French discourse markers in Shaba Swahili conversations

de Rooij, V.A.

Published in:
International Journal of Bilingualism

Citation for published version (APA):
de Rooij, V. A. (2000). French discourse markers in Shaba Swahili conversations. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 4(4), 447-469.

French discourse markers in Shaba Swahili conversations*

Vincent A. de Rooij
University of Amsterdam

Abstract

One of the most striking characteristics of Shaba Swahili/French conversations is the near- exclusive use of French discourse markers. It is shown that from a structural point of view, the use of French markers presents no serious problems. Of course, the mere structural possibility of switching French markers cannot explain their near- categorical use. This phenomenon is best explained by taking into account the function of discourse markers as elements that create and strengthen discourse cohesion and coherence. In order to accomplish this task, discourse markers have to be as salient as possible. In bilingual discourse, this saliency may be maximized by using discourse markers from the language that is most salient. Since the language of morpho- syntax in Shaba Swahili/French discourse is Shaba Swahili, French markers stand out more clearly and have a higher contrastive value than their Shaba Swahili counterparts. Hence, French discourse markers are used instead of their Shaba Swahili equivalents. The importance of increasing contrastiveness as a way of maximizing saliency is evident from the fact that French markers are predominantly accompanied by pauses and/or prosodic cues, and from the fact that they predominantly occur in all-Shaba Swahili contexts, that is, they are followed and preceded by Shaba Swahili material in the majority of cases.

Key words

bilingual conversation

codeswitching

discourse markers

1. Introduction

One of the most interesting features of mixed Shaba Swahili/French discourse is the marked preference for using French discourse markers instead of their Shaba Swahili counterparts. This phenomenon is explained here as resulting from the specific function of discourse markers. As a special kind of contextualization cues (cf. Gumperz, 1982), creating and strengthening cohesion and coherence, discourse markers need to be as salient as possible. Since the morpho- syntax of Shaba Swahili/French discourse is predominantly Shaba Swahili in nature, French markers contrast with their linguistic environment and, hence, are more salient than Shaba Swahili markers.

Address for correspondence

Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Amsterdam, O.Z. Achterburgwal 185, 1012 DK Amsterdam, The Netherlands; e-mail: <vderooij@pscw.uva.nl>.

One of the characteristics of contextualization cues is their tendency to cluster (cf. Auer, 1992, pp. 29–30). The detailed analysis of French markers in Shaba Swahili in Section 3 reveals that French markers tend to be preceded and/or followed by pauses and produced with a characteristic high-low falling or low falling pitch contour (the high-low falling contour starts on a high pitch level, then rises to a peak after which there is a drop in pitch: the rise is short while the drop usually lasts longer). What we have, then, is a clustering of the following contextualization cues: code switch + discourse marker + pitch contour + pause(s). The clustering of these cues further enhances the saliency of French discourse markers.

The data discussed here are drawn from a corpus of informal Shaba Swahili conversations (8 hours and 55 mins) recorded during fieldwork in Shaba, the southeastern province of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in 1991 and 1992, when the country was still called Zaire. All recordings were made in Lubumbashi, the capital of Shaba, which is nowadays called again by its old colonial name Katanga. With an estimated population of 5–600,000, Lubumbashi is one of Congo's biggest cities, after Kinshasa and Mbuji-Mayi. It is the main commercial center of the Congolese Copperbelt and also the capital of Shaba/Katanga. Shaba Swahili is a partially creolized variety of Swahili spoken as a first language by some two million people living in the urban centers of the Copperbelt (see de Rooij, 1997). Its vernacular variety is characterized by the insertion of French words and phrases. French is the official language of the Congo and is also used as the medium of instruction in primary schools from the third year onward, and in all institutions of higher education.

It goes without saying, then, that in codeswitched discourse French lexical items may evoke all kinds of specialized sociocultural connotations. In contradistinction to French nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs French discourse markers are not, generally speaking, used to evoke such connotations. The main reason for this is that discourse markers are, so to speak, low in referential content: they do not denote some object, state, activity, or property. Being used as discourse operators, indexing the relations between chunks of discourse, their meaning is more abstract. It is the purpose of this paper to show how the preference for L2 markers in bilingual discourse is connected to this abstract discourse-related meaning.

2. Definitions and properties of discourse markers

Discourse markers play an important role in the construction of cohesion and coherence in discourse (see e.g., Schiffrin, 1987, for American English; Roulet, Auchlin, Moeschler, Rubattel, & Schelling, 1987, for French). According to Schiffrin (1987, p. 326), discourse markers may be considered as "contextual coordinates of talk," that is, "(…) they index an utterance to the local contexts in which utterances are produced and in which they are to be interpreted." Defined in this way, discourse markers are a special kind of what Gumperz (1982, p. 131) calls contextualization cues, verbal and nonverbal signals interlocutors rely on in processes of conversational inference.

Since discourse markers occur at clause boundaries and mark relations between preceding and following units of discourse, it is not really appropriate to consider them as an integral part of either one of these units. The "in between" character of discourse markers is often signaled through prosodic cues or pauses. Discourse markers tend to be

preceded and/or followed by pauses (Schiffrin, 1987, p. 328) and accompanied by a specific pitch contour (a high-low falling contour in the case of French markers used in Shaba Swahili conversations dealt with below). As a result, discourse markers are set off from preceding and following tone-units and have the status of structurally peripheral elements. It is interesting to note that this structural peripherality is often accompanied by a loss or change of original semantic, referential, content of the markers involved (cf. Roulet et al., 1987, p. 94; Schiffrin, 1987, pp. 127, 319). A good example is the use of lexicalized clauses with verbs of knowing or seeing in various languages: *you know* in English, *weet je* (you know) in Dutch, and *unaona* (you see) in Shaba Swahili. The verbs in these lexicalized clauses no longer express the meaning they express in "normal" complete sentences. A similar shift in semantic content is also evident in the case of discourse markers which are traditionally classified as conjunctions. Depending on the degree of syntactic integration, these markers have different meanings and function on different so-called planes of discourse (cf. Schiffrin ibid). In cases where these markers are integrated syntactically, they function as discourse markers on the level of propositional content of the clauses they link. If they are not integrated syntactically, they tend to function as markers at other levels of discourse, such as action structure.

