

The discourse marker *mos* in rural varieties of Afrikaans in the Western Cape: A descriptive study of syntactic patterns and pragmatic function

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

MA in Linguistics for the Language Professions
(General Linguistics 897)

The background of the page features a large, faded crest of Stellenbosch University. The crest is a shield divided into four quadrants. The top-left quadrant shows a castle tower, the top-right shows a lion, the bottom-left shows a flower, and the bottom-right shows a castle tower. In the center of the shield is a smaller shield with a red and white design. Above the shield is a crest featuring a lion and a book. Below the shield is a banner with the Latin motto "Pectora roborant cultus recti".

Stellenbosch University

by

Wesley Jantjies

Student No.: 14644428

December 2009

Supervisor: Dr. Ondene van Dulm

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this thesis is my own original work and has not previously in its entirety or in part been submitted at any university for a degree.

.....

Signature

.....

Date

Copyright © 2009 Stellenbosch University

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

This thesis considers the linguistic item *mos* as it occurs in the speech of non-standard Cape Afrikaans speakers from the rural areas of the Western Cape, namely Montague, Worcester, Robertson, Touwsrivier, De Doorns, and Beaufort West. The syntactic and pragmatic properties of *mos* are described, as well as its prevalence in discourse in relation to particular social factors. Properties and functions of adverbs and discourse markers, as discussed by Ponelis (1985), Schifffrin (1987, 2001), and Fraser (1993, 1999, 2001), are applied to *mos* in terms of its syntactic characterisation as an adverb and as a discourse marker. The pragmatic analysis of *mos* is based on the analysis of discourse markers, such as *you know* in English, by Schifffrin (1987, 2001). With regard to the grammatical properties of *mos*, it was found that *mos* behaves much like an adverb in terms of syntactic distribution, yet it does not fulfil all the grammatical functions of an adverb, which is why it is being analysed as a discourse marker. The functions of *mos* as an adverb are restricted; *mos* does not perform the adverbial function of modifying verbs, adjectives, other adverbs, and prepositional phrases; rather, the entire proposition expressed by the utterance is modified or qualified by the use of *mos*. Its discourse marker functions follow from this property; discourse markers tend to retain the distributional properties of the syntactic category from which they are derived – in this case, the discourse marker *mos* is derived from the syntactic category of adverb. The position of *mos* within the sentence, both medial and final, is grammatically determined and has a grammatical relationship with other constituents in the sentence. This is similar for its function as adverb and as discourse marker. *Mos* is bound to the sentence structure, yet it may still be removed from the sentence without affecting grammaticality; however, in such an event the intended interpretation may not be as explicit. In analysing the discourse functions of *mos*, a number of pragmatic functions were identified: (i) *mos* indicates information as general knowledge and knowledge that should be known; (ii) it presents information as necessary in order for a narrative to be understood; (iii) it functions in the development of meta-knowledge in order to discover knowledge which the hearer has about a particular topic; (iv) it presents information which is to be interpreted as a causal or reason for a particular event or situation; (v) it presents a position or opinion in an argument which is to be regarded as fact; and (vi) it reveals logical relationships between two utterances.

OPSOMMING

Hierdie tesis handel oor die linguistiese item *mos* soos dit in die spraak van nie-standaard Kaapse Afrikaanse sprekers in die landelike gebiede van die Wes-Kaap, naamlik Montague, Worcester, Robertson, Touwsrivier, De Doorns, en Beaufort-Wes voorkom. Die tesis beskryf die sintaktiese en pragmatiese eienskappe van *mos*, sowel as die effek van spesifieke sosiale faktore op die voorkoms daarvan in diskoers. Die eienskappe en funksies van bywoorde en diskoersmerkers, soos deur Ponelis (1985), Schiffrin (1987, 2001), en Fraser (1993, 1999, 2001) bespreek, word op *mos* toegepas in terme van sy sintaktiese karakterisering as bywoord. Die pragmatiese analise van *mos* is gebaseer op Schiffrin (1987, 2001) se analise van diskoersmerkers, byvoorbeeld *you know* ("jy weet") in Engels. Wat betref die grammatikale eienskappe van *mos* is daar gevind dat *mos* soos 'n bywoord optree in terme van sintakties verspreiding. Dit vervul egter nie al die grammatikale funksies van 'n bywoord nie; om daardie rede word dit as 'n diskoersmerker ontleed. Die funksies van *mos* as 'n bywoord is beperk; *mos* modifiseer nie werkwoorde, byvoeglikenaamwoorde, ander bywoorde, of preposisionele frases nie, maar dit modifiseer wel die algehele proposisie wat uitgedruk word deur die uiting. Die diskoersmerker-funksies volg vanuit hierdie eienskap. Diskoersmerkers is geneig om die sintaktiese gedrag van die sintaktiese kategorie waarvan hulle afgelei is, te behou; in hierdie geval is die diskoersmerker *mos* afgelei vanaf die sintaktiese kategorie bywoord. *Mos* kan in die middel of aan die einde van die sin voorkom en sy posisie word grammatikaal bepaal. Dit is die geval vir beide sy funksie as bywoord en as diskoersmerker. *Mos* is verbind met die sinstruktuur (anders as ander diskoersmerkers), maar dit kan steeds uit die sin verwyder word sonder om grammatikaliteit te beïnvloed; die bedoelde interpretasie mag in so 'n geval egter minder eksplisiet wees. Met die analise van die diskoersfunksies van *mos* is 'n aantal pragmatiese funksies geïdentifiseer: (i) *mos* dui inligting as algemene kennis aan of as inligting wat reeds bekend behoort te wees aan die gespreks genote; (ii) dit stel inligting as noodsaaklik tot die begrip van narratiewe voor; (iii) dit funksioneer in die ontwikkeling van meta-kennis; (iv) dit merk inligting weer wat as rede vir 'n spesifieke gebeurtenis of situasie geïnterpreteer kan word; (v) dit dui 'n posisie of 'n opinie aan wat as feit aanvaar word in 'n argument; en (vi) dit lê logiese verhoudings tussen uitings bloot.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	i
Transcription Key	ii
LIST OF TABLES	iii
CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Definition of discourse markers	2
1.2 Previous research on mos.....	2
1.3 Rationale for the study	3
1.4 Research hypotheses	4
1.5 Research questions	5
1.6 Structure of the thesis.....	6
CHAPTER 2 –DISCOURSE MARKERS	7
2.1 Discourse markers within the field of sociolinguistics	7
2.2 Definition of discourse markers	8
2.2.1 Schifffrin's discourse planes	14
2.2.1.1 <i>Exchange structure</i>	14
2.2.1.2 <i>Action structure</i>	14
2.2.1.3 <i>Ideational structure</i>	15
2.2.1.4 <i>Participation framework</i>	15
2.2.1.5 <i>Information state</i>	15
2.3 Properties of discourse markers	15
2.3.1 Syntactic aspects of discourse markers	16
2.3.2 Pragmatic aspects of discourse markers.....	18
2.3.3 Semantic aspects of discourse markers	20
2.3.4 Discourse markers and meaning relations	20
2.3.5 Referential meaning	21

2.3.6	Social relationships	22
2.3.7	Discourse markers and discourse structure	22
2.3.8	Discourse markers as contextual coordinates	23
2.4	Types of discourse markers.....	24
2.5	Properties and characteristics of the grammatical category ascribed to mos.....	26
2.5.1	Properties of adverbs.....	26
2.5.1.1	<i>Syntactic properties</i>	26
2.5.1.2	<i>Semantic properties</i>	28
2.5.2	Types of adverbs	29
2.5.2.1	<i>Types of adverbs distinguished on the basis of semantics</i>	29
2.5.2.2	<i>Types of adverbs distinguished on the basis of truth conditionality</i>	29
2.5.3	Adjuncts in Afrikaans	29
2.5.3.1	<i>Certainty adjuncts</i>	30
2.5.3.2	<i>Judgment adjuncts</i>	30
2.5.3.3	<i>Colour adjuncts</i>	31
2.5.4	Qualifiers.....	32
2.5.4.1	<i>Familiarity qualifiers</i>	32
2.5.5	Function of adverbs.....	33
2.5.5.1	<i>Adverb as modifier</i>	33
2.5.5.2	<i>Adverb as complement of the preposition</i>	33
2.5.5.3	<i>Adverbs and other word classes</i>	34
CHAPTER 3 –	35
LANGUAGE VARIATION AND AFRIKAANS	35
3.1	Language variation.....	35
3.2	Afrikaans.....	37
3.3	Variation in Afrikaans.....	38
3.3.1	Dialects of Afrikaans	39

3.4	Previous research on mos.....	40
CHAPTER 4 – METHODOLOGY		42
4.1	Data collection	42
4.2	Informants	43
4.3	Data analysis procedures.....	45
4.3.1	Syntactic analysis.....	45
4.3.2	Pragmatic analysis.....	45
CHAPTER 5 – DATA ANALYSIS.....		47
5.1	Syntactic aspects of mos	47
5.1.1	Syntactic distribution of <i>mos</i>	47
5.1.1.1	<i>Mos as bound sentence adverb</i>	47
5.1.1.2	<i>Mos in negative statements</i>	49
5.1.1.3	<i>The appearance of mos in question forms</i>	50
5.1.1.4	<i>The morphological aspects of mos</i>	50
5.1.2	Properties and functions of <i>mos</i> as an adverb	51
5.1.3	Function of adverbs and grammaticality of the sentence.....	52
5.2	Pragmatic aspects of mos	54
5.2.1	<i>Mos</i> as an indicator of shared knowledge	54
5.2.2	Indicating need for hearer understanding.....	57
5.2.3	<i>Mos</i> and the progression of knowledge in discourse	61
5.2.4	The function of <i>mos</i> in presenting an utterance as causal or reason in discourse	62
5.2.5	<i>Mos</i> in arguments	67
CHAPTER 6 – SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION		69
6.1	Discussion of the findings.....	69
6.1.1	<i>Mos</i> as a discourse marker which conveys shared knowledge	69
6.1.2	<i>Mos</i> distinguished from the syntactic category of adverb.....	70
6.1.3	The syntactic category of <i>mos</i> and its pragmatic function.....	71

6.2	Shortcomings of the present study and directions for further research.....	72
References		74
Appendix A		79

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I want to extend sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Ondene van Dulm, who guided me through this study and who provided constant encouragement.

I also wish to thank the staff of the Department of General Linguistics at Stellenbosch University for their various contributions, academically and otherwise, as well as the many student assistants who spent long hours transcribing the recorded interviews.

The data which has informed the present study was supplied by the South Africa–Netherlands Research Programme on Alternatives in Development (SANPAD) project which has also financially supported the work. This work was also financially supported by The National Research Foundation. Any opinion, findings, conclusions and recommendations expressed in this thesis are those of the author and therefore SANPAD and the NRF do not accept any liability in this regard.

Transcription Key

- . Indicates the end of the utterance.
- [...] Indicates that the following utterance(s) is not relevant to the current discussion and has been omitted.
- ... Shows the position where the speaker pauses and/or reformulates.
- Indicates an incomplete utterance; the informant did not complete the sentence.
- " " Indicates code-switching. Words in inverted commas are borrowed (mainly between English and Afrikaans). Also, quoted utterances from the dialogue are indicated with inverted commas.
- () Words in brackets are inserted by the author for the sake of grammaticality of the utterances; i.e. they are not the informant's own words.

[unint.] Indicates an unintelligible (part of an) utterance.

Mos appears in the English gloss of examples as finding an appropriate translation for *mos* in the different contexts may be problematic.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Informant Data	44
------------------------------	----

CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

This thesis deals with the item *mos* in Afrikaans. The aim of the study is to describe the use of *mos* as it occurs in the non-standard variety of Afrikaans spoken in rural areas around the Western Cape.

Before such a description can be provided, however, questions of the linguistic status of *mos* must be addressed. Researchers into the Afrikaans language, such as Ponelis (1985), suggest that *mos* functions as an adverb. If one considers the syntactic distribution and characterisation of *mos*, then it can indeed be observed that *mos* patterns similarly to adverbs. Consider the example in (1).

- (1) Jy kan **mos** sien hy is siek
*You can **clearly** see that he is sick*

(Ponelis 1985: 304)

However, *mos* differs fundamentally from adverbs: while adverbs give details as to the manner in which (e.g. *fast*, or *perfectly*), or degree to which (e.g. *very*, or *highly*), an action is performed (Radford 2009: 3), *mos*, on the surface, does not seem to modify or qualify other elements (or constituents) in the sentence, but rather modifies the entire proposition and guides the hearer to a particular interpretation. In light of this, the present study sets out to characterise *mos* as a discourse marker (hereafter DM) and to distinguish it from the syntactic category of adverb¹ from which it is, most likely, derived. A central aspect to be considered in this context is whether there is a relationship of complementary distribution between *mos* as adverb and *mos* as DM. This question will be addressed through a description of its syntactic distribution and, to a lesser extent, its semantic properties. Furthermore, the pragmatic function(s) of *mos* as a DM will be set out.

The analysis of the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic aspects of *mos* is undertaken on the basis of data gathered among speakers of a non-standard variety of Afrikaans (see below) spoken in rural areas around the Western Cape.

As mentioned by Labov (1972), there is a propensity for linguistic features to show regular distribution over particular social factors, such as socioeconomic class, ethnicity, and age. These linguistic features are used in a similar way among individuals in any context (Labov 1972: 237). In addition to the above goals of describing the syntactic properties and pragmatic functions of *mos*,

¹ According to Schiffrin (1987: 230), "the categories of adverbs and DM are clearly different". The distinction will be made clear in section 2.3.1.

the social distribution of *mos* will also be explored, by considering the relation (if any) between social variables, such as age, gender, ethnicity, and social class, of the speech community (or individual) and the use of *mos*.

The speakers among which data were gathered, who were all Coloured² speakers of non-standard Cape Afrikaans from Robertson, De Doorns, Beaufort West, and Touwsrivier, are regarded as belonging to a single speech community. Thus, for the purposes of the present study, the concept of 'speech community' is defined in terms of the linguistic features shared among a group of speakers of a variety, where homogeneous linguistic structure is observed; the community shares linguistic norms and behaviours (cf. Wardhaugh 2006: 122).

1.1 Definition of discourse markers

A brief definition of DMs is given here, and is expanded upon in chapter 2. A provisional definition of DMs for the purposes of the present study is formulated on the basis of the definitions by Schiffrin (1987) and Fraser (1999). The definition is based mainly on function, although a definition of DMs cannot be based on function alone (cf. section 2.2). DMs cannot be placed in a single syntactic category, as they are derived from a broad range of syntactic categories. A DM follows the category from which it is derived (e.g. adverb, conjunction, etc.) as regards its position in the sentence, but is distinguished as a DM by (i) its function in the sentence (Fraser 1999: 944), (ii) its independence from syntactic structure, and (iii) its optionality (Schiffrin 1987).

Functions which DMs perform in the sentence involve bracketing/labelling units of talk (Schiffrin 1987: 31) and contributing to a particular interpretation for an utterance in which they appear (Fraser 1999: 946). DMs also represent or establish particular relationships between speaker and hearer (Andersen, Brizuela, DuPuy, and Gonnerman 1999: 1340), and have multiple functions on the various levels of discourse (Schiffrin 2001: 58).

1.2 Previous research on *mos*

An extensive analysis of *mos* has not yet been provided; most of the existing analyses pertain to its etymology (or derivation) in historical studies of language change and variation, or language contact (cf. Roberge 2002; Deumert 2004). Conradie (1995) aims to define the function and

² The term "Coloured" is used in a non-pejorative sense to refer to a particular ethnic group of diverse ancestry who reside in southern Africa.

semantic meaning of *mos*. Ponelis (1985) mentions *mos* as a "colour adjunct", but does not regard it as a discourse marker. Most of the researchers mentioned above agree that *mos* has the basic meaning of expressing shared knowledge. According to Roberge (2002: 399), "*mos* ('after all, when it's all said and done, this is something you should know, you must admit, as everyone knows')" indicates that the proposition expressed has some "familiar truth". In short, the use of *mos* suggests that the information is common or should be known, and the item is used in colloquial South African English as well as in both standard and non-standard varieties of Afrikaans. *Mos* is thought to be derived from the Dutch *immers* ("indeed, at least, yet, in any event, after all"; cf. Deumert 2004: 31), or from the colloquial variant *ommers* (Roberge 2002: 339). *Mos* and *ommers* have similar semantic and phonetic properties and both forms are used to "qualify a proposition that speakers consider common knowledge and thus beyond challenge or contradiction by their interlocutors" (Roberge 2002: 405).

1.3 Rationale for the study

The research presented here forms part of a larger research project which aims at mapping the rural dialects of Cape Afrikaans, a non-standard form of Afrikaans, spoken in South Africa (cf. section 4.1). The present study focuses only on the variety/varieties spoken in the Western Cape, and considers only one particular linguistic item, namely *mos*, which is prevalent in, but not exclusive to, these varieties. The study aims to contribute to the steadily growing body of research on Afrikaans, and specifically to the field of sociolinguistics and language variation in South Africa.

1.4 Research hypotheses

The main research hypotheses underlying the present study are as follows:

- (i) *mos* functions as a DM which conveys shared knowledge: *mos* conveys a particular attitude towards an utterance, or proposition, which suggests to the hearer that the information presented should be known or is general knowledge;
- (ii) *mos* can be distinguished from the syntactic category of adverb to which it is ascribed: *mos* is believed to have been derived from the adverb *immers*, but *mos* most likely has functions which are distinct from *immers*, and *mos* probably lacks function(s) which would classify it as an adverb;
- (iii) *mos* has a number of pragmatic functions: apart from conveying general knowledge, *mos* seems to convey particular interpretations for utterances in which it occurs (or their proposition) and it aids in the coherence of discourse;

In terms of assumption (i), *mos* often seems to occur in utterances which appeal to shared knowledge by the hearer and speaker. As stated by researchers, such as Roberge (2002), Deumert (2004), Conradie (1995), and Ponelis (1985), *mos* functions to indicate information in utterances in which it appears as knowledge that is believed to be shared by both speaker and hearer; and it highlights information as general or common knowledge that should be known. In terms of assumption (ii), *mos* seems to follow the syntactic patterning of adverbs and, as stated above, is regarded as an adverb by researchers such as Ponelis (1985), and is thought to be derived from the adverb *immers* (cf. Roberge 2002; Deumert 2004, and Conradie 1995). According to Fraser (1999: 946), DMs follow the syntactic patterning of the syntactic category from which they are derived. However, the functions that the word performs as adverb and as DM are dependent on their position in the sentence, i.e. their syntactic distribution. Where words (including adverbs) have meaning which they contribute or add to the interpretation of the utterance; however, the meaning of *mos* is difficult, and often problematic, to define. Rather than contributing any additional meaning to the utterance, *mos* seems to be contributing an interpretation for the utterance and could thus be seen as having procedural meaning (Fraser 1999: 945). Providing procedural meaning is one of the properties of DMs and is a starting point (although not the only basis) for the consideration of *mos* as a DM. With an analysis of the data, the relationship between the syntactic position and function of *mos* (as adverb or DM) may be identified.

In terms of assumption (iii), *mos* seems to function in information management (cf. Fischer 2000: 105), indicating that the current utterance continues (logically) from a previous topic. The functions of *mos* may be identified by considering the context in which it is used, by looking at the entire discourse, and by observing how *mos* relates an utterance to one which occurs either adjacently or in a previous discourse/topic. The functions presented above are tentative for *mos*, and are some of the functions which are related to DMs.

The research reported in the following chapters is based on the four above assumptions, showing how the occurrence of *mos* in the particular variety relates to the definition of DMs, functional criteria for and properties of DMs, and properties and functions of adverbs. The analysis aims to provide a characterisation of *mos* as an adverb and as a DM, to set out the pragmatic functions of *mos* as a DM, and to investigate the prevalence of *mos* in different age and gender groups.

1.5 Research questions

The research questions (A) to (B) below will be addressed by the descriptive analysis of *mos* presented in chapter 5 (sections 5.1., 5.2.) and chapter 6. *Mos* will be analysed in terms of (i) its syntactic distribution, and (ii) its pragmatic function(s).

(A) What are the pragmatic functions and syntactic characteristics of *mos* in the data set?

As stated above, *mos* is regarded as an adjunct by Ponelis (1985). If this is so, then *mos* should have a number of particular characteristics, as set out by Fraser (1999) and Ponelis (1977; 1985) among others (cf. sections 2.3 and 2.5), which it shares with the lexical category of adverb (cf. section 2.5).

(B) What are the syntactic properties and pragmatic functions of *mos* in Cape Afrikaans that would establish it as a discourse marker?

What would distinguish *mos* from the syntactic category of adverb are its pragmatic functions. The use of *mos* in the present data set for a range of functions, such as expressing information as shared knowledge, relating prior utterances or events to a current topic, and strengthening or weakening a statement or question in terms of speaker attitude or commitment (cf. section 2.3), is discussed in section 5.2. The appearance of *mos* in utterances cannot be considered superfluous on account of

the mere fact that it is used in discourse; i.e. its appearance in discourse is not redundant or unnecessary and functions are anticipated in the employment of (a) DM(s) such as *mos*.

1.6 Structure of the thesis

An overview of the relevant literature is given in chapter 2, offering (i) a discussion of the place of DMs in the field of sociolinguistics (cf. section 2.1), (ii) a definition of DMs (cf. section 2.2), (iii) a discussion of their properties and functions (cf. section 2.3), (iv) an exposition of the types of DMs (cf. section 2.4), and (v) a discussion of the pragmatic and grammatical aspects of adverbs (cf. sections 2.5).

Chapter 3 offers an overview of the literature regarding language variation in general and also variation in Afrikaans in particular. A discussion of the etymology and the syntactic and semantic properties of *mos*, based on those offered by Conradie (1995) and Roberge (2002), is also presented in this chapter.

The empirical research methodology followed in the study is presented in chapter 4. Details with regard to data gathering procedures, the informants, and considerations for the analysis of the data are presented here.

Chapter 5 presents the analysis of the data in three sections. First, the analysis in terms of grammatical aspects is presented (cf. section 5.1), followed by the analysis in terms of pragmatic aspects (cf. section 5.2).

Chapter 6 concludes the thesis with a discussion of the findings, as well as of some limitations of the study and some indications for further research.

CHAPTER 2 –DISCOURSE MARKERS

2.1 Discourse markers within the field of sociolinguistics

The place of research on discourse within the field of sociolinguistics is reflected by Schiffrin's (1987, 2001) work, in which she investigated DMs in order to account for their distribution in spoken discourse, with a focus on the language (i.e. the form and meaning of the DM) and the social interaction. Schiffrin (1987) views discourse as a process of social interaction, and has studied discourse using quantitative and qualitative methods to account for the use and distribution of particular forms in discourse. In investigating the distribution of DMs, Schiffrin (1987, 2001) examines where DMs occur in the syntactic structure of an utterance, and the reason for their occurrence at that particular position in spoken discourse. In looking at this, she considers the form and meaning of the item and the social interaction. "The concept of language as social practice ... recognizes that meaning does not reside in language, but in concrete forms of differing social and institutional practices, in the differing discourses" (Marmaridou 2000: 34).

A number of studies have focused on social factors in the use of particular DMs in various populations. Macaulay (2002), for example, presents a quantitative and qualitative study on gender, social class, and age differences in the use of *you know* as a DM in interview data recorded in Glasgow and Ayr, Scotland. The results of this investigation indicated that there was no significant difference in the use of *you know* as a DM across social classes, but that age, gender, and the recording context were stronger determinants for its use (Macaulay 2002: 754). Similarly, Müller (2005: 40) reports on non-linguistic factors which may be influential in the use and social distribution of DMs, such as gender, age, ethnicity, relationships between and roles of discourse partners (e.g., interviewer and interviewee), and situational context. In her analysis of *you know*, Müller (2005: 191) did not find any significant difference in the frequency of *you know* between the gender of both native (English American) and non-native (specifically, German) English speakers, and the same results showed for same- and opposite-gender partners. Müller's research did not distinguish between various social classes or ethnicities with regard to the use or frequency of the DM; however, Müller (2005: 42) acknowledges that certain DMs are associated with certain social classes/groups. According to Müller (2005: 43), associating a discourse marker with a particular ethnic group implies that the discourse marker is only used by that particular group and not others. In investigating the influence of age on the use of *you know* the results showed that the native speaker groups used *you know* for all functions with the same frequency, while the German group

showed a difference "for the medium age vs. the older group for *you know* as a marker of lexical content search" (Müller 2005: 192).

2.2 Definition of discourse markers

The term used for the class of words which function in the manner described in this section depends on the perspective from which DMs are studied (Fischer 2000: 13). DMs have been studied in various subfields of linguistics, including syntax (Fraser 1999), pragmatics (Fraser 1993, 1999), discourse analysis (Schiffrin 1987, 2001), and sociolinguistics (Müller 2005; cf. also Macaulay 2002). Thus, one finds various terms in the literature, including "discourse particle", "pragmatic marker", "segmentation marker", "modal particle", etc. Note, however, that Fischer (2000: 277) distinguishes between discourse particles and modal particles³.

