THE -MI AND -E MORPHEMES IN JOOLA-FOÑY

Marcia L. Gero and Stephen H. Levinsohn
Summer Institute of Linguistics

Apparently diverse uses of the verb morphemes **-e** and **-mi** may be related on the basis of Hopper and Thompson's (1980) observations about transitivity. In subordinated clauses, **-mi** and **-e** are associated respectively with high and low transitivity values of the kinesis, mood, and individuation parameters. In narrative, **-e** marks imperfective background information, which tends to correlate with low transitivity; **-mi**, in contrast, is used to foreground certain information. The use of **-e** in focus-presuppostion clauses may reflect the inappropriateness of using such constructions to encode foreground information in narrative. Finally, the use of **-mi** in focus-presupposition constructions conveys overtones which relate at least indirectly to high transitivity.

En s'appuyant sur la base des observations de Hopper et Thompson (1980) concernant la transitivité, un rapport peut être établi entre des emplois apparemment divers des morphèmes verbaux **-e** et **-mi**. Dans les propositions subordonnées, **-mi** et **-e** correspondent respectivement à un valeur élevé et un valeur bas de transitivité de chacun de trois paramètres: le "kinesis" (statique - dynamique), le mode et l'individuation. En narrative, **-e** indique des informations imperfectives de l'arrière-plan, lesquelles correspondent le plus souvent à un valeur bas de transitivité; **-mi**, par contre, sert à mettre certaines informations au premier plan. L'emploi de **-e** dans les propositions de type "mise en évidence - présupposition" indique peut-être que de telles constructions ne servent pas à traduire des informations de premier plan. En outre, l'emploi de **-mi** dans les mêmes propositions communique des tonalités qui sont associées, au moins de façon indirecte, à un niveau élevé de transitivité.

0. INTRODUCTION

This paper is a response to David Sapir's (1965, 1967) and Bradley Hopkins' (1990) analyses of the **-mi** and **-e** morphemes in the Jóola-Foñy language.[1]

Our findings confirm Sapir's classification of (i) **-e** as a habitual marker and (ii) both morphemes as mood and subordination markers, as well as Hopkins' description of **-e** as (i) a stative aspectual marker and (ii) a pre-verb focal marker. However, we go on to identify the specific relationship between **-e** and **-mi**, one that can be at least partially explained by Hopper and Thompson's (1980) notion of transitivity.

Sapir's analysis. Sapir discusses the morphemes **-mi** and **-e** in the section entitled 'Syntactic Markers' of his 1965 grammar. About **-mi**, which he calls "verb mood: simple subordinate" (p. 126), he says (p. 35):

> In contrast to theme reduplication [e.g., *nasankensanken* ('he talked'), in which the verb root is reduplicated], the simple subordinate shifts emphasis from the verb to its immediate, usually post-verb, environment. It is used primarily in verb strings and relative clause constructions.

---

[1]Jóola-Foñy is spoken by about 100,000 people in the departments of Bignona, Diouloulou, and Ziguinchor in the Basse Casamance, which is located in the southern part of the Republic of Senegal (Sapir 1965:1). The Jóola language is classified by Greenberg (1963:8) as a member of the northern group of the sub-family West Atlantic, and by Sapir (1971:48) as a member of the Bak group of the northern subdivision.

Jóola Foñy is how the language is spelled in the Senegal government-established orthography. The French spelling (used by Sapir, Hopkins, and others) is *Diola Fogny*.

This paper is based on data collected primarily in Baila, a village of about 1500 inhabitants located about 20 kilometres west of Bignona, over a period of about four years by the first author. Without the insights of the following language assistants, the paper would not have been possible: Mr. El Hadji Coly, Mrs. Astu Goudiaby of Baila, and Mr. Lansana Badji of Sindian.

Our investigations are carried out under the auspices of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, which is working in Senegal under the sponsorship of the Ministry of the Woman, the Child and the Family, as well as the Ministry of Education, Literacy and the Promotion of National Languages.

Bradley Hopkins read an earlier draft of this article and made valuable observations on it. However, responsibility for the conclusions presented here remain solely ours.

Sapir gives the following example:[2]

(1) **á-níín-áw a-ket-mi na-sen-an-sen é-bá-áy**
C1-man-DEF RLS-die-MI 3S-give-1S^O-RD C3-cow-DEF
'The man who died gave me the cow.'

Sapir recognizes two **-e** morphemes: (i) "verb mood: habitual"[3] and (ii) "verb mood: noun emphasis". About the latter he says:

> Functionally equivalent to the simple subordinate, the noun emphasis marker deflects emphasis from the verb. Except in certain special constructions [see §1.2]... it is used exclusively to emphasize the subject or the complement, most particularly a pre-verb complement. In most situations the simple subordinate marker can be used in its stead. The reverse, however, is not true.