How this works will become evident by looking at different uses of the French marker *puisque* ('because') in Shaba Swahili discourse. In traditional grammar, *puisque* is classified as a subordinating conjunction. Many instances of *puisque* in Shaba Swahili, however, cannot be labeled as such. An example is the use of *puisque* in line 05 of Example (1). The speakers in this example are Papa Tshibangu (T) and Papa Dikuyi (D), both migrants from the Kasai region who have learned Shaba Swahili as a second language and have attained near-native fluency in it (for an overview of transcription conventions and of the abbreviations used in the interlinear glosses, see the *Appendix*).

Example (1)

01 T kila   mu-ntu a-na   na   *ton*
         every 1-man   he-COP with pronunciation

   T   *everyone has his own way of speaking*

02   yake   ya   ky< ky-a   kwa-bo.=
         POSS.3S CONN 7-   7-CONN LOC-POSS.3PL
         of his home region.

03 D   =ky-a   kwa-bo   ehm.
         7-CONN LOC-POSS.3PL TAG

   D   *of his home region, that's right.*

04 T   *voyez   bien.*
         see. IMP.2PL well

   T   *keep that in mind.*

05 D   <u>*puisque*</u>, sa(w)a u-na-ona   ba-: ba-Kasayi
         since   as   you-TMA-see 2-   2-Kasaian

   D   <u>puisque</u> ('cause), as you see the: the Kasaians

06 ya (h)u‑mu (0.5) ba‑na‑anza (h)u‑mu
    CONN DEM‑LOC they‑TMA‑begin DEM‑LOC
    over here, here with us

07 mw‑etu mu Shaba ba‑na‑ita ki‑ntu.=
    LOC‑POSS.1PL LOC Shaba they‑TMA‑call 7‑thing
    in Shaba call (it) kintu.

08 T =ehm.
      ehm
   T *ehm.*

09 D na Kasayi a‑ta‑fika a‑na‑anza ku‑sema
      and Kasaian he‑TMA‑arrive he‑TMA‑begin INF‑say
   D *while the Kasaian arriving (here) says*

10 chi‑ntu.=
    7‑thing
    chintu.

11 T =chi‑ntu.
      7‑thing
   T *chintu, that's right.*

(Papa Dikuyi/DM86)

In line 05 of this example, Papa Dikuyi uses *puisque* as a turn taker. He successfully claims a new turn with the intention of supporting Papa Tshibangu's observation and providing a comment on it. He does this by pausing at the pronunciation of *kintu* 'thing, object'. In Luba‑Kasai, as in other Kasaian languages, the word for 'thing' is *chintu*, which is related to Swahili *kintu*. Papa Dikuyi is claiming that Kasaians who have been living in Shaba for some time pronounce it as *kintu*, while Kasaians who have arrived only recently pronounce it as *chintu*. What he is saying, then, is that although one's pronunciation is influenced by one's geographical origin, this influence disappears as time goes by.

It is clear that the sentence following *puisque* is not a subordinate clause to the sentence preceding *puisque*. First of all, there is a change of speaker between *voyez bien* and *puisque*. Second, *puisque* is marked by a high‑low falling pitch contour, which, prosodically, sets it apart from the sentence following it beginning with *sa(w)a*. And third, in order to consider *puisque* in (1) as a subordinating conjunction, the sentence following it would have to give a reason or cause for what was said in the preceding sentence (*voyez bien*). This is clearly not the case.

The use of *puisque* as a discourse marker in (1) is characterized by the following features: it initiates a turn, it is separated prosodically from what follows, and it differs syntactically and semantically from the subordinating conjunction *puisque*. It would be wrong, however, not to consider as discourse markers those instances of *puisque* which show all syntactic and semantic characteristics of a subordinating conjunction. Just like *puisque* as used in (1), which has lost most of these characteristics, they mark a causal

relation between two units of discourse. The only difference is in the nature of the causal relation marked by the different kinds of *puisque* used.

Schiffrin's (1987, pp. 201–217) analysis of *(be)cause* may be illuminating here. According to Schiffrin, *(be)cause* may express different kinds of causal relations depending on the plane of discourse on which it operates. At the level of "ideational structure," *because* marks a "fact-based" causal relation. At the level of "information state," it marks a "knowledge-based" causal relation, and at the level of "action structure," it marks an "action-based" causal relation:

> A **fact-based** causal relation between **cause** and **result** holds between idea-units, more precisely, between the events, states, and so on, which they encode. A **knowledge-based** causal relation holds when a speaker uses some piece(s) of information as a warrant for an **inference** (a speaker-inference), or when a speaker intends a hearer to do so (a hearer-inference). An **action-based** causal relation holds when a speaker presents a motive for an action being performed through talk—either his/her own action or an interlocutor's action (ibid. p. 202).

These different causal relations can be illustrated with the various uses of *puisque* in Shaba Swahili.

Example (1) contains an interesting case of a knowledge-based causal relation. Papa Tshibangu's claim that one's pronunciation is influenced by geographical origin, is based on mutual knowledge, namely, the well-known fact, often jokingly referred to, that Kasaians pronounce *kintu* as *chintu*. Papa Tshibangu's statement may be regarded as an inference, the warrant for which is made explicit in Papa Dikuyi's turn initiated by *puisque*. Normally, the warrant is given by the speaker who also makes the inference. In this case, however, it is the cospeaker who gives the warrant. At first blush, this may seem rather cooperative, since Papa Dikuyi seems to support Papa Tshibangu's statement. In reality, however, Papa Dikuyi criticizes the statement made by Papa Tshibangu: before giving the warrant, he makes it clear that the pronunciation of Kasaians who have been living in Shaba for some time, is no longer influenced by geographical origin.

In line 01 of Example (2), *puisque* marks a fact-based causal relation between a result, namely, the specific situation in Kalemie which is characterized by calm and good fortune, and its cause, namely, the fact that in Kalemie there are not many different ethnic groups. Note that in this case, the marker *puisque* is neither preceded nor followed by a pause nor is it marked by one of the characteristic pitch contours mentioned earlier. It also has the syntactic and semantic features of the subordinating conjunction *puisque*.