In defining DMs, linguists have considered a variety of their properties, including syntactic, pragmatic and semantic properties. Schiffrin (1987, 2001), for example, considers the syntactic categories and distribution of DMs, while Fraser (1993, 1999) analyses DMs in terms of their pragmatic and semantic features/characteristics. In the literature, there appears to be little agreement on the definition of DMs. Depending on the definition given of DMs, and the method by which they are analysed, the perspective on DMs may vary (Schiffrin 2001: 55). Different linguists have proposed different criteria in defining DMs; however, a lack of conformity with any one of the criteria does not necessarily exclude an item as a DM. The criteria mentioned by a particular researcher typically constitute his/her description of the group of linguistic items considered to function as DMs (Müller 2005: 4). As stated by Fraser (1999), it is difficult to place DMs in a particular word class. Grote and Stede (1998) provide a definition of DMs in which the criterion of function is central:

[D]iscourse markers should be described by a dedicated lexicon that provides a classification of their syntactic, semantic and pragmatic features and characterizes the relationships between similar markers. This will be a lexicon whose main grouping criterion is *function* rather than grammatical category; not surprisingly, this is motivated by the

³ According to Fischer (2000: 268), "modal particles ... refer to the pragmatic pretext, i.e. a proposition which is not explicitly mentioned but which is 'at hand' because it is presupposed to be generally available background knowledge; it makes up common ground for the speakers", while the term "discourse particle" is used as an umbrella term for those items that mark an utterance as non-initial; these items are "a homogenous class with a single pragmatic function, distinguishable by their semantic content and by the types of objects to which their indexical elements refer (Fischer 2000: 15).

production perspective, where the parameters governing the generation decisions play the central role.

(Grote and Stede 1998)

The focus of many studies on DMs, such as *oh*, *well*, *y'know*, and *but*, pertains to the definition of DMs (cf. Schiffrin 1987, 2001; cf. also Fraser 1999). However, as pointed out above, researchers do not agree on all the criteria that would exclude, or include, a particular word or phrase as a DM. Indeed, it is exceptional for a particular word or phrase to fulfil all the criteria set out by various researchers in defining DMs. Schiffrin (1987: 327) presents a delimitation of the elements of language which can be used as markers, and includes particles like *oh*, *well*; conjunctions like *and*, *but*, *or*, *so*, *because*; time deictics like *now*, *then*; and lexicalised clauses like *y'know*, and *I mean*. These DMs are illustrated in examples (2) - (9) below.

- (2) S: She transferred from Santa Monica as well. Yeah, uh **you know** she's getting thousands of thousands of pages of reading

(Hellerman & Vergun 2007: 160)

In (2) *you know* is used by S to emphasise the relevance of the subsequent discourse.

- (3) Geri: Howyih doing?
Shirley: Okay how'r you?
Geri: **Oh** alright,
(S): (.hhhhhh)
Shirley: Uhm yer mother met Michael las'night.

(Bolden 2006: 667)

In (3) *oh* is used by Geri to suggest that there is information which she wishes to convey.

- (4) Shirley: .hmhhhh. t.hhhhhh But **so** how'r you?
Geri: .t.hhh I'm okay?
Shirley: What's new?
Geri: Well? .t lemme see las' night, I had the girls over
Shirley: Yeah?

(Bolden 2006: 667)

So as employed by Shirley in (4) marks a shift in the focus of the discourse from Shirley to Geri. *So* marks the shift as something which Shirley had wanted to ask or do for some time during the conversation.

- (5) A: O.K, let's go. B: **But**, I can't find my shoes.
(I assume you are ready)

(Fraser & Malamud-Makowski 1996: 866)

But in (5) indicates that the utterance in which it occurs should be interpreted as a contradiction of the proposition expressed in the prior utterance.

- (6) Debby: Do you ever go down in the winter?
Zelda: No. **Well** we go down but our house is closed.

(Schiffrin 1987: 109)

One of the functions of *well*, as in (6) above, is to repair the negation provided in answer to the previous question.

- (7) We lived there for two weeks without water, or gas.
We had electricity.
And it was wonderful that we could wake up in the morning,
and play the radio, and do what we want.
Because this landlord–landlady was terrible!
And then we lived there for five years,
[continues]

(Schiffrin 1987: 195)

In (7) an explanation as to why their previous place was such a disappointment occurs subordinately to the story and is prefaced by *because*, with *and* continuing the interrupted story.

- (8) It's nice there.
Now our street isn't that nice.

(Schiffrin 1987: 231)

In example (8) *now* presents a comparison between two locations, rather than making a temporal comparison, and is considered to function as a DM.

- (9) Debby: How many people are in the team?
 Irene: Four
 Debby: So it's just t– the two of [you: and...the t–yeh.]
 Irene: [The two couples, yeh.]
 And **then** the kids have their own team.

(Schiffrin 1987: 253)

Then in example (9) lists the two subtopics (*the two couples* and *the kids*) in order.

According to Schiffrin (2001: 57), "DMs can be considered as a set of linguistic expressions comprised of members of word classes as varied as conjunctions ..., interjections ..., adverbs ..., and lexicalised phrases ...". The linguistic items (or units) used as DMs are syntactically diverse as they are drawn from the various syntactic categories of adverbs, conjunctions, etc. However, the form (i.e., the word or phrase) may differ in its use and function as, for example, an adverb. Schiffrin (1987) views discourse as a process of social interaction and studies discourse using quantitative and qualitative methods to account for the use and distribution of forms in discourse. She operationally defines DMs as "sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk" (Schiffrin 1987: 31). DMs are independent of sentential structure, and they are syntactically detachable from the sentence without detracting from the interpretation or meaning of the utterance, or causing any ungrammaticality or unintelligibility. Thus, DMs have no dependence on, or relationship with, the syntactic structure of the utterance in which they occur (Schiffrin 1987: 32; cf. also Müller 2005: 5). DMs also have the property of sequential dependence. This is shown by co-occurrence and combinations of linguistic elements which could not occur together where such elements are not viewed as part of discourse (Schiffrin 1987: 37). In other words, elements from different categories of words are found to modify each other, where such modification or conjunction may only occur with elements from the same category of words, e.g. adverbs can modify, or be linked with, other adverbs, but not with a noun. Co-occurrence between a marker and a sentence-internal element is permissible if one considers DMs to have the property of sequential dependence (Schiffrin 1987: 38). "Sequential dependence" is the term used by Schiffrin (1987: 37) to indicate that DMs work on a discourse level; "they are not dependent on the smaller units of talk of which discourse is composed". Sequential dependence is a property of other linguistic items (or units) as well and cannot be taken as a defining criterion for DMs, as this would erroneously classify the other items as DMs (Schiffrin 1987: 247). Moreover, linguistic elements with contradicting meanings (or propositions) cannot co-occur, yet DMs such as *now*, which indicates the reference time of propositions as at the time of speaking, are found to occur with past tense forms of verbs, such as *was* which is the past tense form of *to be* (indicating a prior reference time).

Both Fraser (1999) and Schiffrin (1987) have proposed the property of grammatical optionality for DMs – this distinguishes the DM from its homonym (which does not function as a DM). The distinction is clear from the examples in (10) and (11).

(10) Jack **and** Mary rode horses.

(11) Jack played tennis. **And** Mary read a book.

(Fraser 1999: 939)

The *and* in (10) and (11) functions as a conjunction and a DM, respectively. *And* in (10) connects the elliptical sentences, *Jack rode horses* and *Mary rode horses*, while *and* in (11) relates two distinct propositions, i.e., *Jack played tennis* and *Mary read a book*. Furthermore, the *and* in (11) may be removed without affecting the grammatical structure of the utterance, while removing *and* from (10) would require a predicate to be added to the subject (*Jack*) in order to maintain grammaticality (cf. section 2.3 for a brief discussion of optionality).

Fraser (1999) considers DMs from the perspective of pragmatics. In defining DMs, Fraser (1999: 938) asks a number of questions: "(W)hat do DMs relate? What are not DMs? What is the grammatical status of DMs? What are the main classes of DMs?" Briefly, according to Fraser (1999), DMs relate two segments of discourse; the DM forms part of a segment (S2) which has some relationship with the preceding discourse segment (S1). DMs also pertain to arguments presented by the speaker in the discourse. The DM introduces an argument which relates to another argument in a prior section of the discourse. By employing a DM the speaker holds a position with regard to an argument, which would be the main part of his or her argument. According to Schiffrin (1987: 50), the position is "a general statement toward whose truth a speaker is committed". Following the position is the support which substantiates or verifies the truth of the statement. Schiffrin (1987: 50) states that there are certain DMs which serve in the formation of an argument. Furthermore, the DM does not necessarily only relate discourse segments adjacent to it, or those immediately preceding the DM. DMs may also relate several segments which occur before the DM. Furthermore, the DM does not always introduce S2, i.e., it need not appear sentence initially; one may find DMs in sentence medial or final position (Fraser 1999: 938).

The above features make DMs interesting to observe with regard to their syntactic distribution. As discussed in section 2.1, Müller's (2005: 40) research included quantitative analyses of non-linguistic factors which may have influenced the frequency of use and social distribution of DMs. In

defining DMs within the context of such studies, it is often their syntactic position, and their syntactic independence in relation to the sentence structure, that is observed (cf. Muller 2005; Schiffrin 1987). Fraser (1999: 946) suggests that DMs "be considered as a pragmatic class, so defined because they contribute to the interpretation of an utterance rather than its propositional content".

Schiffrin's (1987) definition of DMs is formulated by Kyratzis and Ervin-Tripp (1999: 1321) as "linguistic elements that signal relations between units of talk, relations at the exchange, action, ideational, and participation framework levels of the discourse". Discourse has underlying meaning and structure and is regarded as a system with a number of related components (exchange, action, idea structure, information state, and a participation framework). Coherent discourse is the result of the proper combination of these components. DMs are seen to function within these components (or levels) of discourse, and produce coherence within discourse (Schiffrin 1987: 313). DMs may be used in several different positions in discourse simultaneously, which may reduce the degree to which markers are interchangeable. "It is this multifunctionality on different planes of discourse that helps to integrate the many different simultaneous processes underlying the construction of discourse, and thus helps to create coherence" (Schiffrin 2001: 58).

Schiffrin (1987: 31) proposes an operational definition of DMs, defining DMs as "sequentially dependent elements which bracket units of talk". Units of talk can be distinguished on the basis of their structural relations with other units, cohesive relations, and interactional relations. Schiffrin (1987: 31) deliberately defines DMs in relation to units of talk rather than units such as sentence, proposition, speech act (realised as declaratives, interrogatives, and imperatives), or tone unit. Focusing on this broader notion avoids restriction in the analysis of DMs (Schiffrin 1987: 31, 35). DMs are linguistic items/units which have a cataphoric and anaphoric character; thus, DMs may refer to some proposition preceding it, or following it (Schiffrin 1987: 37). Schiffrin (1987: 32) discounts the property of propositional modifiers for DMs; "markers not only have referential uses, but such use is sensitive to units of talk which are not definable in propositional terms".

The DM functions at local and global levels of discourse; DMs function between adjacent utterances and across wider structures of discourse (Schiffrin 2001: 57). The functions of DMs are not necessarily sufficient in defining DMs, or subclasses of DMs, because non-verbal cues, modal particles, and even punctuation markers seem to have similar functions. Therefore, a definition of DMs cannot be based solely on the functional properties observed with regard to DMs (Fischer 2000: 22) (cf. section 2.3.2 on the pragmatic aspects of DMs). "Regarding the subclasses of

discourse particles, it has furthermore been shown that they are functionally very similar [to other word classes, such as modal particles, or adverbials – WCJ], and that thus functional criteria do not serve as distinguishing criteria" (Fischer 2000: 23). DMs function on various planes of discourse. A brief exposition of Schiffrin's discourse planes is presented below.

2.2.1 Schiffrin's discourse planes

Schiffrin (1987) presents a discourse model with five planes of talk on which discourse markers function: exchange structure, action structure, ideational structure, participation framework, and information state. The five planes are distinguished between those that involve non-linguistic units (exchange structure and action structure) and linguistic units (idea structure, participation framework, and information state). The model "focuses on local coherence, i.e. coherence that is constructed through relations between adjacent units in discourse, but it can be expanded to take into account more global dimensions of coherence" (Schiffrin 1987: 24), and it serves as a framework for the definition and analysis of discourse markers.

2.2.1.1 *Exchange structure*

The units of talk in an exchange structure are the sequentially defined units known as turns, as well as adjacency-pair parts, i.e., questions and answers. The exchange structure is "the outcome of the decision procedures by which speakers alternate sequential roles and define those alternations in relation to each other" (Schiffrin 1987: 24). Exchange structure is realised only in dialogue and it is essential in fulfilling the system constraints of talk.

2.2.1.2 *Action structure*

Speech acts are situated; in other words, it is clear what action precedes, what action is intended, what action is intended to follow, and what action actually does follow. "Actions occur in constrained linear sequences – they are not randomly ordered, there is a pattern and predictability to their occurrences – and they are interpreted as situated" (Schiffrin 1987: 25). Action structures act in fulfilling ritual constraints, which are "concerned with the interpersonal requirements of talk: the management of oneself and others so as not to violate appropriate standards regarding either ones own demeanour or defence for another..." (Schiffrin 1987: 25). Action structures are realised in both dialogue and monologue.

2.2.1.3 Ideational structure

Units in this structure are semantic in nature: they are propositions, or ideas. Cohesive relations, topic relations, and functional relations all contribute to the configuration of idea structures. "Cohesive ties are established when interpretation of an element in one clause presupposes information from a prior clause ... because of the semantic relationships underlying the text" (Schiffrin 1987: 26). The idea structure also deals with the organisation of topics and subtopics (what is being talked about). The functional relations between ideas form part of an idea structure; it pertains to the role which ideas play in relation to one another, and within the overall text. Idea structures are also found in both dialogue (question and answer pairs) and monologue (narratives, descriptions, and explanations) (Schiffrin 1987: 26).

2.2.1.4 Participation framework

Schiffrin (1987: 27) defines participation framework as "the different ways in which speaker and hearer can relate to one another". The ways in which the speaker and hearer can be related to their utterances – to their propositions, acts, and turns – is another part of the participation framework, and these relationships in turn influence the ways in which speaker and hearer relate to each other.

2.2.1.5 Information state

At the information state, knowledge and meta-knowledge (i.e. knowledge which the speaker and hearer have about each other's knowledge) are organised and managed as the conversation or discourse progresses (cf. Fraser 1999: 934).

2.3 Properties of discourse markers

According to Cameron (2001: 114), "we have to assume that even the smallest details of talk are functional and potentially meaningful: if something is 'there' in people's talk, then it must be there for some purpose." Therefore, the appearance of a DM has (a) function(s) in the utterance (or text) regardless of its property of optionality; the DM is neither redundant nor unnecessary. The particular function that a word might have in a sentence, i.e. as an adverb or DM, is dependent on the syntactic environment in which the word occurs. The syntactic environment for a DM is different to the environment in which it functions as a word from a conventional syntactic category, such as adverb or conjunction. Thus, the environments for the different functions of, for example,

adverbs on the one hand, and adverbs that function as DMs on the other, are in complementary distribution (Fraser 1999: 944).

Many [DMs – WCJ] are ambiguous due to homophony with a lexical item representing a traditional part of speech, though their functions as [DMs – WCJ] do not follow from the sense of the homophonous lexical item in any linear way.

(Norrick 2001: 850)

Linguists are generally careful to characterise DMs with criteria that might define them as items separate from any other syntactic category, such as adverb or conjunction. Functions of DMs are, in some cases, similar to those of adverbs, conjunctions, etc., but it is their distribution which differentiates them from adverbs and conjunctions, from which DMs are often derived. Recall in this regard Schiffrin's (1987) proposition of the property of grammatical optionality for DMs, which distinguishes the DM from its homonym which does not function as a DM (cf. also Fraser 1999).

Fischer (2000) analyses DMs in their original context, which allows her to account for the various functions of the DM (such as flow of information, or management of speech) as well as the varying meanings of DMs. "Regarding the subclasses of discourse [markers – WCJ], it has furthermore been shown that they are functionally very similar and thus functional criteria do not serve as distinguishing criteria" (Fischer 2000: 23). The following subsections offer an exposition of the syntactic and pragmatic aspects of DMs.

2.3.1 Syntactic aspects of discourse markers

DMs often occur in sentence initial position, but they may also occur in sentence medial or final position as they are independent of sentential structure. DMs are often found at the beginning of a discourse unit. They furthermore typically occur between clauses, but they may also be found within the boundaries of the clause. With regard to the syntactic independence of DMs, they are not bound to the sentence structure of the discourse in which they occur (Müller 2005: 5). Some DMs can occur in positions which defy justification with regard to syntactic structure. The sentence will retain its grammaticality and the propositional content of the segments even if the DM is removed (Schiffrin 1987: 32; Müller 2005: 5; Fraser 1999: 938, 944). The utterance initial or final position may have specialised uses, and DMs may be preceded by other DMs (Schiffrin 1987: 241). The DM is not syntactically integrated into the sentence in such a way that it cannot be removed without affecting the grammatical structure of the sentence (Fraser 1999: 933). The definition of DMs is not

based on the sentence, which would imply dependence on, and relationship with, syntactic structure which is not evident (Schiffrin 1987: 32). As markers which relate two, or more, segments with propositional content, DMs hold no apparent grammatical relationship to other elements in the sentence; yet they belong to a grammatical category since they form part of the sentence structure, however loosely. DMs may not be modified morphologically with, or by, inflections or affixes. Thus, DMs form part of the closed class of words (or lexical items), i.e. they are function words. However, interjections which function as DMs belong to an open class category and can be modified or combined to form phrases such as *good heavens*, or formulaic phrases such as *I tell you* (Norrick 2009: 887)⁴.

Fraser (1999) presents a grammatical(-pragmatic) view of DMs, and considers the grammatical status of DMs. He concludes that DMs are drawn from a number of syntactic categories (or classes), such as conjunctions, adverbs, and prepositions, and that they retain the syntactic properties of the relevant class with which they are associated (Fraser 1999: 946). Because DMs have the properties of the syntactic class from which they are derived, they follow a similar syntactic patterning to their derivational (or syntactic) counterpart. However, on account of their varying syntactic patterning across different DMs, placing them into a single class (of their own) is problematic (Fraser 1999: 944). The grammatical function that a word might have in a sentence, i.e. as an adverb or DM, is dependent on the syntactic environment in which the word occurs. Thus, the environments for the different functions of a particular word (or phrase) are in complementary distribution. In characterising (a) DM(s), the syntactic pattern of the particular DM must be observed (Fraser 1999: 944). Compare the examples (12) and (13) below.

(12) Lily is tall, **but** Jerry is short.

(13) Harry left late for the party. **But** he got there on time.
(He would not arrive on time.)

(Fraser & Malamud-Makowski 1996: 866)

In (12) *but* indicates a relation of contrast between the two segments, which is one function of *but* as a conjunction. In (13) *but* functions as a DM which signals that the utterance prefaced by *but* should be interpreted as a contrast of the proposition expressed in the prior utterance (the implication of the first sentence is placed in brackets below the utterances). In other words, the interpretation for the proposition of the utterance in which *but* appears is that Harry arrived on time,

⁴ Note, however, that Norrick (2009) studied pragmatic markers, which he distinguishes from DMs.

which contrasts with the proposition expressed in the prior statement which suggests that he would not arrive on time.

2.3.2 Pragmatic aspects of discourse markers

According to Müller (2005: 6) "researchers also claim that markers do not add to the informational or propositional content of the utterance which contains the marker" and "using non-propositionality as a defining criterion for DM presupposes a clear definition and delimitation of propositional meaning of sentences or utterances". According to Grote and Stede (1998: 131), DMs may take on a range of semantic and pragmatic "overtones", and, thus, the use of a particular DM is "meaning-driven" and not determined with grammatical structure in mind. DMs usually have more than one function (i.e., they have the property of multifunctionality), or at least have sub-functions (Müller 2005: 8). DMs appear to facilitate the interpretation of utterances, i.e., the various interpretations an utterance might have are focused or constrained to achieve a single interpretation, or at least to guide the hearer to a preferred interpretation (cf. Schwenter 1996: 861; cf. also Fraser 1999: 936). DMs therefore have to be separated from other function words within the sentence in which they occur; they are syntactically separate from the clause in which they occur and have pragmatic functions within the discourse (Fraser 1999: 933). Furthermore, DMs are optional; therefore, any utterance which contains the DM may occur without that marker. The grammatical structure of the sentence is retained and its proposition still maintained regardless of the presence or absence of the DM. DMs "are also widely claimed to be optional in the further sense that they do not enlarge the possibilities for semantic relationship between the elements they associate" (Schourup 1999: 231), and any interpretation for the proposition which was made explicit by the DM is still available, although it is less clear.

Schiffrin (1987: 63) asks "how does context interact with meaning to produce the total communicative force of an expression?", and thus works within the field of pragmatics, regarding DMs as contextual coordinates which create coherence in discourse. Fraser (1999: 936) focuses on DMs as linguistic expressions which have a core meaning which can be developed or expanded by the context, and which signal the relationship that the speaker intends between the utterance introduced by the discourse marker and a preceding utterance. Blakemore (in Fraser 1999: 936) proposes that DMs "do not have a representational meaning the way lexical expressions like *boy* and *hypothesis* do, but have only a procedural meaning, which consists of instructions about how to manipulate the conceptual representation of the utterance". So, the segment which is introduced by the DM (or the segment in which the DM appears) is offered an interpretation by the expression

which has this procedural meaning (Fraser 1999: 944). Furthermore, according to Fischer (2000: 16), the meaning of the proposition seems to come from context rather than the particular DM used⁵.

Fischer (2000: 105) mentions a number of pragmatic functions of DMs, including that of information management. Such information management may, for example, involve segmenting utterances, or "indicating that the current utterance continues on the previous topic". A further function mentioned by Fischer is that of flow of information, i.e. "whether the perception and understanding are displayed, including the feature of interpersonal contact", etc.

The appropriate interpretation of the discourse segments depends on the particular DM used in order for the sequence of the segments to be considered coherent, and in determining coherence the speaker meaning has to be considered (Fraser 1999: 941). According to Fraser (1999: 942), a DM "imposes on S2 a certain range of interpretations, given the interpretation(s) of S1 and the meaning of the [DM – WCJ]". According to Fraser (1999: 944), "the meaning of a [DM – WCJ] is procedural not conceptual". A procedural expression identifies how the segment which it introduces is to be interpreted in relation to the preceding segment, as in (14).

(14) John is fat. **In contrast**, Jim is thin.

(Fraser 1999: 945)

The DM in (14), *in contrast*, indicates a difference between the referents in the two segments. The people referred to in the segments are in a relation of contrast with regard to weight. Therefore, each DM has its own core meaning (Fraser 1999: 945). Fraser (1993: 3) regards DMs as commentary markers. Commentary markers occur optionally within the utterance, but they signal an entire message separate from the propositional content of the utterance, and merely provide a comment on this propositional content. Thus, DMs may be said to have a "core meaning" which steers the hearer to an interpretation of the proposition presented in the segments where the DM occurs, or serves to comment on the proposition. However, assigning a core meaning to a DM is problematic, as the same marker may occur in multiple positions (or levels) with varying functions and meanings in these different spots (Romero-Trillo 2006) (cf. section 2.3.4).

⁵ Fischer (2000: 16) and Fraser (1999: 242) seem to differ with regard to the meaning of the proposition and discourse marker. But not necessarily. Fraser states that the DM offers an interpretation for the particular proposition (i.e. the DM does not contribute any propositional meaning, only procedural), while Fischer goes on to say that the meaning of the utterance/proposition seems to come from context rather than the DM. This latter consideration is consistent with the former.

If one considers the indexical functions, discourse planes (cf. section 2.2.1), and linguistic properties of DMs then there are no functional equivalents observed between DMs. Thus, although markers are used in the same discourse slots, they perform different functions in those slots (Schiffrin 1987: 326). Each DM has specific syntagmatic functions within the structure of the particular sequence in which the DM occurs. It is suggested that markers only have one indexical function. "It is because discourse is multiply structured, and its various components integrated with each other, that multiple relations hold between utterances – not because markers themselves realise a different function ... with each occasion of use" (Schiffrin 1987: 325).

2.3.3 Semantic aspects of discourse markers

Semantic features of DMs primarily constitute the semantic relations which may be established by a DM in relation to other items within the utterance (e.g., a causal or temporal link) (cf. Grote and Stede 1998). Furthermore, Fischer (2000: 223) states that the meaning and function of DMs are dependent on context, and context is an important consideration in the analysis of DMs which cannot be observed in isolation; therefore, taking the previous utterance and the utterance in which the DM appears into account would give an explanation for their apparent "dependence on structural context" and their "reference to aspects of the discourse situation". When considering semantic relations in analysing DMs, they have to be analysed in their natural contexts. The aims of the speaker also play a role in the analysis (Fischer 2000: 219). Fischer (2000: 219) aims to analyse the semantic meaning of discourse particles and presents a feature-based approach which may bring a distinction to the traditional categories interjection, hesitation, and segmentation marker. The semantic aspects of *mos* are not considered in the present study; however, this section is included in order to provide a complete exposition of the linguistic aspects of DMs.