Sapir gives the example in (2).

(2) **é-bé ni-noom-e**
C3-cow 1S-buy-E
'I bought a COW.'

Sapir also notes that in narrative, while the verbs describing "an unfolding series of events" are unmarked, "conversations, events that stand out, and statements describing the general scene or situation... invariably take either NE or VE markings [i.e., **-e** or the reduplicated form]" (pp. 36-37). More will be said in §4 about his analysis of verbs in narrative.

In a subsequent paper (1967, written in French), Thomas and Sapir again distinguish the habitual **-e** from the subordinators **-e** and **-mi**. Concerning the latter, they say (p. 345):

> Par l'emploi soit du suffixe **-e**, soit du suffixe **-mi ~ -um**, le verbe est subordonné aux autres termes de la proposition. Le **-e** s'emploie principalement lorsqu'on veut mettre le sujet, ou un complément antérieurement placé, en relief. Le **-mi ~ -um** a un emploi beaucoup plus général qui permet de remplacer le **-e**, d'être employé à l'habituel, à l'affirmatif du résultatif, et dans les propositions relatives.

In the same paper he also notes (p. 346) that "dans certaines circonstances particulières, la forme **-mi ~ -um** marque une subordination qui est plus prononcée que celle de **-e**" (see §3 of this paper for further discussion of this contrast).

Thus, Sapir posits two **-e** morphemes: (i) the habitual marker and (ii) the noun emphasis marker. He also posits **-mi** as a subordinator and claims that, in clauses where focus falls on a fronted constituent, **-mi** can often be substituted for **-e**, but **-e** cannot be substituted for **-mi**.

---

[2]In the interest of consistency, we have taken the liberty to rewrite Sapir's examples using the phonemic transcription followed throughout the rest of this paper. +ATR vowels are marked by accents (**á, é, í, ó, ú**) and lengthened vowels are doubled. The consonants of Jóola-Foñy are (Sambou 1983:18) **p, b, m, f, w, t, n, s, r, l, c, j, ñ, y, k, g, ŋ, h**; the vowels are **í, é, á, ó, ú, i, e, a, o,** u. Sambou also considers glottal stop to be phonemic, but we feel it is predictable.

The morphemes under study in this paper are simply glossed **-e** and **-mi**. Other abbreviations used in this paper are as follows: ANA - anaphoric; C1-C16 - class markers (numbered according to the system devised by Sambou 1983:30-31); CONJ - conjunction; ^D - disjunctive pronoun; DEF - definite article; DEF^P - plural definite article; DEM - demonstrative; DEV - development marker (see Payne 1992:60); DIR - direction towards; FUT - future; IN - inanimate; INSTR - instrument; INT - interrogative; ITER - iterative; lit. - literally; LOC - locative; NEG - negative; ^O - object; P - plural; PREP - preposition; PS - possessive; PST - past; RCP - reciprocal; RD - reduplication; RFX - reflexive; RLO - relative clause object pronoun; RLS - relative clause subject pronoun; S - singular; ^sp - species; 1,2,3 - first, second, third person; 1P - first person plural (inclusive); 1PX - first person plural (exclusive).

[3]We consider the habitual morpheme **-e** to be aspectual, rather than modal; see Comrie's (1976) definition cited in §1.

Hopkins' analysis. In the section entitled "Terminaisons: Relatives Accomplies" (1990:89), Hopkins first confirms Sapir's analysis of **-e**, saying that "il sert a mettre en relief un nominal ou un autre élément de la proposition". He then adds that "**-e** apparaît normalement avec des verbes de qualité (ou d'état)". He notes that, in a relative construction, **-e** can combine with stative or descriptive verbs to form adjectives and gives the example in (3).

(3) **ku-seek ku-gabak-a-jak-e ku-jaa-lo**
C2-woman C2-two C2-RLS-be^good-E C2-go-DIR
'Two beautiful women came.' [i.e., 'Two women who were beautiful came.']

Hopkins thus at least associates **-e** with the stative aspect.

Overview. This paper claims that: (i) in independent clauses, in addition to its habitual imperfective meaning, **-e** at times carries a progressive imperfective meaning; (ii) in relative clauses, the use of a second morpheme **-e**[4] in place of the default marker **-mi** indicates a lowering of transitivity, as defined by Hopper and Thompson (1980), in one of the following parameters: kinesis, mood,[5] or individuation.