Example (2)

```
01  na   ku-le      Kalemie ni    ba(h)ati puisque
    and  LOC-DEM    Kalemie COP   luck     since
```
and over there in Kalemie there is well-being puisque *(since)*

```
02  (h)a-ku-na       ma-kabila ya      mingi (h)apana.
    NEG-LOC-COP      6-tribe   CONN    many  NEG
```
there aren't many ethnic groups.

(Papa Kamuanga/DM82)

In line 03 of Example (3), finally, *puisque* is used as a marker of an action-based relation. The argument following *puisque* gives the motive for an "(…) action being performed through talk (…) (Schiffrin, 1987, p. 202)," in this case the posing of the question preceding *puisque*.

Example (3)

01 *son avis*   mambo e-ko-na-fanya.   (0.5) *alors*
     his opinion matters he-COP-TMA-do (0.5) then
     he is doing things as he sees fit alors *(so)*

02 *est-ce que*, (0.5) Mungu, *vraiment* tu-ko
     QMARK   God   really   we-COP
     God, are we really

03 *à l'   image* ya   Mungu?= *puisque,*
     in DET image CONN God   since
     created in God's image? puisque *(since)*

04 Mungu a-ri-sema   mbele a-ri-sema, (0.5)
     god   he-TMA-say first he-TMA-say
     God said, in the beginning he said

05 tu-fany-e   mu-ntu ku   *image* y-etu.   (0.5)
     we-make-FIN 1-man LOC image POSS-1PL   (0.5)
     let's create man in Our image

06 *alors*, kama mu-ntu a-na-teswa,   c('est)   *à*
     then   if   1-man he-TMA-suffer DEM(COP) PREP
     so, if man suffers this means

07 *dire que*   Mungu na   yee   e-ko-na-teswa.
     say   COMP God   PREP pron.3SG he-COP-TMA-suffer
     that God himself is suffering as well.

     (Dédé M./DM7)

Of course, the use of *puisque* may mark several of these causal relations at the same time (cf. Schiffrin, 1987, pp. 210–216). In Example (3), for instance, *puisque* also marks a knowledge-based causal relation: The warrant for the propositional content of the question is given in the sentence following *puisque* saying that God himself has said that he created man in his image.

These different uses of *puisque* clearly show that one and the same discourse marker may differ in syntactic status and have different meanings and discourse functions. As already mentioned, there is a relation between the degree of syntactic integration of a marker and the level of discourse at which it functions (cf. Schiffrin, 1987, p. 319). *Puisque*, for instance, when integrated syntactically, marks a causal relation at the level of ideational structure, that is, it acts as a link between two propositions, the one preceding *puisque* consisting of a result the cause of which is given in the proposition following

puisque. When *puisque* is not, or only partly, integrated syntactically, it functions as a marker of a causal relation at a nonideational plane of discourse. The nonintegrated *puisque* in Example (1), for instance, marks a knowledge-based causal relation at the level of information state. At the same time, it marks a causal relation at yet another nonideational plane of discourse, namely, exchange structure: it marks a turn-based causal relation, thus acting as a turn taking element.

The variable syntactic status of individual markers together with the fact that markers belong to different word categories, makes it almost impossible to formulate a definition of discourse markers solely on the basis of shared structural properties. The unity of discourse markers as a distinct linguistic category lies first and foremost in shared functional status:

> (…) markers provide **contextual coordinates** for utterances: they index an utterance to the local contexts in which utterances are produced and in which they are to be interpreted (Schiffrin, 1987, p. 326).

This is not to say that markers do not share any structural properties at all. As pointed out above, markers occur at clause boundaries and are often accompanied by pauses or prosodic cues. Furthermore, we have also seen that markers have a specific semantic property: they tend to lose their original semantic content. Occurrence at clause boundaries seems to be the only hard defining property, however, since markers may be used with or without prosodic cues and pauses while the degree of loss of inherent meaning may vary.

3. French discourse markers in Shaba Swahili conversations

The prominent role of French discourse markers in Shaba Swahili conversations becomes immediately clear when looking at Table 1 which lists the occurrence of French markers and their Shaba Swahili counterparts in the corpus under investigation. The markers are classified under broad functional labels. It should be noted that the French marker *non* is to be regarded as a calque of Shaba Swahili *(h)apana*, because as far as I know *non* is not used as a marker of quoted speech with emphatic meaning in metropolitan French.

From Table 1 it is evident that French markers are strongly preferred. How is this preference to be explained? As linking devices, mostly devoid of referential meaning, markers provide essential information on how the relation between the joined clauses is to be interpreted, and, therefore, need to be prominent or salient within the flow of speech. In monolingual discourse, this can only be achieved by producing the marker with particular prosodic cues (e.g., a high-low pitch shift) or pauses before and/or after the marker. In bilingual discourse with one dominant language, as in Shaba Swahili/French discourse where Shaba Swahili is the dominant language, the salience of markers may be enhanced by using the L2 counterparts of L1 markers: A switch before, after, or before and after a marker ensures that the marker contrasts with its linguistic environment and, in this way, attracts more attention.

This is indeed what we find if we take a closer look at the linguistic environments in which French markers occur (see Table 2): 88.9% of these markers are followed and/or preceded by Shaba Swahili material, while only 11.1% of the French markers occur in all-French contexts. In other words, the overwhelming majority of French markers are preceded

Table 1

French markers and their Shaba Swahili counterparts

	French marker	N	Shaba Swahili marker	N
marker of topic development/topic transition	bon	380	basi/bashi	–
marker of quoted speech	non	91	(h)apana	1
marker of contrast	mais	516	lakini	16
markers of causal relationship	puisque	183	juu	39
	parce que	78	(kwa) sababu	10
markers of conclusion and succession	alors	124	tena	32
	donc	200	kisha	3
	et puis	75	(h)a(la)fu	23
			kumbe	7
Total		1647		132

and/or followed by a code switch. Moreover, it is striking that more than half (51.9%) of all French markers are preceded *and* followed by Shaba Swahili material, which means that there is a switch before and after the marker and, hence, an optimal contrast between the marker and its environment (cf. Maschler, 1997 for Hebrew-English bilingual discourse).