2.3.4 Discourse markers and meaning relations

The discourse slot in which the DM appears influences the interpretation of the utterance where the marker occurs. Discourse markers do not contribute to the propositional content (or meaning) of utterances, but they may offer a proposition which influences the interpretation of the utterance (constraints on the interpretational procedure) (Müller 2005: 6). The DM gives an indication as to how the utterance is to be interpreted, and does not itself convey any meaning itself in the discourse, but guides the hearer to an interpretation for the proposition of an utterance. DMs indicate how the speaker intends the proposition (or basic meaning) to be interpreted with the previous discourse in

mind (or relating to a prior discourse) (Norrick 2001: 850). Schiffrin (1987: 318) suggests that markers "select a meaning relation from whatever potential meanings are provided through the content of talk, and then display that relation". The relationship between utterance and context, i.e., that between implicit and potential meaning, is constrained by the appearance of a DM; thus the marker functions in presenting this relationship (Schiffrin 1987: 319; Fischer 2000: 16; cf. also Fraser 1999: 942). Consider example (15) below.

(Fraser 1993: 7)

"Many DMs are used in ways which reflect their meanings." (Schiffrin 1987: 317) Because the core meaning of a DM does not change, as does its position in discourse (i.e., the discourse slot in which it appears), it is suggested that markers themselves do not convey social and/or expressive meanings (Schiffrin 1987: 318). "[D]iscourse markers ... have ... 'expressive functions', [which are – WCJ] subjective (e.g., evoking the hearer's attention, expressing common knowledge, denoting 'negative' or 'positive' politeness)" (Brinton 2001: 139). The marker *y'know*, for example, may have expressive meaning, which may include some component of referential meaning (Schiffrin 1987: 63), as in (16).

(16) Like the... **y'know** what Hasidic is?

(Schiffrin 1987: 269)

In (16), the DM *y'know* appeals to the hearer for acknowledgement or receipt of information. Schiffrin (1987: 63) states that "referential meaning may influence discourse function by contributing to expressive and/or social meaning".

2.3.6 Social relationships

DMs are used as markers of social relationships between interlocutors in a speech event (Andersen, Brizuela, DuPuy, and Gonnerman 1999: 1340). DMs function to (i) indicate a speaker's intention to change the topic of discourse, (ii) indicate comparability between the current utterance and previous discourse, (iii) bring the hearer away from the current focus of the discourse, (iv) indicate a difference between the current utterance and information presented in the preceding utterance, and (v) indicate a resultant relationship between the present utterance and the previous context (Fraser 1993: 4). DMs reflect the relative status of speaker and addressee, as well as their level of familiarity/intimacy and the topic and setting of the discourse (Norrick 2001). An illustration of (i) is presented in example (17) with the use of the DM *incidentally*.

(17) Archimedes worried about this problem and one day in his bath realized the answer. **Incidentally**, the account of how it all happened has to be wrong.

(Fraser 2009: 893)

2.3.7 Discourse markers and discourse structure

There are two frameworks within which the function of DMs have been studied, namely Coherence Theory and Relevance Theory (cf. Blakemore 2002 & Blass 1990). The former focuses on textual functions, while the latter focuses on cognitive processes (Müller 2005: 8). Coherence and relevance in discourse are briefly discussed below.

DMs support the construction of discourse structure, to provide an orientation concerning the content and the structure of the conversation, and to provide help in the formulation process. DMs serve to take, hold, and yield or support a turn with regard to signal-based-turn-exchange (Fischer 2000: 21). According to Fischer (2000: 20), Blakemore analysed discourse particles within the framework of relevance⁶ theory and found discourse particles to establish coherence between utterances. DMs as contextual coordinates add to coherence (Schiffrin 1987: 330). With regard to relevance, the expressions used as DMs are used to indicate how the relevance of one discourse is dependent on another: they are expressions which "impose constraints on relevance in virtue of the inferential connections they express." (Fraser 1993: 3) Discourse markers as contextual coordinates are discussed in further detail below.

2.3.8 Discourse markers as contextual coordinates

There is a deictic dimension to the function of DMs: they provide contextual coordinates. As contextual coordinates, DMs add to coherence (Schiffrin 1987: 330); they serve "an integrative function in discourse, contributing to discourse coherence: they serve as a kind of *discourse glue*" (Fraser 1993: 1).

According to Schiffrin (1987: 326), markers are used in order to "index an utterance to the local contexts in which utterances are produced and in which they are to be interpreted". DMs index utterances to the participant coordinates of speaker and hearer, i.e. they index an utterance focused on the speaker (proximal), or the hearer (distal), or even both. With regard to the textual coordinates of talk which focus on prior versus upcoming text, DMs index the utterance in which they appear on the preceding text (proximal) or the upcoming text (distal), or both (Schiffrin 1987: 323).

"Discourse [markers]...display a certain mental content for purposes concerning the speaker-hearer relationship, for instance, to make the speaker's mental processes transparent for the hearer"

⁶ Relevance "is often seen as exclusively a property of utterances or a relation between an utterance and a text or discourse" (Blass 1990: 44). According to Blass (1990: 44), Sperber and Wilson a proposition is seen "as relevant...to a context: that is, a stock of propositions or assumptions derived not only from preceding discourse, but also from meaning, perception of the environment and inference",

(Fischer 2000: 21). DMs are seen as facilitating the hearer's understanding of the speaker's utterance (or may influence the hearer's interpretation of a particular discourse segment or utterance). "[D]iscourse markers, such as *well*, *so*, or *you know* have ... 'textual' functions in organizing discourse (e.g. marking topic or participant change, narrative segmentation, discourse analysis" (Brinton 2001: 139). A DM that functions as contextual coordinate is illustrated in example (18) below.

- (18) And she tried to get other jobs and she couldn't
 So what she did, she got a job as a uh bookkeeper in an office.

(Schiffrin 1987: 203)

In (18) it is clear that the job she got as a bookkeeper is a direct result of her inability to find any other jobs. *So* in the above example serves as a contextual coordinate by relating a prior cause to an upcoming result (cf. Schiffrin 1987: 324).

A property describing DMs which is not supported by many researchers is that of phonological reduction⁷ (Müller 2005: 5). Phonological reduction is not regarded as a definition (or defining criterion) for DMs. Another property which has been rejected as a defining property of DMs is orality (or the distinction between oral and written mediums) (Müller 2005: 6). "(O)rality...describes a frequent condition of the linguistic items many academics treat as discourse or pragmatic markers." (Müller 2005: 7) Due to the fact that most researchers focus on oral DMs, most studies on DMs are based on spoken data. It is therefore often assumed that DMs occur mainly in oral discourse.

2.4 Types of discourse markers

Fraser (1992; 1993) examines three types of DMs, namely (i) those signalling reference to the discourse topic (discourse topic markers); (ii) those signalling that current discourse activity relates to the foregoing discourse (discourse activity markers); and (iii) those signalling a relationship between the current message and some prior message (message relationship markers). Discourse topic markers indicate a different discourse topic, that which is being talked about at any given time by participants in a discourse, or they may indicate a reemphasis of a current topic (Fraser 1993: 10). This is illustrated in example (19) below.

⁷ The property of phonological reduction is mentioned by Schiffrin (1987) as one of the specific conditions that allow an expression to be used as a discourse marker. She states that DMs "have a range of prosodic contours, [for example – WCJ] tonic stress and ... phonological reduction" (Schiffrin 1987: 328).

- (19) This is a typical day in New England. Oh, **before I forget**, I'm going on vacation tomorrow.

(Fraser 2009: 893)

Discourse activity markers indicate the current discourse activity in relation to an aspect of the preceding discourse. This can be performed by DMs such as *to clarify* (in clarifications), *if I may explain* (in explanations), and *in summary* (in summarising) (Fraser 1993: 11). Message relationship markers are those DMs that indicate the relationship of the proposition being conveyed in the current utterance to a preceding utterance. One group of message relationship markers is parallel DMs, such as *also*, *by the way*, which indicate that the current message is parallel to what was stated before (in a previous utterance or discourse) (Fraser 1993: 11). Furthermore, Fraser (1999: 946) claims that there are two classes of DMs, namely those which relate messages and those which relate topics. The former group comprises DMs which relate a part of the propositional content expressed by the segments S2 and S1 (Fraser 1999: 946). This class of DMs is further divided into three subclasses, namely contrastive, elaborative, and inferential markers. Contrastive markers indicate that the interpretation for the segment which contains the DM contrasts with an interpretation of the other segment which typically precedes it, as in the case of the DM *in comparison* (Fraser 1999: 947). Elaborative markers suggest a parallel relationship between the segments S2 and S1, such as *furthermore*, which indicates that the following segment is to be interpreted as adding an item to a list of conditions which were specified by the preceding discourse (Fraser 1999: 948). These markers signal that the current utterance constitutes an elaboration of an earlier one (Fraser 1993: 13). Inferential markers indicate that the utterance in which the DM occurs is to be regarded as a conclusion which is based on the prior discourse, or a preceding utterance (Fraser 1999: 948). For example, the segment following *thus* is to be considered as expressing a conclusion justified by the content of a preceding utterance or segment (Fraser 1999: 948). They signal that the current utterance conveys a message which is, in some sense, consequential to some aspect of the previous discourse (Fraser 1993: 13). The second class of DMs involves an aspect of "discourse management". DMs which are included in this class, e.g. *before I forget*, *incidentally*, etc., function to present a new topic or return to a previous topic. The DM either marks a return to a previous topic or marks a deviation from the current topic (presented in the first segment) to a new topic (Fraser 1999: 949).

2.5 Properties and characteristics of the grammatical category ascribed to *mos*

This section deals with the grammatical aspects of the form *mos*, more specifically its lexical category and its syntactic properties. A lexical (or grammatical) category as defined by Radford (1997: 29) "is a class of expressions which share a common set of grammatical properties". As mentioned in Chapter 1, *mos* had commonly been ascribed to the category of adverbs. Hence, a first objective is to clarify the notion 'adverb'. An elementary definition of adverb, according to Radford (2009: 3), is that, semantically, adverbs "denote the manner in which an action is performed". This definition of adverbs is further elaborated below. It is important at the outset to determine which morphological and syntactic properties of adverbs are shared by *mos*. The general characteristics of adverbs are set out in section 2.5.1 below, mainly with regard to English syntax. The exposition is therefore not necessarily an accurate representation of adverbs in Afrikaans or of *mos* in particular. An exposition of adjuncts in Afrikaans is presented in section 2.5.3. Note that *mos* may not hold all of the properties discussed below, and that the properties might be defined differently if the syntactic structure of Afrikaans is taken into consideration, for example if the syntactic positions of adverbs and verbs are considered. The discussion presented here, however, aims to relate the specific case of *mos* to the more general linguistic characterisations of adverbs and adjuncts.

2.5.1 Properties of adverbs

2.5.1.1 Syntactic properties

The term "adverb" denotes a syntactic category, while "adverbial" is a functional term which may be ascribed to other adverbs and various other categories (Alexiadou 1997: 15). Adverbs which function as adverbials are constituents which are distinct from subject, verb, object, and complement. The distinction between adjuncts, disjuncts, and conjuncts which function as adverbials may be stated as follows:

Adjuncts are integrated within the sentence structure of the clause to at least some extent...disjuncts and conjuncts, on the other hand, are not integrated within the clause. Semantically, disjuncts express an evaluation of what is being said either with respect to the form of the communication or to its content...[s]emantically, conjuncts have a connective function. They indicate the connection between what is being said and what was said before.

(Quirk and Greenbaum 1976: 126)

The term "adverb" is also sometimes used to refer to an adjective phrase that is used as an adverbial. Ponelis (1977:66) distinguishes between adverbs of place, time, and manner, as well as so-called sentence adverbs. The adverbs of place and time are not discussed here. Adverbs of manner include adjective phrases, such as *te gou* ("too quick"), and *flink* ("spirited, enthusiastic"), and words derived from verbs, like *lopend* ("running"), and *dans-dans* ("dancing") (Ponelis 1977: 66). Sentence adverbs may fall into one of two distinct categories, namely bound and unbound. With bound sentence adverbs there is a relationship between the sentence (statement or proposition) in which they appear and a preceding statement or sentence, or language context (discourse segment). For example, *daarom* ("therefore"), and *al* ("even though") are bound sentence adverbs. Unbound sentence adverbs do not refer to preceding discourse segments or statements. They include adverbs like *dare* ("after all, surely"), and *gelukkig* ("luckily") (Ponelis 1977: 66). The sentence adverb can be distinguished from the other adverbials in that it can be followed by the negative marker in the verb phrase, as in (20).

- (20) Hy is **beslis** (glo...) **nie** hier nie.
*He is **definitely** (apparently...) **not** here.*

(Ponelis 1977: 67)

For present purposes, the term "adverb" will be used to refer to all constituents that may function as adverbs without any distinction made between adverbial and adverb.

Different categories of words have different distributions (i.e., they occupy a different range of positions within phrases or sentences). In assigning a word to a category, syntactic considerations are usually taken into account, i.e. the position of the word in relation to other words in a sentence structure (Radford 1997: 32). The various categories of words have certain morphological and syntactic properties. The latter is more reliable, or consistent, in determining the grammatical category of words (Radford 2004: 38), whereas the former is more problematic as morphemes may have more than one use (other than deriving adverbs from adjectives) (Radford 1997: 36; Radford 2004: 39). There is a correspondence between adjectives and adverbs, in that adverbs are variably derived from adjectives (morphologically). However, adjectives and their corresponding adverbs appear in different environments (Quirk and Greenbaum 1976: 136).

Adverbs are relatively free in their distribution; they may occur in initial, medial, or final position (Alexiadou 1997: 10). However, the type of adverb may sometimes determine the position that the adverb may occupy; so particular adverbs are not entirely free to occur in any position in the

sentence. According to Ernst (2004: 756) the sentence clause consists of "zones" or "fields" into which the adverbial adjuncts are organised, with particular adverbial expressions occurring only within one zone which comprises of a number of adjoining, or adjacent, positions. Thus, certain adverbs are restricted to certain positions in the sentence clause prescribed by the zone into which the adverb is organised. Adjuncts are characterised as having distributional freedom; however, Bonami et al. (2004: 1) have distinguished another type of adverb, namely scopal elements "whose scope properties may have consequences on their position". According to Alexiadou (1997: 9), a particular number of adverbs may occur within a sentence in a particular order. Furthermore, this ordering of adverbs is the same across languages. Any deviation of the strict ordering of adverbs may result in ungrammaticality (Alexiadou 1997: 9).

As stated earlier, DMs are taken from a range of syntactic categories, such as conjunctions, adverbs, prepositions, and also some idioms. "It is difficult to see how a subset of conjunctions, adverbs, and prepositional phrases could be cobbled together to form a syntactic category, particularly since their individual syntactic patterning follows their obvious syntactic lineage" (Fraser 1999: 944). DMs follow a similar syntactic distribution within a sentence or clause as their homonym, or the syntactic category from which the DM is derived; the DM displays the hereditary characteristics of that syntactic category, e.g. adverb, conjunction, or preposition. Thus, DMs cannot be combined to form a single syntactic category; the position of the DM in the sentence may differ depending on the DM, and the function of the DM may also be influenced by the position in the sentence. However, DMs are differentiated, in some cases, from their adverbial counterparts (or homonyms) by pronunciation, meaning, and syntactic position (Schiffrin 2001: 64). It is uncertain whether syntactic distinctions are eliminated at the discourse level where the markers function, or whether markers are distinguished from one another by their inherited syntactic properties (Schiffrin 1987: 64; 2001: 58).

2.5.1.2 Semantic properties

Alexiadou (1997: 4) suggests that adverbs are difficult to define on account of the heterogeneous quality of words that are considered adverbs, and therefore, it is problematic to place these words into the category of adverbs. Bonami et al. (2004: 4) proposed two properties for adverbs, namely the properties of parentheticality and incidentality. The former property characterises adverbs that do not contribute any semantic meaning to the proposition asserted by the sentence in which the adverb appears, but serve as a comment on the asserted proposition. The latter property characterises adverbs which have a particular prosody that distinguishes them from other constituents within the sentence.

2.5.2 Types of adverbs

2.5.2.1 Types of adverbs distinguished on the basis of semantics

Alexiadou (1997: 7) identifies a number of types of adverbs: evaluative adverbs, such as *fortunately*; conjunctive adverbs, such as *finally*; speaker-orientated adverbs, like *frankly*, which conveys speaker attitude; modal adverbs, such as *probably*; domain adverbs, such as *logically*; and subject-oriented adverbs, like *courageously*. Alexiadou also includes verb phrase (VP) adverbs which are manner adverbs (e.g., *correctly*), completion or resultative adverbs (e.g., *entirely*, *completely*), and aspectual or quantificational adverbs (e.g., *always*).

2.5.2.2 Types of adverbs distinguished on the basis of truth conditionality

Infantidou-Trouki (1997: 196) makes use of speech act theory in analysing sentential adverbs, and within this framework the sentential adverbs are considered as non-truth conditional expressions which are regarded as indicating a speech act or propositional attitude. The sentential adverbs are illocutionary adverbials, attitudinal adverbials, evidential adverbials, and hearsay adverbials. Illocutionary adverbs, such as *frankly*, do not contribute any meaning or truth condition to the proposition they precede. They indicate the type of speech act being performed. Attitudinal adverbs, such as *tragically*, indicate the attitude which the speaker wishes to convey on the proposition of the utterance. These adverbs modify the entire proposition and guide the hearer to an interpretation as to how the utterance should be understood. Thus, attitudinal adverbs do not contribute to the truth conditions of an utterance and are "semantically external to the proposition expressed by the utterances that carry them" (Infantidou-Trouki 1997: 197). Evidential adverbs indicate the degree of credibility held by the speaker for what is being said; for example, *possibly*, suggests the reliability of the argument made by the speaker. Hearsay adverbs, such as *apparently* and *allegedly*, indicate weaker commitment, with regard to the utterance, from the speaker. Infantidou-Trouki (1997: 200) has found that the hearsay adverbial *allegedly* is truth conditional, which contradicts the claims of the speech act theory; therefore, hearsay adverbs contribute to the truth conditionality of an utterance.

2.5.3 Adjuncts in Afrikaans

The properties of adverbs set out above are based mainly on English and, therefore, may be limited in their application to Afrikaans and particularly to *mos*. However, awareness of these aspects of

adverbs remains instructive in light of the grammatical analysis of *mos* which forms part of the present study. Likewise, the properties of adjuncts should be considered. According to Botha and Van Aardt (1983: 194), adjuncts are the optional, non-verbal elements of a verb phrase. Ponelis (1985) gives a primarily semantic account of attitudinal adjuncts in Afrikaans. Attitudinal adjuncts ("houdingsadjunkte") are divided into certainty adjuncts ("stelligheidsadjunkte"), judgment adjuncts ("oordeelsadjunkte") and colour adjuncts ("kleuradjunkte") and these adjuncts qualify or modify the entire proposition of the utterance in which they appear. Attitudinal adjuncts are discussed below.

2.5.3.1 Certainty adjuncts

Certainty adjuncts indicate a particular interpretation (or degree of certainty) of the proposition in which the adjunct appears. The adjunct which appears in the statement either strengthens the proposition expressed, as in (21), or weakens it, as in (22).

(21) Dit is **beslis** geelhout
*It is **definitely** yellow-wood*

(22) Dit is **moontlik** geelhout
*It is **possibly** yellow-wood*

(Ponelis 1985: 294)

In(21) the adjunct *beslis* ("definitely, positively") shows strengthening of the proposition, while *moontlik* ("possibly") in (22) indicates weakening (or softening) of the proposition of the sentence.

2.5.3.2 Judgment adjuncts

A particular judgment or attitude of the speaker toward a proposition is conveyed with the use of a judgment adjunct, as the example in (23) illustrates.

(23) Die onderhandelinge het **tragies genoeg** misluk
*The negotiations **tragically enough** fell through*
 = Die onderhandelinge het misluk, **en ek beskou dit as tragies**
 = *The negotiations fell through, and I regard it as tragic.*

(Ponelis 1985: 294)

2.5.3.3 Colour adjuncts

Colour adjuncts, such as *immers* ("indeed, yet"), *mos* ("indeed"), *natuurlik* ("of course"), and *blykbaar* ("apparently"), occur in statements and may also occur in questions and imperatives; they weaken or strengthen the proposition of the question or the imperative in which they appear. Consider the example in (24).

- (24) Wie is hy **dalk**?
 Who is he then?

(Ponelis 1985: 295)

There are particular colour adjuncts with an element of strengthening, like *lank* ("long, for a while"), and *glad* ("altogether, quite"), which are restricted to occur within negative sentences. Adjuncts that function as weakeners, such as *juis* ("exactly, precisely"), and *eintlik* ("actually"), also appear in negative sentences, as in (25).

- (25) Hy is **lank** nie onmisbaar nie.
 *He has not been necessary **for a long time**.*

(Ponelis 1985: 296)

Weakening of a statement is accomplished by expressing or qualifying a statement, or utterance, as a possibility; this is illustrated in examples (26) - (27).

- (26) Bakkerye doen **beslis** baie moeite om 'n ordentlike produk te lewer.
 *Bakeries **definitely** put in a lot of effort to deliver a decent product.*

- (27) Bakkerye doen **blykbaar** baie moeite om 'n ordentlike produk te lewer.
 *Bakeries **apparently** put in a lot of effort to deliver a decent product*

- (28) Bakkerye doen **in 'n sekere sin** baie moeite om 'n ordentlike produk te lewer.
 *Bakeries, **in a particular sense**, put in a lot of effort to deliver a decent product.*

(Ponelis 1985: 298)

In example (26) there is a strengthening adjunct *beslis* "definitely". Example (27) presents a possibility with the use of a weakening adjunct, while in (28) there is a qualifying weakener *in 'n*

sekere sin ("in a particular sense"). There is a relationship between the utterances (26) and (28), in that they both express the fact (29) below.

- (29) Bakkerye doen baie moeite om 'n ordentlike produk te lewer.
 Bakeries put in a lot of effort to deliver a decent product

(Ponelis 1985: 298)

In (27) there is no indication of truth or falsity and, therefore, there is no implied fact (29). Thus, weakening can be achieved by qualifying the fact of a statement to a possibility.

Attitudinal adverbs, as discussed by Infantidou-Trouki (1997: 197), can be compared to attitudinal adjuncts as they indicate the attitude which the speaker wishes to convey on the proposition of the utterance.

2.5.4 Qualifiers

Qualifiers weaken the reliability of the statement in which they occur, and they do not contribute to the fact (truth condition) of the statement (Ponelis 1985: 300). Qualifiers (or modifiers) are the free or optional non-verbal elements of the verb phrase. Qualifiers can further be divided into restriction/limitation qualifiers ("beperkingskwalifiseerders"), contrast qualifiers ("kontraskwalifiseerders"), familiarity qualifiers ("bekendheidskwalifiseerders"), anti-factuality qualifiers ("teenfeitlikheidskwalifiseerders"), and restrictive group ("voorbehoudsgroep") (Ponelis 1985). *Mos* is placed within the group of familiarity qualifiers and is illustrated in its function as familiarity qualifier below. Only familiarity qualifiers will be discussed in some detail while a brief description of the other qualifiers will be given (cf. Ponelis 1985 for a complete illustration).

2.5.4.1 Familiarity qualifiers

The familiarity qualifiers, such as *immers*, *mos*, *natuurlik* ("of course"), *tog*, and *dan* ("then"), indicate that the information (or proposition) of the statement in which they occur is knowledge that is familiar, should be known, follows logically from previous information, or can be derived from other information (with familiarity qualifiers such as *noodwendig* ("necessarily"), *voor die hand liggend* ("obviously"), etc.), and information that is clear to an extent with familiarity qualifiers such as *duidelik* ("clear"). A familiarity marker which refers to previously stated information is illustrated in the following example (30).

- (30) Die begroting is opgestel. Nou is die groot werk **mos** agter die rug.
*The budget is set up. Now, **as you know**, the biggest job is behind us.*

(Ponelis 1985: 303)

In (30) the statement that the budget is set up refers to old information that the budget was the biggest part of the job and that it has been handled.

The above discussion of adjuncts in Afrikaans provides a useful background for the discussion of *mos* in sections 5.1.2 and 5.1.3 in terms of the properties and function(s) of *mos* as an adverbial in the sentence, as well as how sentence grammaticality (and the properties of *mos*) restricts its function as an adverb within the sentence.

2.5.5 Function of adverbs

2.5.5.1 *Adverb as modifier*

Adverbs may modify a following adjective, as in (31), or a particular adverb, such as *enough*, can postmodify an adjective. Adverbs that modify adjectives are mostly regarded as intensifiers, such as *baie* ("very") in Afrikaans, and are restricted to a few lexical items. These intensifiers can modify adjectives, adverbs and verbs (Quirk and Greenbaum 1976: 127; Radford 1997: 34), for example,

- (31) That is a **highly** *poisonous* reptile. (adverb modifying an adjective)

2.5.5.2 *Adverb as complement of the preposition*

Adverbs can also modify particles in phrasal verbs, and these adverbs (or intensifiers) may also modify prepositions (or prepositional phrases); e.g. the nail went **right** *through* the wall (Quirk and Greenbaum 1976: 127). Adverbs that function as intensifiers, modifying other adverbs, adjectives, verbs and prepositions, may also modify indefinite pronouns, predeterminers, and cardinal numerals; e.g. **nearly** *everybody* came to our party (Quirk and Greenbaum 1976: 128). There are certain intensifiers that can also modify noun phrases. There are particular adverbs of place and time (such as *here* and *there*) which function as complement of a preposition (Quirk and Greenbaum 1976: 129).

