that DMs have a functional category which is diverse with respect to the syntactic class. These DMs depend on the functions of DMS. For instance, some DMs in English act as adverbs (they describe verbs such as *now, actually, anyway*); some act as conjunctions (subordinating and coordinating such as *and, but);* some act as verbs (*say, look, see*); some are interjections (*oh, gosh, boy*); some act as clauses (*I mean, you know*)

Therefore, DMs have a functional category.

g. DMs are Gender Specific

According to Lakoff (1975:54) women use hedges or DMs frequently to show unassertiveness. Lakoff argues that women believe that being assertive is not a feminine quality therefore this is the reason women use hedges or DMs frequently as compared to men in conversations.

Brinton (1996:33) argues that DMs are used frequently in women's talk. The topics shared by women in conversations arouse more DMS. On the other hand, men use less DMs in their conversations because the topics that are discussed in men's conversations are not those that arouse more DMs.

According to Coates (2003:86) women's speech is said to be 'tentative' because of the claim that hedges are commonly used by women. Coates refers to DMs as hedges. They are linguistic forms such as *I'm sure, you know, I think, sort of, perhaps* and *like* commonly used to mitigate utterances force.

Coates argues that women use hedges in consideration with the choice of topic of discussion. Female speakers discuss sensitive topics hence more use of hedges while men avoid discussing such topics hence low use of hedges. Hedges are used to mitigate the force of whatever that is said hence they protect the interlocutors' face.

Kim & Kang (2011) argued that DMs are used commonly in spoken languages. In this study, it is evident that women respond more emotionally than men in Korean language and hence women use more DMs than men in their speech.

h. DMs are used with a High Frequency in Speech

DMs tend to be used with a high frequency in utterances as noted by Brinton (1996:33). The speaker tends to use them in speech for different reasons. This repetition therefore makes them identifiable as DMs in utterance within a language.

In this current research, lexical items from the data collected in Lúlogooli were used to test if they exhibited the characteristics discussed above. However, use of DMs with gender as a characteristic was not used in this analysis because gender is a sociolinguistic factor which is not a variable in this current study because this is a pragmatic study. The other characteristics discussed above in 2.2 of DMs were considered in analyzing the data.

From the data obtained in Lulogooli, the following lexical items exhibit the given characteristics of DMS. To begin with connectivity as a characteristic:

a. *nohomba* 'or'

Nohomba can be shortened to *noho*. This word has been used as a connector in this utterance.

Example 1.

Speaker: *kuduka   umuguliku   inguvu   **nohomba**   akarato.*
          'Must   you her buy   cloth   or   a shoe'

          'You must buy her clothes or shoes'

The first segment of buying her a cloth is connected to buying a shoe using *nohomba* in the utterances. In utterance 2 *noho* has been used to connect money to something which can be any gift. *Noho* has been used to introduce a question *noho ki?* Ór what?'

Example 2.

Speaker A: *ukummanura   ni   ukumhaku   kindu   cha   varangaa   ikihanwa*
           'to appreciate   is   to give her   something   that   they call   a gift'

Speaker B: *Akangóndo   **noho**   ki?*

           'money   or   what?'

24

'one had to appreciate by giving a gift. It could be either money or something else.'

Speaker A: *Ku umundu yavuraa   kugumira kumwana chigira niva*
                So   a person he did not   touch   on the baby because if
                umusigu araza na ovee nu umwana, nukingi umwana **noho**

                an enemy   comes   and   you have   with the baby   you will protect
                the baby   or

                nawikingi?   Nuurwanendi?

                'you will protect yourself?   You will fight how?

                'A person was not expected to hold the baby because when an enemy
                come he would not know if to protect himself or the baby and how
                would he fight?'

noho is used to connect segment 1 you will shield the child to segment 2 you will shield yourself.

Example 3.

Speaker: *umwiivuri   wovo   naaturi   havundu   umunyora   kari*
                'A parent   yours   when he/she leaves a place   you find   even
                Amasahi **noho**
                blood   or
                ummbiri gwakuhiha.
                 body   is cared'

                'when a parent leaves a place one's body and blood gets scared

Noho is a procedural word in Lúlogooli therefore not a content word. For instance, in

Example 4.

 Speaker: *umurembe mwanitu;   mkaniitu* **noho** *muyayiitu   huwiikaye*
                'A greeting   child ours; sister ours   or   brother ours   where you seat

                 ridiku   rya   karunu.

                Day   of   today.'

25

'greetings my sibling; my sister or brother wherever you are today'

Noho only denotes that there is another alternative to be mentioned by the speaker. In this example, the speaker talks of a sibling who can either be a sister or a brother. This means that *noho* does not have a conceptual meaning.

In the two utterances *noho* serves as a connector because it connects ideas within the utterances above. Therefore, *noho* exhibits the two characteristics of DMs. It acts as a connector and lack truth condition. Therefore, it is a DM in Lúlogooli.

   b. *navuzwa 'although'*

These words serve as connectors within utterances in Lúlogooli. A similar word equivalent to *navuzwa is nitari*. The two can be used interchangeably because they serve the same purpose in Lúlogooli. For example, in 5 below.

Example 5

Speaker A*:*   *Izinging'a zienezira izisekondari nindi izikoleji nindi*
                    'days those   secondary and   colleges and

                    iziunivaziti ziariho?
                    universities were there?'

'Those days secondary schools and colleges were there and universities were there too.'

Speaker B: *Irisoma ria iguru riariho **navuzwa** ikindu   chaaza kogoyanya*
               'Learning of high was there although something came   to spoil

               *avaandu viitu ni inasoori **navuzwa** avaandu vaasoma amadiku genegara*

                people ours   is   bang. Nevertheless, people   who learnt days those

               amadiku genegara ivovahulikaa   yava.
               days   those   are those heard   these.

'Higher education was there although what spoilt our people was bang. Nevertheless, people who learnt those days were famous.

26

Navuza in this utterance serves as a connector connecting the fact that higher learning was there in the past and people being disrupted by **bhang**. *Navuzwa* exhibits the characteristic that DMs are optional. However, they make content explicit.

The message communicated in this utterance is still there even when *navuzwa* is omitted. However, the content is not explicit as when the word is there. Such that how did **bhang** relate to learning? Or how did education relate to people? There could be possible interpretations of the statement as will be discussed in RT in chapter four.

Nitari as a procedural word because it lacks content. It is only used to introduce a negative statement besides what the speaker has already mentioned. As a connector it is procedural therefore it is a non-truth condition (lacks truth condition). *Navuza* therefore exhibits the characteristics of DMs serving as a connector, an optional element in an utterance and lack of truth condition.

     c. Kandi 'also'

This word exhibits the following characteristics of DMs. First it acts as a connector between two discourse units. For example, in 6.

Example 6

Speaker: *avaana vaaziza   musukuru madiku yago **kandi***
      'children they went to school   days those   also
     Virane   hamgorova.
      They came back   in the evening.'
     'children went to school those days and also came back home in the evening.'

The speaker uses *kandi* to create coherence by linking the idea that children went to school and children coming back home in the evening.

Secondly, *kandi* can be categorized as a coordinating conjunction and it lacks truth condition being a functional word that does not contribute to the propositional meaning expressed by the speaker.

Kandi therefore qualifies to be a DM in Lulogooli because of the characteristics it exhibits.

     d. Vuzwa 'just'

This word can be categorized as an adverb because it comes after verbs and is used as a verb modifier in example 7 below.

Example 7.

Speaker:　　　*kuveye na vigizi vakuya **vuzwa** avana musukuri.*

　　　　　　　'We have and teachers who beat just　children in school.'

　　　　　　　'There are teachers who just beat children in school'

The word is also optional in the utterance however when omitted the utterance is not explicit. Use of this word is common in oral constructions as opposed to written.

This word therefore is a DM in Lulogooli

　　e. Ku 'so'

This word is used to enhance coherence in utterances such that the hearer can infer use of *ku* from the speakers previous utterances.it therefore is a connector. This can be seen in 8 below.

Example 8.