Just like discourse markers in monolingual discourse, French markers in Shaba Swahili are accompanied by pauses and produced with specific pitch contours. This is evident from the figures in Table 3: 84.3% of all French markers in codeswitching contexts are marked by prosodic cues and/or pauses. What we find, then, is a clustering of context-ualization cues: discourse marker+codeswitching+prosodic cues and or pauses.

From the tables we may draw two main conclusions. First, it is clear that in Shaba Swahili/French conversations, Shaba Swahili markers lose out against their French counter-parts, and, second, French markers tend to be used in such a way as to be maximally salient.

In the following section, we will take a closer look at the use of the French markers *donc*, *alors*, and *et puis*, which I have classified as markers of conclusion and succession. I have chosen these particular markers because they signal a rather self-evident link between successive clauses. Therefore, one might expect that there is less need to increase saliency by using prosodic cues, and pauses, and by embedding them in all-Shaba Swahili contexts. It will be shown that this expectation is not borne out by the data.

4. The use of *donc, alors,* and *et puis*

Although *donc*, *alors*, and *et puis* differ from each other in meaning, they can be considered as belonging to one category for two reasons. First, these markers form a continuum with *donc* 'thus', 'therefore' as a marker of conclusion at one end of the continuum, and *et puis* 'and then', 'after that' as a marker of succession at the other end. In between, we find *alors* 'then', 'at that time'. Originally a marker of temporal succession, *alors* has also acquired some features of *donc*, on the principle of *post hoc ergo propter hoc*.

Table 2

Linguistic environments of French markers (row percentages in brackets)

	F-marker-S	S-marker-F	S-marker-S	F-marker-F	Row totals
bon	77 (20.3)	69 (18.2)	196 (51.6)	38 (10.0)	380
non	1 (1.1)	15 (16.5)	72 (79.1)	3 (3.3)	91
mais	125 (24.2)	68 (13.2)	278 (53.9)	45 (8.7)	516
puisque	49 (26.8)	23 (12.6)	89 (48.6)	22 (12.0)	183
parce que	17 (21.8)	9 (11.5)	40 (51.3)	12 (15.4)	78
donc	37 (18.5)	33 (16.5)	105 (52.5)	25 (12.5)	200
alors	39 (31.5)	21 (16.9)	39 (31.5)	25 (20.2)	124
et puis	16 (21.3)	12 (16.0)	35 (46.7)	12 (16.0)	75
Column totals	361 (21.9)	250 (15.2)	854 (51.9)	182 (11.1)	1647

F=French material, S=Shaba Swahili material

Table 3

French markers in codeswitching environments accompanied by pauses and/or prosodic cues.
(Row percentages in brackets)

	Accompanied by pauses and/or prosodic cues	Not accompanied by pauses and/or prosodic cues	Row totals
bon	337 (98.5)	5 (1.5)	342
non	85 (96.6)	3 (3.4)	88
mais	326 (69.2)	145 (30.8)	471
puisque	147 (91.3)	14 (8.7)	161
parce que	52 (78.8)	14 (21.2)	66
donc	161 (92.0)	14 (8.0)	175
alors	79 (79.8)	20 (20.2)	99
et puis	48 (76.2)	15 (23.8)	63
Column totals	1235 (84.3)	230 (15.7)	1465

A second reason for dealing with these markers as a group, is that their Shaba Swahili counterparts cannot be classified unproblematically as either markers of conclusion or markers of succession. The meanings of the Shaba Swahili markers of conclusion and succession in the corpus (see Table 4) often overlap with two or all three of the French markers *donc*, *alors*, and *et puis*. Lenselaer (1983, p. 530) gives the following range of meanings for *tena*: 'alors, en 2ᵉ lieu, en plus, en outre, ensuite, puis, après cela'. For *kisha* he gives: 'ensuite, après, alors, en plus, finalement' (ibid. p. 151). For *(h)a(la)fu* he gives, among others: 'peu après, ensuite, bientôt' (ibid. p. 131). And for *kumbe* he gives: 'or, ainsi donc' (ibid. p. 239).

The frequencies of French and Shaba Swahili markers of conclusion and succession given in Table 4, show that Shaba Swahili markers are relatively rare compared to their French counterparts.

I will now deal with the French markers one by one starting with *donc. Donc*, as a marker of conclusion, initiates a unit of discourse which gives new information or makes

Table 4

Markers of conclusion and succession

Shaba Swahili markers		
tena	32	
kisha	3	
(h)a(la)fu	23	
kumbe	7	
Subtotal (Shaba Swahili markers)	65	
		65 (14%)
French markers		
alors	124	
donc	200	
et puis	75	
Subtotal (French markers)	399	
		399 (86%)
Total (Shaba Swahili + French markers)	**464**	

previously implicit information explicit. Contrary to what we have seen in the case of the causal marker *puisque* (see Section 2), where the unit following the marker logically predates the one preceding the marker, *donc* initiates a unit that logically follows the one preceding *donc*. Therefore, if we schematize the relations between the units of discourse linked by *donc*, we end up with the mirror image of the relations marked by causal markers (cf. Schiffrin, 1987, pp. 191–227 analysis of (*be*)*cause* and *so*):

relation	1:	**cause**	MARKER OF CONCLUSION	**result**
relation	2:	**warrant**	MARKER OF CONCLUSION	**inference**
relation	3:	**motive**	MARKER OF CONCLUSION	**action**

The information offered by the unit of discourse following *donc* need not be totally new, but may consist of a reformulation of the unit preceding *donc* as in (4), line 01, and (5), line 02.

Example (4)

```
01  tu-ko    ba-ntu ba-moya b-a      chini. donc
    we-COP 2-man  2-DET   2-CONN low    donc
```
we're a low kind of people. <u>Donc</u> *(so)*

```
02  tu-ko    ba-faible. eh?
    we-COP 2-weak
```
we're weak. are'nt we?

(Dédé M./DM15)

Example (5)

```
01  be-ko     en collaboration na     shetani.   (0.5)
    they-COP in  collaboration  with devil       (0.5)
```
they work together with the devil.

02 <u>*donc*</u>, ni   ba-ntu ba-moya b-a   shetani.
    so   COP 2-man 2-DET   2-CONN devil

<u>Donc</u> *(so)*, *they are people of the devil.*

(Fidélie/DM4)

In Example (6), line 01, the use of *donc* may be seen as an example of a relation 1 (cause‑result) and/or relation 2 (warrant‑inference).