2.5.5.3 *Adverbs and other word classes*

Conjuncts are another type of adverb and comprise of words such as *so* and *yet*. They resemble coordinators with regard to particular syntactic features and function as connectives. Clauses introduced by conjuncts cannot be moved in front of the preceding clause; consider the following example,

(32) We paid him a very large sum. **So** he kept quiet about what he saw.

(Quirk and Greenbaum 1976: 141)

The above section on the functions of adverbs gives us an indication of the functions of adverbs and provides a basis for determining the grammatical functions which *mos* is able to perform in the sentence as an adverb(ial). This will lead to a clarification of the category of *mos*, or at least the extent to which *mos* (with regard to the functional criteria) *mos* can be regarded as an adverb. It might then be possible to make a distinction between the function of *mos* as an adverb and as a DM.

The contents of this chapter have provided expositions of adverbs and DMs which would allow for a classification of *mos* in chapter 5 as an adverb and DM with regard to properties and functions proposed for adverbs and DMs. DMs were discussed in terms of (i) syntactic aspects; (ii) pragmatic aspects; (iii) semantic aspects; and (iv) the manner in which they appear and function in discourse structure, marking social relationships, relationships between utterances, and creating coherence within discourse. In terms of the pragmatic aspects of DMs, properties such as multifunctionality, interpretation of utterances, and coherence were illustrated; and in terms of syntactic aspects DMs were claimed to belong to a separate category which is differentiated from other syntactic categories in the sentence. The syntactic patterning of a word (such as *mos*) should be considered in distinguishing between its function as a DM and as an adverb.

CHAPTER 3 – LANGUAGE VARIATION AND AFRIKAANS

3.1 Language variation

Variation in language involves the many (social or regional) dialects, registers, and styles of a language, for which the umbrella term "variety" is often used (Du Plessis 1995: 10). "Variety" is a neutral term which is free from the stigma or prejudice which may be associated with terms like "dialect", "vernacular", or "pidgin" (Holmes 1992: 9). The term "variety" is used to include all the possible forms of systematic variation which may exist within and between languages. Variety is defined by Du Plessis (1995: 10) as a patterned system of linguistic items with corresponding social and/or geographical distribution, and includes units larger than dialects (such as different languages) and units smaller than dialects (such as registers) (cf. Wardhaugh 2002: 25). Varieties can be characterised by focusing on linguistic features which appear frequently in the language patterns of the speech community, and by observing the salient features of the variety and establishing whether these contrast with varieties spoken in other areas or by other groups (Holmes 2001: 145; cf. also Wardhaugh 2002: 133).

Language variation includes the notion of dialect, but as well as notions such as sociolect, register, style, etc. "Sociolect" refers to the characteristics associated with the speech or linguistic behaviour of social groups (Wardhaugh 2002: 149). The word "style" refers to the variety of ways in which a language is used. The style used is influenced by the formality of the occasion in which the speaker finds him/herself (Wardhaugh 2002: 50). The level of formality is determined by a number of factors, such as age, social group, the type of occasion, as well as the relationship, e.g. emotional involvement, between the participants in a speech situation (Wardhaugh 2002: 51).

Within the field of language variation, the term "dialect" refers to linguistic varieties which are distinguishable from one another by linguistic features, principally vocabulary and phonology, but also grammar (i.e. syntax and morphology) (cf. Holmes 1992: 10; Wardhaugh 2002). A distinction can be made between standard dialects, regional dialects, and social dialects.

The standard dialect is a prestigious dialect which has attained a privileged position within society as the result of social, economic, and political influence (Holmes 1992: 84). In the case of South

Africa, for example, Standard South African English is one of the eleven official languages and is used in government, education, and the media, and common features of the language are realised across the nation.

Social dialects constitute dialects which are characteristic of particular social groups. These groups may be determined by a variety of factors, including socio-economic class, religion, and ethnicity (cf. Wardhaugh 2006: 49). In the case of social dialects, there is a relationship between speech patterns, in terms of linguistic features (e.g. syntax and phonology), and the above-mentioned non-linguistic factors (cf. Holmes 2001: 144). The particular linguistic features which distinguish speech communities (i.e., which distinguish one social group from another) are patterned and predictable with regard to their prevalence (Holmes 1992: 161, 2001: 146). For example, the African American Vernacular English spoken in cities such as New York, Detroit, and Buffalo is a dialect associated with Black Americans who live in urban areas (Wardhaugh 2002: 49).

Finally, regional dialects are observed in geographical areas where conventionalised norms with regard to linguistic features characteristic of that particular region are observed (Wardhaugh 2006: 44; Holmes 1992: 135). These features typically stem from an unconscious desire of speakers of a particular region to distinguish themselves from individuals of other regions (Fasold 1990: 228). For example, the regional variety of English in Texas is spoken with a "nasal twang" (Fromkin & Rodman 1998: 412).

Against the above background of language variety, it is informative to consider the case of diglossia. In a diglossic situation, a distinction is made between a High (H) code and a Low (L) code, where "code" is the term used to refer to any language or variety (Wardhaugh 2006: 88). The H and L codes are two distinct codes used for separate functions and in different domains within a linguistic community characterised by diglossia (Wardhaugh 2006: 89). The H code is used in formal situations (such as in government, religious activities, and in writing), whereas the L code is used in less formal situations (such as conversation among family and friends).

Diglossia occurred since the early days of European settlement in South Africa, and continues today. In the late seventeenth century, the growing number of immigrants resulted in great linguistic diversity, and called for two different languages to serve formal and informal functions; an early form of Afrikaans was used as the L code (or spoken variety), and formal Dutch was used as the H code (or written code) (Ponelis 1996: 129).

3.2 Afrikaans

A brief discussion of Afrikaans in terms of its origins, speakers, and social and geographical distribution is presented here in order to orientate the reader. According to Botha and Van Aardt (1983: 16), Afrikaans (then known as "Cape Dutch") developed in the 17th century from the Dutch dialects of Jan van Riebeeck and his company who arrived in the Cape in 1652, as well as other Dutch immigrants who came subsequently. A rich linguistic influence resulted from immigrants who settled in the Cape and contributed to the steady expansion of Afrikaans (Ponelis 1996: 129). Dutch is the foundation from which Afrikaans developed its structure, i.e. its sound structure (phonology), word structure (morphology), vocabulary, sentence structure (syntax) and idioms. As Cape Dutch expanded in Southern Africa, it became established as a language of Africa, hence its name, "Afrikaans". In the genesis of Afrikaans, the Dutch grammatical structure was somewhat changed so that Afrikaans is now an independent language with its own sound and spelling system, vocabulary, syntax and idiom structure (Botha & Van Aardt 1983: 17).

At an early point in the genesis of Afrikaans, the language came into contact with languages of indigenous Blacks, as well as those of Europeans that traded or settled in Southern Africa. Language influence is inevitable during such language contact, when disparate groups of people live and work close together. In this context, borrowing took place, as Afrikaans lacked Dutch words for certain indigenous items and matters (Botha & Van Aardt 1983: 18). The vocabulary of Afrikaans is abundant with borrowings from the language of the Khoi (or Khoeikhoi) (e.g. *gogga* "insect", *eina* "ouch"), indigenous Black languages like isiXhosa and Sesotho (e.g. *koedoe* "kudu"), Malay Portuguese (*baie* "very", *baadjie* "jacket"), Dutch (*kaggel* "fireplace"), French (*koerant* "newspaper", *akkommodasie* "accommodation" (through Middle Dutch)), and English (*trein* "train", *tjek* "cheque") (Botha & Van Aardt 1983: 18-19; cf. also Ponelis 1996: 135).

As far as modern Afrikaans is concerned, the Western Cape has the highest percentage of first (home) language (L1) Afrikaans speakers, namely 39.8% (STATS SA reference here). According to Van der Merwe and Van Niekerk (1994: 18), "(m)ore than 46% of all Afrikaans [L1 – WCJ] speakers reside in the two provinces of the Western Cape and Northern Cape". Gauteng has the second highest number of Afrikaans L1 speakers, with 20.9%, and the Eastern Cape has 10.3%. In terms of spatial distribution, a 1991 census investigating dominant home language distribution patterns in South Africa found that Afrikaans covers 99.4% of the Western Cape (Van der Merwe & Van Niekerk 1994: 10). According to Van Rensburg (1990: 68), Kaapse ("Cape") Afrikaans is

spoken by speakers of all social backgrounds of Cape Town and its immediate surroundings: Muslims, Christian Coloureds, and Whites.

3.3 Variation in Afrikaans

Du Plessis (1995: 13) claims that there is a certain degree of linguistic heterogeneity that exists within all languages, and that variation can be defined as the fact that language does not presuppose a homogenous unit and that the same thing can be said in more than one way in the same language. According to Du Plessis (1995: 13), then, variation is exactly that phenomenon which allows for the same things to be said in more than one way.

Claasen and Van Rensburg (1983) focus on language variation in Afrikaans, and state that language variants are not arbitrarily formed, adding that the possibility of variation is restricted by rules (Claasen & Van Rensburg 1983: 152). Moreover, language variants may become visibly organised (or structured) differently: particular forms appear as the non-standard form rather than the standard form, and may be distributed over the entire Afrikaans speech community, or across speakers who do not come into contact with each other at all. Such forms show a preference to appear as non-standard Afrikaans (1983: 153). Diphthongs and vowels are categorically susceptible to variation in Afrikaans (cf. section 3.3.1), although variables are often realised in diminutives, plural, genitive constructions, repetitions, intonation patterns, comparative constructions, prepositions, and word order. Moreover, insertions and omissions in syntactic structure and in word forms can also illustrate variation in the different forms of Afrikaans (Claasen & Van Rensburg 1983: 134).

Non-standard varieties of Afrikaans deviate from the standard form in one or more of the abovementioned realisations (i.e., by one or more variables). Furthermore, non-standard varieties tend to have no, or very limited, literary tradition. Non-standard varieties are often subjected to prejudice; however, such varieties do not represent a lower, less prestigious or inferior language (Claasen & Van Rensburg 1983: 135, Wardhaugh 2002: 28).

It is also important to note that no person's language is limited to only one form, be it the standard form or a non-standard form. A continual interaction may take place, with the speaker determining which of the forms is employed in a given situation (Van Rensburg 1985: 15).

3.3.1 Dialects of Afrikaans

In terms of dialectal features with geographical bounds, Ponelis (1996: 131) distinguishes between an eastern variety of Afrikaans, in which words such as *ek* ('I') are pronounced with an open vowel [æ], and the south-western and north-western varieties where the same word is pronounced with a higher vowel, namely [ɛ]. Ponelis (1996: 131) further suggests that standard Afrikaans pronunciation is based mainly on the eastern variety of Afrikaans.

Van Rensburg (1990: 68) distinguishes between three basic varieties of Afrikaans, namely (i) Kaapse (Cape) Afrikaans, (ii) Oosgrens (Eastern Border) Afrikaans (which includes Vrystaatse (Free State) Afrikaans, Transvaalse Afrikaans and Griekwa- (Griqua) Afrikaans), and (iii) Oranjerivier (Orange River) Afrikaans. Communities speaking Cape Afrikaans can be found in Cape Town and its immediate environs (Van Rensburg 1963: 68). The dialect of Afrikaans considered in the present study is (non-standard) Cape Afrikaans.

A feature of Cape Afrikaans on the phonological level, which distinguishes it from other varieties, is the raising of the [iə] diphthong to the [i:] vowel in words like *weet* ('to know'), which is pronounced [vi:t] in Cape Afrikaans, and [viət] in (standard) Oosgrens Afrikaans (Van Rensburg 1990: 70; and cf. Von Wielligh 1925: 132). On the syntactic level, Cape Afrikaans can further be distinguished by the use of constructions such as *met...saam* ('together...with...'), e.g. *hy bly met my saam* ('he lives with me') (Claasen & Van Rensburg 1983: 151, 155).

Regarding geographical location, the districts of Robertson, Worcester, Tulbagh, Montague, and Beaufort West, where data were gathered for the present study, may be regarded as the "crossing" where the Afrikaans of the Boland and Karoo exert their influence. In these districts, there are no significant dialectal differences among speakers, although some differences may be heard in the outlying districts (Von Wielligh 1925: 137). According to Botha and Van Aardt (1983: 11), the Boland dialect is found in the speech of communities in Paarl, Stellenbosch, and Malmesbury and it is limited to a small area; it is not the general use. The Afrikaans of Worcester, which extends from the Breë River to the foot of the Heksrivier Mountain range, is similar to that of Paarl and Stellenbosch (Von Wielligh 1925: 123). The speech of Montague, which is an outlying district, exists under the influence of the Karoo-speech (Von Wielligh 1925: 138). The varieties of Afrikaans of the various rural speech communities that are investigated in the present study are distinguishable from one another, and are distinguishable from the standard variety of Afrikaans in, for example, phonology and syntax etc. Furthermore, the Afrikaans spoken in these areas, which

extends from the Boland district to the Karoo district, is influenced by the Afrikaans of either the Boland or Karoo districts, depending on geographic adjacency. However, for the purposes of the present study these varieties are regarded as a single variety as they share similar features (see above) which deviate from the standard variety of Afrikaans.

3.4 Previous research on *mos*

According to Roberge (2002: 399), and as mentioned in section 1.2, "*mos* 'after all, when it's all said and done, this is something you should know, you must admit, as everyone knows'" indicates that the proposition expressed has some "familiar truth"; it is suggested that the information is common or should be known. The form is used in colloquial South African English as well as in standard and non-standard Afrikaans varieties. *Mos* is thought to be derived from Dutch *immers* ("indeed, at least, yet, in any event, after all"; cf. Deumert 2004: 31; Conradie 1995: 45), or the colloquial variant *ommers* (Roberge 2002: 339).

Mos and *ommers* have similar semantic properties and both forms are used to "qualify a proposition that speakers consider common knowledge and thus beyond challenge or contradiction by their interlocutors" (Roberge 2002: 405). Roberge (2002: 400) investigated the historical aspects of *mos* (as well as *maskie*) in order to determine whether or not the two words had been borrowed from Dutch (and its varieties) or Portuguese. He regards *mos* as a "metropolitan dialectism that was generalised at the Cape", considering only its formal and semantic properties (Roberge 2002: 400).

Conradie (1995) regards *mos* as a modal particle and considers its variety of interpretations, which he bases on the various functions and typical contexts of *mos*. Conradie (1995: 45) suggests that "a description of *mos* should not be along the lines of prototypical meaning but rather along those of the prototypical discourse situation which suits *mos*". He also presents a number of functions and semantic meanings for *mos*. Conradie (1995) states that a modal particle often expresses a relationship with the lexical item from which it is differentiated. On this basis, he suggests that the semantic basis for *mos* may in some cases be formed from the core meaning of *immers* in Afrikaans. Whereas *immers* supports an existing logical relation between propositions that manifest contextually, *mos* suggests relevance, but leaves it to the hearer to determine the function of the proposition in the context or situation (Conradie 1995: 49). Utterances with *mos* present a proposition as relevant in relation to something, or as cause or reason for something, and refer to elements in the context or situation (Conradie 1995: 50).

This chapter offered a brief description of Afrikaans, and served to place the study into context with regard to the geographical location of the variety of Afrikaans which is investigated in the present study, as well as to present illustrative examples in order to display some linguistic differences between the varieties of speech communities around the Western Cape. Afrikaans has developed from varieties of 17th century Dutch, but has since gained independence as an official language with its own vocabulary, syntax, morphology, and phonology. The variety of Afrikaans, namely non-standard Cape Afrikaans, which is investigated in the present study, is found in the rural areas of the Western Cape and is spoken by people of disparate social backgrounds, not only by the Coloured community. According to Roberge (2002: 400), the use of *mos* was first generalised in the Cape, yet it can be maintained that *mos* occurs in the standard and non-standard varieties of Afrikaans across Southern Africa, and also in colloquial South African English.

CHAPTER 4 – METHODOLOGY

This chapter sets out the methodology followed in the present study, which aims to describe the use of the linguistic item *mos* by speakers of non-standard Afrikaans in rural areas around the Western Cape, with regard to its syntactic distribution and pragmatic function. The data collection procedures are described in section 4.1, and the informants in section 4.2. Section 4.3 gives an exposition of the data analysis procedures, covering the syntactic analysis, the analysis of pragmatic functions, and the investigation into the role of social factors in the prevalence of *mos*.

4.1 Data collection

The data analysed in the present study were originally collected for purposes of another larger-scale study, namely the South Africa-Netherlands Programme on Alternatives in Development (SANPAD) project, which aims to document Afrikaans dialects in rural areas in South Africa (particularly communities in the Northern, Western and Eastern Cape). Wardhaugh (2002: 45) uses the term "dialect geography" to describe "attempts made to map the distributions of various linguistic features so as to show their geographical provenance". The research within the SANPAD Project is currently in progress by researchers at Rhodes University in Grahamstown, South Africa, in association with colleagues at the Department of General Linguistics of the University of Stellenbosch. Partners at the Meertens Institute (The Netherlands) and Northwest University (South Africa) are also involved in the project. The research emulates a study done in The Netherlands where the regional dialects of the country were studied and the differences in terms of syntactic features were super-imposed on a map of The Netherlands. On a similar basis, the above-mentioned researchers in South Africa are investigating non-standard dialects of Afrikaans.

The data which are analysed in the present study were gathered for the SANPAD project in rural areas around the Western Cape, namely Montague, Robertson, Touwsrivier, Worcester, Beaufort West, and De Doorns, by myself and colleagues at the General Linguistics Department of the University of Stellenbosch. For the present study the term "Cape Afrikaans" is used to refer to the non-standard variety of Afrikaans spoken in these outlying districts of Cape Town (i.e. Montague, Robertson, Worcester, Touwsrivier, and Beaufort West), mainly to distinguish the Afrikaans spoken in those areas from the Afrikaans spoken in the Boland district, in areas such as Paarl, Stellenbosch, and Malmesbury, and from the Afrikaans in the Karoo. Nonetheless, *mos* is prevalent in the Afrikaans of all of these districts and/or dialects of Afrikaans.

Data were gathered through individual interviews which were recorded using a digital audio recorder. A questionnaire had been set up for the purposes of the SANPAD project, which offered a number of possibilities for how a particular sentence is produced with the same meaning in the various communities. The informants were asked to judge the grammaticality, or acceptability, of the various sentences, which were read to them by the interviewer. The informants were required to select one or more of the sentences, namely that which they deemed to accurately reflect the norm for their speech community. Informed consent was obtained from the informants before each interview, and only data from those informants who gave their permission were used. The names and personal details of the informants remain confidential.

The data analysed in chapter 5 are drawn from the database of orthographic transcriptions of the interviews. The interview data were transcribed by a number of student assistants at the Department of General Linguistics of Stellenbosch University and by myself.

4.2 Informants

Informants for the SANPAD project had been pre-selected according to certain socially defined criteria. The researchers participating in the SANPAD project considered age, ethnicity, and socioeconomic class, as well as geographical location. These particular non-linguistic factors were taken into consideration in order to ensure the selection of informants who were speakers of a non-standard variety of Afrikaans.

The informants for the present study were all born, or had lived most of their lives, in the aforementioned rural areas of the Western Cape (Touwsrivier, Robertson, Beaufort West, and De Doorns), with little or no contact with (or exposure to) urban areas, in most cases less than seven years (see below). The informants were all of Coloured ethnicity and were from the lower middle class. The present study is informed by data from eight informants, six females and two males, whose ages ranged from 42 to 65 years. This relatively small sample size is considered adequate for present purposes, as there are enough informants in order for the researcher to make confident generalisations about the speech community (cf. Chambers et al. 2002: 29).

The details of all informants are presented in Table 1 below. In terms of geographical origins, two of the informants (TF42 and TF65) lived in Touwsrivier, four (BM56, BF44, BF59, and BF60) in Beaufort West, one (RF55) in Robertson, and one (DM56) in De Doorns. Most of the informants had lived in these rural towns for the greater part of their lives. However, many of the informants

had lived in other towns or cities for part of their lives. Three of the informants (TF42, BF59, and BF60) lived temporarily in Cape Town, one (TF65) in another rural town called Matjiesfontein, and another two informants (RF55 and DM56) had lived in Worcester. One of the informants lived in the Coloured communities of Atlantis and Athlone (near Cape Town) for six and five years, respectively. He had worked in Atlantis and had attended secondary school in Athlone. Informant TF42 lived in Cape Town for ten years, working as an assistant nurse, and TF65 worked in Cape Town for two years as a domestic at a hospital. The highest level of education attained by most of the informants was grade 10, but three of the informants received certificates equivalent to a matric (grade 12) certificate. Informants BM56 and BF59 had completed tertiary education at a number of universities in South Africa and at a teacher training college, respectively. They were thus more highly qualified than the other informants. The informants mainly worked in relatively unskilled labour, including occupations such as nursing, domestic work, and waiting tables. The home language of all the informants was Afrikaans; however, some were required by their jobs to speak at least some English. Although Informants BF59, BF60, and BM56 reported that they could speak English, while informants TF65, BF44, RF55, and DM56 spoke exclusively Afrikaans. Still, the language which they used on a daily basis at home is Afrikaans. The communities involved in the present study were not necessarily monolingual Afrikaans communities.

Table 1 Informant Data

Informants	Place of Birth	Age	Highest Grade Passed	Home Language (L1)	Other Languages (L2)	Occupation	Gender	Current Town	Other Towns
TF42	Touwsrivier	42	n/a	Afrikaans		Assistant Nurse	F	Touwsrivier	Cape Town
BF44	Beaufort West	44	Grade 11	Afrikaans		n/a	F	Beaufort West	
RF55	Robertson	55	Grade 12	Afrikaans		n/a	F	Robertson	Worcester
BM56	Beaufort West	56	University Level	Afrikaans	English	n/a	M	Beaufort West	
DM56	De Doorns	56	Grade 5	Afrikaans		Railway Worker	M	Touwsrivier	Worcester
BF59	Beaufort West	59	(Training) College	Afrikaans	English	n/a	F	Beaufort West	Cape Town
BF60	Beaufort West	60	Grade 10	Afrikaans	English	n/a	F	Beaufort West	Cape Town
TF65	Touwsrivier	65	n/a	Afrikaans		Casual Worker	F	Touwsrivier	Matjiesfontein

4.3 Data analysis procedures

The data analysis is aimed at generating answers to research questions (A) to (B) posed in section 1.5. Research questions read as follows: (A) What are the pragmatic functions and syntactic characteristics of *mos* in the data set?; and (B) What are the syntactic properties and pragmatic functions of *mos* in Cape Afrikaans that would establish it as a discourse marker?

The analysis is therefore twofold, covering (i) syntactic aspects, that is, describing the syntactic properties of *mos*, providing a syntactic characterisation of *mos*, and distinguishing *mos* from the syntactic category of adverb and establishing it as a DM (cf. section 4.3.1); and (ii) pragmatic aspects, focusing on the pragmatic functions of *mos* as a DM (cf. section 4.3.2).

4.3.1 Syntactic analysis

The focus of section 5.1 is on the syntactic characteristics of adverbs. The extent to which the properties of adverbs (cf. section 2.5) can be applied to *mos* is investigated, and the possibility of distinguishing *mos* from its functions as adverb and establishing it as a DM in terms of its syntactic distribution is investigated (cf. Fraser 1999). The analysis draws on the exposition of adverbs in section 2.5. The function of *mos* as an adjunct (cf. section 2.5.3) is illustrated in section 5.1 and will aid in classifying *mos* as an attitudinal adverb in terms of properties and functions of adjuncts as set out in section 2.5.3.

The data analysis will expand on this characterisation and identify more properties of adverbs which apply to *mos* and its function as an adverb. The analysis will also present cases where *mos* is inconsistent with the syntactic category of adverbs in its primary function of modifying the verb (or adjective, preposition, and other adverbs). Following this, *mos* will then be identified as a DM and supporting evidence for this new classification will be given in terms of syntactic position, function and properties (cf. section 2.3).

4.3.2 Pragmatic analysis

Section 5.2 focuses on the pragmatic (discourse) functions of *mos*. At first glance, *mos* appears to function similarly to DMs like *y'know* and *so* in English in terms of pragmatic function. Schifffrin (1987) and Macaulay (2002) studied these two DMs (amongst others). The analysis in section 5.2 is based on these works. A brief account of *so* and *because* as discussed by Schifffrin (1987) is

presented below in order to give a general picture of their use in discourse and to provide a framework for analysing *mos* where it occurs in utterances which are, or could be, prefaced by the Afrikaans equivalent of *so* or *because* (cf. section 2.1 for a summary of Macaulay's (2002) analysis of *you know* in terms of social factors which influence its use and frequency.)