Speaker:　　　'*izisendi zyari izindinyu kunyoora. Imwaazizanga na*

　　　　　　　'Money   was hard   to get. When you went with

　　　　　　　*Amaduma Ikakirao   muhonge nago kuraini. **Ku** ikuzii*

　　　　　　　maize   to Kakrao you stay with it on queue. so when we went to

　　　　　　　musukuru, nooveeku   niring'ondo avaandi vakoronda   vuzwa.'

　　　　　　　School   when you have money   others   they follow you   just.

　　　　　　　'money was hard to get. When one went with maize to Kakrao, he or she would take long on queue and so in school when one had money others would just follow those who had money.

In this utterance *ku* is a procedural word and therefore lacks truth condition. It only guides the hearer to interpret the utterance.

　　f. Hee 'filler'

Fillers occur with high frequency in speech and are common in oral conversations. Fillers lack the truth condition because they do not contribute to the meaning of the

propositions expressed by the speaker. Fillers can be omitted in utterances however they serve some key functions such as helping the speaker seek the attention of the hearer and therefore leading to effective communication.

The filler qualifies to be a DM in Lúlogooli due to the discussed characteristics it exhibits.

g. *Uduke kumanya* 'you get to know'

This lexical item exhibits the following characteristic. First, it is an optional element in an utterance such that when omitted it doesn't change the intended speaker meaning.

Example 9.

Speaker:	*amaisha ga karunu gave rugano sana,*
	'Life of today is different a lot,
	uduki kumanya *amaisha*
	you get to know life
	ga karunu gavukani ahanene kandi ahanene sana.
	Of today is different a lot also big a lot.'

'Life is so different today, you get to know that today life is so different'

The phrase u*duke kumanya* could possibly be omitted in the above utterance. *Uduke kumanya* is a phrase that has been used frequently in the data collected compared to the other DMS identified in Lúlogooli.

h. *Na kuvora agirigari* **'and to say the truth'**

This phrase exhibits the following characteristics of DMS: It is an optional in this utterance; appears utterance initial position and is commonly found in oral utterances.

Example 10.

Speaker:	***Na kuvora agirigari*** kooza, avana avanyingi vasoma saana.
	'and to say the truth uncle, children many are learned so much.'
	'And to say the truth uncle, many children are so much learned.'

| Speaker: | ***Na kuvora agirigari*** avavo vayanzaku ichai dave. |
| | 'And to say the truth Luos they liked tea not' |

29

'And to say the truth Luos did not like tea.'

The phrase could possibly be omitted and the message communicated by the speaker is not altered. The phrase *Na kuvora agirigari* serves as a DM in Lúlogooli due to the characteristics the phrase exhibits.

    i. *mwana witu* *'child ours'*

This phrase exhibits the following characteristics of DM. It is optional in utterances and also common in oral utterances being that it can be used to persuade one to do something. For instance, in example 11 below.

Example 11.

Speaker: *yaani   ni akasimu karai samu **mwana witu**,*

         'to mean is a phone good   a lot   child ours,

        Nuvikaza   mmuya,

        if you put   in pocket'

        'It is a good phone our child, if you pocket it.'

It is an optional phrase and in this context it occurs in high frequency being that it is used as a persuasive language.

It is also common in oral utterances rather than in written ones because a speaker uses the phrase to establish rapport with the hearer at the same time to show friendliness.

The phrase has a functional class which is a noun phrase (NP). It is used to refer to one in a way that is not offending however, there may be no blood relation.

    j. *Ku indyo* *'so it is'*

This phrase exhibits the following characteristics of DMs. First it is an optional word in an utterance. For instance, in utterance 12.

Example 12.

Speaker*:*   **Ku indyo** *kooza. Ivorogoori witu yira   muririma,*

        'So it is   uncle. In Maragooli ours there in cultivation,

        Avandu vaazizaa subui   kare.

people   they go   morning   early.'

'so it is uncle. In our home in Maragoli, people go to cultivate very early in the morning.'

In utterance (12) the phrase *ku indyo* can be omitted and the meaning of the utterance is not altered with. This means that the phrase does not contribute to the propositional meaning of the utterance and therefore it is non- truth condition. The phrase exhibits the lack of truth condition.

Example 13.

Speaker: *Ivorogoori   witu   yira   muririma,   avandu   vaazizaa*

'In Maragooli   ours   there   in cultivation,   people   they go

Subui   kare

Morning   early.'

'In our home in Maragoli, people go to cultivate very early in the morning.'

This is the proposition to be communicated by the speaker in 13 on how cultivation is done in Maragoli land and therefore the meaning is still there even when *ku indyo* is omitted.

The phrase also appears utterance initial. The speaker in this case begins a conversation with the phrase so as to establish rapport with the hearer. The phrase *ku indyo* therefore is a DM in Lúlogooli having exhibited the three characteristics discussed.

   k. Na 'and'

This DM could be used as a connector and at some point it is used unexpectedly at the beginning of an utterance especially when asking questions. For instance, in example 14.

Example 14

Speaker A*: Zinguvu   ziviri   zyeng'ine   na vari   ni   zinguvu   zya   karuni*

'Clothe   two   only   and they had   and   clothes of   today

yizi   dave. Ku   inguvu   yiyi   paga   ave   vuzwa   nayo.   Kari

this not. So   a cloth   this must have   just   with it   even

ave   narera   umwana.

If   taking care   a child'

'Nannies had only two clothes different from todays. So one clothes had to be put on even when talking care if the child.'

Speaker B: ***Na***   avareri   vatura   hai   avarera   avana?

'And   nannies they came from   where who took care kids?'

'And where did nannies come from?'

Na in this utterance is optional, it can be omitted when it appears at the initial position. However, it is a word that will be explained pragmatically in chapter four. When *na* appears in the middle of an utterance, it serves as a connector as in example 15 below.

Example 15.

Speaker: … *naveye ni   zinguvu ziviri zivaga, ziviri yizi zyu kuzya mwivugana*

'if had   with clothes   two   three,   two   this for going   in church

*Noho kuzya isafari **na** iyindi   yiyi yageromba vuza iya hango.*

Or   going   journey and the other one she made it   just of   home.'

'If one had two or three clothes, one was for going to church or on a journey and the other was put on at home'

Na can be categorized under conjunctions because it serves as a connector. Therefore, the word qualifies to be called a DM in Lúlogooli.

l.   *Yaani* 'in other words'

This is a word borrowed from Swahili. The word is commonly used in oral speech when elaborating information. It can be omitted in an utterance and the utterance meaning is not altered. It is therefore a procedural word. For instance, in example 16 below.

Example 16.

Speaker: *niiduki   mu saa Saba yaho, umuroombee iriboso,*

'When it reaches   at   1pm   there,   you prepare him/her ugali,

(yaani) uvuchima, uvuchima rigari saamu.

In other words, ugali, ugali completely good.'

'When it reached 1 pm you would prepare him or her good ugali.'

The word can also be used to indicate hesitation especially when the speaker is not sure of what to say or has forgotten what he or she was to say.

These word can also act as a connector. For instance, in example 17.

Example 17.

Speaker: rwa   kwazia hango hehe yakurinda   vurahi ***yaani***
When we went home hers   she took care of us good   in other words
Kwenya   kutura   weve   dave.
We did want to leave her home   not'.

'when we visited her she took good care of us in other words, we did not want to leave her home.'

Yaani therefore is a DM in Lúlogooli.

2.3. Conclusion

Having discussed the following characteristics of DMs as given by different researchers such as Schourup (1999), Brinton (1996), Fraser (1996, 1990) Schiffrin (1985, 2015) among others. A DM should have the following characteristics: act as a connector, be optional in an utterance, appear at the beginning of an utterance, have non-truth condition, have a functional class and be commonly used in oral utterances.

From the analysis done using Lúlogooli data, the following are some of the DMs in Lúlogooli that will be discussed in the subsequent chapters: *nohomba* 'or'; *nitari / navuzwa* 'although'; *yaani* 'to mean'; *uduke kumanya* 'you get to know'; *na kuvora agirigari* 'and to say the truth'; *mwana witu* 'child ours'; *ku indyo* 'so it is'; *na* 'and'; *kandi* 'also'; *vuzwa* 'just', *ku* 'so' and *hee*' filler'.