Thus, the functions of **-e** and **-mi** can be categorized as follows:
(i) In independent clauses, **-e** expresses the habitual and progressive categories of the "imperfective" aspect (Comrie 1976:24-25).
(ii) In relative clauses, the use of a second **-e** morpheme instead of **-mi** indicates a lowering of transitivity in one of the following parameters proposed by Hopper and Thompson (1980):
- kinesis, which treats the difference between actions and resultant states;[6]
- mood, which treats the difference between actions that are certain and actions that are doubtful;
- individuation, which treats the difference between definiteness and indefiniteness.
(iii) In clauses in which the focus is on a pre-verbal constituent (Sapir 1965:35),[7] **-e** is the default marker for the construction, whereas **-mi** carries overtones such as specificity-exclusivity or intensity.
(iv) In narrative, **-e** and **-mi** both have special usages, apart from those already mentioned: **-e** marks background information, while **-mi** marks accentuated action, usually at the peak. These usages are consistent with Hopper and Thompson's observation that low transitivity correlates with background information in narrative, whereas high transitivity correlates with foreground.

1. -e RELATED TO THE IMPERFECTIVE ASPECT IN INDEPENDENT CLAUSES

-e in independent clauses in Jóola-Foñy carries the meaning of either habitual or progressive. Comrie (1976:25) classifies the habitual and the progressive as categories of imperfective aspect, imperfectivity being defined as "explicit reference to the internal temporal structure of a situation, viewing a situation from within" (p. 24). Imperfectivity is contrasted with perfectivity, which "indicates the view of a situation as a single whole, without distinction of the various separate phases that make up that situation" (p. 16).

[4]A third morpheme **-e** functions as a locative marker (meaning 'here, close by'), along with **-u** ('there', location indefinite), **-a** ('there', location definite), **-aña** ('over there'), and **añaamo** ('way over there'); see Sapir 1965:58.
[5]Hopper and Thompson actually make the distinction REALIS - IRREALIS within the parameter they call MODE. The distinction in Jóola-Foñy is more one of certainty-doubt (ibid.).
[6]This use of **-e** is also imperfective, in that Comrie seems to equate stative with non-progressive continuous when he says that progressivity is "the combination of continuous meaning and nonstativity" (1976:38); i.e., progressive and non-progressive are both continuous, the contrast being one of stativity.
[7]Sapir treats such clauses with **-mi** as subordinate with an understood copula.

1.1 HABITUAL

The combination of a reduplicated root and **-e** indicates that an action is habitual. This form contrasts with the reduplicated form without **-e** (the default form of the verb), which carries a perfective meaning in normal conversation:

(4) **na-moor-e-moor fan-faŋ**
3S-sleep-E-RD much-RD
'He sleeps a lot.'

na-mo-moor fan-faŋ
3S-sleep-RD much-RD
'He slept a lot.'

The corresponding negative habitual form is **-ériit ~ óriit;** the root is not reduplicated:

(5) **kú-rí-óríít u-r-u**
3P-eat-E^NEG DEM-C14-LOC
'Do people never eat that?'

ku-ri-ut u-r-u
3P-eat-NEG DEM-C14-LOC
'They didn't eat that?'

1.2 PROGRESSIVE

As Sapir notes (1965:48), there are three ways to express the progressive in Jóola-Foñy, two of which are illustrated in (6), while the third involves **man** and **-e** (discussed in §2.1.1).

(6) **oom-b-o di é-sííl**
be[8]-C15-IN PREP C3-cook
'She is cooking.'

é-sííl nan di y-o
C3-cook 3S^be PREP C3-IN
'She is cooking.'

However, the above forms may alternate with the following form (not mentioned by Sapir), in which the morpheme **-e** is used:

(7) **oom-b-o á-sííl-é**
be-C15-IN 3S-cook-E
'She is cooking.'

2. -e AND -mi RELATED TO TRANSITIVITY IN SUBORDINATE CLAUSES

It is clear from Sapir's discussion of the habitual and noun emphasis marker (1965:33-41) that the imperfective **-e** described in §1 is distinct from the **-e** found in subordinate clauses. This paper suggests that the latter **-e** can best be explained through the grid of Hopper and Thompson's transitivity theory, which posits that transitivity relates to the degree of success in transferring (carrying over) activity from one participant to another and involves a number of parameters, each associated with some aspect of the effectiveness with which events take place (1980:252).

In Jóola-Foñy three of the ten transitivity parameters posited by Hopper and Thompson capture the contrasts between **-e/-mi** in subordinate clauses: kinesis (discussed in §2.1); mood (discussed in §2.2); and individuation (discussed in §2.3).