According to Schiffrin (1987: 202), *because* has the semantic meaning of "cause" and *so* that of "result". *Because* and *so* function on various levels of discourse⁸ to mark "cause" and "result" (ideational structure), "warrant" and "inference" (information structure), and "motive" and "action" (action structure) (Schiffrin 1987: 203-209). With regard to "warrant" and "inference", information that is not shared by the speaker and hearer is prefaced by *because* which indicates that the information is necessary as background information in order for the hearer to make an interpretation about a particular topic. *So* prefaces an inference and also indicates a transition in meta-knowledge (Schiffrin 1987: 205). "Motive" and "action" do not directly relate to the functions of *mos* and will not be discussed here.

As a DM (and adverb) *mos* relates utterances and creates coherence within discourse. This function of *mos* will be identified and explained with reference to research by Schiffrin (1987) as discussed in section 2.3. The derivational category of *mos* (i.e. adverb) functions in a similar manner as it "help(s) create discourse not because of their rule-governed distribution, but because [it – WCJ] indicate(s) an interpretative link between two parts within the text" (Schiffrin 1987: 9). *Mos* will also be analysed in its function of information management as discussed by Fischer (2000). As stated in section 2.3, DMs do not contribute any propositional meaning to the utterance in which they occur, but an interpretation for the utterance is offered by the appearance of the DM; therefore, the meaning or interpretation which *mos* offers (if any) will be identified. All of the above functions will be exemplified and substantiated with examples taken from the data.

⁸ Cf. section 2.2.1 for a brief exposition of Schiffrin's discourse planes.

CHAPTER 5 – DATA ANALYSIS

5.1 Syntactic aspects of *mos*

This section presents a description of *mos* with regard to its syntactic aspects, as it occurred in the present data set. The properties of *mos* will be described and illustrated with examples from the data in terms of its position and grammatical function in the sentence. *Mos* will be illustrated in terms of its function as an adverb, on the one hand, and distinguished from the syntactic category of adverb, on the other, where it functions as a DM.

5.1.1 Syntactic distribution of *mos*

Roberge (2002) and Deumert (2004) claim *mos* to be derived from the adverb *immers* ("indeed"). If this is so, we can regard the DM *mos* as following the syntactic patterning of *immers* and that there is a differentiation in terms of spelling (and accordingly pronunciation), meaning (although it might share similar meaning(s) with *immers*), pragmatic function (cf. section 5.2), and, possibly, syntactic position. This is typical of DMs, which are often distinguished from their homonyms in pronunciation, meaning and syntactic position (cf. section 2.5.1.1), such as *y'know*. Recall the functions of adverbs (cf. section 2.5.5); *mos* does not perform any of these functions and in this regard it cannot be considered an adverb. However, *mos* may function as a bound sentence adverb (cf. 5.1.1.1), and it also functions similarly to particular adjuncts in Afrikaans which strengthen or weaken statements, and which convey an opinion or attitude towards propositions expressed in utterances (cf. section 5.1.2 where the adverbial properties of *mos* are discussed).

5.1.1.1 *Mos as bound sentence adverb*

Considering the discourse functions of *mos* (cf. section 5.2), it is observed that statements or sentences in which *mos* appears have a relationship with a preceding sentence or statement, or discourse segment. With bound adverbs, there is always a relationship present between a previous utterance in the discourse and the utterance in which it appears; *mos* may then be seen as functioning in a similar way to bound sentence adverbs. Consider example (33) below which illustrates the relationship between two discourse segments.

- (33) TF65: Nee, my my jongste, my tweede jongste. Hy's nog in die huis, want hy't ook deur siekte. Is -. Hy -. Kan hy **mos** nie eintlik...
*No, my youngest, my second youngest. He's still in the house, because he has also suffered sickness. He cannot **mos** actually...*
- B: Werk nie.
Work.
- ...
- TF65: Nee, hy's **mos** daar by die hostel en dis **mos** nie swaar werk nie.
*No, he's there at the hostel and it's **mos** not heavy work*

The sentence in which *mos* appears (*dis mos nie swaar werk nie* ("it's *mos* not heavy work")) relates to a prior utterance *Kan hy mos nie eintlik...lig nie* ("He cannot *mos* actually...lift"). There is a relationship that is presented between the two utterances; the utterance in which *mos* appears relates a prior utterance (or proposition) to the current utterance – the utterances (propositions or events) which *mos* relates are not necessarily adjacent; *mos* may function globally across discourse (cf. section 5.2.4).

In the data set which has informed the present study, there are no examples which show *mos* to occur sentence initially. *Mos* appears not to be free in its distribution; it mainly occurs in sentence medial position, and there is one occurrence of *mos* in sentence final position (cf. example (38)) in the data. When *mos* occurs sentence medially it occurs within the boundaries of the clause, but not typically between clauses. This is illustrated in the examples (34) and (35).

- (34) En daai plek het **mos** 'n Engelse skool ook.
*And that place **mos** also has an English school.*
- (35) En dan leer die ma en pa jou **mos** nou verder weer in die huis, nè? ...
 Onse kinders kry **mos** baie. Ons Afrikaners kry **mos** baie swaar in Engels.
*And then the mother and father teach them further at home, isn't it? ... Our children **mos** struggle a lot. Our Afrikaners **mos** struggle in English.*

In the first two examples above *mos* occurs sentence medially within the boundaries of the clause, and it can be observed that *mos* is not bound to the sentence structure of the sentences; the grammaticality of the sentences will be retained even if *mos* is removed from the sentence. Consider example (36) below where *mos* has been omitted from the sentence in example (34).

- (36) En daai plek het 'n Engelse skool ook.
And that place also has an English school.

In (36) the sentence is still grammatical; however, the meaning or interpretation for the particular utterance is no longer constrained or focused by the appearance of *mos*. *Mos* is grammatically optional in the sentence; it is a functional word in the sentence and may be omitted without affecting the grammatical structure of the sentence. While the interpretation which would have been contributed by *mos* is still available, it is not focused or as clear; the sentences or discourse segments which *mos* relates will still have a relationship, but it will be less clear. Although *mos* has a grammatical relationship with the other elements within the sentence it appears in, it is not syntactically integrated into the sentence and can be removed or omitted without affecting the grammaticality of the sentence.

Mos may also be found in sentence final position; however, there are not many occurrences of *mos* in this position in the data. Examples (37) and (38) illustrate the occurrence of *mos* in sentence final position.

- (37) Hulle praat **mos**. Hulle is **mos** van Namakwaland daar Garies se Nadia.
They mos talk– They are mos from Namaqualand there Garies's Nadia.

- (38) Hy moet gevra word **mos**.
He must mos be asked.

Example (37) shows *mos* occurring at the end of the sentence; however, *mos* appears at a sentence break where the utterance is interrupted for correction etc. Another illustration of *mos* in final position is seen in example (38).

5.1.1.2 *Mos in negative statements*

Similarly to (bound) sentence adverbs, it is permissible for *mos* to precede the negative marker, as illustrated in examples (38) and (39). An example of a different sentence adverb in this position is given in (20), repeated here as (40).

- (38) Ja, dan kan 'n mens **mos** nou nie sê: "Hy gaan. Hy het gister skool toe gegaan."
Yes, then a person cannot say, "He is going." "He went to school yesterday."

- (39) Hy's **mos** daar by die hostel en dis **mos** nie swaar werk nie.
He's there at the hostel and that's not heavy work.

- (40) Hy is **beslis** (glo...) **nie** hier nie.
He is definitely (apparently...) not here.

(Ponelis 1977: 67)

5.1.1.3 The appearance of *mos* in question forms

According to Conradie (1995: 50), propositions in which *mos* occur take on the locutive form of a statement. The aim of the speaker is derived through communication; the occurrence of *mos* in a statement is presented as suggestion, but the communication may take on the value of a question. The latter is often strengthened with the use of *nè* ("right", "isn't it?") at the end of the utterance, as is illustrated in example (41). However, *mos* cannot occur in question forms, as is illustrated by the ungrammatical constructed examples in (42) and (44). This could distinguish *mos* from its function of adverb, as adverbs can typically occur in questions without affecting the grammaticality of the sentence.

- (41) Ja, hulle is **mos** nou geskuif Stellenbosch toe, nè?
*Yes, they were **mos** moved to Stellenbosch, isn't it?*
- (42) *Is hulle **mos** nou geskuif Stellenbosch toe?
Were they **mos moved to Stellenbosch?*
- (43) A: Ek kan **mos** daar buite gaan?
*I can **mos** go outside?*
B: Ja.
Yes.
- (44) *Kan ek **mos** daar buite gaan?
Can I **mos go outside?*

5.1.1.4 The morphological aspects of *mos*

There is no evidence for *mos* being morphologically modified with inflections or affixes⁹, etc., which is a property of discourse markers. This would make *mos* part of the closed class of words, i.e. *mos* is a function word, which is a property of DMs (although there is a group of DMs which may be modified, cf. section 2.3.1). There are no examples in the data set which show *mos* to be morphologically modified in any way (with inflections or affixes).

⁹ One could consider instances where *mos* precedes the negative marker, as in *mos nie*, which is contracted to *mossie*. There are no instances of this in the data, though.

5.1.2 Properties and functions of *mos* as an adverb

There are particular functions that *mos* can have in a sentence which are similar to certain types of adjuncts; namely, certainty adjuncts, colour adjuncts, and familiarity qualifiers (and also sentence adverbs). Rather than qualifying the verb, other adverbs, adjectives, or prepositions, *mos* may qualify or modify the entire proposition expressed by the utterance, as do a number of adjuncts (cf. section 2.5.3).

Mos may have functions as a certainty adjunct which strengthens a position held by the speaker, as is illustrated in example (45).

- (45) O, ja. Seker digkuns... letterkunde. Ja, want hy het **mos** gedigte geskryf.
*Oh, yes. Probably poetry... literature. Yes, because he **mos** wrote poems.*

In (45) the speaker presents a position in the first segment; she presents a statement as a possibility, or probability. The next segment, which presents the support for the claim, is an utterance which is strengthened by the appearance of *mos* (cf. section 5.2.5).

Mos is placed in the category of colour adjuncts by Ponelis (1985: 295), and functions to strengthen or weaken the statement (or proposition of the statement) in which it appears, as can be seen in examples (46) and (47) below.

- (46) Ja-nee, ek weet nie daarvan nie, maar polio is **mos** 'n kwaai ding.
*Yes-no, I don not know about that, but polio is **mos** a vicious thing.*
- (47) Jy weet **mos** wat is dit waarvan (hulle) praat.
*You **mos** know what it is that they are talking about.*

However, colour adjuncts may also appear in questions and imperatives, and either weaken or strengthen the proposition of the question or statement. *Mos*, however, cannot occur in questions, as is illustrated in examples (42) and (44) in section 5.1.1.3.

Mos can also be classified as a familiarity qualifier. *Mos* indicates information presented in the statement it appears in as common knowledge or knowledge that should be known; that the information follows logically from previous information; or that the information contained in the

utterance can be derived from other information stated in a prior utterance or previous discourse. This is shown in example (48) below.

- (48) Ja, (ge)studeer. Nee ons het dit toe – Ons het toe – Ons skrywe **mos** teen die einde van die jaar met die matrikulante.
*Yes, stud(ied). No, we then had – We then had – We **mos** write towards the end of the year with the matriculants.*

Still, there are adverbial functions which *mos* does not (or cannot) perform, such as modifying verbs, adjectives, other adverbs, and prepositions (cf. section 5.1.3 below). *Mos* does not function to compare two entities or intensify adjectives or adverbs, and *mos* does not function as an adverbial conjunction. However, its pragmatic function is similar to conjunctions such as *so* and *because* in the sense that an utterance which presents a result or cause, respectively, may be related with the use of *mos* (cf. section 5.2.4).

5.1.3 Function of adverbs and grammaticality of the sentence

Mos does not have the grammatical function of adverbs. Adverbs modify adjectives, verbs, other adverbs, or prepositions. *Mos* does not seem to modify any verb, adjective, adverb, or preposition. For example, if we consider prepositions that may be modified by adverbs, "through" can be modified by adverbs such as "right". Compare the following examples (49) and (50) below.

- (49) **Reg** deur.
Right through

- (50) ***Mos** deur.

The expression in (50) in which *mos* appears preceding the preposition *deur* ("through") is ungrammatical, while the expression in (49) where *reg* ("right") modifies *deur* is grammatical. As stated above, *mos* cannot modify single linguistic elements or words; rather, the entire proposition expressed in the utterance is modified by *mos*. In example (50) above, *mos* does not give an indication as to the extent or time-span of the break or activity, as an adverb would. The occurrence of *mos* requires a verb to be present in the sentence (although the verb is not modified by *mos*). *Mos* has to occur with a verb in order for the above example (50) to be grammatical, as is illustrated in example (51).

- (51) Dit is **mos** deur.
*It is **surely** through.*

The sentence in (51) is grammatical, yet the preposition *deur* is still not modified by *mos* (i.e. there is no additional meaning or quality attributed to *deur*). The entire utterance is modified by the appearance of *mos*, which is the function of attitudinal adverbs. Attitudinal adverbs, however, can occur without a verb if we consider example (52).

- (52) A: Did he not make it to the show?
B: **Unfortunately** not.

The attitudinal adverb *unfortunately*, which conveys the speaker's attitude or opinion towards the proposition expressed in the previous utterance, is understood in relation to the previous utterance – the proposition from the previous utterance is implied in the response. Furthermore, *mos* cannot occur sentence initially (this is informed by the data; there are no examples where *mos* occurs sentence initially and therefore it is assumed that *mos* only occurs sentence finally and medially if grammaticality is to be maintained). An example where *mos* precedes an adjective is given in (53) below.

- (53) En dan raak hy **mos** moeilik.
*And then he **mos** becomes difficult.*

In example (53) *moeilik* ("difficult, demanding, discontented") is not qualified or modified by *mos*; the entire proposition is qualified and related to another utterance. In the case of (53), *mos* does not seem to be performing as an attitudinal adverb as there is no attitude or opinion being expressed by the speaker, but rather *mos* performs a pragmatic/discourse function (cf. section 5.2.4).

This section on the syntactic aspects of *mos* offered a description of the syntactic properties and functions of *mos* which would allow for its classification of *mos* as an adverb (albeit with restricted functions), but also providing the possibility to distinguish it as a DM. A further discussion of the similar features which *mos* shares with certain adverbs and DMs is given in chapter 6. The following section presents an analysis of the discourse functions which *mos* performs in conversation.

5.2 Pragmatic aspects of *mos*

This section aims focuses on the pragmatic functions (or discourse uses) of *mos*, specifically as employed by the Cape Afrikaans speakers represented in the data. The section begins with the most common function of *mos*, which is that of indicating shared or common knowledge, turning next to the question of how *mos* functions in aiding speaker understanding in discourse presenting background information for inferences, including context. Attention is also given to the use of *mos* in arguments, and its role in presenting causes or reasons for a particular proposition or event, as well as indicating logical relationships.

5.2.1 *Mos* as an indicator of shared knowledge

On the basis of the literal meaning of the DM *y'know*, one can deduce its function as a marker of mutual knowledge which the speaker and hearer share, or as a marker of knowledge that is generally known (Schiffrin 1987: 268). *Mos* appears to share similar (literal) meanings with *y'know*, indicating either that the information is available to the hearer, or that the information is generally available, and so can be assumed to be known by the hearer. Furthermore, in cases where *mos* is used, the hearer and speaker are apparently both aware of each other's knowledge about a particular topic. Consider example (54) below.

- (54) B: Ja-nee nee nee, nou is hy groot. En die Teologiese skool is gesluit.
Yes-no no no. It is big now. And the Theological school is closed.

BM56: Ja, hulle is **mos** nou geskuif Stellenbosch toe, nè? Russel Bothman was saam met my. Ons was saam.
Yes, they were mos moved to Stellenbosch, isn't it? Russel Bothman was with me. We were together.

- B: Stellenbosch toe. Ja, hulle is eintlik.
To Stellenbosch. Yes, they are actually

In (54) the topic is the old Theological School. Speaker BM56 uses *mos* in an utterance which expresses knowledge that he assumes speaker B possesses. Speaker BM56 further uses *nè?* ("right?", "isn't it?"), which prompts the hearer to display information reception or understanding in order to check whether this information is indeed known by the hearer. Speaker B then responds with *Stellenbosch toe* ("To Stellenbosch"), confirming her knowledge about the topic (cf. section 5.2.3). In example (55) *mos* functions in indicating shared knowledge or knowledge that the

speaker believes should be known; *mos* is used to remind the hearer about information or knowledge that had been given previously in the discourse.

- (55) B: So...uhmm.. En julle praat by die huis, Afrikaans? Is jy getroud, en kinders en so aan of is dit... jy alleen?
So...uhmm...and you speak at home, Afrikaans? Are you married, and children and so on or is it are you alone?
- RF55: Nee. Ek is getroud.
No, I am married.
- B: O, ja. Jy't **mos** gesê jy's getroud.
*Oh, yes. You **mos** told me you're married.*
- RF55: Ek is **mos** toe nou... uh... laat getroud. Ek is nou vier jaar getroud.
*I am **mos** uh... married late. I've been married four years now.*

The following example illustrates the use of *mos* in reminding the speaker of general knowledge, or knowledge which she should have, or is believed to have.

- (56) B: Bedags, ja, ge gestudeer en dit was – was dit 'n spesiale soort matriek of hoe het julle dit gedoen?
During the day, yes, studied and it was – was it a special sort of matric or how did you do it?
- RF55: Ja, (ge)studeer. Nee ons het dit toe – Ons het toe – Ons skrywe **mos** teen die einde van die jaar met die matrikulante.
*Yes, stud(ied). No, we then had – We then had – We **mos** write towards the end of the year with the matriculants.*

It is common knowledge that matriculants write their final exam at the end of the year. RF55 employs *mos* in the utterance *Ons skrywe mos teen die einde van die jaar met die matrikulante* ("we *mos* write towards the end of the year with the matriculants") in order to remind the hearer of the fact that matriculants write at the end of the year; she believes that the hearer has this knowledge and requests her to focus on it as an answer to her question. The next example (57) illustrates a similar function of *mos*, but where shared knowledge is checked with the marker *nè* ("right", "isn't it") co-occurring with *mos* (cf. also example (54) above).

- (57) B: Ja. Ek is nou somer net nuuskierig, praat julle ooit iewers Engels in julle familie?
Yes. I am just a little curious, do you ever talk English somewhere in your family?

- TF65: Ja, my kinders se kinders.
Yes, my childrens' children.
- B: Die kinders se kinders praat Engels.
The childrens' children speak English.
- TF65: Praat Engels.
Speak English.
- B: En waar bly daai kinders? In die Kaap?
And where do those children live? In the Cape?
- TF65: In P.E.
In P.E. (Port Elizabeth)
- B: O, in P.E.
Oh, in P.E.
- TF65: In P.E. gee die een onder(wys)... twee gee onderwys in PE, so daai twee kinders is Engels en die ander een is ook Engels.
In P.E., the one teaches... two teach in P.E., so those two children are English and the other one is also English.
- B: So die ma is Engels en die pa, ag Afrikaans en die pa is Afrikaans?
So the mother is English and the father... oh Afrikaans and the father is Afrikaans?
- TF65: Nee, die ma is ook Afrikaans, die pa is ook Afrikaans. Maar kyk, die kinders leer nou Engels, want hulle gaan na die Engelse skool toe van kleins af. En dan leer die ma en pa jou **mos** nou verder weer in die huis nè? En die taal nou ... Onse kinders kry **mos** baie... Ons Afrikaners kry **mos** baie swaar in Engels.
*No, the mother is also Afrikaans, the father is also Afrikaans. But look, the children learn English, because they attend the English school from when they're little. And then the mother and father **mos** teach you English further at home, right? And the language now... Our children **mos** struggle... Us Afrikaners **mos** struggle a lot with English.*
- B: Twee wat onderwysers is. En die ander?
Two who are teachers. And the others?
- TF65: (Die) ander een is 'n Fidelity in die Kaap en die ander... die meisietjie... (die) meisie werk in die George. Sy's getroud. En een in Matjiesfontein (by) die hotel is getroud. En Francois wat **mos** nou hierbo in is. Die ander een is ook daar in in... Hoe sê mens die plek se naam? Sal nie kan sê nie, is getroud. So ek is nou verlos. Ek het net vir Francois by my nou in die huis.
*The other one is a Fidelity in the Cape and the other... the little girl... the girl works in George. She's married. And one in Matjiesfontein at the hotel is married. And Francois who is now **mos** up here. The other one is also there in in... How does one say the places name? Can't say, is married. So I am now free. I just have Francois with me now in the house.*

B: Ja, natuurlik.
Yes, of course.

The first occurrence of *mos* is used in the utterance *en dan leer die ma en pa jou mos nou verder weer in die huis, nè?* ("and then the mother and father *mos* teach you further in the house, right?") which presents a proposition that is general knowledge; a typical event which occurs in most families is conveyed in the utterance. We see again a request from speaker TF65 for the hearer to verify or confirm her knowledge about the current topic in using *nè*. So, speaker TF65 presents a statement which she believes the hearer to have knowledge about and checks this. The subsequent occurrences of *mos* in the statements *onse kinders kry mos baie swaar* ("our children *mos* struggle a lot") and *ons Afrikaners kry mos baie swaar in Engels* ("us Afrikaners *mos* struggle a lot with English") are also presented as common knowledge, or typical events, and this is confirmed by the response by speaker B *ja, natuurlik* ("yes, of course").

Mos also occurs, however, in the manner indicated for *you know* by Macaulay (2000: 755), who states, in contrast to Schiffrin, that in "initial and final position, *you know* is frequently used before or after statements that clearly do not represent shared knowledge". Consider the example in (58), where *mos* appears in this manner.

- (58) DM56: En partykeer as ek nou die kant gewerk het toe was hier **mos** nou 'n trollie toe's die lyn **mos** nou al toe. Die ou lyn wat ons nog gebruik dat ek soggens party oggende met die trollie gekom (het) tot hier in De Doorns.
That is the thing. That's the thing. And then after a while they came to fetch me there in the mornings and sometimes if I now worked this side then here was mos a trolley, the line was mos already closed then. The old line that we still use that I came here in the morning some mornings to De Doorns in the trolley.

In example (58) above, *mos* is used in a narrative where the DM56 conveys new information to the hearer. The hearer has no knowledge of the topic, and the information expressed in the utterances in which *mos* occurs can be regarded as necessary in order for the hearer to follow the story. Information that is communicated by the speaker in order to achieve hearer understanding is discussed in the following section.

5.2.2 Indicating need for hearer understanding

A further function of *y'know*, according to Schiffrin (1987), is to mark information as "to-be-shared", as well as information which may be necessary in order for the hearer to understand the

subsequent narrative event (Schiffrin 1987: 274). As stated earlier, an important aspect of a DM such as *y'know* is that its function (or discourse use) is directly influenced by its literal meaning¹⁰, but it has other uses which may not directly stem from a literal meaning. *Y'know* appeals to the hearer to focus attention on information which the speaker provides (Schiffrin 1987: 267). *Y'know* may then elicit a response from the hearer which signals an acknowledgment to the speaker providing this information, and in this way a situation where the speaker knows about the hearer's knowledge is created (Schiffrin 1987: 269). "(Y)'know displays the speaker as one whose role as information provider is contingent upon hearer reception. Since speakers may require different types of hearer reception – ranging from attention to what is said to confirmation of a proposition to relinquishment of the floor – it is not surprising that *y'know* occurs in so broad a range of environments" (Schiffrin 1987: 295). *Y'know* marks the speaker as information provider, and is used in narratives to focus the hearer's attention on information which is relevant and important for his/her understanding of the story; for the hearer to appreciate the story such background information is necessary (Schiffrin 1987: 284). This function of *y'know* is interesting to consider in the context of the present data on *mos*. In narratives information or topics and subtopics are organised – information which the hearer has to consider in understanding or following the narrative is indicated with the use of *mos* in utterances provided by the speaker. *Mos* appeals to the hearer to focus on the information presented in an utterance (or its proposition) and a particular interpretation is constrained. A conclusion is inferred by the hearer as the hearer may then draw a conclusion from the utterance. Consider example (59) below.

- (59) DM56: Dis omtrent so sê drie kwart na 'n uur toe. So soggens ses uur vir sewe uur moet ek. Ek moet eintlik half ses al begin, want daar's plekke waar ek moet stap en dan moet ek die hekke oopmaak ook. En ek kan nie die hek die hek oop los nie ek moet hom toe maak ook nou nog en [...] die dinge. dan's it –
It's about so say forty five (minutes) to an hour. So in the mornings six o'clock for seven o'clock I must. I must actually begin at half (past) five, because there're places where I must walk and then I must also open the gates. And I can't leave the gates open, I must also close them still and [unint.] those things. Then it's –
- B: Dan's mens eintlik moeg as jy by die werk aankom.
Then a person is actually tired once you get to work.
- DM56: Dit is die ding. Dis die ding. En dan nou later van tyd het hulle my soggens kom haal daarso. En partykeer as ek nou die kant gewerk het

¹⁰ Macaulay (2000: 760) disagrees with Schiffrin on this point, stating that there "does not appear to be any strong evidence that either *you* or *know* retains its basic meaning and function", he rather considers *you know* to be grammaticalised and separated from its basic meaning (Macaulay 2000: 755).

toe was hier **mos** nou 'n trollie toe's die lyn **mos** nou al toe. Die ou lyn wat ons nog gebruik dat ek soggens party oggende met die trollie gekom (het) tot hier in De Doorns.