CHAPTER THREE

THE SYNTACTIC AND SEMANTIC FUNCTIONS OF LULOGOOLI DMS

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic functions of DMs and the distinction between semantics and pragmatics of DMs in Lúlogooli.

Blakemore (2002:59) noted that one should view both the semantic and pragmatics meanings using a relevance theoretic approach. Therefore, semantics come first then followed by pragmatics. Semantics involves the process of message decoding while pragmatics involves how one makes inference from the provided context. Blakemore further noted that communication is a social activity. Blakemore argued that Sperber and Wilson (1995) perceive communication as a sub- personal process that involves the cognitive processes responsible for representing people's ideas and thoughts using stimuli like utterances. Therefore, in communication there are different processes involved such as encoding and inference. The researcher will start by discussing the semantic and then look at the pragmatic functions of the DMs identified in Lúlogooli conversations because semantics precedes pragmatics. Syntactic functions are also discussed to find out which position they occupy and if position influences meaning interpretation. However, Shiffrin notes that they are syntactically optional words.

3.2 Syntactic and Semantic Functions of Lúlogooli DMs.

Milagros (2007) noted that DMs have got a semantic function in utterances. Milagros noted that semantic relations exist when two discourse segments relate because of the content in their propositions. For instance,

a. *nohomba*

This DM is a connector. It therefore relates two or more segments. This DM connects utterances that have same- level relationships. Fraser (2009) expressed this relation in terms of coordination/ parataxis. A segment 1 is related to segment 2 when *nohomba* is used within an utterance. This DM can only appear in the middle of two discourse units or segments. For instance, in example 18 below

Example 18.

Speaker: *kuduka umuguliku   inguvu   **nohomba**   akarato.*

'Till   you her buy   a cloth   or   a shoe.'

'till you buy her clothes or shoes'

Speaker A: *ukummanura ni ukumhaku kindu   cha varangaa ikihanwa*

'To reward   is to give   something that they call   a gift'

'Rewarding one gives a gift '

Speaker B: *Akangóndo **nohomba**   ki?*

'Money   or   what?'

Speaker: *umwiivuri   wovo   naaturi   havundu   umunyora   kari*

'A parent   yours   when he/she leaves   a place   you get   even

*Amasahi   **nohomba**   ummbiri   gwakuhiha.*

Blood   or   body   is scared'

'When one is left alone without a parent his blood and body get scared.'

nahomba connects segments that have only main clauses; *kuduka umuguliku inguvu* (main clause, segment 1) 'Must you buy her a cloth' and *Kuduka umuguliku akarato.* (Main clause, segment 2) 'Must you buy her a shoe'

Because the two are all main clauses therefore it is a compound sentence. *nohomba* is therefore a coordinating conjunction.

Any of the two main clauses could came first but the DM only comes in the middle of the utterance. Coordination is also evident in this utterance.

Umwiivuri wovo naaturi havundu umunyora kari amasahi gwakuhiha.

(Main clause, segment 1)

'A parent yours when he/she leaves a place you get even blood is cared'

umwiivuri wovo naaturi havundu umunyora kari ummbiri gwakuhiha.

(Main clause, segment 2)

'A parent- yours- when he/she- leaves- a place- you -get -even –body is- cared'

The syntactic function of nohomba in Lúlogooli is to coordinate utterances that have only main clauses.

nohomba expresses an alternative. The speaker uses it to give a choice to the hearer. From the options given the hearer or listener is supposed to pick on one.

b. *navuzwa* 'although'

This DM syntactically appears in the middle of an utterance. It is used as a connector to link segments. This DM is used to indicate hypotaxis as noted by Fraser (2009) that a DM can be used to indicate hierarchical relationship when they serve as subordinating conjunctions. For example, in example 19.

Example 19.

Speaker A: *Izinging'a zienezira   izisekondari nindi izikoleji nindi iziunivaziti*
'days those   secondary   and   colleges and universities

ziariho?

were there?'

'Those days secondary, colleges and universities were there.'

Speaker B: *Irisoma ria iguru riariho **navuzwa**   ikindu   chaaza kogoyanya*
'Learning of high   was there   although something came   to spoil
Avaandu vitu   ni inasoori .
People   our   is bang.

'higher learning was there although what spoilt our people was bhang.'

The positive proposition: Irisoma   ria   iguru   riariho

'Learning of   high   was there'

'Higher learning was there'

The negative proposition: *ikindu   chaaza kogoyanya avaandu viitu ni inasoori*

'something came spoilt   people   our   was bhang'

'What came to spoil our people was bang.'

Subordinating conjunction of contrast in this case is **navuzwa.** The process of learning is being contrasted with taking bang.

In the above example, subordinating clause cannot begin the utterance as opposed to English where a subordinating conjunction can be used to begin a complex sentence. In Lúlogooli, such an utterance would be ungrammatical.

*****navuzwa**   Irisoma   ria iguru riariho ikindu chaaza kogoyanya avaandu

'Although learning of high   was there something came to spoil people

Vitu   ni   inasoori .

ours   was   bang.'

'Although higher learning was there, bang spoilt people.'

navuzwa is a subordinating conjunction. *navuzwa* is used to introduce a negative statement besides what has been communicated by the speaker. For instance, in the example above the speaker communicates that in as much as learning was there, many people did not go to school and therefore became drug addicts.

Navuzwa therefore opposes the existing statement that had been made by the speaker in the first segment of the utterance.

As used in the (20) below the DM *navuzwa* can be used twice in the same statement.

Example 20.

Speaker B: *Irisoma   ria iguru riariho* **navuzwa**   *ikindu   chaaza   kogoyanya*

'Learning of high   was there   although something came   to spoil

*Avaandu vitu   ni inasoori . **Navuzwa** avaandu vaasoma amadiku*

People   our   was bang, Nonetheless people who studied days

genegara ivovahulika yava.

Those are those heard these.'

'Higher learning was there although what came to spoil our people was bhang. Nonetheless, those who studied were famous.'

The second use of *navuzwa* can mean 'nonetheless' or 'after all'. From the first proposition made by the speaker that bhang interfered with people's learning, the speaker concludes that after all there are those who studied and are well known.

c. *kandi* 'also'

This word appears in the middle of two segments and therefore acts as a conjunction. It is an additive marker. For instance,

Example 21.

Speaker: *Mulogooli   iye   yaleta   ichai.   Ku   avavoo   vaamanya*
             'A maragoli   is   the one brought   tea.   So   the Luo   they knew
             Nivahenzaku   nivarora   ng'ani   avaandu   yava   vaayanza   ichai.
             And looked at it   they saw   why   people   these   they like   tea.
             *Nivatanga   **kandi**   navo   kunywa   ichai.*
             they began   also   them   to take   tea.'

             'Maragolis brought tea and so the Luos looked at it and saw why Maragolis liked tea and they also began taking it.'

In example (21) it is indicated that it is not only Maragolis who took tea but Luos did too. The meaning of *Kandi* is said to be semantic because context is not needed to infer meaning.

Kandi can be used at initial position of an utterance such as in example 22.

Example 22.

Speaker A: *ndetera   umwana   kutura   kukitanda*

             ' Bring me   the child   from   the bed.

Speaker B: ***Kandi***   umwana   yakugona.

              Again   the child   he/she is asleep.

             Again the child is asleep.'

Example 23.

Speaker: *Esooda ya cocacola ugurii   umkana, arikoronda*
'A soda of Cocacola you bought a girl,   she will follow you

Kari   urimnyara   dave. Umundu undi   akunyara   da.
Even   you will manage not. A person   another   he will manage not

kandi *musukuru avaana vari   avaneneene.*
Again   in school   children were   big'

'When one had a soda he or she could win a girl's heart, others will not
compete you and again children in school were so mature.'

In examples (22) and (23) *kandi* means again. The hearer uses an inferential process to
get the utterance meaning. Therefore, the meaning is pragmatic. The pragmatics of this
marker will be discussed in the section. 3.2.

In other utterances a speaker can as well use *ma Kandi* 'then also' to mark order of
events. For instance, in utterance 24.

Example 24.