[8]Hopkins (p.c.) considers **oom** in this construction to be a demonstrative root.

2.1 -e AND -mi RELATED TO KINESIS

This transitivity parameter in Jóola-Foñy involves verbs that describe a resultant state, i.e., one that results from a past action and continues into the present (marked by -e), versus verbs that describe a past action (marked by **-mi** or the 'null' form).[9] This contrast occurs both in clauses introduced by **man** (hereafter, '**man** clauses') and in relative clauses.

2.1.1 -e and -mi in man clauses.[10] In (8a) the **man** clause marked by **-e** describes the person in the state of sitting. In (8b) the **man** clause marked by **-mi** views the event 'how they have worked' as a whole, i.e., perfectively. Similarly, in (8c) the null clause 'and cried' is viewed perfectively. (9) and (10) are similar.

(8) a. **ni-took-ul-oo-t-o síndé-ná man a-lako-e**
1S-find-DIR-3S^O-C13-IN house-in CONJ 3S-sit-E
'I found her there sitting in the house.'

b. **ni-ju-juk man ku-rok-mi eeno súúm-án-súúm**
1S-see-RD CONJ 3P-work-MI like^that please-1S^O-RD
'I have seen how they have worked; it pleases me.'

c. **di ku-lako man ku-ŋan**
DEV 3P-sit CONJ 3P-cry
'They sat down and cried.'

(9) a. **n-an á-púr-úló-mí . . . buk-an-ak búróm man ku-moor-e**
C16-RLO 3S-go^out-DIR-MI C2-person-DEF all CONJ 3P-sleep-E
'When she went out . . . , everyone was sleeping.'

b. **aw ka-fuutul man i-sof-ut-i-mi**
2S^D C7-laugh CONJ 1S-catch-NEG-2S^O-MI
'You laugh because I didn't catch you.'

c. **awpan-u-lako taat-e man u-kit ka-sanken-ak**
2S FUT-2S-sit here-LOC CONJ 2S-begin C9-talk-DEF
'You'll stay here so you can begin the discussion.'

(10) a. **pan-a-jaw man baakari a-caam-e a-ban**
FUT-3S-go CONJ Bakari 3S-pay-E 3S-finish
'He will go after Bakari has finished paying.' [i.e., 'when Bakari is in the state of having finished paying.']

b. **oo a-reg-ii-mi man jáw-úm-óór-mí eeno**
3S^D 3S-say-3P^O-MI CONJ go-INSTR-RCP-MI that^way
'It was he who told them how it had all happened.'

c. **man a-roŋ a-ñiil man a-jak**
CONJ 3S-give^birth C1-child CONJ C1-be^good
'And she gave birth to a child, and he was beautiful.'

Note that, while the verbs in (8) and (9) might all be considered to have intrinsically stative meaning, the verb **ecaam** ('to pay') in (10a) does not, evidence that **-e** itself carries the meaning of resultant state. (10a) is one of several illustrations of the special construction Sapir mentions as an exception to the normal usage of **-e** (1965:111; see §1). The presence of **-e** in the other examples he cites also expresses the sense of resultant state.

In (11) **-e**, together with the verb **efaŋ** 'to be much', expresses the comparative (a kind of stative).

---

[9]The non-inflected, non-reduplicated form of the verb.

[10]**man** is a "compound connective" (Sapir 1965:105) and links clauses in a chronological or purposive relationship (null verb clauses), as well as those which express the predicate complement or a causal relationship (those marked by **-mi**).

(11) **bare bu-bak bá-kón b-o bu-fan-faŋ man**
but C5-tree^sp C5-one C15-IN C5-be^much-RD CONJ
bu-kango-e u-bak-aw w-aa-w-u
C5-be^far-E C6-tree-DEF^P C6-other-C6-LOC
'But one tree was farther away than the other trees.'

2.1.2 -e and -mi in relative clauses. In relative clauses introduced by **-a/-an**, **-e** can also describe a resultant state. **-e** in these constructions contrasts with **-mi**, which describes a past action, rather than a state.

In (12a) the relative clause marked by **-e** is subordinate to an understood existential verb ('it was Leopard who . . .'). In (12b) the relative clause marked by **-mi** is subordinate to the main verb ('was over there').

(12) a. **kamaat jasaama-ay a-lañ-oor-e a-jaŋa a-jak-e**
behold Leopard-DEF RLS-return-RFX-E C1-girl C1-be^good-E
'Behold, it was Leopard, who [had now] turned into a beautiful girl.' [i.e., 'who was now in the state of having turned into a beautiful girl.']

b. **kamaat jasaama-ay a-lañ-oor-mi a-jaŋa a-jak-e oom-b-o**
behold Leopard-DEF RLS-return-RFX-MI C1-girl C1-be^good-E be-C15-IN
'Behold, Leopard, who [before] had turned into a beautiful girl [but was now Leopard again] was over there.'