*That is the thing. That's the thing. And then after a while they came to fetch me there in the mornings and sometimes if I now worked this side then here was **mos** a trolley, the line was **mos** already closed then. The old line that we still use that I came here in the morning some mornings to De Doorns in the trolley.*

B: O, ek sien. Dan kan 'n mens darem 'n "lift" op die manier kry.
Oh, I see. Then a person can then get a lift in a way.

DM56: Daar's hy, ja. Tot een dag toe die inspekteur bietjie dan die saak kom nagaan het. [...]
That's it, yes. Until one day when the inspector came to check the matter a little. [...]

In (59), speaker DM56 introduces new information which is relevant to the story. The hearer's response, *O, ek sien* ("Oh, I see"), indicates an understanding of the story, as well as acknowledgement of the relevance of the information supplied. DM56 in turn recognises, or confirms, the hearer's acknowledgement in the response *Daar's hy, ja* ("That's it, yes"). In this way, *mos* may function similarly to *y'know* in narratives; *mos* occurs in a statement where new information is presented as part of a narrative. Speaker DM56 interrupts the story to include this new information *toe was hier mos nou 'n trollie toe's die lyn mos nou al toe* ("here was *mos* a trolley the line was *mos* already closed then"), which is backgrounded information in order for the hearer to understand or arrive at the intended interpretation for the story. The hearer acknowledges receipt of this information and responds accordingly. Furthermore, speaker B adds an interpretation which is inferred from the backgrounded information, namely *Dan kan 'n mens darem 'n "lift" op die manier kry* ("Then a person can at least get a lift in this way"). The interpretation is confirmed by speaker DM56 in *Daar's hy, ja* ("That's it, yes").

As the above example illustrates, *mos* can be used to indicate background information intended for hearer reception in order for the hearer to make sense of the story, or have a better understanding of the story. Basically, the relevance of the information is indexed by *mos*, and this elicits a response from the hearer which confirms his/her reception of the information and its relevance.

Related to the above, *y'know* is used to bracket information which may be necessary as "'background material' before an upcoming narrative event will make sense to the hearer" (Schiffrin 1987: 274). This background information is considered by Schiffrin as "warranted" and the interpretations inferred from the background information are known as "inferences" (Schiffrin 1987:

205). Statements in which *mos* occurs seem to warrant information in order for the hearer to make an inference – *mos* may indicate that the information is warranted. This is illustrated by example (61).

- (60) B: En toe in standerd nege uit die skool uit. Kaap toe of nog hier op Touwsrivier gebly?
And then left school in standard nine. To the Cape or still stayed here in Touwsrivier?
- TF42: Kaap, so ses maande nog gebly. Ek het eintlik **mos** nou swanger geword met die oudste seun.
*Cape Town, stayed for about another six months. I actually **mos** became pregnant with the oldest son.*
- B: Ja, dan kan 'n mens **mos** nou nie die skool laat klaar maak nie.
*Yes, then a person **mos** cannot finish school.*

In example (60) speaker TF42 presents information that she wishes to put out there as shared. The information which speaker TF42 conveys is new information about which the hearer has no prior knowledge. The information is furthermore of a personal nature, so *mos* may be seen as softening the statement and inviting the hearer to share this personal information with the speaker. The information provided by speaker TF42 is intended as background information in order for the hearer to make a particular interpretation, or to associate the proposition expressed in the previous utterance with that of the current utterance, in which *mos* occurs, for a better understanding of the situation under discussion. The speaker receives affirmation from the hearer with *Ja* ("Yes."), who has received the information, and then adds her interpretation *dan kan 'n mens mos nie die skool laat klaar maak nie* ("then a person *mos* cannot finish school"). *Mos* may be used by speaker B to indicate that the utterance or proposition intended by TF42 is known by her, and she does not want to give more information than is necessary. This is yet another function of *mos*; thus, *mos* is used by TF42 and speaker B to perform different functions. The basis is the information balance between speaker and hearer: the speaker wants to tactfully inform without giving too much information which the hearer already knows, the speaker wants to control information and presumption (Conradie 1995: 48). TF42 expresses her interpretation of the previous utterance by speaker B, and indicates her understanding.

As stated previously, another function of *mos* in narratives is to focus the hearer on information which is relevant to the narrative, and information which supplies context to the narrative, as in (61).

- (61) B: O, jy was lank weg. O, vertel waar. Jy's hier gebore en ... en toe?
Oh, you were gone long. Oh, tell me where. You're born here and ... and then?
- RF55: Ek't... Ja, en toe werk ek by die – Ek is **mos** nou by die hospitaal in... Ek is...
 Ek het toe in die kindersaal (gewerk). En dis toe vir my so verbasend gewees
 (dat die) kinders wat ons Rooikruis toe stuur spesifiek –
*I... Yes, and then I worked at the – I am **mos** now at the hospital in in... I am...
 I had worked in the children's ward. And it was so surprising for me that the
 children who we sent specifically to the Red Cross –*

In example (61) RF55 interrupts her sentence to add information, which could be regarded as warranted in the sense that she places the narrative into context in order for the hearer to follow the story a little more comprehensively. This warranted information is presented in an utterance in which *mos* occurs. The information is not necessary in order for the hearer to understand the story, or to make inferences with regard to a previous utterance or discourse, but merely to supply context. The next section considers the use of *mos* in discourse where the speaker has knowledge about a certain topic, but is unsure about the hearer's knowledge, and illustrates how the speaker makes a deliberate effort to learn about the hearer's knowledge.

5.2.3 *Mos* and the progression of knowledge in discourse

According to Schiffrin (1987: 204), "even though speakers may enter a conversation with initial assumptions about what information is shared, their knowledge and meta-knowledge about what information is actually shared continually evolves throughout the conversation". Schiffrin (1987: 268) presents a matrix which illustrates meta-knowledge about speaker/hearer shared knowledge, where "the hearer knows the background information and the speaker knows that". In this sense, *mos* functions on the level of information state; *mos* is used in utterances where the knowledge of the speaker and hearer is organised and managed as the discourse progresses. In the examples below the speaker usually has assumptions about the hearer's knowledge of a particular topic, and the hearer is often requested to confirm or indicate his or her knowledge. Knowledge and meta-knowledge continually evolves throughout the conversation or discourse, which makes it possible for ideas to be related, and also plays a role in facilitating the hearer's interpretation of propositions. According to Schiffrin's matrix model, *mos* may be seen to be used in a situation where knowledge is shared by the hearer and this is known by the speaker. *Mos* is used in "a situation in which the speaker knows about (has meta-knowledge of) knowledge which is shared by the hearer" (Schiffrin 1987: 269). Where the speaker is not certain about the hearer's knowledge *nè* ("right?", "isn't it?") is often employed to bring about transition in meta-knowledge. This can be illustrated by the example in (54), repeated here as (62).

- (62) B: Ja-nee nee nee, nou is hy groot. En die Teologiese skool is gesluit.
Yes-no no no. It is big now. And the Theological school is closed.

BM56: Ja, hulle is **mos** nou geskuif Stellenbosch toe, nè. Russel Bothman was saam met my. Ons was saam.
*Yes, they were **mos** moved to Stellenbosch, isn't it? Russel Bothman was with me. We were together.*

- B: Stellenbosch toe. Ja, hulle is eintlik.
To Stellenbosch. Yes, they are actually.

The speaker uses *mos* in an utterance which conveys information that he believes the speaker to have knowledge about. He checks this by employing the marker *nè?* ("right?", "Isn't it?"), which is a request to the hearer to indicate his or her knowledge about the particular topic. The speaker's request is met by the hearer in her response, *Stellenbosch toe* ("to Stellenbosch"). So the speaker's assumption about the hearer's knowledge is confirmed and the situation is achieved where the speaker and the hearer have knowledge about a particular topic and they both know about their shared knowledge.

5.2.4 The function of *mos* in presenting an utterance as causal or reason in discourse

Mos may be used for a similar function as English *so* on the level of the participation framework. *Mos* may function as a DM which expresses that what follows (i.e. the proposition) is a cause from which a logical result follows. The semantic meaning of *so*¹¹ is that of "result" (Schiffrin 1987: 201). *Because* often prefaces statements in which the proposition provides or indicates a cause of a result. *Mos* occurs in utterances which are prefaced by both *so* ("so") and *want/omdat* ("because"). *Mos* indicates that a proposition is relevant with regard to a previous statement, thus functioning as a marker of cause or reason. Utterances in which *mos* occurs present a proposition as relevant in relation to a prior utterance, or as cause or reason for an event or proposition expressed in a preceding utterance, and refers to elements in the context or situation (Conradie 1995: 50). Recall Schiffrin's discourse model where ideational structure is discussed (cf. section 2.2.1. DMs that function on this level guide the hearer to infer an interpretation from information presented in a previous utterance. *Mos* is used in explanations where the hearer is requested to consider information from a previous clause, which has been given. Thus, with the occurrence of *mos* in explanations, it is assumed that information which is necessary for the hearer to make an interpretation is given (i.e. information is presupposed). Consider the following example (63).

¹¹ Müller (2005: 72) disagrees with Schiffrin and considers *so* and its discourse function (i.e. marking result or consequence) as syntactically and semantically optional as "the relationship expressed by *so* between the propositions before and after it is one of the interpretative options the hearer has anyway".

- (63) TF65: Ek het sewe, maar uitgetroud, ek het net een in die huis nog
I have seven, but married away. I just have one in the house still.
- B: Net een in die huis
Just one at home
- TF65: Ja, dis nog net een maar hy's al ses-en-twintig
Yes, it's just one but he's already twenty six
- B: O, die jongste is ses-en- twintig
Oh, the youngest is twenty six
- TF65: Nee, my my jongste, my tweede jongste. Hy's nog in die huis, want hy't ook
 deur siekte. Is -. Hy -. Kan hy **mos** nie eintlik...
*No, my my youngest, my second youngest. He's still in the house, because he
 has also suffered sickness. Is -. He -. He cannot **mos** actually...*
- B: Werk nie.
Work.

In example (63) *mos* is used in an utterance where a causal is given for a particular event that is expressed in an utterance which occurs in a previous utterance. TF65 gives a reason as to why her son is still living with her. The relationship between the two utterances or segments *hy't ook deur siekte* ("he's still in the house, because he has also suffered sickness") and *kan hy mos nie eintlik...* ("he cannot actually...") is clear even without *mos*, but *mos* may serve to relate the segments explicitly and contribute to the interpretation of the proposition. What the speaker understands is that *he has suffered sickness and so he cannot lift things* (i.e. do hard labour). *Mos* refers back to a prior utterance and relates it to the current utterance. Now consider the occurrence of *mos* in (64).

- (64) B: O, ok. Nee, dis goed. Hy wil liever werk.
Oh, ok. No, that's good. He rather wants to work.
- TF65: Nee, hy's **mos** daar by die hostel en dis **mos** nie swaar werk nie.
*No, he's **mos** there at the hostel and it's **mos** not heavy work.*

In the above example TF65 continues to tell about her son who lives with her. Here she tells of a job that he is doing at a hostel. The first *mos* used in the utterance by TF65 could be seen as presenting warranted information (cf. section 5.2.2 above) which is to be taken as relevant to the following utterance. The second use of *mos* indicates a relationship between the present proposition and the one expressed earlier in the discourse, i.e. *Kan hy mos nie eintlik...lig nie* ("Cannot *mos* actually...lift"). So, the utterance in which *mos* appears presents a reason for her son being able to work. The hearer is requested to consider the utterance in which *mos* occurs and relate it to the previous discourse in order to make an inference. *Mos* may also present reasons for assumptions

made by an interlocutor. In other words, *mos* is used by the speaker in confirming (and, possibly, also denying) an assumption held by an interlocutor. *Mos* refers back to the assumption expressed in a previous utterance in an explanation or confirmation of this assumption. This is illustrated in the example (65) where TF42 confirms an assumption about her situation held by speaker B.

- (65) B: So tien jaar, ja. Maar dit is ook nie eintlik vervreemd van hierdie plek nie.
Nog altyd familie gehad en terug gekom en so.
*About ten years, yes. But that is also not actually estranged from this place.
Still always had family and returned and so on.*
- TF42: Ja, my ouers, my ouers het **mos** nou hier gebly. En my ma bly ook nog
steeds hier, ja. Ja.
*Yes, my parents, my parents **mos** stayed here. And my mother also still lives
here, yes. Yes.*
- B: Al die jare hier gebly. Nog steeds hier. Is dit so? So sy leef nog.
Lived here all these years. Still here. Is that so? So she's still alive.

In (65) speaker B puts forward an assumption about the situation of speaker TF42. This assumption is confirmed by speaker TF42 (cf. section 5.2.4 on checking hearer understanding) in her response, *Ja, my ouers my ouers het mos hier gebly* ("Yes, my parents my parents *mos* stayed here"). In the response by speaker TF42 *mos* functions to signal a reason which verifies the assumption expressed in the preceding utterance by speaker B; the utterance by speaker TF42 in which *mos* appears is thus related to the previous utterance by speaker B.

The example in (66) illustrates *mos* as it functions over a wide range of talk in presenting information as a causal or reason for a particular event.

- (66) B: Ja. Ek is nou sommer net nuuskierig, praat julle ooit iewers Engels in julle familie?
Yes. I am just a little curious, do you ever talk English somewhere in your family?
- TF65: Ja, my kinders se kinders.
Yes, my childrens' children.
- B: Die kinders se kinders praat Engels.
The childrens' children speak English.
- TF65: Praat Engels.
Speak English.
- B: En waar bly daai kinders? In die Kaap?
And where do those children live? In the Cape?

TF65: In P.E.
In P.E. (Port Elizabeth)

B: O, in P.E.
Oh, in P.E.

TF65: In P.E. gee die een onder(wys)... twee gee onderwys in PE, so daai twee kinders is Engels en die ander een is ook Engels.
In P.E., the one teaches... two teach in P.E., so those two children are English and the other one is also English.

B: So die ma is Engels en die pa, ag Afrikaans en die pa is Afrikaans?
So the mother is English and the father... oh Afrikaans and the father is Afrikaans?

TF65: Nee, die ma is ook Afrikaans, die pa is ook Afrikaans. Maar kyk, die kinders leer nou Engels, want hulle gaan na die Engelse skool toe van kleins af. En dan leer die ma en pa jou **mos** nou verder weer in die huis nè? En die taal nou ... Onse kinders kry **mos** baie... Ons Afrikaners kry **mos** baie swaar in Engels.
*No, the mother is also Afrikaans, the father is also Afrikaans. But look, the children learn English, because they attend the English school from when they're little. And then the mother and father **mos** teach you English further at home, right? And the language now... Our children **mos** struggle... Us Afrikaners **mos** struggle a lot with English.*

B: Twee wat onderwysers is. En die ander?
Two who are teachers. And the others?

TF65: (Die) ander een is 'n Fidelity in die Kaap en die ander... die meisietjie... (die) meisie werk in die George. Sy's getroud. En een in Matjiesfontein (by) die hotel is getroud. En Francois wat **mos** nou hierbo in is. Die ander een is ook daar in in... Hoe sê mens die plek se naam? Sal nie kan sê nie, is getroud. So ek is nou verlos. Ek het net vir Francois by my nou in die huis.
*The other one is a Fidelity in the Cape and the other... the little girl... the girl works in George. She's married. And one in Matjiesfontein at the hotel is married. And Francois who is now **mos** up here. The other one is also there in in... How does one say the places name? Can't say, is married. So I am now free. I just have Francois with me now in the house.*

In (66) speaker B poses a question to TF65 and asks whether there is any English spoken in her family. TF65 replies with *Ja, my kinders se kinders* ("Yes, my children's children"). Later in the discourse she continues to explain why or how her grandchildren learned to speak English; TF65 states that *die kinders leer nou Engels, want hulle gaan na die Engelse skool toe van kleins af* ("the children learn English, because they attended the English school from when they were little"), she continues this explanation with the utterance *En daai plek het mos 'n Engelse skool ook* ("And that place *mos* has an English school too"). In the above example *mos* relates two non-adjacent

utterances. *Mos*, then, is able to function over a wide range of talk. The hearer is able to draw from the related utterances (*hulle gaan na die Engelse skool toe van kleins af* and *daai plek het mos 'n Engelse skool ook*) in order to make an inference.

Related to the above, it is observed that *mos* indicates logical relationships between utterances. As stated earlier, DMs have the property of indicating meaning relations; they relate utterances. The following example illustrates the manner in which *mos* presents information that follows logically from a previous utterances or discourse segment. Consider example (67) below.

- (67) B: So jy't nie kleinkinders wat wat allerhande taalveranderinge bring nie.
So you don't have grandchildren who who bring all sorts of language changes.
- TF65: Nee, niks nie. En hier by die werk het ons nou al sekere goedjies soos wat ons inwoners in neem by ons. Ons het **mos** swart inwoners ook hier, dan sal hulle miskien nou... Ons het nou al gehoor hulle sê "sala kahle (usale kuhle)". Net... Dan is dit nou Bantu.
*No, none. And here at work we also have certain things like what our residents bring in. We **mos** also have black residents here, then they will maybe now... We have already heard them say "sala kuhle (usale kuhle)". Just... That is now Bantu.*
- B: O, ja, ja, ja, ja. Bietjie Xhosa, ja.
Oh, yes, yes, yes, yes. A little Xhosa, yes.
- TF65: Ja, bietjie Xhosa, ja. En so nou [unint.], ons praat terug.
Yes, a little Xhosa, yes. And so now [unint.], we reply.
- B: Ja.
Yes.
- TF65: Trouens, want jy leer nou wat daai een sê en dan... Want dis moeilik. Ons sit nou met 'n pasiënt hier bo byvoorbeeld, nou praat daai een op sy taal. Nou jy kan nie vir hom antwoord nie. En dan raak hy **mos** nou moeilik, want die ding wat hy wil hê gee jy nie vir hom nie. En so leer 'n mens miskien.
*As a matter of fact, because you learn what that one says and then...Because it's difficult. We sit up here with a patient, for example, who talks in his own language. Now you cannot answer him. And then he **mos** becomes difficult, because the thing that he wants, you're not giving to him. And so a person maybe learns.*
- B: Dis reg, ja. Ja, ja, ja. Tog 'n bietjie... 'n bietjie van hulle taal kan praat.
That's right, yes. Yes, yes, yes. At least a little... can speak a little of their language.

Mos may indicate that the proposition expressed by the utterance in which it occurs follows logically from a proposition which precedes the utterance or which occurs earlier in the discourse.

In this case, *nou praat daai een op sy taal. Nou jy kan nie vir hom antwoord nie* ("who talks in his own language. Now you cannot answer him") is indicated to relate to *en dan raak hy mos moeilik* ("and then he *mos* becomes difficult"). The situation (or proposition) presented in the latter utterance, in which *mos* occurs, is a direct result of the situation in the former utterance; there is a logical relationship displayed between the two utterances.

5.2.5 *Mos* in arguments

Y'know functions to indicate shared knowledge in order to convince an opponent in a disagreement to accept an opinion expressed by the speaker and to bring the hearer to the speaker's side of an argument (Schiffrin 1987: 279). This occurs in arguments where a speaker presents support for a debatable opinion or position (Schiffrin 1987: 279). The use of *y'know* also indicates that the speaker wants the hearer to accept the position, or the proposition, presented without any disagreement or opposition. *Mos* appears to fulfil this function too, as is clear from example (68).

- (68) B: Ja, nou nou ek het toe ek by UWK begin het toe was Jakes al die rektor daar. En Afrikaans en Taalwetenskap was by UWK al die jare een en dieselfde gewees maar in die later jare het hulle Taalwetenskap en Afrikaans twee aparte departemente want Taalwetenskap is nie net oor Afrikaans nie. Dit gaan ook oor snaaksighede van taal met Engels en snaaksighede van taal met Xhosa.
Yes, now now I began at UWC when Jakes was already the dean there. And at UWC Afrikaans and Linguistics was all the years one and the same, but in the later years they (made) Linguistics and Afrikaans two separate departments, because Linguistics is not only about Afrikaans. It's also about the perculiarities of language in English and perplexities of language in Xhosa.

BM56: Weet jy, ons het ou Ronnie Beltcher oor gehad wat. Wat het hy vir ons gegee?
You know, we had old Ronnie Beltcher over who. What did he give us?

- B: O, ja. Seker digkuns... letterkunde. Ja, want hy het **mos** gedigte geskryf.
*Oh, yes. Probably poetry... literature. Yes, because he **mos** wrote poetry.*

BM56: Dis reg, ja. Ja, ja. Ons moes ook sulke snaakse stories uit jou streek uit vir hom kom vertel oor bygelowe en so aan. Kry ons sommer lekker punte op jou [unint].
That's right, yes. Yes, yes. We also had to come and tell him such funny stories from our area about superstitions and so on. Then we "sommer" got nice points on our [unint].

In example (68) *mos* is used in an utterance which stands as support for a position held by the speaker. The position held by the speaker is substantiated by the utterance *want hy het mos gedigte*

geskryf ("because he *mos* wrote poems"), in which *mos* occurs. In the argument, *mos* could be indicating the current utterance (in which it occurs) as warranted information; the hearer should focus on this information as support for the speaker's position, and as a probable answer to the question. The hearer responds with *dis reg, ja* ("that's right, yes") which expresses agreement with the position held by the speaker, and the answer by speaker B is confirmed. Example (69) below illustrates a similar use of *mos*.

- (69) B: Sal jy sê: "Hy gaan gister skool toe"?
Will you say, "He is going to school yesterday"?

BF58: Nee, gister... Jy kan **mos** nie sê: "hy gaan". Hy het gister skool toe gegaan.
 [...] Dis **mos** al "past tense" hy het **mos** al gegaan. Het gister skool toe gegaan.
*No, gister... You **mos** cannot say, "he's going". He did go to school yesterday.*
 [...] It's... I want to... It's **mos** already past tense, he **mos** already went. Went
 to school yesterday.

In the above example speaker BF58 is asked whether the utterance *Hy gaan gister skool toe* ("He is going to school yesterday") is an accurate representation of the speech (or of a particular sentence construction) in her community and she responds negatively with *nee* ("no") and goes on to present her argument. *Mos* is used by speaker BF58 in *Jy kan mos nie sê: "hy gaan"* ("You *mos* cannot say, 'he is going'") to express an opinion, and the subsequent occurrence of *mos* is found in the support for the opinion held by speaker BF58 in *Dis mos al "past tense"* ("That's *mos* already past tense"). In this second occurrence (in the support) *mos* is used as an appeal to the hearer to focus attention on the proposition (i.e. that the sentence is already in the past tense). This proposition is further supported in the subsequent utterance *hy het mos al gegaan* ("he *mos* went already"), where the past action is illustrated.

The section above explicated the range of pragmatic functions which *mos* can perform in discourse. The data allows for an observation of the context in which *mos* is used and how it functions in dialogues and narratives. The pragmatic functions of *mos* are further discussed in chapter 6. The next section presents an account of the prevalence of *mos* influenced by the social factors of age and gender.

CHAPTER 6 – SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

As mentioned in section 4.1, the research presented here forms part of a larger research project which aims at mapping the rural dialects of non-standard Afrikaans. The present study focuses only on Cape Afrikaans, one of the non-standard varieties of Afrikaans spoken in the Western Cape, and considers only one particular linguistic item, namely *mos*, which is prevalent in, but not exclusive to, this variety. The present study aims to contribute to the steadily growing research on Afrikaans, and specifically to the field of sociolinguistics and language variation in South Africa.

The findings are discussed in section 6.1 below in relation to the underlying assumptions, each with its respective research question (cf. sections 1.4 and 1.5), which have guided the present study. In section 6.2, the possible weaknesses of the research and the data which has informed the present study is discussed and topics for further research are mentioned.

6.1 Discussion of the findings

6.1.1 *Mos* as a discourse marker which conveys shared knowledge

Assumption (i) on p. 4 entails that *mos* functions as a DM which conveys shared knowledge; *mos* conveys a particular attitude towards an utterance, or proposition, which suggests to the hearer that the information presented should be known or is general knowledge.

According to researchers such as Roberge (2002), Deumert (2004), Conradie (1995), and Ponelis (1985), the basic function of *mos* is its emphasis on common or general knowledge. The data has shown that *mos* serves as a marker of meta-knowledge about what the speaker and hearer share and it is a marker of general knowledge, and of knowledge that should be known (cf. section 5.2.1). *Mos* may also refer to previous statements within a discourse (i.e. refer to knowledge which is not general or available to anyone except the interlocutors); thus, *mos* does not necessarily express general knowledge (about the world), but also information that is restricted between the individuals in the current discourse situation (cf. p. 62). Furthermore, *mos* may also indicate that the information expressed in the current utterance in which it appears has to be considered, or focused on, in order for a particular narrative to be understood (cf. section 5.2.2). According to Schiffrin (1987: 204), "even though speakers may enter a conversation with initial assumptions about what information is shared, their knowledge and meta-knowledge about what information is actually

shared continually evolves throughout the conversation". Thus, *mos* has extensive functions in discourse, and does not serve only to convey a proposition as mutual knowledge, but it is used in order to create coherence within discourse; *mos* manages the flow of information, presenting information which is deemed relevant in interpreting narratives or utterances; brings a hearer in to share personal information by relating to the hearer; presents a context for a narrative requesting the hearer to focus attention on particular events or situations; presents an argument which cannot be contested, etc. All of the above functions are discussed in chapter 5 (cf. sections 5.2.2 to 5.2.5; cf. also sections 6.1.3 and **Error! Reference source not found.**). As illustrated by the present data, *mos* functions as a familiarity qualifier as it presents information as common knowledge or knowledge that should be known, and also indicates a logical relationship between a prior utterance or discourse segment and the current utterance in which it appears (cf. 5.2.4).