Example (6)

01 a-na-patia   mpombe ↓*donc* e-ko-na-fanya
    he-TMA-give beer   so   he-COP-TMA-make

he gives (us) beer <u>donc</u> *(so) he makes*

02 ma-*geste* moya (h)ivi   juu ya
   6-gesture DET like that in order to

gestures in that way in order to

03 ku-*attirer* tu-patan-e   tu-sumburi-e.
   INF-attract we-agree-FIN we-talk-FIN

attract us so that we would agree with one another, and talk.

(Somwe/DM54)

Of the two hundred occurrences of *donc*, only 25 (12.5%) are followed and preceded by French material, while the remaining 175 (87.5%) are preceded and/or followed by Shaba Swahili material.

If we compare the use of *donc* at turn‑initial and turn‑internal[1] positions, we see that the use of turn‑initial *donc* in codeswitching contexts is relatively infrequent compared to turn‑internal usage: there are only 24 turn‑initial occurrences against 151 turn‑internal occurrences as shown in Tables 5 and 6. These tables show that the vast majority of both turn‑initial and turn‑internal occurrences of *donc* are accompanied by prosodic cues. Also note the near-absence of pausing in turn‑initial usage. This is not surprising since turn transitions are known to be extremely fluent: time intervals between subsequent turns "(…) average amounts measured in a few tenths of a second (Levinson, 1983, p. 297)." In other words, pauses preceding a turn-initial marker may thus be expected to be rare, no doubt related to the fact that pausing before and/or after a turn‑initial marker carries the risk of another speaker claiming a new turn. We also see that in both turn‑intial and turn‑internal usage the all-Shaba Swahili context is the most frequent one.

Turning to *alors*, it was found that 99 (79.8%) of the 124 occurrences are preceded

---

[1] There were two reasons for distinguishing between turn‑initial and turn‑internal use of discourse markers. First, the distinction made it possible to analyze the use of markers as a turntaking device, a topic that is only marginally touched upon in this paper. Second, the distinction between turn‑initial and turn‑internal usage was made to find out whether both categories were characterized by the same clustering of contextualization cues. It was found that pauses accompanying turn-initial markers are rare whereas pauses accompanying turn‑internal markers are much more frequent. As pointed out in the main text, the low frequency of pauses accompanying turn‑initial markers is directly related to the fact that turn transitions are — generally speaking — extremely fluent in nature.

Table 5

Turn-initial occurrences of *donc* in codeswitching contexts (Percentages in brackets)

	F-marker-S	S-marker-F	S-marker-S	Row totals
+prosodic cue +pause	–	1 (4.2)	–	1 (4.2)
+prosodic cue –pause	5 (20.8)	7 (29.2)	10 (41.7)	22 (91.7)
–prosodic cue +pause	–	–	1 (4.2)	1 (4.2)
–prosodic cue –pause	–	–	–	-
Column totals	5 (20.8)	8 (33.3)	11 (45.8)	**24**

Table 6

Turn-internal occurrences of *donc* in codeswitching contexts (Percentages in brackets)

	F-marker-S	S-marker-F	S-marker-S	Row totals
+prosodic cue +pause	12 (7.9)	7 (4.6)	23 (15.2)	42 (27.8)
+prosodic cue –pause	18 (11.9)	14 (9.3)	55 (36.4)	87 (57.6)
–prosodic cue +pause	1 (0.7)	2 (1.3)	5 (3.3)	8 (5.3)
–prosodic cue –pause	1 (0.7)	2 (1.3)	11 (7.3)	14 (9.3)
Column totals	32 (21.2)	25 (16.6)	94 (62.3)	**151**

and/or followed by Shaba Swahli material, while *alors* is followed and preceded by French material in 25 cases (20.2%).

As remarked above, the meaning of *alors* combines aspects of *donc* and *et puis* (see Roulet et al., 1987, pp.145–153 for a comparative analysis of *donc* and *alors* and other *marqueurs consécutifs* as they call them). As Dédé K.'s (K) use of *alors* in line 09 of the following example shows, it is difficult to determine, even with the help of context, whether one should prefer the reading of a marker of conclusion or a marker of succession. The speakers in this example are both unemployed, fluent bilinguals in their early twenties. Félicien (F) says that he heard a cure for AIDS had been found in Japan. He links this with the popular idea that the Japanese have invented the AIDS virus to avenge the nuclear attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in World War II. Dédé K.'s turn iniatiated by *alors* further elaborates on this idea.

Example (7)

01 F *derniè< dernièrement* shiku< ba-na<   shiku
       recent< recently   day   they-TMA day

    F *recent< recently, one day< they< one day*

02   ba-na-sema,   (1.0) eh, ba-na-pata   dawa
       they-TMA-say (1.0) eh they-TMA-get medicine

       they said, (1.0) eh they found a medicine

03   ku   ba-*Japonais*. ase(ma) *puisque* bo   njo
       LOC 2-Japanese DM   because pron.3PL TOP/LOC

       among the Japanese. (they say) because it is they

04   ba-li::   ba-ri::   eh ba-ri::-fanya   nani   SIDA.
       they-TMA they-TMA eh they-TMA-make FILLER AIDS

       who ma< ma< eh who made this ehm AIDS.