Speaker: *Nivayavi   chaama vurahi kuduka avandu vagavurane*
'when you uproot   arrow root well   till   people   they share
Mmugizi gwoosi.   Kuri hano, niva   yive unyara kuyava; kizyiku
In neighbourhood all. Like here, if   you can   uproot   it goes
Wa joni   wanga Mwachi,   wa Hezironi   paga avandu   vavee hano
to John,   to Mwachi, to Hezron,   till   people   who are here
*varyiku **ma kandi** umundu yenyi atageku.*

eat and again a person who wants plants it'

'when arrow roots were uprooted, people shared in the neighbourhood
and those who wished to plant it did.'

The meaning of *ma kandi* according to the utterance is semantic and therefore no
inference is used. This DM functions as a connector in example 24.

d. *vuzwa* 'just'

This DM commonly appears after verbs in Lúlogooli. This can be observed in the utterances

Example 25.

Speaker: *Ummbo yari yaamanya vuzwa ovosera,   yanywezaa* **vuzwa**
           'A Luo   had   known   just porridge, he drank   just
           Ovosera   ikihaaya.

           Porridge   without sugar.'
           'Luos only knew porridge and they took porridge without sugar'

Example 26

Speaker: *Avandu   shimbi   vaviri   vaazizaa* **vuzwa** *na   amagembega*
           'People   about   two   they went   just   with   jembes
           Munyi   musembelaa   yinu   yaga   kurimira.
           you   dig with   here   these to cultivate.'

           'people went with the hoes you use here to cultivate'

Example 27

Speaker: *kuveye   na   vigizi   vakuya* **vuzwa** *avana   musukuri.*

           'We have   and teachers who beat   just   children in school.'

           'we have children who just beat children in school'

In examples (25), (26) and (27) *vuzwa* comes after verbs. It therefore acts as an adverbial however it can be omitted in the utterance and the meaning of the utterance is not altered.

Vuzwa can also appear at the beginning of an utterance like in example 28.

Example 28.

Speaker A: *umundu   umkari   nanyori   umwana   na   umundu*
                 'A person   female   when gets   a child   and a person
                 Nataveho   ukumkonya   kuduka   yenye   umundu

                 If not there   to help her   till   looks for   a person

40

Kutura uwavo

from their home.'

When a woman got a child, she had to look for someone from their home to take care of her if there was no one to do that.

Speaker B: *yazaa   kukoraki?*

              'Comes   to do what?

               'What does he come to do?'

Speaker A: **vuzwa**   *kumwarikila.*

              'Just   to cook for her.

In example 28 *vuzwa* is used before the verb it modifies. This DM can be used to emphasize given information by the speaker. In utterance the speaker wishes to emphasis the role of one who comes to assist.

e. ku: 'so'

Is used to show effect. It has two forms where one has a short vowel *ku* which means 'to' for example in 29 below.

Example 29

Speaker: … *avana avanyingi vaazya   muziuniversiti ma   karunu*

           …children many   they went in universities   then   today

           *izigasi   ziaageha   **ku** avana vene yava.*

           jobs   are less   to children these ones'.

           'Many children that are learned are jobless.'

While the long vowel sound /*ku*:/ is the DM that means 'so'. It is used in examples (30) and (31) to show effect.

Example 30.

Speaker: *Umundu mwikura yaagumiraa kumwana naatanji   **ku**singira.*

           'A person male   he held   the child   when he begun to stand,

           *yakamora   yakumara   karunu naajaji   **ku**tambagira,*

           he/she crawled   he/she finished   now   he had begun to walk well,

<div align="center">

ku yaze   woove   kwugumiriku.

so he/she comes   where you are   to hold him/her.'
</div>

'A male person did not hold the baby until when the baby began to walk well and could come to you'

So it has a pragmatic function besides semantic which shows an effect. This will be discussed under pragmatic functions of DMs in the next chapter.

Other utterances where *ku* shows effect is in example 31.

Example 31.

Speaker A: *avareta   amashine   vari avandu noho?*

'Those who brought   the machines were   people   or?'
'were those that brought machines people or who did?'

 Speaker B: *Avahindi.*

'Indians'

Speaker B: **Ku** *avahindi yava vari numudoga?*

'so   Indians   these   had   vehicles?
'so these Indians had vehicles?'

f. *hee* –it is a filler

It is a word that can be regarded as a filler in Lúlogooli. It is used by the speaker to draw the hearer's attention towards what is being communicated. For example, in example 32.

Example 32

Speaker: *Ndeva hee Elijah, limenyo lwa kare   nindi lya kalunu liavukani?*

'I ask (filler) Elijah, life   of   before and   of   today is different?'
'How is life today different compared to the past?'

g. *duka kumanya* 'get to know'

This DM syntactically appeared at the beginning of utterances. The speaker therefore draws the hearer's attention by using the phrase *duka kumanya* before saying the main

point he or she wishes to communicate. *duka kumanya* is therefore used in example 33 to get the hearer's attention and to highlight what the speaker is about to say. This phrase is used immediately after the subject *u* 'you'.

Example 33

Speaker: **Uduke   kumanya** *urwenella igasi   yaraho inyingi*

'You get to know   those days job   was there   a lot to people

ku avandu   avanyingi variho

to   people   many   that were there'

'those days jobs were many and many people were employed.'

However, it is an optional word and therefore when the speaker chooses to use it in an utterance then syntactically it plays a role in the utterance. Although it does not contribute to the utterance meaning expressed by the speaker.

h. *Na kuvora agirigari* 'and to say the truth'

This DM appears at the beginning of an utterance.it comprises two DMs *na* and *kuvora agirigari*. It is also an optional phrase which does not contribute to the proposition of the statement made by the speaker in example 34 below.

Example 34

Speaker: **Na   kuvora agirigari** *kooza, avana avanyingi vaasoma   saana.*

'And to say the truth   uncle, children   many   are learned so much.'

This DM can as well serve as a connector linking what was said earlier to what is about to be said. Being that it begins with the conjunction 'and'. For instance, in example 35.

Example 35.

Speaker: *mmadiku gakuvemu   yaga avaana   avanyingi vavura izigaasi*

'in days   we are in   these   children many   have no jobs

na kuvora agirigari kooza, avaana   avanyingi vaasoma sana.

and to say   the truth uncle, children   many   are learned   so much.

'These days many children who are learned have no jobs and to say the truth many are knowledgeable.'

The speaker expects the hearer to know that there is joblessness and therefore it is shared knowledge between the hearer and the speaker. The speaker therefore only tries to remind the hearer about it.

The Semantic function of this DM is to highlight what the speaker is about to say. The speaker in example 35 emphasizes the fact that many children are learned and yet they are jobless.

e. ku indyo 'so it is'

This DM may appear either at the beginning or at the end of an utterance. When it appears at the beginning of an utterance, the speaker uses it to inform the hearer that he wants to talk and therefore seeks the hearer's attention. It is not related to the topic of discussion. This can be identified in example 36.

Example 36

Speaker B*: **Ku indyo** kooza. Ivorogoori   witu   yira   muririma,*
             'so it is   uncle, In Maragooli ours   there   in cultivation,
             Avandu   vaazizaa   subui   kare.
             People   they go   morning   early.'
             'In Maragoli people go to the shamba very early to cultivate.'

When this DM appears at the end of an utterance, it shows that the speaker has completed his or her turn and gives room to the next speaker. It is also used to conclude what has already been said by the speaker like in example 37 below.

Example 37

Speaker: …*umwivuri   weve   navee   umundu   amanyi   illago*
             '…..a parent   his/her   if is   a person   who knows the law
             Arakushira   imbiri   na   yive
             he/she will take you   in front   and   you
             *Kuri   umwiigizii   uranyora uvudinyu.   **ku indyio** gave*
             Like   a teacher   you will get   it hard'. so it is.
             '….a parent who knows the law will accuse you and as a teacher you will find it hard.'

e. na 'and'

This marker syntactically appears in the middle or at the beginning of an utterance. Use of *na* at the beginning of the utterance is 'unexpected' because in Lulogooli sentence construction when asking a question, the word that should appear first in this case is *mwarindandi avana kare*? 'you care for children before' however, it is pragmatically conditioned because it requires context for interpretation. *Na* will be discussed further under pragmatic functions.