6.1.2 *Mos* distinguished from the syntactic category of adverb

The research hypothesis (ii) on p. 4 claims that *mos* can be distinguished from the syntactic category of adverb to which it is generally ascribed. As stated previously, *mos* is believed to have been derived from the adverb *immers*, but *mos* most likely has functions which are distinct from *immers* and *mos* is probably inadequate in its function(s) as an adverb. Research question (B) on p. 6 asks what syntactic properties and pragmatic functions of *mos* in non-standard Cape Afrikaans would establish it as a DM, and addressing this question serves to guide the analysis in substantiating the corresponding research assumption (ii).

Firstly, an attempt was made to establish *mos* as an adverb in terms of its properties and functions. There are a number of criteria which were considered in this regard. The findings indicate that the function of *mos* as an adverb is restricted, although it has the adverbial function of relating utterances and expressing an attitude towards or an opinion on a particular utterance. Adverbials function similarly to adverbs and in this regard *mos* may be classified as an adverb (and as stated in 2.5.1 the term "adverb" is used in this study to refer to all constituents that function as adverbs). With regard to the syntactic properties of *mos*, it can be regarded as a bound sentence adverb, as there is a relationship between the utterance in which *mos* appears and a previous utterance (not necessarily within the discourse). In terms of its distribution, *mos* is relatively free with regard to its position in the sentence, occurring either sentence medially or finally (no instances of *mos* in sentence initial position occur in the data); however, the syntactic distribution of an adverb is generally determined by the type to which it belongs. There appear to be prescribed positions that can be occupied by *mos* in the sentence, i.e. *mos* has, to some extent, a grammatical relationship

with the other linguistic elements or constituents within the sentence (cf. 5.1.3). Therefore, the grammaticality of the sentence appears to have to be taken into account in the use of *mos*, unlike in the case of other DMs, such as *you know*, which may occur in most positions within the clause without affecting grammaticality. Yet *mos* still does not appear to be tied to the structure of the sentence. The omission of *mos* from the sentence does not result in ungrammaticality, nor is the meaning of the proposition or utterance affected, although an intended interpretation by the hearer may not be achieved. With regard to semantic properties (cf. section 2.5.1.2), *mos* does not contribute any meaning to the proposition conveyed by the utterance, yet it offers an opinion or comment on the proposition, which is especially observed in its use in arguments. *Mos* may also strengthen the proposition in arguments where it may function like an evidential adverb which indicates a degree of credibility (cf. section 5.2.5). In this sense, *mos* displays the property of parentheticality which has been proposed as a property of adverbs by Bonami et al. (2004: 4). Furthermore, *mos* does not contribute any truth condition to the proposition, which distinguishes it as an attitudinal adverbial, as *mos* qualifies the entire proposition of the utterance in which it appears, and in some instances guides the hearer to an interpretation of the utterance (cf. sections 5.2.2 and 5.2.4; cf. also 6.1.3 below).

6.1.3 The syntactic category of *mos* and its pragmatic function

The assumption (iii) on p. 4 claims that *mos* has a number of pragmatic functions; apart from conveying general knowledge, *mos* seems to convey particular interpretations for utterances in which it occurs and it aids in the coherence of discourse. The corresponding research question (A), which asks what the pragmatic functions and syntactic characteristics of *mos* in the data set are, served to guide the analysis in order to substantiate the assumption (iii).

Although *mos* fulfils some of the functions of adverbs, there are also particular discourse functions which it performs. There are functions of adverbs which *mos* does not perform, such as modifying the verb, adjectives, other adverbs, and prepositions; *mos* is restricted to particular positions in the sentence at the risk of ungrammaticality. As stated above, *mos* modifies the entire proposition of the utterance. *Mos* can be distinguished from its function as adverb as a DM. DMs do, however, follow the syntactic patterning of their homonyms (or the syntactic category from which they are derived). In the case of *mos*, its syntactic distribution as a DM is similar to that of an adverb. Where *mos* can be distinguished from its function as an adverb is in certain sentence forms: it is not permissible for *mos* to occur in question forms (cf. 5.1.1.2 and 5.1.1.3) unlike most adverbs. *Mos* may then be

distinguished as a DM and further functions for *mos* may be observed in discourse. The property of non-propositionality is considered for *mos* as its occurrence in the sentence does not contribute any meaning to the utterance. As a DM, *mos* facilitates the interpretation of utterances in narratives and arguments (cf. 5.2.2 and 5.2.5), and functions in indicating an utterance as a causal or reason (cf. 5.2.4). *Mos* was found to function in the creation of meta-knowledge where knowledge shared by the interlocutors is made known (cf. 5.2.3), and *mos* indicates that the current utterance in which it appears follows from a prior utterance. In the same way, coherence within discourse is created by the use of *mos*.

Apart from marking knowledge as common or shared (cf. section 5.2.1), *mos* functions (i) to present information as necessary in order for a particular narrative to be understood or for an utterance to be interpreted (cf. section 5.2.2); (ii) to create a progression of knowledge in discourse (cf. section 5.2.3); (iii) to present a causal or reason in discourse (cf. 5.2.4); and (iv) to strengthen a position in an argument – the position is not contested, but is held by the speaker and presented as fact (cf. section 5.2.5).

6.2 Shortcomings of the present study and directions for further research

Although informative, the data were not gathered specifically for the purposes of the present study, and the data may be insufficient in illustrating the variety of functions or properties that *mos* may have as a DM. Even so, this study shows how data gathered for a particular purpose may be mined in terms of questions not originally postulated. This is of great value in the South African context, where financial and human resources for data collection are limited. Still, the (interview) context in which the data were collected provides little information on the use of *mos* in natural environments. Further research investigating the use of *mos* in various contexts could take an ethnographic approach, aiming at a qualitative analysis of the context of the interaction(s) in which *mos* is used. The use of *mos* in H codes and L codes, formal or informal situations, etc. would be interesting to consider for future research.

Apart from the use of *mos* as a DM, researchers could also consider other markers associated with speakers from various ethnicities in South African. Markers such as *just now* or *now now* in South African English are broadly (perhaps exclusively) used by speakers of South African English. *Just now* and *now now* do not follow their literal meanings and would most probably function in discourse time where they would hold "temporal relationships between utterances in a discourse", as opposed to temporal adverbs, if we consider DMs such as *now* and *then* (cf. Schiffrin 1987: 229).

There are also other linguistic items in the data, such as *darem*, *nou* (which in many cases co-occurs with *mos*), which appear to be used as DMs and which could be investigated with regard to their functions. Further research could be conducted on the semantic properties or meaning(s) of *mos* as used by speakers of non-standard Afrikaans or colloquial South African English.

The prevalence of *mos* in terms of social factors could be analysed with a larger corpus of data gathered from various (natural) social settings among speakers varying in terms of age, gender, socioeconomic status and ethnicity, and the relationship between the interlocutors could also be considered. The informants in the study were not balanced in terms of age and gender, i.e. there were not an equal number of male and female informants across particular age groups to provide an accurate investigation with regard to the prevalence of *mos* among age and gender groups. With regard to the prevalence of *mos* in terms of social factors which play a role in its frequency of use, the data mainly comes from people of the same ethnicity, of the same or similar socioeconomic background, and so no significant results would be shown in this regard. As *mos* is not only used among Coloured speakers of non-standard Afrikaans, further analysis of *mos* in terms of its functions and prevalence in other varieties of Afrikaans, and South African English, across ethnic groups, would be interesting. An investigation into the social factors which influence the use of *mos* could explore its use in informal and formal settings; thus, the setting(s) where *mos* is employed, possibly for more functions, can be investigated – a semantic interpretation for *mos* can also be found, and a core meaning which might differ in particular discourse slots could be found for *mos*.

The above discussion of the results of the present study presented final thoughts on the classification of *mos* as an adverb, and also mentioned (and applied) criteria that would establish it as a DM in terms of properties and functions of DMs (and adverbs). The limited function of *mos* as an adverb, as well as its use in discourse, gave reason to presume (a) DM function(s) for *mos* and to consider other functions for *mos*. A number of DM functions for *mos* were revealed by the data, and in this way it could be differentiated from its function as adverb (or adverbial) and established as a DM. *Mos* as a DM and *mos* as an adverb are mainly differentiated in terms of function; *mos* still follows the syntactic patterning of an adverb, and it is integrated into the sentence structure to some extent (which is not common for DMs) and, thus, may still affect the grammaticality of the sentence in which it appears in, yet it may be removed from the sentence but a particular interpretation, or interpretations, for the utterance may be taken away. There are a number of properties and functions which *mos* shares with adverbs, which allowed it to be grouped within the syntactic category of adverb, yet *mos* has limited functions as an adverb. In view of this latter fact, and its use in discourse, *mos* is shown to have DM functions.

References

- Alexiadou, A. 1997. *Adverb placement. A case study in antisymmetric syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Andersen, E.S., M. Brizuela, B. DuPuy and L. Gonnerman. 1999. Cross-linguistic evidence for the early acquisition of discourse markers as register variables. In *Journal of pragmatics* 31: 1339-1351.
- Blakemore, D. 2002. *Relevance and linguistic meaning. The semantics and pragmatics of DMs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blass, R. 1990. *Relevance relations in discourse. A study with special reference to Sissala*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bolden, G.B. 2006. Little words that matter. Discourse markers "so" and "oh" and the doing of other-attentiveness in social interaction. In *Journal of Communication* 56: 661-688.
- Bonami, O., D. Godard & B. Kampers-Manhe. 2004. Adverb classification. In *Handbook of French semantics*. Corblin, F. and H. de Swart (eds.). CSLI Publications.
- Botha, J.P. and J.M.H. van Aardt. 1983. *Afrikaans vir die praktyk*. 2nd Edition. Cape Town: Kaap and Traansvaal Publishers Ltd.
- Brinton, L.J. 2001. Historical discourse analysis. In Schiffrin, D., D. Tannen, and H.E. Hamilton (eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. 138-160.
- Chambers, J.K., P. Trudgill, and N. Schilling-Estes (eds.). 2002. *The handbook of language variation and change*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Limited.
- Cameron, D. 2001. *Working with spoken discourse*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Claasen, G.N. and M.C.J. van Rensburg. 1983. *Taalverskeidenheid. 'n Blik op die spectrum van taalvariasie in Afrikaans*. Cape Town: Academia.

- Conradie, C.J. 1995. Die partikel *mos*. 'n Semantiese verkenning. In Coetzee, A. (ed.). *Hoe Beteken dit Alles?/What Does it All Mean? Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir Taalkunde/South African Journal of Linguistics* 28: 45–55. Linguistic Society of Southern Africa.
- Du Plessis, H. 1995. *Variasietaalkunde*. Pretoria: Kagiso Publishers.
- Deumert, A. 2004. *Language standardisation and language change. The dynamics of Cape Dutch*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ernst, T. 2004. Principles of adverbial distribution in the lower clause. In *Lingua* 114: 755-77.
- Fasold, R. 1990. *The sociolinguistics of society*. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Fischer, K. 2000. *From cognitive semantics to lexical pragmatics. The functional polysemy of discourse particles*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fraser, B. 1993. DMs across language. In L.F. Bouton (ed.) *Pragmatics and language learning* (monograph series 4 (1-6): 1-18.
- Fraser, B. 1999. What are discourse markers? In *Journal of pragmatics* 31: 931-952.
- Fraser, B. 2009. Topic orientation markers. In *Journal of pragmatics* 41: 892-898.
- Fraser, B. and M. Malamud-Makowski. 1996. English and Spanish contrastive discourse markers. In *Language Sciences* 18 (3-4): 863-881. Great Britain: Elsevier Science Limited.
- Fromkin, V. and R. Rodman. 1998. *An introduction to language*. 6th Edition. Orlando: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Grote, B. and M. Stede. 1998. Discourse marker choice in sentence planning. In *Proceedings of the international workshop on natural language generation*. Canada.
- Hellerman, J. and A. Vergun. 2007. Language which is not taught. The discourse marker use of beginning adult learners of English. In *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 157-179.

- Holmes, J. 1992. *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. London: Longman
- Holmes, J. 2001. *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. 2nd Edition. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Infantidou-Trouki, E. 1993. Sentential adverbs and relevance. In *Lingua* 90 (1/2).
- Kyratzis, A and S. Ervin-Tripp. 1999. The development of discourse markers in peer interaction. In *Journal of pragmatics* 31: 1321-1338.
- Labov, W. 1972. The study of language in its social context. In Labov, W. *Sociolinguistic patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Macaulay, R. 2002. You know, it depends. In *Journal of pragmatics* 34: 749-767.
- Marmaridou, S.S.A. 2000. *Pragmatic meaning and cognition*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Müller, S. 2005. *Discourse markers in native and non-native English discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Norrick, N.R. 2001. Discourse markers in oral narrative. In *Journal of pragmatics* 33: 849-878.
- Norrick, N.R. 2009. Interjections as pragmatic markers. In *Journal of pragmatics* 41: 866-891.
- Ponelis, F.A. 1977. *Grondtrekke van die Afrikaanse sintaksis*. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik Ltd.
- Ponelis, F.A. 1985. *Afrikaanse sintaksis*. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik Ltd.
- Ponelis, F.A. 1996. Codes in contradiction. The sociolinguistics of 'Straatpraatjies'. In Adhikari, M. (ed.). *Straatpraatjies. Language, politics and popular culture in Cape Town, 1990-1922*. Cape Town: J.L. van Schaik Publishers.

- Quirk, R. and S. Greenbaum. 1976. *A university grammar of English*. Hong Kong: Commonwealth Printing Press Ltd.
- Radford, A. 1997. *Syntax. A minimalist introduction*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Radford, A. 2004. *Minimalist syntax. Exploring the structure of English*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Radford, A. 2009. *Analysing English sentences. A minimalist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Roberge, P. 2002. The modal particles *mos* and *maskie* in Cape Dutch. In *Language Sciences* 24: 397-408.
- Romaine, S. 2003. Variation in language and gender. In Holmes, J. & Meyerhoff, M. (eds.) *The handbook of language and gender*. Berlin: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Romero-Trillo, J. 2006. Discourse markers. In *Encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. Oxford: Elsevier. pp. 639-642.
- Schiffrin, D. 1987. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffrin, D. 2001. Discourse markers: language, meaning, and context. In Schiffrin, D., D. Tannen, and H.E. Hamilton (eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. 55-75.
- Schourup, L. 1999. Discourse markers. In *Lingua* 107: 227-265.
- Schwenter, S.A. 1996. Some reflections on o sea. A discourse marker in Spanish. In *Journal of Pragmatics* 25: 855-874.
- Statistics South Africa (STATSSA) available at: www.statssa.gov.za (13 August 2009).
- Van der Merwe, I.J. & L.O. van Niekerk. 1994. *Language in South Africa. Distribution and change*. Stellenbosch: University of Stellenbosch.

- Van Rensburg, M.C.J. 1990. *Taalvariëteite en die wording van Afrikaans in Afrika*. Bloemfontein: DUO-drukkers.
- Von Wielligh, G.R. 1925. *Ons geselstaal. 'n Oorsig van gevestilike spraak soos Afrikaans gepraat word*. Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.
- Wardhaugh, R. 2006. *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. 5th Edition. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Limited.

Appendix A

Orthographic transcriptions of interviews

The informants are coded in terms of their location, gender, and age; therefore, the first letter denotes the rural area (see below) within the Western Cape from where the interviews took place, the second letter (either M or F) indicates the gender of the informant, and the number which appears after the letters denotes the age of the informant. So, TF56 would tell us that the informant is from Touwsrivier, is female, and is 56 years old. This is given in order for the reader to get an idea of who uses *mos* and in which manner or for which functions.

B: Beaufort West

D: De Doorns

R: Robertson

T: Touwsrivier

Utterances by the interviewer are indicated by B.

The transcriptions below are all excerpts containing *mos* from 8 interviews with 9 informants, with enough samples extracted in order to give the reader an idea of the context in which *mos* occurred and what its pragmatic function may be. Dialogues and monologues from the interviews are separated by bold lines.

Touwsrivier; Female; 42 years old
--

B: So tien jaar, ja. Maar dit is ook nie eintlik vervreemd van hierdie plek nie. Nog altyd familie gehad en terug gekom en so.
About ten years, yes. But that is also not actually estranged from this place. Still always had family and returned and so on.

TF42: Ja, my ouers, my ouers het **mos** nou hier gebly. En my ma bly ook nogsteeds hier, ja. Ja.
*Yes, my parents, my parents **mos** stayed here. And my mother also still lives here, yes. Yes.*

B: Al die jare hier gebly. Nogsteeds hier. Is dit so? So sy leef nog.
Lived here all these years. Still here. Is that so? So she's still alive.

B: En toe in standerd nege uit die skool uit. Kaap toe of nog hier op Touwsrivier gebly?
And then left school in standard nine. To the Cape or still stayed here in Touwsrivier?

TF42: Kaap, so ses maande nog gebly. Ek het eintlik **mos** nou swanger geword met die oudste seun.
*Cape Town, stayed for about another six months. I actually **mos** became pregnant with the oldest son.*

B: Ja, dan kan 'n mens **mos** nou nie die skool laat klaar maak nie.
*Yes, then a person **mos** cannot finish school.*

Beaufort West; Female; 44 years old
--

BF44: As ons nou drie van drie appels praat. Ek het drie daarvan.
If we now talk about three apples. I have three of them.

B: hmm
hmm

BF44: Klink reg.
Sounds right.

B: Jy weet **mos** wat is dit waarvan (hulle) praat.
*You **mos** know what it is they're talking about.*

B: Maar hulle gebruik baie keer 'hy' waar ek 'n 'sy' of 'n 'dit' sou gebruik, jy weet.
But a lot of the time they use "hy" ('he', 'it') where I would use a "sy" ('she', 'it') or a "dit" ('it', 'this'), you know.

BF44: Hu Ja-nee, ek weet Namakwalanders.
Yes-no, I know Namaqualanders.

B: Dis reg, ja.
That's right, yes.

BF44: Gewoonlik, ja. Ek weet, ja.
Usually, yes. I know, yes.

B: Dis nogal interessant.
It's interesting though.

BF44: Nadia se oupa. Hu hulle praat **mos** hulle is **mos** van Namakwaland daar. Garies se Nadia.
*Nadia's grandfather. They **mos** speak. They are **mos** there from Namaqualand. Garies' Nadia.*

BF44: Jy wil **mos** nou hê ek moet nou sê wat wat ek gereeld hoor. Ek hoor... ek hoor definitief –
*You **mos** want me to say what what I often hear. I hear... I definitely hear –*

BF44: Of die kind wat altyd sê: "Nee, maar ek sit dan op die stoel in die kamer. Ek sit **mos** op die stoel". **Mos** is eintlik ook **mos** 'n verbode woord vir 'n kind en 'n ouer daai tyd gewees. **Mos**, **mos**, jy **mos** vir my.
*Or the child who always says, "No, but I am sitting on the chair in the room. I am **mos** sitting on the chair". **Mos** is actually **mos** a forbidden word for (between?) a child and a parent at that time. **Mos**, **mos**, you **mos** me.*

Robertson; Female; 55 years old
--

B: O, jy was lank weg. O, vertel waar. Jy's hier gebore en ... en toe?
Oh, you were gone long. Oh, tell me where. You're born here and ... and then?

RF55: Ek't... Ja, en toe werk ek by die – Ek is **mos** nou by die hospitaal in... Ek is... Ek het toe in die kindersaal (gewerk). En dis toe vir my so verbasend gewees (dat die) kinders wat ons Rooikruis toe stuur spesifiek –
*I... Yes, and then I worked at the – I am **mos** now at the hospital in in... I am... I had worked in the children's ward. And it was so surprising for me that the children who we sent specifically to the Red Cross –*

RF55: Hulle het gesterwe. My broer het juis twee duisend gesterf.
They passed away. My brother just passed away in two thousand.

B: Sjoe.
Sjoe.

RF55: In...hy was predikant in Johannesburg, en toe't ek... maar besluit, okay, ek gaan huis toe kom, omdat my ma is ook **mos** nog oud en daai soort van goed en my pa is al oor die...vyftien jaar oorlede.
*In...he was a preacher in Johannesburg, and then I decided, okay I am going home, because my mother is **mos** also old and that sort of thing and my father died already more than...fifteen years.*

B: So...uhmm.. En julle praat by die huis, Afrikaans? Is jy getroud, en kinders en so aan of is dit... jy alleen?
So...uhmm...and you speak at home, Afrikaans? Are you married, and children and so on or is it are you alone?

RF55: Nee. Ek is getroud.
No, I am married.

B: O, ja. Jy't **mos** gesê jy's getroud.
*Oh, yes. You **mos** told me you're married.*

RF55: Ek is **mos** toe nou... uh... laat getroud. Ek is nou vier jaar getroud.
*I am **mos** uh... married late. I've been married four years now.*

B: O, dit alles in. Het jy voltyds matriek gedoen of soort van deelyds deur...
Oh, that all in. Did you do matric full-time or sort of part-time through...

RF55: Nee deelyds. Ek is nag dienste en dan dan het ek ... dan het ek saans–
No, part-time. I (did) night classes and then then I had ... then I had in the evenings –

B: Bedags, ja, ge gestudeer en dit was – was dit 'n spesiale soort matriek of hoe het julle dit gedoen?

During the day, yes, studied and it was – was it a special sort of matric or how did you do it?

RF55: Ja, (ge)studeer. Nee ons het dit toe – Ons het toe – Ons skrywe **mos** teen die einde van die jaar met die matrikulante.

*Yes, stud(ied). No, we then had – We then had – We **mos** write towards the end of the year with the matriculants.*

BM56: Ja, andersyds en andersyds is die mens ook nou nie Engels georiënteerd hierso nie. So, kyk, die bietjie wat hier is oor die kleurgrens gaan nou maar Graaff Reiniet toe, want daar is blykbaar 'n Engelse skool so ver ek weet [unint.]

Yes, on the other hand people are not English orientated over here. So, look, the few who are here over the "kleurgrens" go to Graaf Reniet, because there is apparently an English school as far as I know [unint.]

B: O, dis reg, ja. Dit is so.
Oh, that's right, yes. It is so.

BM56: So... So... Maar ons... Ons is nie Engels georiënteerd hierso nie. Jy kry... Jy kry van jou swart mense wat nou wat nou van die Oos Kaap af terug kom. Van die studente het **mos** nou daar gaan studeer om allerlei redes ook. Hier was miskien nie 'n hoërskool nie of wat ookal of hulle moes noodgedwonge soontoe gegaan het as gevolg van die... Dis nou nie, ja. Wat noem (jy) dit nou? Die [unint.] ja.

*So... So... But we... We are not English orientated over here. You have... You have your black people who who come back from the Eastern Cape. A few of the students **mos** studied there and for all sorts of reasons also. Here was maybe no high school or whatever. Or, for necessity, they had to go there due to the... It's not, yes. What is it called? Die [unint.], yes.*

BM56: Maar maar vir ons is dit ook maar vreemd in die sin dat jy dit nou sien. Dit is nou 'n tendens omdat hulle **mos** nou als wil verengels om een of ander rede miskien nou ter wille van eenvormigheid of die besigheidstaal van die wêreld en so aan. Kyk, ek moet ook darem sê as ek nou kon sou ek ook seker darem my kinders bietjie Engels geleer het, want hulle sukkel nogal op skool en universiteite veral vanaf die platteland. uhm om nou aan te pas in Engels maar maar dis maar 'n moeilike ding. Maar dis Afrikaans... Dis 'n Afrikaanse plek.

*But but for us it is also strange in the sense that you see it. It is now a tendency, because they **mos** want to Anglicise everything for some or other reason, maybe for uniformity or the business language of the world and so on. Look, B must also say if B could B would've probably also taught my children a little English because they struggle quite a bit in school and university especially those from the rural areas. Uhm to adapt to English, but but it's a difficult thing. But it's Afrikaans... It's an Afrikaans place.*

B: Ja-nee nee nee, nou is hy groot. En die Teologiese skool is gesluit.
Yes-no no no. It is big now. And the Theological school is closed.

BM56: Ja, hulle is **mos** nou geskuif Stellenbosch toe, nè? Russel Bothman was saam met my. Ons was saam.

*Yes, they were **mos** moved to Stellenbosch, isn't it? Russel Bothman was with me. We were together.*

B: Stellenbosch toe. Ja, hulle is eintlik.
To Stellenbosch. Yes, they are actually.

BM56: Kyk, ek... ek... ek sê baie keer as jy nou van jou wit tipe kleurlinge uithaal en daar moet nou verslaggewers, sê nou maar van Amerika, af kom en hulle is by 'n ongelukstoneel, en daar is

nou die drie dames of twee ouens wat ek nou ken dan gaan hulle sê: "It was... it was five whites". "We were five whites".