(13) a. **u-m-e an i-manj-e**
DEM-person-LOC RLO 1S-know-E
'he whom I know (knew and still know)'

b. **u-m-u an i-manj-mi**
DEM-person-LOC RLO 1S-know-MI
'he whom I knew (now deceased)'

2.1.3 Imperfective -e together with -mi in subordinate clauses. As noted above, **-e** and **-mi** may contrast in subordinate clauses to express differences in kinesthetic transitivity, while a different **-e** morpheme expresses habitual or progressive aspect in independent clauses. This same habitual-progressive **-e** may occur in a subordinated verb which ends with **-mi** (Sapir 1965:41, footnote 8). The combination of habitual-progressive **-e** and stative **-e** cannot occur because they are semantically incompatible, since habitual and progressive are inherently non-stative. In (14) **-e** is habitual.

(14) **pan i-caam-i a-ñool-om a-yok-en-e-am-mi**
FUT 1S-pay-2S.O C1-child-1S^O RLS-be^tired-CS-E-1S^O-MI
'I'll repay you with my child who is always bothering me.'

In (15) **-e** is progressive when the sentence is interpreted as being in second person, or habitual, if in third person; the meaning must be determined from the context.

(15) **a-n-aw a-pit-e-mi ai**
C1-man-DEF RLS-cut-E-MI who
a. 'You who are cutting, who are you?'
b. 'Who is the man who is always cutting?'

2.2 -mi AND -e RELATED TO MOOD

The contrast between **-e** and **-mi** in subordinate clauses in Jóola-Foñy is sometimes modal. As illustrated in the sentences below, **-e** can imply doubt in (i) **man** clauses, where the contrasting null form expresses certainty, and (ii) subordinate clauses, where the contrasting **-mi** form expresses an absence of doubt (Hopkins 1990:89, discussing Sambou 1983:52).

2.2.1 -E in man clauses. In the following example, the first sentence lacks **-e** and the second contains it.

(16) **ni-so-sof man a-kaan bu-rok-ab u-b-e**
1S-decide-RD CONJ 3S-do C5-work-DEF DEM-C5-LOC
'I've decided he should do this work.'

ni-so-sof man a-kaan-e bu-rok-ab u-b-e
1S-decide-RD CONJ 3S-do-E C5-work-DEF DEM-C5-LOC
'I think he should do this work [but I'm not sure].'

2.2.2 -e and -mi in subordinate clauses. Once again, the second of the pairs of sentences contains **e**:

(17) **n-an u-manj-oor-mi n-o ínjé oom-b-o lekoor-ey**
C16-RLO 1PX-know-RCP-MI C16-IN 1S^D be-C15-IN school-DEF
'When we met each other, at the time I was going to school.'

n-an u-manj-oor-e n-ei
C16-RLO 1PX-know-RCP-E C16-INT
'When was it that we met each other?' [I don't remember meeting.]

(18) **ni-ti-ting ka-janda-ak n-an**
1S-break-RD C9-plow-DEF C16-RLO
u-wañ-een-mi bulan
1PX-cultivate-PST-MI Bulan
'I broke the plow when we cultivated Bulan [a particular field].'

ni-ti-ting ka-jand-ak n-an u-wañ-een-e bulan
1S-break-RD C9-plow-DEF C16-RLO 1PX-cultivate-PST-E Bulan
'I think I broke the plow when we cultivated Bulan.'

2.3 -e AND -mi RELATED TO INDIVIDUATION

In relative clauses introduced by **-a/-an** ('who/whom'), the contrast between **-mi** and **-e** is sometimes that of definiteness (one of the components of Hopper and Thompson's individuation parameter). **-mi** expresses high transitivity definiteness, while **-e** expresses contrasting low transitivity indefiniteness.

In each of the following examples, the first sentence uses **-mi** and the second -e.

(19) **nu-yajoor ínjé di buk-an-ak k-an a-boñ-ulo-mi**
1PX-meet 1S^D PREP C2-person-DEF^P C2-RLO 3S-send-DIR-MI
'My path crossed with the people he had sent here.'

nu-yajoor ínjé di buk-an k-an a-boñ-e
1PX-meet 1S^D PREP C2-person C2-RLO 3S-send-E
'My path crossed with some people he had sent.'