05 D ehm.
       ehm

    D *ehm.*

06 F njo   ku-ji-*venger*=
       TOP/LOC INF-REFL-revenge

    F *in order to take revenge.* =

07 D =ji-*venger*   juu ya   *bombe*,
       REFL-revenge because of bomb

    D *= take revenge because of the bomb,*

08 F ya   *bombe* ya   ba-nani,   Hiroshima.
       CONN bomb   CONN 2-FILLER Hiroshima

    F *the bomb of ehm Hiroshima.*

09 D <u>*alors,*</u> ba-na-ji-*venge*-ak-a   mu
       so   they-TMA-REFL-revenge-INT-FIN LOC

    D <u>alors</u> *(so), they take revenge on*

10   *Amé<* mu *Amérique,* ba-le   ba-ntu w-a
       Ame< LOC America   2-DEM 2-man 2-CONN

       Ame< on America, those people who

11   *pars<* ba-ri-*participer*   mu   ile   *bombe,*
       ?   they-TMA-participate LOC DEM bomb

       par< who participated in that bomb,

12   (1.0) *parce que*: ba:-*Américain* ba-ri-yu-ak-a:
       (1.0) because   2-American   they-TMA-know-REM-FIN

       (1.0) because the Americans knew

Table 7

Turn-initial occurrences of *alors* in codeswitching contexts (Percentages in brackets)

	F-marker-S	S-marker-F	S-marker-S	Row totals
+prosodic cue +pause	–	–	1 (3.1)	1 (3.1)
+prosodic cue –pause	4 (12.5)	5 (15.6)	10 (31.3)	19 (59.4)
–prosodic cue +pause	–	–	1 (3.1)	1 (3.1)
–prosodic cue –pause	5 (15.6)	2 (6.3)	4 (12.5)	11 (34.4)
Column totals	9 (28.1)	7 (21.9)	16 (50.0)	**32**

Table 8

Turn-internal occurrences of *alors* in codeswitching contexts (Percentages in brackets)

	F-marker-S	S-marker-F	S-marker-S	Row totals
+prosodic cue +pause	13 (19.4)	3 (4.5)	10 (14.9)	26 (38.8)
+prosodic cue –pause	8 (11.9)	5 (7.5)	7 (10.4)	20 (29.9)
–prosodic cue +pause	3 (4.5)	5 (7.5)	4 (6.0)	12 (17.9)
–prosodic cue –pause	6 (9.0)	1 (1.5)	2 (3.0)	9 (13.4)
Column totals	30 (44.8)	14 (20.9)	23 (34.3)	**67**

13   uranium ya   (h)u-mu   mw-etu
        uranium CONN DEM-LOC LOC-POSS.1PL

      the uranium of our region.

      (Dédé/DM7)

Looking at Table 7, one notices again the near-absence of pausing in turn-initial usage, while here too the marker occurs most frequently in the all-Shaba Swahili context. Turn-internal usage of *alors* (see Table 8) is similar to the pattern encountered in turn-internal usage of the other French markers in that 86.6% of all occurrences are marked by prosodic cues and/or pauses. However, unlike other markers, turn-internal *alors* occurs most frequently preceded by French and followed by Shaba Swahili material.

The last marker to be treated in this section is *et puis*. *Et puis* is a combination of *et* 'and' and *puis* 'after that, then' (*puis* on its own occurs three times in the corpus). *Et puis*

may be translated as 'and then', '(and) besides', or 'furthermore'. *Et puis* is used to introduce a unit of discourse which is meant to contribute to the development and expansion of the current topic or argument. In line 5 of Example (8), an example of *et puis* is given.

Example (8)

01 njo   eh Mungu, ni   Mungu w-a   *richesse*,
   TOP eh God   COP God   1-CONN wealth
   God, is a god of riches, (0.5)

02 (0.5) ni   Mungu w-a   *or*,   ni   Mungu
         COP God   1-CONN gold COP God
   is a God of gold, is a God

03 w-a   *argent*. (0.5) ↓*donc* (h)ii *richesse*
   1-CONN silver   (0.5) so   DEM wealth
   of silver. (0.5) therefore, all this riches

04 yote (h)ii i-na-tu-*appartenir*   shi
   all   DEM it-TMA-us-belong to   pron.1PL
   belongs to us, we who are

05 ba-toto   yake.   (1.0) et puis,   Mungu
   2-children POSS.3SG (1.0) furthermore God
   His children. (1.0) et puis *(furthermore), God*

06 a-shi-na   Mungu w-a   bu-chafu *mais*
   he-NEG-COP God   1-CONN filth   but
   is not a God of squalor mais *(but)*

07 *c'est un   Dieu de la   propreté.*
   it's   DET God of DET cleanliness
   it's a God of cleanliness.
   (Fidélie/DM13)

Of all 75 occurrences of *et puis*, 12 (16.0%) are followed and preceded by French material. The remaining 63 (84.0%) are preceded and or followed by Shaba Swahili material and involve codeswitching, which is quite similar to what we found for other markers.

Turn-initial usage of *et puis* in codeswitching contexts is not as strongly marked by prosodic cues as most markers dealt with thus far (see Table 9). As could be expected from what we have seen earlier, turn-internal usage is characterized by lack of pauses while turn-internal *et puis* is accompanied by pauses in 67.5% of all cases (see Table 10). Also evident from Tables 9 and 10 is that *et puis* is used most frequently in all-Shaba Swahili contexts, a pattern which we encountered in the use of other markers as well.

The analysis of French markers of conclusion and succession clearly shows that speakers aim at using markers in such a way as to maximize their saliency. The choice of French markers is not stylistically or semantically motivated, as switches often are, but seems to be entirely discourse related. In the bilingual corpus under investigation, where Shaba Swahili is

Table 9

Turn-initial occurrences of *et puis* in codeswitching contexts (Percentages in brackets)

	F-marker-S	S-marker-F	S-marker-S	Row totals
+prosodic cue +pause	1 (4.3)	–	–	1 (4.3)
+prosodic cue –pause	2 (8.7)	3 (13.0)	4 (17.4)	9 (39.1)
–prosodic cue +pause	–	1 (4.3)	–	1 (4.3)
–prosodic cue –pause	1 (4.3)	3 (13.0)	8 (34.8)	12 (52.2)
Column totals	4 (17.4)	7 (30.4)	12 (52.2)	**23**

Table 10

Turn-internal occurrences of *et puis* in codeswitching contexts (Percentages in brackets)

	F-marker-S	S-marker-F	S-marker-S	Row totals
+prosodic cue +pause	2 (5.0)	1 (2.5)	11 (27.5)	14 (35.0)
+prosodic cue –pause	4 (10.0)	2 (5.0)	4 (10.0)	10 (25.0)
–prosodic cue +pause	4 (10.0)	2 (5.0)	7 (17.5)	13 (32.5)
–prosodic cue –pause	2 (5.0)	–	1 (2.5)	3 (7.5)
Column totals	12 (30.0)	5 (12.5)	23 (57.5)	**40**

the dominant language, Shaba Swahili markers are simply less salient than their French counterparts and, therefore, weaker and less effective in performing their role of signaling relations between consecutive clauses, or larger speech units such as conversational turns.