Example 38

Speaker A: ***Na* kare   mwarindandi   avaana?**

'And   before   you took care how   of children?'

'and how did you take care of children in the past?'

***Na* avareri vatura   hai   avarera   avaana?**

'And nannies they came where   who took care of   children?'

'and where did nannies come from?'

When *na* is used at the beginning of the utterance it is used to introduce a question based on the discourse topic already discussed. It is therefore an inferential marker. The speaker asks the question with reference to how the nannies took care of children in the past. For instance, in example 39 below.

Example 39

Speaker A:*Etofauti   itulaa   kuriha?*

'Difference comes   from where?'

'Where does the difference come from?'

Speaker B: *Etofauti itulaanga   kuvurindi kutura kuvivuri.*

'Difference it comes from caring   from   parents'

'the difference comes from how the parents take care of the kids.'

Speaker A: *vamurindaa   vurahi saana. Iririnda   rya vamurindaa*

'They care for her   well   so much. The caring   that they care for her

45

Vurahi   ryenella, illara riza ngáni   vamwoononyaa.

Well   that   one   comes that   they spoil her'.

'parents care for her 'very well' that they spoil her

Speaker B: *Kumurinda   vurahi?*

'Caring for her   well'

Speaker A: *Yee, yavo varoraa   vamurindaa   vurahi*

'yes, they   see   they are caring for her   well'

'   'They think that they take 'good' care of the child'

Speaker B: **Na** *kare mwarindandi avana?*

'and before you care how for children?'

'and how did you care for the children before?'

In (39) above, speaker A and B are discussing how parents take care of their children in the present life. According to speaker A, nowadays parents do not take 'good' care of children like they did in the past. Speaker B then refers to what speaker A has communicated by using *na* as an inferential marker.

Speaker B: can ask speaker A that,

Mwarindandi   avana   kare?

'you took care how   children   in the past?'

kare mwarindandi avana? 'before you took care how of children?' Is a construction that is acceptable only in speech to show informality however, grammatically the word that introduces the question is mwarindandi……?'how did you take care of….'

When this DM is used in the middle of an utterance it acts as a conjunction.it links two segments and it is used as a marker that shows addition.

Example 40

Speaker: …*naveye   ne   zinguvu ziviri, zivaga,   ziviri yizi zyu kuzya*

'if she had   with clothes   two,   three,   two   this for going

*Mwivugana noho kuzya isafari   **na** iyindi   yiyi*

46

<div style="text-align: right">to church   or   going for a journey and the other one</div>

<div style="text-align: right">*yagerombaza vuza ya hango.*</div>

<div style="text-align: right">She makes it   just for home.'</div>

The semantic functions of *na* when it appears in the middle of the utterance is to indicate addition. An additional information is added to what exists as in the above utterance.

f. *Yaani* 'in other words'

As stated earlier, this is a borrowed word from Kiswahili. This DM is used to elaborate existing information communicated by the speaker like in example 16 discussed earlier on in chapter one.

Speaker: *niiduki   mu saa Saba yaho, umuroombee iriboso,*

               'When it reaches at 1pm   there, you prepare him/her ugali,

               (yaani) uvuchima, uvuchima rigari   saamu.

               In other words, ugali,   ugali   completely good.'

               'When it reached 1 pm you would prepare him or her good ugali.'

The word can also be used to indicate hesitation especially when the speaker is not sure of what to say or has forgotten what he or she was to say. Like in example 41 below.

Example 41

Speaker: *kwazizaa (yaani)...wavaranga   Eldoret   kurora   vaakoza*

               'We used to go (hesitation) where they call Eldoret to see uncles.'

g. Mwana witu 'child ours'

It is used to refer to someone in a friendly way so as to establish rapport between the speaker and the hearer. The relation between the speaker and the hearer is not necessarily a blood relation. One can refer to the other using this term whether a male or female. The speaker can use *mwana witu* to create a conducive environment for communication.

<div style="text-align: center">47</div>

3.4 Conclusion

This chapter has described the semantic, syntactic and the pragmatic functions of Lúlogooli DMs as used in conversations. It is clear that even though DMs are procedural they serve a purpose in conversations because they show the relationship between segments hence enhancing coherence.

CHAPTER FOUR
A RELEVANCE THEORY ANALYSIS OF DISCOURSE MARKERS IN LULOGOOLI.

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the researcher discusses the pragmatic functions of DMS in Lúlogooli and also identifies how RT accounts for DMS using tenets of RT which was developed by Sperber and Wilson (1986, 1995, 1998, 2002). RT is a theory that deals with human communication that is based on cognitive principle. Sperber and Wilson (2002) noted that utterances make manifest a number of assumptions that the hearer has so many other possible interpretations therefore an utterance should be predictable enough for easy interpretation so as to maximize relevance. The speaker therefore should guide the hearer towards the intended meaning.

4.2 Relevance Theory and Discourse Markers

According to Sperber and Wilson (2012:6) RT is based on two main claims that: the human cognition tries to maximize relevance which is the cognitive principle of relevance and the second claim is that each act of communication that is ostensive provides a presumption of relevance that is optimal which is the communicative principle of relevance.

The two principles explain and describe how the comprehension procedure is triggered in communication. According to RT, everyone is relevance oriented. The hearer chooses what is worth being processed from all the stimuli one is exposed to. Depending on the people's abilities, the mind automatically maximizes relevance.

When a person receives information from different stimuli, he/ she uses little effort to differentiate what is relevant and irrelevant to him or her. RT assumes that the human mind concentrates on maximizing relevance. Therefore, the speaker communicates ostensively meaning he/she shows their intention to the hearer. The speaker makes his/her intention known because according to Sperber and Wilson (1995:268) the communication process is described as mutually manifest. This means that both the hearer and the speaker have got the same goal of achieving an effective communication.

DMs are used to make an utterance mutually manifest because the speaker uses them to guide the hearer towards a particular interpretation. The speaker therefore makes

his/her utterance easy for the hearer to interpret so that the hearer gets the intended meaning by the speaker.

Sperber and Wilson (1995: 125) noted that an input which could be thought, idea or information can be relevant when the hearer generates greater cognitive effects and uses little processing effort to process the input. When this happens, relevance is increased. The hearer can perceive a communication signal that provides positive cognitive effects for the signal to be relevant. On the other hand, signals that are covert receive little cognitive effects hence makes it difficult to achieve relevance

When a discourse connective is omitted the relationship between the two discourse segments is not explicit and therefore the processing effort the hearer uses to interpret is not the same as when the DM is used as a connector.

For instance, when *navuzwa* is used in an utterance, it makes the utterance overt such that the hearer is able to tell that *navuzwa* contradicts existing information. *Navuzwa* is an overt signal that helps the hearer receive great cognitive effects that maximizes relevance. As illustrated previously in example 19.

Speaker B: *Irisoma ria iguru riariho* **navuzwa**   *ikindu   chaaza kogoyanya*
              'Learning of high   was there   although   something came   to spoil
              Avaandu vitu   ni inasoori .
              People   our   is bang.

              'higher learning was there although what spoilt our people was bhang.'

The communicative principle emphasises on the ostensive communication which demonstrates the speaker's intention in communication. The ostensive stimuli enable the hearer make some presumptions. Sperber and Wilson (1995:270) described presumptions required for communicators to achieve optimal relevance. The presumption describes how an input should receive attention, it states that a stimulus that is ostensive should be relevant enough and also be worth the hearer's effort in processing it. The stimulus should be one that is the most relevant and compatible with the abilities and preferences of the interlocutor

DMs are used by the speaker to express his or her intention to the hearer so as to maximize relevance. It could also be presumed that the speaker tries to express

politeness, tries to be truthful and also informative. The speaker uses DMs to express intentions. For example, in 42 and 43 below.

Example 42.

Speaker A: *kuri   avaana vasoma   ndi genyeka vanyore zigasi*

   'Like   children they study these   supposed   they get jobs

   Hamberi hakuziiza   hara

   ahead   where we are going   there'

   'The way children are studying they are supposed to get jobs in future.'

Example 43.

Speaker B: *mmadiku ga karunu mwana witu nuvudinyu vuza kunyora*

   izigasi.