(20) **na-ŋar e-liw-ey y-a-gumbulo-mi á-jéétúm i-ñaa-ool**
3S-take C3-meat-DEF C3-RLS-be^left-MI 3S-bring C?-mother-3S^O
'He took the meat that was left and brought it to his mother.'

na-ŋar e-liw y-a-gumbulo-e á-jéétúm i-ñaa-ool
3S-take C3-meat C3-RLS-be^left-E 3S-bring C?-mother-3S^O
'He took some meat that was left and brought it to his mother.'

2.4 SUMMARY OF -e AND -mi IN RELATIVE CLAUSES

The difference between the functions of **-e** and **-mi** in relative clauses may be summarized as follows.

Relative clauses with **-mi** (the default marker) satisfy the following three conditions:
- aspectually, they are active, not stative;
- modally, they are certain, not dubitative;
- referentially, they are definite, not indefinite.

Relative clauses with **-e** fail to satisfy one of the above three conditions; they may be stative, dubitative, or indefinite.

3. -e AND -mi RELATED TO FOCUS ON A PREVIOUS CONSTITUENT

In constructions with **-e** in which a constituent is fronted (including the interrogative), the focus falls on the fronted constituent (Sapir 1965:35). In a comparable construction containing **-mi**,[11] the focus also falls on the fronted constituent, but in addition **-mi** conveys overtones of specificity-exclusivity ((21), related to the parameter of individuation) or of intensity ((22); Thomas and Sapir 1967:346). Alternatively, in the interrogative, **-mi** implies a more distant completed past action than when **-e** is used ((22) and (23), related perhaps to the parameter of kinesis).[12] Thus, when focus falls on a pre-verbal constituent, **-e** is the default marker, whereas **-mi** suggests contrastive or intensive focus:

(21) **m-o paap na-reg-e**
ANA-IN Paap 3S-say-E
'That's what Paap said.' [a summary statement]

m-o paap na-reg-mi
ANA-IN Paap 3S-say-MI
'*That's* what Paap said.' [not something else]

(22) **b-ei nu-je-e [jee = jaw + -e]**
C15-INT 2S-go^E
'Where did you go?'

b-ei nu-jaw-mi
C15-INT 2S-go-MI
1. '*Where did you go?*' [said in anger or exasperation]
2. 'Where did you go?' [yesterday, last week]

(23) **buu nu-moor-e**
how 2S-sleep-E
'How did you sleep?'

buu nu-moor-mi
how 2S-sleep-MI
1. 'How did you sleep?' [on your travels last week]
2. 'How was it that you slept?' [on a mat, perhaps?]

4. -e AND -mi IN NARRATIVE

In narrative discourse, **-e** and **-mi** are used in all the ways described so far in this paper, but in addition they have some special narrative uses.[13]

---

[11]The **-e** and **-mi** constructions are probably not identical. Those involving **-mi** consist of a relative clause and, presumably, an understood 'be' verb. Thus the second sentence in (21) might be represented, '*That* (is) [what Paap said]'. Those involving **-e**, however, appear to be single independent clauses (Hopkins, p.c.).

[12]The variation in the *implicatures* or *implicitly communicated assumptions* associated with the employment of **-mi** (in place of the default marker **-e**) to focus on a pre-verbal constituent is consistent with the principles of Relevance Theory (Sperber and Wilson 1986). According to this theory, a communicator who chooses a marked form intends to "convey additional implicatures" that would not be suggested by the unmarked form (Gutt 1991:41). However, Sperber and Wilson show that the same [marked] construction may have different implicatures in different contexts, and the implicature judged to be "optimally relevant" in a particular instance is arrived at only by processing an utterance "in an immediately accessible context".

[13]A more extensive analysis of narratives is needed, to relate the uses described here to the exact functions of the reduplicated and null verb forms.

4.1 -e IN NARRATIVE

Generally, **-e** is used in clauses that describe background information of an imperfective nature. This is a more specific claim than that of Sapir (1965:37), who includes "events that stand out" and "statements describing the general scene or situation" in a single category marked by **-e** or reduplicated forms of the verb.

Imperfective backgound information is usually encoded in the form: noun + **man** + [verb + **-e**]. This form contrasts with the form: verb + **man** + [verb + **-e**] (described in §2.1.1). This latter form consists of two clauses, whereas the noun + **man** + [verb + **-e**] form is a single topic-comment clause, in which the noun (the topic) is 'topicalized' or set off from the rest of the clause (the comment) by man. The noun + **man** form is also distinct from the focused form (see §3), which may begin with a focused noun but is never followed by either man or a comment.