5. Conclusion

The explanation of the use of French discourse markers in Shaba Swahili/French conversations is partly structural and partly functional. The analysis of the distribution of the markers has shown that they may be considered as syntactically peripheral elements: they are often preceded and/or followed by pauses and marked by prosodic cues (on the correlation between peripherality and codeswitching/borrowing see Van Hout & Muysken's 1994 study of Spanish borrowings in Quechua). This peripheral status makes them impervious to morphosyntactic constraints on codeswitching. Another factor facili-

tating switching is linear equivalence. Canonical word order in French and Shaba Swahili is SVO and does not change in clauses introduced by the markers analyzed here. From a structural point of view, then, switching of French markers is hardly problematic.

However, the mere (structural) possibility of switching French markers does not explain the sometimes near-exclusive use of French markers. This phenomenon can be explained by taking into account the function of discourse markers (for a pragmatic/functional explanation of codeswitched discourse markers which is related to the one offered here, see Maschler's 1994, 1995, 1997 work on Hebrew/English discourse). Discourse markers are there to create and strengthen discourse cohesion and coherence. In order to accomplish this task discourse markers have to be as salient as possible. This saliency is often signaled by pausing before and/or after markers or producing them with marked pitch contours (cf. Schiffrin, 1987). In bilingual discourse this saliency may be maximized by using discourse markers from the language that is most salient. In Shaba Swahili/French discourse French is more salient because the language of morpho-syntax in Shaba Swahili/French discourse is Shaba Swahili. In this linguistic environment, French markers stand out more clearly and have a higher contrastive value than their Shaba Swahili counterparts. Hence, French discourse markers are used instead of their Shaba Swahili equivalents.

The importance of increasing contrastiveness as a way of maximizing saliency is evident from the fact that in the majority of cases, French markers are accompanied by pauses and/or prosodic cues, and from the fact that they predominantly occur in all-Shaba Swahili contexts, that is, they are followed and preceded by Shaba Swahili material in the majority of cases (on the use of L2 material in L1 discourse as a way of marking contrast, see Auer, 1984, 1995; Gumperz, 1982, p. 84). However, if saliency in terms of contrastive value would play such a decisive role, one would expect bilinguals to use L1 markers in their L2. Judging from my observations of French as spoken by Shaba Swahili/French bilinguals, this is not the case. However, situations of bilingualism in which speakers use L1 markers in their L2 do exist. Nortier (1989, pp. 142–143), for example, found that speakers of Moroccan Arabic use Arabic coordinate conjunctions conjoining Dutch sentences. As a testable hypothesis I would propose that there is a social precondition for L1 markers to be used in L2 discourse, namely, both languages must be characterized by a high degree of context neutrality: as long as the use of the L2 is mainly restricted to formal contexts and perceived as "they code" the L2 is more or less impermeable to L1 markers.

A rather different explanation for the use of L2 markers in L1 environments than the one offered here is possible. One might argue that for speakers with a limited proficiency in a high-prestige L2 the use of L2 markers, which requires little knowledge of L2 morpho-syntax, is an easy way of "upgrading" their language use (cf. Poplack, 1980 on the use of so-called *emblematic switches*). However, since the speakers in this study are all fluent, or near-fluent, speakers of French, this explanation seems out of place here.[2]

---

[2] An anonymous IJB reviewer commented that this explanation is not necessarily irrelevant "(…) because while the speakers may not feel a need to 'upgrade' their Sh. Sw. by peppering it with French, there could still be a community norm that Sh. Sw. is enhanced by the inclusion of some French. Syntactically, as pointed out, discourse markers are the easiest items to do this with." I do not want to exclude this possibility, especially as a norm guiding the behavior of young speakers. It could, therefore, explain the frequent use of French discourse markers, but not the near-exclusive use of these markers, nor could it explain the systematic clustering of French markers with other contextualization cues.

Until now, I have assumed that French markers preceded and/or followed by Shaba Swahili material involve codeswitching. However, the mere frequency of these markers combined with the fact that they occur much more frequently than their Shaba Swahili equivalents, raises the question as to whether these French markers should be considered borrowings. In other words, should we consider French markers as being part of the Shaba Swahili lexicon? This is an important question because I have explained the frequent use of French markers as being due to their status as French words making them more salient in Shaba Swahili/French discourse than their Shaba Swahili equivalents. The question as to whether French markers are to be considered borrowings is, of course, also an important one from a structural point of view. After all, borrowed forms are often assumed to be impervious to constraints on codeswitching (cf., for example, Sankoff, Poplack, & Vanniarajan, 1990; Myers-Scotton, 1993).

It seems clear that Shaba Swahili markers are losing out against their French equivalents. Because of their generalized usage, one may argue that French markers have assumed the status of Shaba Swahili words, and hence of borrowings. However, the widespread Shaba Swahili/French bilingualism, that is, the coexistence of these languages, ensures that for bilingual speakers French markers always retain at least something of their status as French words, and hence their saliency within Shaba Swahili/French discourse, and can never become truly part of their Shaba Swahili lexicon. Looked at in this way, the high incidence of French markers may just as well be seen as the result of high frequency codeswitching.

In situations of language contact, the use of L2 markers in L1 discourse is by no means a rare phenomenon. Speakers of American varieties of German, for instance, almost exclusively use American English markers such as *you know*, *well*, and *because* instead of German markers (Salmons, 1990). A related case is what Bernsten and Myers-Scotton (1993, pp. 141–143) call the incipient borrowing of *but* and *because* in the language use of Shona/English bilinguals in Zimbabwe. Coso-Calame, De Pietro, & Oesch-Serra (1985, p. 388) report the frequent use of French markers surrounded by Italian material in the Italian of Italian migrants living in Neuchâtel (Switzerland). It should also not be left unmentioned that some of the Shaba Swahili equivalents of the French markers analyzed in this chapter were drawn from another language, namely, Arabic. The form *lakini*, 'but' comes from *lākin/lākinna*, 'however, yet, but', *(kwa) sababu*, 'because' from *sabab*, 'reason', 'cause', 'motive', and *(h)a(la)fu*, from *khalfu*, 'at the back', 'in the rear' (Wehr, 1979, pp. 1000, 456, 298). Other studies dealing with L2 markers in L1 discourse include Comrie (1992) on Russian markers in Kamchadal (Itelmen), a language spoken on the Kamchatka peninsula, and Brody (1987) and Stolz and Stolz (1994) on Spanish markers in Meso-American languages. Of all these authors, only Brody (ibid. p. 513) links the occurrence of conjunctions used as discourse markers with the "detachable, lexical nature" of these words. The use of Spanish conjunctions used as discourse markers in Meso-American languages is particularly interesting because in some cases the introduction of these markers is accompanied by syntactic innovations triggered by categorial and linear nonequivalence. The motivation for inserting L2 markers in L1 discourse appears to be so powerful that structural constraints on codeswitching and borrowing are not strong enough to stop this process.