   'in days   of   today child ours   it is hard   just   to get jobs'

   'These days it is hard to be employed,'

The speaker refers to the hearer as 'our child' so as to show politeness and express his or her intention to communicate that in turn establishes closeness with the hearer in as much as there is no blood relation. By calling the hearer 'our child' the speaker tries to be friendly to the hearer which enhances an effective communication process.

The DM *na kuvora agirigari* can also be used by a speaker in Lúlogooli when the speaker tries to be truthful.

Duka kumanya can be used by the speaker when he or she tries to be informative. That is to inform the hearer his or her intention to communicate.

During communication the speaker tries to keep his or her preferences and the encyclopedic knowledge of the hearer so as to express their ideas in a way that is worth the processing effort of the hearer.

4.3 Pragmatic Functions of Discourse Markers in Lúlogooli Conversations

Yus (2012:10) among other researchers; Blakemore (2002), Ran (2003) noted that DMs have pragmatic functions. Yus further argued that attributes of grammar may or may not constrain the intended interpretation of an utterance by the hearer. For one to interpret an utterance, he or she must have the ability to access the required context that

can be optimally processed to enable easier interpretation. Yus noted that for a hearer to cognitively contextualize an utterance, the organization of the grammar plays an important role. This is because, grammatical organisation impose constrains on the wide range of possible utterance interpretations.

Sperber and Wilson (1995:125) noted that an input can be relevant when positive cognitive effects are generated by the hearer and the processing effort is reduced. Cognitive effects inform the hearer how he or she views the world. Sperber and Wilson (1995:45) further note that, the hearer's cognitive environment influences his or her environment and helps the hearer determine the kind of cognitive effects to be derived. The cognitive effects could strengthen the assumptions that exist, confirm an assumption by weakening or contradict the assumption and may lead to elimination of the assumption. During communication the context used by the speaker varies in different utterances. The new information given by the speaker creates cognitive effects that the hearer uses the new information to infer by connecting with the existing information. The hearer also uses his or her encyclopedic knowledge to aid in the inferential process.

Blakemore 1992:134 also noted that the interpretation of a segment in discourse that comes first, immediately gives an accessible context that enables the recovery of the expressed proposition in the second segment. Utterance interpretation requires the hearer to identify the expressed proposition and recover the contextual effects intended by the speaker. Coherence in a discourse depends on how the first segment is relevant to the other. For instance, in example 44 below.

Example 44.

Speaker: *Izimbiimbu   ziaraaho navuzwa   eserekari   yagaya.*

                    Seg 1   *seg 2*

                    'Canes   were there   although   the government it refused.'

                    'The government made caning illegal in schools.'

When *navuzwa* is omitted in an utterance, the hearer could achieve less cognitive effects and more processing effort is required during interpretation. *Navuzwa* is used by the

speaker to contradict the existing assumption that has been made by the speaker in the first statement that learning was there.

Blakemore (1992:136) also noted that the second segment which contains new information can only be relevant when it allows contextual implications to be derived; gives evidence that will either contradict or strengthen what is communicated in segment one and finally contradicts the assumption that is expressed in segment one which leads to the elimination of the proposition. In example 44 the second segment contradicts the existing assumptions of students being caned in school.

In example 44 above, the second segment can be interpreted with reference to the first segment. The hearer is expected to generate contextual effects from the first segment. These effects could be; what are the negative effects of caning students? Is caning a bad thing? The context in this question therefore gives the hearer the intended speaker meaning of the whole utterance. The context provided by the speaker by use of the connector *navuzwa* guides the hearer to interpret the speaker's meaning

Blakemore 1992:135 noted that to achieve coherence in a discourse, segment one has to be relevant to segment two. The hearer can come up with a specific connection between segments when he or she can supply specific contextual assumptions for instance, in example 43 segment 1 can only be relevant to segment 2 only when specific assumptions are supplied by the hearer. In this case, the hearer needs to assume that canning is not a good thing and that is why it was illegalized by the government.

Example 45

Speaker: *kuveye   na avigizi vaazirila   kukuba avana kari*
          'We have and teachers who continue to cane children even

          izing'inga zino navuza niva arakuya   umwana
          days   these although if he or she will cane a child

          maasale   ku mmbiri kwiikwe, umwivuri weve
          He or she gets hurt on body   his/her, a parent his or her

          Navee   umundu   umanyi   illago   arakushira imbiri.
           if he is a person who knows the law   he or she will you take in
          front.'

'There are teachers who still cane students these days, if a student is hurt when he or she is caned, the child's parent can accuse the teacher'

In example 45, segment two (*niva arakuya umwana ma asale ku mmbiri kwiikwe umwivuri weve navee umundu umanyi illago arakushira imbiri*.) can be interpreted from the first segment which provides contextual implications that teachers are not allowed to cane students these days. The hearer should come up with contextual assumptions to interpret the speaker's utterance.

DMs in a discourse often give a clue of what is intended to be conveyed by a speaker. Through this process the hearer gets the semantic representation of utterances that enables the recovery of a relevant proposition. According to Blakemore (1992, 2002) connective DMs are said to constrain implicatures by either indicating some specific cognitive effect or indicate how context should be selected. For example, in 46 below.

 Example 46

Speaker: *umwana anyara kukora vurahi musukuru muprimari*

'A child can do   well   in school in primary

navuza   ifisi nataveho yaziza   urukari   kare

Although fees if not there she went for marriage early.'

'A child can do well in primary school and when fees is not there she is married off at an early stage.'

In example 46 the first segment *umwana anyara kukora vurahi musukuru* 'a child can do well in school' is a positive proposition expressed and therefore the contextual assumptions by the hearer required for interpretation are; when a child passes her exams in school she goes to a good secondary school; secures a good job later. Procedurally DMs guide the hearer in the inferential process during utterance interpretation. The DM *navuzwa* used to connect the two discourse units enables the hearer to have a negative proposition. *Navuzwa* constrains the hearer's thought towards an intended interpretation. That is the child did not proceed with her learning. The hearer can infer the following: that the child ended living a 'bad' life she did not wish to live due to lack of fee and that the child did not continue with her education. The hearer can infer

54

meaning from the utterance using the DM *navuzwa* that has been used by the speaker to constrain interpretation of the hearer.

In example 47 the speaker uses *ku* to help the hearer infer the speaker's intended meaning.

Example 47

Speaker A: *avaana   varwanira   kwikara   inyuma   mukilasi*

               'children   fought   to sit   at the back   in class.'

               'in class children struggled to sit at the back.'

Speaker B: *Na yive waduka musukuru saa ki?*

               And you reached in school at what time?

               'what time did you arrive in school ?'

Speaker A: *ndingira wa kaviri, kavaga*

      'I entered second, third'

      'I was the second or third to enter the classroom.'

Speaker B: **ku** *wikara inyuma mukilasi.*

      'So you sat at the back in class' '

      'so you at the back.'

The speaker provides the hearer with context that children preferred to sit at the back than in front and the speaker went to class among the first people to arrive and therefore liked sitting at the back. From the context, the hearer is able to conclude that the speaker sat at the back. *Ku* therefore encodes a pragmatic meaning.

In the previous utterance in example 39, speaker A communicates that he does not like the way parents bring their kids up these days. Therefore, speaker B uses the proposition made by speaker A previously to find out how kids were brought up during the past. Speaker B wishes to find out how different children were raised compared to how children are raised currently from speaker A's previous utterances. Therefore, *na* in this case is an also an inferential marker.

According to Blakemore (1992:139) utterance initial DMs are used to show that the hearer should know something the speaker already has in mind and therefore the speaker only reminds the hearer that the utterance he or she wishes to make is important and relevant. Such DMs may not necessarily act as connectives. Such connectives are used to signal a particular communicative intention of the speaker and they do not contribute to the expressed proposition.

The speaker uses the DM *na kuvora agirigari* to communicate to the hearer that what he or she is about to say is important and therefore uses it to seek the hearer's attention so as to communicate his intention. For instance, in example 48.

Example 48.

Speaker: **na kuvora   agirigari**   *imbura yayonoonya mirimi   iminyinge mno.*

'And   to say   the truth   rain   spoilt   shambas   many   a lot'

'and to say the truth rains spoilt so many crops in the shamba.'