Some examples of the noun + **man** + [verb + **-e**] form follow, together with their context in narrative ((24b), (24d), (25b)) In each, the clause is resultant stative.

(24) a. **k-eel k-ákón farankunda**
C8-days^past C8-one Farankunda
'in days past, in Farankunda [a village]'

b. **ínjé man i-baj-e si-mit fu-tok di si-gaba**
1S^D CONJ 1S-have-E C4-year C7-five PREP C4-two
'I was seven years old'

c. **di fu-jam**
PREP C7-rainy^season
'in the rainy season'

d. **e-mit-ey man e-lub-e mu-mel m-a-reoor-e**
C3-sky-DEF CONJ C3-rain-E C10-water C10-RLS-reach^a^medium^amount-E
'it [lit. the sky] had rained lightly,'

e. **di baj ku-suña kú-fèeji k-a-jaa-lo ku-fel**
DEV have C2-thief C2-three C2-RLS-go-DIR C2-untie
si-sahar-as s-ólólí
C4-sheep-1P^O C4-four
'there were three thieves who came [and] untied four of our sheep.'

(25) a. **nu-juk-iil koo peh**
1PX-see-3P^O 3P^D all
'We saw them [the thieves], all of them'

b. **an-oo-san man a-acen-e é-róop-oo**
person-ITER-RD CONJ 3S-hold^in^hand-E C3-set-E
'each one was holding his machete.'

Background information of a stative nature may also be expressed with an existential verb marked by **-e**. In this case, neither the topic noun nor **man** is present.

In (26), **-e** introduces imperfective background information at the outset of a story with the existential verb **baje** ('there was').

(26) **baj-e si-mit s-a-wuj-e di é-súk-éy y-ati sanjuum . .**
have-E C4-year C4-RLS-pass-E PREP C3-village-DEF C3-PS Sanjuum
'There was, years ago in the village of Sanjum . . .'

The verb **took** 'find' also appears to be used existentially, introducing something that happened. Such information either provides the background to the events that follow from it or is of a parenthetical nature.

In (27), the first **took-e** introduces the information 'one day we finished cooking', which sets the scene for 'I said to her . . .'. The second **took-e** introduces the parenthetical information 'she had given birth to a baby':[14]

(27) **took-e fu-nak fá-kón ú-síil u-ban (took-e na-ron-doŋ**
find-E C7-day C7-one 1PX-cook 1PX-finish find-E 3S-give^birth-RD
f-ar-af ji-ñiil-aj) ní-síil i-ban n-een-oo . .
C7-stomach-DEF C11-child-DEF 1S-cook 1S-finish 1S-say-3S.O
'It happened that one day, [when] we finished cooking (it happened that she had given birth to a baby), [when] I finished cooking, I said to her . . .'

The verb **nu-manj-e** 'you know' is also used to introduce information which provides the background to what follows or is of a parenthetical nature:

(28) **nu-manj-e di lekoor nu-kaan-e-kaan basike . .**
2S-know-E PREP school 1PX-do-E-RD basketball
'You know, in school we used to play basketball . . .'

4.2 -mi IN NARRATIVE

-mi is used not only as a relative clause marker, but also in independent clauses (see Hopkins 1990:88). In narrative, two uses may be distinguished: at the beginning of a story; and in connection with accentuated events, especially at the peak.

4.2.1 At the beginning of a story. -mi often occurs at the outset of a story and functions to introduce the specific event which triggers the rest of the story; typically, one or more major participants are also introduced at the same time.

The following example is the first sentence of a narrative:

(29) **ja-jeeru koo-ri já-múngúnó ku-jaw-mi ka-noomen-ak si-ñaa-iil**
C11-rabbit 3P-PREP C11-hyena C2-go-MI C9-sell-DEF C4-mother-3P^O
'Once upon a time, Rabbit and Hyena went to sell their mothers.'

One Jóola-Foñy speaker noted that **-mi** acts to draw the attention of the reader to what follows. Sapir (1965:35) observed that the presence of **-mi** "shifts emphasis from the verb to its immediate, usually post-verb environment". If this function is retained in narrative, this suggests that the presence of **-mi** draws attention to what immediately follows as representing the first foreground events of the story.[15]

4.2.2 At the peak of a story. -mi is also used at the peak of a story, or when a foreground event is being accentuated. Jóola-Foñy speakers say that **-mi** suggests intensity or forcefulness, as illustrated in (30) and (31).

(30) **na-tek-mi ka-raab-ak a-ban naan-mi: ji-jaw bóót**
3S-hit-MI C9-cheek-DEF 3S-finish 3S^say-MI 2P-go home
'He HIT his cheek, [and] he SAID [sternly], "You all go home".'