Look, I... I... A lot of the time I say if you take out some of your White type Coloureds and reporters, say from America, come down and they are at an accident scene, and there are these three women or two men who I know then they'll say, "It was... It was five whites". "We were five whites".

BM56: Ek weet **mos** nou, maar hulle trakteeer hulle op grond van die velkleur.
*I **mos** know, but they treat them based on their skin colour.*

B: Ja. O, ja, ek verstaan.
Yes. Oh, yes, I understand.

BM56: Kyk, ek wil darem vir julle sê ek... Ja, ek het ek het darem nou nie al... Ek het nog nie baie beweeg nie (van) Beaufort (af) behalwe Kaapstad toe. Daar praat hulle **mos** nou weer 'n ander tipe Afrikaans. Maar wel in in Garies, en in daai goede ek dink ek het vreemde goed gehoor. Heel waarskynlik kon ek van die goed... daai ook al gehoor het.
*Look, I want to tell you though, I... Yes, I haven't I haven't yet... I haven't moved much from Beaufort except to Cape Town. There they **mos** talk another type of Afrikaans. But certainly in Garies and in those places I think I had heard strange things. Most likely I could have heard... already heard these things too.*

B: Ja, nou nou ek het toe ek by UWK begin het toe was Jakes al die rektor daar. En Afrikaans en Taalwetenskap was by UWK al die jare een en dieselfde gewees maar in die later jare het hulle Taalwetenskap en Afrikaans twee aparte departemente want Taalwetenskap is nie net oor Afrikaans nie. Dit gaan ook oor snaaksighede van taal met Engels en snaaksighede van taal met Xhosa.
Yes, now now I began at UWC when Jakes was already the dean there. And at UWC Afrikaans and Linguistics was all the years one and the same, but in the later years they (made) Linguistics and Afrikaans two separate departments, because Linguistics is not only about Afrikaans. It's also about the peculiarities of language in English and perplexities of language in Xhosa.

BM56: Weet jy, ons het ou Ronnie Beltcher oor gehad wat. Wat het hy vir ons gegee?
You know, we had old Ronnie Beltcher over who. What did he give us?

B: O, ja. Seker digkuns... letterkunde. Ja, want hy het **mos** gedigte geskryf.
*Oh, yes. Probably poetry... literature. Yes, because he **mos** wrote poetry.*

BM56: Dis reg, ja. Ja, ja. Ons moes ook sulke snaakse stories uit jou streek uit vir hom kom vertel oor bygelowe en so aan. Kry ons sommer lekker punte op jou [unint.].
That's right, yes. Yes, yes. We also had to come and tell him such funny stories from our area about superstitions and so on. Then we "sommer" got nice points on our [unint.]

B: So het jy vir die spoorwee gewerk? En hulle het jou elke keer heen en weer gestuur?
So did you work for the railway? And they sent you here and there all the time?

DM56: Nee mevrou, die die die saak was, okay, by enige werk kan jy **mos** nou uh na 'n plek toe gaan waar jy nou wil by werk of dat jy nou belangstel in 'n werk en dan's dit nou op 'n ander plek. Sien dit het toe **mos** so gebeur dat ek nou oorplasing aangevra het vir die groot span in Touwsrivier [unint.] span. En nou sê die uh [...]
*No ma'am, the the the case was... ok, at any job you can **mos** uh go to a place where you will work or there's a job which you're interested in and then it's now in another place. See, it **mos** happened that I now applied for a transfer to the larger team in Touwsrivier [unint.] team. And then the uh says [...]*

DM56: Nou voorheen toe't ons nou... Toe't ek nou eers bietjie [unint.] gewerk toe was ek nou heeltemaal uit. Uh ons was net sê vir drie maande op 'n plek wanneer jy nou die saak gaan beginne agterkom hoe die mense se saak werk en hoe die dinge inmeekaarkom. Dan's dit tyd lat jy weer moet oppak en ry weer na ander plek toe [unint.] vir drie dae **mos** daar. Nee, maar die werk gaan nou altyd aan. [...]
*Now before we then... Then I first worked a little [unint.] then I was completely off. Uh we were just, say, at one place for three months when you begin to realise the case/matter. Then it's time that you have to pack up again and drive to another place [unint.] **mos** there for three days. No, but work goes on as always [...]*

B: Moes julle basies kyk dat die treinspoor veilig is?
Did you basically have to see that the railway is safe?

DM56: Ons moes hom... Ons moet hom onderhoud, ja. Onder... onderhoudwerk gebeur –
We had to... We had to maintain it, yes. Main... Maintenance happens –

B: Ja, onderhoud doen. Ja, "maintenance".
Yes, maintenance. Yes, maintenance.

[...]

DM56: En daarna toe's ek **mos** nou by die mobiele onderhoudspan en daar het ek nou neentien neentien neentien. Laat ek nou sien. Ja, neentien nege en tagtig toe't ek nou daarvan af geskuif.
*And afterwards I was **mos** with the mobile maintenance crew and I (was moved from) there in nineteen nineteen nineteen. Let me see. Yes, nineteen ninety-nine I was moved from there.*

DM56: Dis omtrent so sê drie kwart na 'n uur toe. So soggens ses uur vir sewe uur moet ek. Ek moet eintlik half ses al begin, want daar's plekke waar ek moet stap en dan moet ek die hekke oopmaak ook. En ek kan nie die hek die hek oop los nie ek moet hom toe maak ook nou nog en [...] die dinge. dan's it –
It's about so say forty five (minutes) to an hour. So in the mornings six o'clock for seven o'clock I must. I must actually begin at half (past) five, because there're places where I must walk and then I must also open the gates. And I can't leave the gates open, I must also close them still and [unint.] those things. Then it's –

B: Dan's mens eintlik moeg as jy by die werk aankom.
Then a person is actually tired once you get to work.

DM56:Dit is die ding. Dis die ding. En dan nou later van tyd het hulle my soggens kom haal daarso. En partykeer as ek nou die kant gewerk het toe was hier **mos** nou 'n trollie toe's die lyn **mos** nou al toe. Die ou lyn wat ons nog gebruik dat ek soggens party oggende met die trollie gekom (het) tot hier in De Doorns.
*That is the thing. That's the thing. And then after a while they came to fetch me there in the mornings and sometimes if I now worked this side then here was **mos** a trolley, the line was **mos** already closed then. The old line that we still use that I came here in the morning some mornings to De Doorns in the trolley.*

B: O, ek sien. Dan kan 'n mens darem 'n "lift" op die manier kry.
Oh, I see. Then a person can then get a lift in a way.

DM56:Daar's hy, ja. Tot een dag toe die inspekteur bietjie dan die saak kom nagaan het. [...]
That's it, yes. Until one day when the inspector came to check the matter a little. [...]

Beaufort West; Female; 58 years old
--

BF58: En toe is antie Marie **mos** oorlede toe moes ek nou naaldwerk gedoen het (so)dat ek kan bekend word met die masjien. En daar vandaan is ek –
And then aunty Marie mos passed away so I had to do needlework so that I could become familiar with the machine. And from there I –

B: En auntie ... sê standerd... (die) laaste standerd?
And aunty ... says standard.. the last standard?

BF58: Standerd sewe. Uit die skool uitgegaan. Moes toe maar opskop want... toe moes ek naaldwerk gaan doen.
Standard seven. Left school. Had to leave because... then I had to go and do needlework.

B: Gaan werk.
Go work.

B: Is antie Marie 'n ouer suster?
Is aunty Marie a older sister?

BF58: Sy's 'n ouer suster gewees. Ja. Ja, antie Marie het ook naaldwerk gedoen.
She was an older sister. Yes. Yes, auntie Marie also did needlework.

B: Dit het **mos** baie gebeur vroeër jare dat die meisies vroeg uit die skool gehaal is sodat hulle aan die werk kan kom. Sodat hulle inkomste kan inbring.
It mos happened a lot in the early years that girls were taken out of the schools earlier so that they could start working. So that they can bring in an income.

BF58: Ek moet net my tyd check. Dis "one o'clock".
I just have to check my time. It's one o'clock.

B: Oh, yisterday! Al so laat?
Oh, yesterday! Already that late?

BF58: Want uh ek weet nie hoe laat kom St Matthews uit nie.
Because uh I don't know at what time St. Matthews lets out.

B: Want ek moet **mos** nou weer by die huis wees. My ma het **mos** 'n manier nie om te sê: "Ek het geweet" nie, maar: "Ek wis". Kyk ons gebruik **mos** soms daai "had".
Because I mos have to be home soon. My mother mos has a way of not saying, "ek het geweet", but "ek wis". See, we mos sometimes use that "had".

B: Sal jy sê: "Hy gaan gister skool toe"?
Will you say, "He is going to school yesterday"?

BF58: Nee, gister... Jy kan **mos** nie sê: "hy gaan". Hy het gister skool toe gegaan.
[...] Dis **mos** al "past tense", hy het **mos** al gegaan. Het gister skool toe gegaan.
No, gister... You cannot mos say, "he's going". He did go to school yesterday. [...] It's... I want to... It's mos already past tense, he mos already went. Went to school yesterday.

Beaufort West; Female; 59 years old
--

B: [...] Goed en dan is die vraag of u op Beaufort-Wes ook skool gegaan het?
[...] Good and then the question is if you attended school in Beaufort West?

BF59: Ja.
Yes.

B: Goed. En watter graad of standerd voltooi is. Dit is nou graad tien of standerd een of –
Good. And which grade or standard did you complete? That is now grade ten or standard one or –

BF59: Twaalf.
Twelve.

B: Uh twaalf. Sorry, ja.
Uh twelve. Sorry, yes.

BF59: Standerd tien.
Standard ten.

B: Is deur matriek?
Passed matric?

BF59: Ja-nee, agterna eers. Ons is **mos** van die ou grades, wat (is) daai graad tien, nè? Standerd agt.
Yes-no, afterwards only. We are mos still with the old grades, what is that grade ten, right? Standard eight.

B: En hy't nogal lank bestaan daai Zondebloem as ek reg onthou.
And it lasted rather long that Zondebloem if I remember correctly.

BF59: Baie lank, ja. Dit was **mos** 'n primere skool. Was een en dan die sekondêre skool en die opleiding skool.
Very long, yes. It was mos a primary school. Was one and then the secondary school and the training college.

B: Wat wat ook by daai kollege was, of nie?
Who who was also at that college, or not?

BF59: Nee, nee, hulle het... Die mans het **mos**... Hulle het **mos** die... Nou weet ek hulle het nie uhm graad 10... Hulle het in matriek en toe na 'n ander skool toe. Ja.
No, no, they... The men did mos... They mos the... Now I know they didn't uhm grade 10... They did in matric and then went to another school. Yes.

B: Ok. Ons... Eintlik voel dit vir my mens moet jou "first intiution" moet jy vertrou. So ons gaan nou nie... Want as mens te lank 'n ding oor en oor sê dan klink hy **mos** net reg.
Ok. We... Actually for me it feels you must trust your 'first intuition'. So we are not going – Because if a person says something too long over and over then it mos sounds right.

BF59: (Dan) klink hy **mos** later reg, ja. Of jy het dit al so gehoor.
*It **mos** sounds right later, yes. Or you have heard it like that before.*

BF59: [unint.] maar wat ek wou sê is hulle is nogal oulik. En hulle praat Engels. Hulle – Nou die seun van my wat oorlede is se kinders... Hulle is **mos** nou in die Kaap.
*[unint.] but what I wanted to say is they are rather cute. And they speak English. They – Now my son who passed away's children they are **mos** now in the Cape.*

BF59: Haai, weet jy ek dink dit het iets – Smallville op die TV. Dis 'n TV program. Toe roep – Hulle sê vir my... My dogters se kinders sê vir my "Mortie".
Hey, you know I think it has something – Smallville on the TV. It's a TV programme. So they called – They say to me... My daughters' children say to me "Mortie".

B: O. O, dis nie ouma.
Oh. Oh, it's not grandma.

BF59: Dis nou nie ouma, "Mortie"... "Mortie".
It's now not grandma "Mortie"... "Mortie".

B: Ja, "Mortie". Ag, moeder. "Mortie".
Yes, "Mortie". Aw, shame. "Mortie".

BF59: "Mortie", Smallvie sê [unint.] dan vra ek vir Marelise wat is dit met Smallville. Nou sê sy, "Mammie, die Amerikaners praat **mos** so".
*"Mortie", Smallville says [unint.] then I asked Marelise what it is with Smallville. Then she says "Mummy, the Americans **mos** talk like that".*

Beaufort West; Female; 60 years old
--

BF60: Toe voel ek nou nie baie gelukkig daaroor nie. En Dinsdae moet ek na haar toe gaan en toe het ek en sy bietjie voordat sy nog... ek nog vir haar kon vra toe sê sy vir my [...]
So I didn't feel very happy about that. And Tuesday I had to go to her and then for a little while she and I... before she... I could still ask her then she told me [...]

B: Toe sê sy: "Is dit?"
Then she said, "Is it?"

BF60: Toe sê ek vir mevrou: "Ek is nie kwaad vir jou nie, ek is teleurgesteld".
So I said to ma'am, "I am not angry with you, I am disappointed".

B: Ja.
Yes.

BF60: Want want 'n mens voel nie –
Because because a person doesn't feel –

B: Want 'n nuwe eienaar gaan **mos** nou nie dit respekteer nie.
*Because a new owner is **mos** not going to respect it.*

BF60: Ja, en jy meen –
Yes, and you mean –

B: Tensy mens dit 'n bepaling maak.
Except if you make legal provisions (have an agreement clause).

BF60: Nee, maar ek... ek dink ek het die ander keer nog lank gelede het ek vir haar gevra sy moet dit net vir my op skrif sit.
No, but I... I think I asked her the other time long ago she must just put it on paper for me.

B: Ja.
Yes.

BF60: Sou sy nou aanhou om vir my te sê: "Wat worry jy? Ek het **mos** nou klaar so gesê." Maar ek weet darem ook nie. Haar dogter wat in Florida bly het dit ook vir my gesê.
*Then she kept on telling me, "What are you worrying about? I've **mos** already said so." But I don't know though. Her daughter who lives in Florida told me the same thing.*

B: En sy het nie.
And she did not.

BF60: En en maar my redenasie is sy moes vir my sit gemaak het en vir my gesê het: "Joan, kyk, die storie is nou dit. Die rente wat ek by die bank kry gaan nou outomaties 'n bietjie kleiner word met die gevolg is, ek het dit nou maar dit goed gedink om die plek in die mark te sit". Dis **mos** menslik.

*And and my reasoning is she should have sat me down and told me, "Joan, look, this is the story. The interest that I got at the bank will automatically become smaller with the consequences. I have thought of putting the place on the market". It's **mos** human.*

B: Maar in altwee gevalle daar is wel mense wat so praat. maar nie hier nie.
But in both cases there are people who talk like that. But not here.

BF60: Nee.
No.

B: Nie eers op die plase nie.
Not even on the farms.

BF60: Nee.
No.

B: Elders? Boesmanland? Of antie het **mos** gesê Kuruman.
*Elsewhere? Boesmanland? Or aunty **mos** said Kuruman.*

BF60: Kuruman. Kuruman
Kuruman. Kuruman

B: Kuruman
Kuruman

BF60: Garies. **mos** Garies en [unint.]
*Garies. **mos** Garies and [unint.]*

B: Ja, Garies. So goed.
Yes, Garies. Ok, good.

B: Ok. Nou gaan dit oor... in my soort Afrikaans sê ek: "O, ek is baie bly om hier te wees". Ek neem aan mens kan dit hier ook so sê, maar nou kry jy mense wat sê: "O, ek is baie bly om hier te is".
Ok. Now it's about in my Afrikaans I say, "Oh, I am very happy to be here. I assume a person can also say it like that over here, but then you get people who say, "Oh, I am very happy to be (is?) here".

BF60: Ja. Nee. Jy sit **mos** hier. Ons is nogal mense wat so praat.
*Yes. No. You are **mos** sitting here. We are people who talk like that.*

B: Is daar mense wat so praat?
Are there people who speak like that?

BF60: Met 'n is?
With a "is"?

B: Ja. Party praat so, ander praat nie self soos wat daai [unint.] praat.
Yes. Some speak like this, others don't talk like that themselves[unint.].

BF60: Nee, Nee. Daar is mense wat –
No, No. There are people who –

B: Dat ons – Want, kyk, daar is **mos** mense wat gaan voel: "ooh dit maak my bietjie "nervous"" en dan wil hulle dit afgeskakel hê, maar ek wil nou net seker wees dis vir tannie oraait. Dan doen ons dit so.
*That we – Because, look, there are **mos** people who are going to feel, "oh, this makes me a little nervous" and then they just want it done, but I just want to be sure that it's alright for "tannie". Then we'll do it like this.*

Touwsrivier; Female; 65 years old
--

TF65: Daar ander kant se hostel. Ja, hostel. Vir spoorwegwerkers.
The hostel there on the other side. Yes, hostel. For railway workers.

B: O, was dit 'n hostel vir die... spoorwegwerkers? O, en toe hulle hom nie meer gebruik... die spoorwee nie.
Oh, was it a hostel for the... railway workers. O, and when they did not use it anymore... the railway.

TF65: Toe koop... Toe't hulle **mos** nou daar aansoek gedoen by die spoorweg om hom te huur.
*Then [they] bought. Then they **mos** applied there at the railway to hire it.*

TF65: Ja. Toe het die mense **mos** nie gebly... hier gebly nie.
*Yes. Then the people **mos** didn't live... live here.*

TF65: Ja, ons het al die tyd met spoorweghuise gebly. Toe ons hiernatoe nou kom toe het ons hier anderkant gekoop.
Yes, we lived all the time with railway houses. When we came here we bought on the other side.

B: O, ja. So julle het altwee lekker eie huise hier op die dorp.
Oh, yes. So you both have your nice own houses in the town.

TF65: Ja.
Yes.

B: Dis darem nie sleg nie. Of verbeel ek my?
That's not too bad then. Or am I wrong?

TF65: Nee, dis oraait. Ons moet **mos** 'n plekkie hê. 'n Mens moet **mos** 'n huisie hê. Jy kan nie heeldag trek nie.
*No, it's alright. We must **mos** have a place. A person must **mos** have a house. You cannot move all day.*

TF65: En dan kom kook hier. Ek het **mos** nou lank gekook hierso... Tien jaar.
*And then come to cook here. I have **mos** cooked here for a long time... Ten years.*

TF65: Ek het sewe, maar uitgetroud, ek het net een in die huis nog
I have seven, but married away. I just have one in the house still.

B: Net een in die huis
Just one at home

TF65: Ja, dis nog net een maar hy's al ses-en-twintig
Yes, it's just one but he's already twenty six

B: O, die jongste is ses-en- twintig
Oh, the youngest is twenty six

TF65: Nee, my my jongste, my tweede jongste. Hy's nog in die huis, want hy't ook deur siekte. Is -.
Hy -. Kan hy **mos** nie eintlik...
*No, my my youngest, my second youngest. He's still in the house, because he has also
suffered sickness. Is -. He -. He cannot **mos** actually...*

B: Werk nie.
Work.

B: Ja, nou het hy... Hoe het hy die skouer besering gekry?
Yes, now did he... How did he get the shoulder injury?

TF65: Hy't **mos** uh... Nee, hy was drie jaar toe was hier uh polio?? in die lug.
*He **mos** uh... No, he was three years (old) when polio was in the air.*

B: O, as 'n kind het hy al...
Oh, as a child he already...

TF65: Weet u van daai jaar?
Do you know about that year?

B: Ja-nee, ek weet nie daarvan nie, maar polio is **mos** 'n kwaai ding.
*Yes-no, I don not know about that, but polio is **mos** a vicious thing.*

B: O, ok. Nee dis goed. Hy wil liever werk.
Oh, ok. No, that's good. He rather wants to work.

TF65: Hy's **mos** daar by die hostel en dis **mos** nie swaar werk nie.
*He's **mos** there at the hostel and that's **mos** not heavy work.*

B: Ja
Yes

TF65: Hy is maar nou daar, en dan kom hy huis toe. So hy is seker gelukkig.
He is there now, and then he comes home. So he's probably happy.

B: Ja.
Yes.

TF65: [...] daarmee, nè. Jy werk **mos** waar jy gelukkig is.
[...] *with that, right?. You **mos** work where you are happy.*

B: Ja.
Yes.

B: Ja. Ek is nou sommer net nuuskierig, praat julle ooit iewers Engels in julle familie?

Yes. I am just a little curious, do you ever talk English somewhere in your family?

TF65: Ja, my kinders se kinders.
Yes, my childrens' children.

B: Die kinders se kinders praat Engels.
The childrens' children speak English.

TF65: Praat Engels.
Speak English.

B: En waar bly daai kinders? In die Kaap?
And where do those children live? In the Cape?

TF65: In P.E.
In P.E. (Port Elizabeth)

B: O, in P.E.
Oh, in P.E.

TF65: In P.E. gee die een onder(wys)... twee gee onderwys in PE, so daai twee kinders is Engels en die ander een is ook Engels.
In P.E., the one teaches... two teach in P.E., so those two children are English and the other one is also English.

B: So die ma is Engels en die pa, ag Afrikaans en die pa is Afrikaans?
So the mother is English and the father... oh Afrikaans and the father is Afrikaans?

TF65: Nee, die ma is ook Afrikaans, die pa is ook Afrikaans. Maar kyk, die kinders leer nou Engels, want hulle gaan na die Engelse skool toe van kleins af. En dan leer die ma en pa jou **mos** nou verder weer in die huis nè? En die taal nou ... Onse kinders kry **mos** baie... Ons Afrikaners kry **mos** baie swaar in Engels.
*No, the mother is also Afrikaans, the father is also Afrikaans. But look, the children learn English, because they attend the English school from when they're little. And then the mother and father **mos** teach you English further at home, right? And the language now... Our children **mos** struggle... Us Afrikaners **mos** struggle a lot with English.*

B: Twee wat onderwysers is. En die ander?
Two who are teachers. And the others?

TF65: (Die) ander een is 'n Fidelity in die Kaap en die ander... die meisietjie... (die) meisie werk in die George. Sy's getroud. En een in Matjiesfontein (by) die hotel is getroud. En Francois wat **mos** nou hierbo in is. Die ander een is ook daar in in... Hoe sê mens die plek se naam? Sal nie kan sê nie, is getroud. So ek is nou verlos. Ek het net vir Francois by my nou in die huis.
*The other one is a Fidelity in the Cape and the other... the little girl... the girl works in George. She's married. And one in Matjiesfontein at the hotel is married. And Francois who is now **mos** up here. The other one is also there in in... How does one say the places name? Can't say, is married. So I am now free. I just have Francois with me now in the house.*

B: Ja, natuurlik.
Yes, of course.

TF65: Weet jy, as daar mense inkom, daai kinders is nog altyd so; so groot soos hulle nou daar is, as daar mense by my in die stoep inkom en dan kan jy sien hulle raak weg.
You know, if people come in, those children are still the same; as old as they are, if people come in on the stoep then you see them vanish.

[...]

B: Is dit? Nou hoekom is dit? Is dit oor hulle pa so kwaai is?
Is it? Now why is that? Is it because their father is so strict?

TF65: (Hulle) sal nie daar sit nie. Nee, dit is wat jy **mos** geleer (het); as daar groot mense kom moet jy nie in die geselskap sit nie.
(They) won't sit there. No, it is what you mos learned; if adults come you mustn't sit in the conversation.

B: So jy't nie kleinkinders wat wat allerhande taalveranderinge bring nie.
So you don't have grandchildren who bring all sorts of language changes.

TF65: Nee, niks nie. En hier by die werk het ons nou al sekere goedjies soos wat ons inwoners in neem by ons. Ons het **mos** swart inwoners ook hier, dan sal hulle miskien nou... Ons het nou al gehoor hulle sê "sala kahle (usale kuhle)". Net... Dan is dit nou Bantu.
No, none. And here at work we also have certain things like what our residents bring in. We mos also have black residents here, then they will maybe now... We have already heard them say "sal kahle (usale kulhe)". Just... That is now Bantu.

B: O, ja, ja, ja, ja. Bietjie Xhosa, ja.
Oh, yes, yes, yes, yes. A little Xhosa, yes.

TF65: Ja, bietjie Xhosa, ja. En so nou [unint.], ons praat terug.
Yes, a little Xhosa, yes. And so now [unint.], we reply.

B: Ja.
Yes.

TF65: Trouens, want jy leer nou wat daai een sê en dan... Want dis moeilik. Ons sit nou met 'n pasiënt hier bo byvoorbeeld, nou praat daai een op sy taal. Nou jy kan nie vir hom antwoord nie. En dan raak hy **mos** nou moeilik, want die ding wat hy wil hê gee jy nie vir hom nie. En so leer 'n mens miskien.
As a matter of fact, because you learn what that one says and then...Because it's difficult. We sit up here with a patient, for example, who talks in his own language. Now you cannot answer him. And then he mos becomes difficult, because the thing that he wants, you're not giving to him. And so a person maybe learns.

B: Dis reg, ja. Ja, ja, ja. Tog 'n bietjie... 'n bietjie van hulle taal kan praat.
That's right, yes. Yes, yes, yes. At least a little... can speak a little of their language.