References

AUER, P. (1984). *Bilingual conversation.* Pragmatics & beyond, Vol.8. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

AUER, P. (1992). Introduction: John Gumperz' approach to contextualization. In P. Auer & A. di Luzio (Eds.), *The contextualization of language* (pp. 1–37). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

AUER, P. (1995). The pragmatics of codeswitching: A sequential approach. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (Eds.), *One speaker, two languages: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on codeswitching* (pp. 115–135). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

BERNSTEN, J. G., & MYERS-SCOTTON, C. (1993). English loans in Shona: Consequences for linguistic systems. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, **100/101**, 125–148.

BRODY, J. (1987). Particles borrowed from Spanish as discourse markers in Mayan languages. *Anthropological Linguistics*, **29**, 507–521.

COMRIE, B. (1992). *Language contact in East Siberia (Chukotka & Kamchatka).* Paper presented at The Ninth Tromsø Symposium on Language: Arctic Pidgins, 4–6 June, 1992.

COSO-CALAME, F. del, De PIETRO, F., & OESCH-SERRA, C. (1985). La compétence de communication bilingue: Etude fonctionelle des codeswitchings dans le discours de migrants espagnols et italiens à Neuchâtel (Suisse). In E. Gülich, & T. Kotschi (Hg.), *Grammatik, Konversation, Interaktion* (pp. 377–398). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

De ROOIJ, V. A. (1996). *Cohesion through contrast: Discourse structure in Shaba Swahili/French converstations.* Amsterdam: IFOTT.

De ROOIJ, V. A. (1997). Shaba Swahili: Partial creolization due to second language learning and substrate pressure. In A. K. Spears & D. Winford (Eds.), *The structure and status of pidgins and creoles* (pp. 309–339). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

GUMPERZ, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies.* Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

LENSELAER, A. (1983). *Dictionnaire swahili-français.* Paris: Editions Karthala.

LEVINSON, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

MASCHLER, Y. (1994). Metalanguaging and discourse markers in bilingual conversation. *Language in Society*, **23**, 325–366.

MASCHLER, Y. (1995). Structural and pragmatic contrasts shaping an emergent bilingual grammar. In *Papers from the Summer School Language Contact and Code-Switching, 14–17 September* (pp. 142–152). Ljouwert/Leeuwarden: Fryske Akademy.

MASCHLER, Y. (1997). Emergent bilingual grammar: The case of contrast. *Journal of Pragmatics*, **28**(3), 279–313.

MYERS-SCOTTON, C. (1993). *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in codeswitching.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

NORTIER, J. M. (1989). *Dutch and Moroccan Arabic in contact: Codeswitching among Moroccans in the Netherlands.* Dordrecht: Foris.

POPLACK, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPAÑOL: Toward a typology of codeswitching. *Linguistics*, **18**, 581–618.

ROULET, E., AUCHLIN, A., MOESCHLER, J., RUBATTEL, C., & SCHELLING, M. (1987). *L'articulation du discours en français contemporain.* Berne: Peter Lang.

SALMONS, J. (1990). Bilingual discourse marking: Codeswitching, borrowing, and convergence in some German-American dialects. *Linguistics*, **28**, 453–480.

SANKOFF, D., POPLACK, S., & VANNIARAJAN, S. (1990). The case of the nonce loan in Tamil. *Language Variation and Change*, **2**, 71–101.

SCHIFFRIN, D. (1987). *Discourse markers.* Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

STOLZ, C., & STOLZ, T. (1994). *Hisponoindiana: Spanisch-Indianischer Sprachkontakt und Grammatikalisierung in Mesoamerika. Vortrag DGfS-Tagung Münster*, **11**(3), 1994.

Van HOUT, R., & MUYSKEN, P. (1994). Modeling lexical borrowability. *Language Variation and Change*, **6**, 39–62.

WEHR, H. (1979). *A dictionary of modern written Arabic*. (edited by J. Milton Cowan, fourth edition). Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Appendix

Abbreviations used in the glosses

CD	noun class concord, Arabic numerals preceeding CD indicate specific noun classes
COMP	complementizer
CONN	connective
COP	copula
DEM	demonstrative
DET	determiner
DM	discourse marker
FILLER	gloss for *nani* (Standard Swahili which is used to fill pauses
FIN	final vowel of Shaba Swahili verb form
FUT	future tense
HAB	habitual aspect
IMP	imperative
INDEF	indefinite tense
INF	infinitive
INT	intensive aspect
LOC	locative
NEG	negation
POSS	possessive
PREP	preposition
PRON	pronoun
QMARK	question marker
REFL	reflexive object clitic
REM	remote future or past tense
TAG	tag
TMA	tense/mood/aspect
TOP	topicalizer
1,2,3S	1,2,3rd person singular
1,2,3PL	1,2,3rd person plural

Transcription conventions

.	sentence final intonation
,	high-low falling pitch contour
↓	sharp low-falling pitch contour
<	sudden break in intonation pattern

=	indicates absence of pause between speakers or sentences (latching)
(0.5)	pause (in seconds)
(h)	denotes h-deletion, a common feature of Shaba Swahili
((laughs and gets up from his chair))	relevant contextual information between double brackets
A: anarudia je? mi[shiyue.] B: [ah ni nguvu eh?]	speaker overlap (between square brackets)
(SSS)	S's indicate number of syllables not transcribed
(?0.5)	untranscribed speech (in seconds)
(?ashakufanya)	uncertain transcription