(31) **ni-juk-mi a-ñiil-aw ni-sof-oo-mi ni-nag-oo-mi**
1S-see-MI C1-child-DEF 1S-grab-3S^O-MI 1S-beat-3S^O-MI
'I *saw* the child, I *grabbed* him and I *beat* him!'

When used to accentuate an event, **-mi** does *not* shift emphasis from the verb to its post-verb environment. Indeed, (31) is the final sentence of a story.

---

[14]The difference between **took-e** and the reduplicated form **totook**, which is also used existentially, has not yet been determined. The same is true of the reduplicated equivalent of **numanje** 'you know (29), viz., **numanmanj**.

[15]The example Sapir quotes shows that he considered the emphasis to be shifted from the relative clause to the rest of the independent clause in which the relative clause was embedded.

4.3 NARRATIVE RELATED TO TRANSITIVITY AND FOCUS

The association in narrative of **-e** with background information, and of **-mi** with accentuated foreground information, is consistent with Hopper and Thompson's observation (1980:294) that foreground clauses *on average* have significantly higher transitivity than background clauses.

Thus, the use of **-e** in connection with focus on a preverbal constituent (see §3) is consistent with its association with background information, both because it "deflects emphasis from the verb" (Sapir 1965:35) and because clauses with "focus-presupposition articulation" (Andrews 1985:77-79) are not normally used to describe the foreground events of a narrative.[16]

5. CONCLUSION

This paper has shown that apparently diverse uses of the verb morphemes **-e** and **-mi** may in fact be related, on the basis of Hopper and Thompson's (1980) observations about transitivity.

(i) In subordinate clauses, the default marker **-mi** is associated with high transitivity values of the kinesis, mood, and individuation parameters, whereas **-e** is associated with low transitivity values of the same parameters.

(ii) In narrative, **-e** marks imperfective background information, which tends to correlate with low transitivity; high transitivity **-mi**, in contrast, is used to foreground the specific opening event which triggers the rest of the story and to accentuate other events, especially at the peak. Even the use of **-e** when the focus falls on the constituent which precedes the verb may reflect the inappropriateness of using a focus-presupposition clause to encode foreground information in narrative.

(iii) Finally, again in focus constructions, the overtones that the use of **-mi** conveys relate at least indirectly to high transitivity:

- the overtone of specificity-exclusivity relates to the parameter of individuation;
- the overtone of a more distant past action relates to the parameter of kinesis;
- the overtone of intensity is similar to the use of **-mi** to accentuate foreground events in narrative, especially at the peak.

REFERENCES

Andrews, A. 1985. The major functions of the noun phrase. In T. Shopen (ed.), Language typology and syntactic description, I.62-154. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 1976. Aspect: An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Greenberg, Joseph H. 1963. The languages of Africa. International Journal of American Linguistics, 29.1, part 2.

Gutt, Ernst-August. 1991. Translation and relevance: Cognition and context. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hopkins, Bradley. 1990. La phrase complexe en diola-fogny (ouest-atlantique): propositions relatives. Journal of West African Languages 20.2:81-98.

Hopper, Paul A. and Thompson, Sandra A. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. Language 56:251-99.

Jarvis, Elizabeth. 1991. Tense and aspect in podoko narrative and procedural discourse. In Stephen Anderson and Bernard Comrie (eds.), Tense and aspect in eight languages of Cameroon, 213-37. Arlington: Summer Institute of Linguistics and University of Texas at Arlington.

Payne, Stephen. 1992. Une grammaire pratique, avec phonologie et dictionnaire, de kwatay. Dakar: Société Internationale de Linguistique.

Sambou, Pierre-Marie. 1982. La déscription du systeme verbal du jóola. Annales de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines de Dakar 12.303-27.

[16]Jarvis (1991) observes that what she calls "focus perfectives" are used in Podoko to present setting-type events.

———. 1983. Lexique diola fogny - français. Les langues nationales du Senegal. Dakar: Centre de Linguistique Appliquée de Dakar, D.2.

Sapir, J. David. 1965. A grammar of Diola-Fogny; A language spoken in the Basse-Casamance region of Senegal. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1971. West Atlantic: An inventory of the languages, their noun class systems and consonant alternations. In T. Sebeok (ed.), Current trends in linguistics, 7:45-112. The Hague: Mouton.

Sperber, D. and D. Wilson. 1986. Relevance: Communication and cognition. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Thomas, Louis-Vincent and Sapir, J. David. 1967. Notes et documents; le Diola et le temps. BIFAN 29B.1-2.331-424.