In example 49 below, the speaker uses u*duke kumanya* at the beginning of the utterance to communicate to the hearer that he or she should know what the speaker has in mind.

Example 49

Speaker: **uduke   kumanya** *urwenella avaandu vamenya madiku amanyinge*.

'you get   to know   that time   people   lived   days   many'

'you get to know that in the past people lived long'

Liu (2016), also noted that a DM can be used to shorten psychological distance between the speaker and the hearer. The DM establishes the cognitive context that enhances interaction.

The DM *duka kumanya* in this case means that there is shared knowledge between the speaker and the hearer therefore creating a shared context that reduces the psychological distance between the speaker and the hearer.

Example 50.

Speaker: *Nivaakuguuta,   waahula   ivatura   yira nurwimbu.*

               'if they had won   you could hear   when they leave   there with

               a song.'

               Ooh   rero   uhinganga

               'Oh   today   you disagree.'

               Ooh rero uhinganga

               'Oh today you disagree'

               Ndyo   uduka   kumanya vakuuguta   uvurwani

               'that you get to know   they (warriors) have won   the battle'

In this utterance the speaker uses *duka kumanya* to enable the hearer to derive
contextual implications. The hearer should know that the song is sang because the
(they) warriors have won the battle. The speaker communicates to the hearer that the
song sang is a war song and is sung when worriors won a battle *Ndyo   uduka   kumanya
vakuuguta uvurwani* 'that you know that the worriors have won the battle.' The speaker
therefore minimizes misinterpretation of the song.

4.4 Contextual and Procedural Encoding

Blakemore (2002:1) noted that meaning can be encoded linguistically as: procedural
and conceptual. Wilson (2016: 11) also notes that concepts are lexical items that are
represented in thought and can be viewed in consciousness while procedures are
functional lexical items that are not brought out in the consciousness and therefore
cannot be conceptualized. Procedures only provide constraints on how concepts are to
be interpreted. According to Sperber and Wilson (1995:258) the existing and new
assumption combine with concepts to form implicatures and explicatures.

As noted earlier DMs are procedures that aid in the inferential process. Therefore,
procedural words in Lulogooli include *nahomba, navuzwa, kandi*, *ku, duka kumanya
na kuvora agirigari, vuzwa, yaani, and ku indyo.*

4.5 High- Level Explicatures and Implicatures

Linguistic decoding during utterance interpretation is used by the hearer. The hearer identifies contextual signals that are relevant to infer interpretation (Gauche 2017:67). According to Sperber and Wilson (1995:192) when the hearer is provided with an ostensive stimulus he or she uses intuition and automatically reasons to infer interpretation.

The speaker choses which propositions to use whether explicit or implicit. The two propositions can be constrained by the context the speaker uses. Explicatures are communicated ostensively and encoded linguistically in utterances. The meaning of explicatures can be constrained by the context and semantic or pragmatic meaning. On the other hand, implicatures can be ostensive or not but they are constrained by contextual assumptions only (Sperber and Wilson 1995: 11).

DMs are used in conversations to make content more explicit and therefore the speaker uses DMs ostensively so as to guide the hearer towards the right interpretation. As noted by Brinton (1996) DMs are not rendered useless in utterances. When they are omitted the meaning of the utterance is still there however, it is not explicit.

Wilson (1999:129) noted that explicatures are more explicit and use less inference in the recovery of the speaker's meaning while implicatures use more inference in the recovery of the speaker's meaning. Explicatures are derived from words that are encoded linguistically. High level explicatures require both linguistic context and the ability of the hearer to use the utterance of the speaker and also how the speaker is connected to the utterance so that the hearer gets extra meaning of the speaker's intentions.

For the hearer to get the speaker's attitude a pragmatic interpretation is used by using contextual assumptions such as shared background knowledge. For example, in 51 below.

Example 51

Speaker : isigara   ni kindu chononya mmbiri gwu umundu utumikara

             'cigarrete is something spoils the body of   a person   that uses it

             navuza   avandu   vaaginara   vagiyanza.

      Although   people   that are used to it   like it.

In the context provided by the speaker and the shared knowledge about effects of cigarette could help the hearer to get to know the speaker's attitude about the topic of discussion. The speaker's encyclopeadic knowledge about cigarette is that; Cigarrete is harmful to anyone who uses it; cigarre**te** interferes with the body and not good for human consumption.

The speaker therefore dislikes cigarrete due to the harmful effects it has on the human mind. The speaker uses the DM *navuzwa* to explicitly inform the hearer that use of cigarrete is harmful to the body and that people should not like it.

Therefore, high level explicature is the added meaning that is found in an utterance which is used as a guidance in the process of interpretation. Use of explicatures is very important in the inferential process because it gives speaker's intended meaning using less processing effort. Implicatures are used interpretively because in their interpretation one uses encyclopeadic knowledge with the new information given by the speaker (Wilson and Sperber 2004:608)

4.6 Conclusion

This chapter addresses DMs in relation to the principles of relevance theory. The two principles are the cognitive and the communicative principles. It is noted that the mind maximizes relevance automatically. Speakers therefore use ostensive communication so as to maximize relevance. DMs are used by the speaker ostensively. When communication is ostensive, the processing effort used is less and the greater the cognitive effects. DMs guide the hearer in the inferential process by constraining the hearer's interpretation towards the speaker's meaning. The pragmatic functions expressed in this chapter provide evidence that use of DMs in conversations enhance an effective communication between the speaker and the hearer.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND FINDINGS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter gives a summary of the findings of the study and a conclusion. The study then gives recommendation for research in the future in view of the findings.

5.2 Summary

This study analyzed DMs in Lúlogooli based on a relevance - theoretical framework. The study aimed at describing how DMs in Lúlogooli are used to facilitate the achievement of maximum relevance in oral conversations.

The key objectives of the study were: Identification of DMs in Lúlogooli conversations; analyze the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic functions of DMs, and describe how RT accounts for DMs in Lúlogooli.

The following characteristics were used to identify the DMs: DMs as connectors; optional words; appear commonly in oral communication; non truth condition; occur in the initial position; have multiple categories and have a high frequency in speech.

The following DMs were identified in Lúlogooli conversations:

Nohomba serves as a conjunction that connects main clauses only. It is therefore a coordinating conjunction. This connector is used by the speaker when giving two options for the hearer to pick one. Pragmatically this DM can be said to have a procedural meaning because it is a functional word. *Nohomba* guides the hearer to interpret meaning of the two discourse units that it links. *Nohomba* is the same as 'or' which is a coordinating conjunction in English. Therefore, the use of 'or' in Lúlogooli and English is the same.

Navuzwa 'although' is a DM in Lúlogooli, used concurrently with *nitari* which has the same meaning. *Navuzwa* is a subordinating conjunction that links a main clause and a subordinate clause. This DM also has a procedural meaning. It guides the hearer in the inference of the speaker's meaning. It was noted that the use of *navuzwa* in Lulogooli is the same as English word 'although'. However, unlike in English where a subordinating conjunction can be used at the beginning of a complex sentence, in Lúlogooli such a construction would be considered ungrammatical. Therefore, *navuzwa* can only be used in the middle of two discourse units in utterances.

Kandi 'also'is a DM that is used as a coordinating conjunction. It is used to indicate additional information besides what has already been said by the speaker. It encodes a procedural meaning. *Kandi* is used as 'also' in English. When *kand*i is used as the beginning of an utterance it does not serve as a conjunction instead it serves as an inferential marker.

Vuzwa 'just' is a DM that is used as an adverb because it commonly appears after verbs in the date that was obtained. The word could be omitted in the utterances. It does not contribute to the propositional meaning of the proposition expressed by the speaker. However pragmatically it guides the hearer's interpretation process and therefore makes content more explicit. The use of this DM in Lúlogooli is the same as 'just' in English 'although' in Lúlogooli it only appears either after or before a verb.

Ku 'so' is a DM that has two functions, it acts as a connector that shows a result or effect and secondly, it is an inferential marker. The hearer uses it to infer meaning of an utterance from the existing information. It is used just as 'so' in English. *Ku* is pronounced with a long /u:/ while the short /u/ means on and to which are prepositions.

duka kumanya 'get to know' is a DM that is used by the speaker to perform the following functions: First to get the attention of the hearer during conversations. Secondly, to inform the hearer that about what the speaker is about to say in the next discourse unit and therefore reduce the psychological distance between the hearer and the speaker. When the psychological distance is reduced, maximum relevance is achieved.

Na kuvora agirigari 'and to say the truth' is a DM that consists of two DMs, *na* and *kuvora agirigari*. It appears utterance initial position and it is used by the speaker to achieve the following: First to assert truth. The speaker informs the hearer that what is to be uttered is important and true. The hearer therefore needs to view what the speaker says as true. The speaker therefore manipulates the hearer's thinking. Secondly, being that it is an utterance initial DM, it is used to draw the hearer's attention towards what is being discussed. This DM has a procedural meaning in utterances because it does not contribute to the content of the speaker's expressed propositions. It is commonly used in oral utterances.

Ku indyo 'so it is' is used to mark a conclusion after a conversation. In many cases it occurs towards the end of conversations. For the hearer to interpret the speaker's utterance, there must be previous information and context given. When used at the beginning of an utterance it is only used to create a conducive environment between the speaker and the hearer (rapport) and in this case it is not attached to what the speaker wishes to communicate. It is specifically used in oral communication.

Na 'and' is a DM that functions as a connector or conjunction. It is used pragmatically where the speaker infers meaning from the information that exists. This happens especially when it is used utterance initial. Because *na* has a procedural meaning, it is used to constrain the hearer's interpretation in order for the communication to achieve maximum relevance.

Yaani 'in other words' is a borrowed word from Swahili. It is an elaborative marker. It is a marker in Lúlogooli. The marker is also used to show hesitation in utterances especially when the speaker has forgotten what he is to say.

Mwana witu 'child ours' is a DM used to refer to someone in a friendly way. It can also be used as a persuasive marker that one uses to convince someone to get to do something. When rapport is established between the speaker and hearer the communication process tends to run smoothly.

Hee 'filler' is used in spoken conversations. It is used by the speaker to draw the hearer's attention towards what he or she is about to say. It was frequently used when asking questions. It appears immediately after the word 'to ask'.it is also used in responding to what the speaker says to show that the hearer is attentive.

5.3 Findings

Therefore, the DMs discussed above have the following functions in utterances:

a. Used as utterance connectors or conjunctions (*na, navuzwa, nohomba, kandi*)
b. Used to establish rapport between the speaker and the hearer. (*mwana witu*)
c. Used to draw one's attention towards what is communicated (*hee, na kuvora agirigari.*)
d. Used to elaborate the content expressed (*yaani*)
e. Used to highlight what the speaker is about to say. (*na kuvora agirigari*)
f. Used as a discourse filler in communication (*hee*)

g. Used to constrain the hearer's interpretation of an utterance so as to achieve optimal relevance. (*navuzwa, nohomba, kandi, yaani*)

5.4 Recommendation

Having looked at DMs in Lúlogooli using RT approach, it can be of interest for one to analyze DMs in Lúlogooli using a different approach such as Discourse Analysis and Speech Act theory to determine the functions of DMs. A comparative study can be done among DMs in Lúlogooli, Nilotic languages or other Bantu languages to find out if the uses of DMs are the same in languages and what other roles DMs play in communication apart from constraining the hearer's interpretation process. A study can be done to investigate how men and women use DMs in Lúlogooli.

REFERENCES

Akmajian, A. et al. (2017). *Linguistics.* The Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Cambridge.

Alami, M. (2015). *Pragmatic functions of Discourse markers*: A review of related literature. International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature. 3(1-10).

Alshamari R. (2015) *A Relevance- theoretic account of the three discourse markers in North Hail Arabic*. Studies in Literature and Language; 6-15.

Andersen, G. (1998). "The pragmatic marker *like* from a relevance- theoretic perspective" in Discourse markers: *Descriptions and theory.* John Benjamins publishing company.

Anindo, C. (2016) *A morphosemantic study of toponyms; Lulogooli place names*. M.A thesis. UoN.

Bayer, J. and Obenauer H. (2011). *Discourse particles, clause structure and question type; The linguistic Review*; 28 (2011) 449-491.

Blakemore, D. (1987). *Semantic constraints on Relevance*. Oxford. Blackwell.

Blakemore, D. (1992). *Understanding utterances.* Oxford. Blackwell.

Blakemore, D. (2002). *Relevance and linguistics: The Semantics and Pragmatics of discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Blass, R. (1990). *Relevance Relations in Discourse: A study with special reference to Sissala.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brinton, L. J. (1996). *Pragmatic markers in English.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dimmendaal, J. (2014). Attitude markers in Nilotic Languages. Across linguistic perspective. *Studies in Nilotic linguistics*.1-14.

Fraser, B. (1988). *Types of English discourse markers*. Acta Linguistica Hungarica 38(1-4):19-33.

Fraser, B. (1990). *An approach to discourse markers*. Journal of pragmatics. 14,383-398.

Fraser, B. (1996). *Pragmatic markers*. Pragmatics 6(2)

Fraser, B. (1999). *What are discourse markers*? Journal of Pragmatics, 31 (7), 931-952.

Fraser, B. (2009). *An account of discourse markers*. IRP (293-320)

Gauche, M. (2017). *A Relevance theoretic- analysis of selected South African English Pragmatic markers and their cultural significance.* M.A Thesis; South Africa.

Hansen, M. (1998). *The Semantic status of discourse markers*. Lingua. Denmark 235-260.

Jonsson H. (2013). The use of the discourse markers *kind of* and *sort of* in London Teenage conversation. M.A thesis. Lund University.

Kindiki, K. (2008). *Pragmatic functions of attitude markers in Kiitharaka*. M.A Thesis.

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics:* New York. Cambridge University Press.

Li Quianbo (2016). *A case study on the Pragmatic use of discourse markers*. Canadian Social Science, 12(11) 106-113.

Makuto, V., Ogutu, A. and Nyamasyo, A. (2014). *Forms and functions relationships: use of discourse markers in Kabras conversations*. JLTEA

Malande, O. (2011). *What is a name? An analysis of the Semantic of Lúlogooli personal names*. International Journal of Humanities and Social Science. M.A Thesis UoN.

Manyora, H. (1997). "*Intra- sentential Relationships of Lúlogooli*. M.A Thesis. UoN.

Maschler, Y. & Schifrin, D. (2015). *The handbook of discourse analysis*. John Wiley & sons, Inc.

Matsui T. (2002). *Semantic and Pragmatics of Japanese discourse marker dakara (so/ in other words); a unitary account*. Journal of Pragmatics, 867-891

Miskovic, L., Dedaic N. & Polomac V. (2015). *The meaning and interpretation of the Serbian discourse marker bre*. Journal of Pragmatics.

Piurko, E. (2015). *Discourse markers: their function and distribution in the media and legal discourse*. M.A Thesis. Luthuanian University.

Ran Y.P. and He, Z.R. (1999). *The Pragmatic constraints of discourse markers. FLTR* (3) 1-8.

Ran, Y.P. (2002). *The Pragmatic study of discourse markers in conversations.* PHD dissertation.

Ran, Y.P. (2003). *The Pragmatic functions of discourse marker "well"*. Journal of Foreign Languages (4) 58-64

Schifrin, D. (1987). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge University Press.

Schourup, L. (1985). Common discourse particle in English conversation: *like, well, y'know.* Garland.

Schourup, L. (1999). *Discourse markers*. Lingua. 227-265.

Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance*. Cambridge University Press.

Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1995). Post face in the second edition of Relevance: *Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wilson D. & Sperber D. (2004). *Relevance theory*. In L.R. Horn & G ward. (eds.), The handbook of Pragmatics. Blackwell. 607-632.

Wilson, D. & Sperber D. (2012). *Meaning and Relevance.* Cambridge University press.

Wilson, D. (1999). *Relevance and relevance theory*. In Wilson & Keil F. (eds) MIT Encyclopedia of the cognitive Sciences. Cambridge: MIT press 719-722.

Yus, F. (2012). *The Oxford online handbook of linguistic analysis*. Relevance Theory.