THE SPEAKER AS COMMENTATOR

Rẹmi ṢONAIYA

Department of Foreign Languages
Obafemi Awolowo University
Ile-Ife, Nigeria.

Abstract: The literature on information structuring or information packaging has discussed primarily the assumptions made by the speaker concerning the mental state of the hearer regarding the entities or states of affairs that are mentioned in the speaker's utterances. These assumptions are said to determine how the speaker then goes on to package the information intended for the hearer. This approach we characterise as a hearer-oriented one, which needs to be counter-balanced by a speaker-oriented one for a complete picture of information structuring to be obtained. Thus, this article examines ways in which the speaker packages information in order to convey definite perspectives taken with respect to what is expressed in his or her utterances. Linguistic data from Yoruba are analysed and shown to portray different perspectives taken by a speaker regarding persons, processes and states of affairs. The dynamics involved in the use of the emphatic and non-emphatic pronouns of the language are examined with respect to the identification of persons; iterative constructions using the marker **tún** are shown to involve different perspectives taken regarding processes; and the two verbs of being, **jẹ́** and **ni** allow for distinct points of view to be expressed in respect of states of affairs.

Key words: Information Packaging; Information Structuring; Pronouns; Iterative Constructions; Identification

1. INTRODUCTION

Much of the discussion in the literature on information structuring or information packaging has revolved around the issue of what the speaker assumes to be the mental state of the hearer with respect to the entities or states of affairs referred to in the speaker's utterances. It is these

assumptions that will determine how the information contained in the speaker's utterances will be "structured" or "packaged". The reason for this hearer-oriented approach is clearly expressed in Chafe (1976:27) which states that people's minds not only contain a very large store of knowledge, but that they are also "at any one moment in certain temporary states with respect to that knowledge". He maintains that language can only function effectively if the speaker takes into account these different temporary states of the mind of the person being addressed.

Prince (1981:224) defined information structuring as "the tailoring of an utterance by a sender to meet the particular assumed needs of the intended receiver". Other recent works (for example, Lambrecht 1994, Vallduví and Engdahl 1996) have also accounted for information packaging in terms of the ways in which the speaker's assumptions about the hearer's state of knowledge at the time of utterance is reflected in the grammar of languages. The definition of information structure proposed by Lambrecht is the following:

> That component of sentence grammar in which propositions as conceptual states of affairs are paired with lexicogrammatical structures in accordance with the mental states of interlocutors who use and interpret these structures as units of information in given discourse contexts. (1994:5)

It seems to us that there are at least two sides to the issue of information structuring. While one aspect of it focuses on the addressee and the state of mind he is assumed to be in regarding the proposition expressed in an utterance, a second part should focus on the speaker himself and illustrate the perspective he takes with respect to the utterances being made. Thus, while Bisang and Sonaiya (1997b), for instance, examine the different lexical and grammatical markers by which the Yoruba speaker makes it known that he is making certains assumptions about his interlocutor's state of knowledge at the time of utterance, it is the second aspect of information packaging that we wish to examine in this paper.

The paper adopts the point of view that certain grammatical and aspectual markers of a language may be regarded as "comments" made by the speaker regarding persons, processes and states of affairs. That is, different structures are used in specific contexts and choices are made among related lexical items to convey a certain point of view on the part of the speaker. Drawing our examples primarily from the Yoruba language, we will examine ways in which different points of view may be expressed in relation to persons, to processes and to states of affairs. Thus, the concern here is no longer with the structures that bear witness to the fact that a speaker makes assumptions about his interlocutor's state of mind; the question that will be considered here, rather, is : what different grammatical forms does a speaker employ to reflect different attitudes and perspectives taken with respect to entities, processes and states of affairs referred to in utterances?

The next section (§ 2) examines the dynamics of identifying persons by analysing the functions of the emphatic and non-emphatic pronouns of the language. It will be seen that while the predicate in utterances with non-emphatic pronouns merely serves to express a property of the subject, utterances involving emphatic pronouns are more complex and they interact in an interesting way with other phenomena like the High Tone Syllable and the focus particle ni.

Section 3 looks at the representation of iterative processes in Yoruba. The iterative marker, tún, is analysed in the two syntactic frames in which it is employed and seen to convey specific perspectives, on the part of the speaker, regarding the processes involved. Based on the structural similarity between the syntactic frames in which tún occurs and the structure of serial verb constructions in the languages, the question is posed whether a unified account of the two types of phenomena might not be proposed.

The final section (§4) is a discussion of the representation of different perspectives in respect of states of affairs. In this respect, the two verbs of being in Yoruba, jẹ́ and ni, will be examined to see how they allow distinct points of view regarding states of BE-ing to be expressed.

2. ON PERSONS

The main issue with respect to persons, in general, has to do with identification. It is important that individuals referred to in utterances be correctly picked out by the hearer, and languages employ various strategies in accomplishing this task. It may be argued that the giving of names, for instance, apart from other important cultural significance attached to it in communities like that of the Yoruba, is a way of simplifying the task of identifying individuals. Thus, if a person asks another one "Have you seen John this morning ?", the assumption is that there is a particular John, out of all the Johns known by both the speaker and the addressee, that is most likely to be singled out for identification. It may happen, of course, that there are several individuals activated in the mind of the addressee (for instance, if there is more than one John working in the interlocutors' office), so that the question is then asked, "Which John?"

The question of identification has to do with the notion of "otherness", a notion that has received a lot of attention in the work of Antoine Culioli and his colleagues (the French term used is "altérité" - see Culioli 1990, Franckel et Lebaud 1990). It was said above that names serve to pick out individuals, singling them out from among so many others. With respect to personal pronouns, the situation is more complex, and this is what will be examined in this section. While emphatic pronouns pattern like proper names and are predicated upon the notion of otherness, the non-emphatic ones are not, and serve merely as a locus upon which some some specific action is predicated.

2.1 Personal Pronouns

Yoruba possesses two sets of subject pronouns, commonly described as "emphatic" and "non-emphatic":

1.	Non-emphatic	Emphatic	
	mo	èmi	I
	o	ìwọ	You (sg.)
	ó	òun	He/She/It
	a	àwa	We
	ẹ	ẹ̀yin	You (pl.)
	wọ́n	àwọn	They

2.1.1 Non-emphatic pronouns. Non-emphatic pronouns may be seen as devoid of a consciousness of self; that is, the notion of "person" does not seem to be vital in their use. They do not seem to involve any specific structuring of information apart from simply indicating a certain property of the subject which is expressed by the predicate of the utterance. The "comment" which the speaker may be said to be making via the use of a non-emphatic pronoun is to communicate to the listener not to focus so much on the person but rather on the predicate. Thus, the dialogue in (2) below is not so much concerned with the issue of the persons involved as with eating:

2. a. ṣé o ti jẹun   'Have you eaten?'
      Q 2s Perf. eat
   b. mo ti jẹun   'I have eaten'
      1s Perf eat

The situation here is that there is no contrastiveness involved, and so the idea of "person" does not need to be underscored. Also, there is maximum contextual support; the exchange is related to the two interlocutors themselves, and not focussed on some other third party. That is, for non-emphatic pronouns, the question of identifiability does not really arise. Non-emphatic pronouns are deictic categories, especially the first and second persons (see below on the status of the third person), and there is no difficulty identifying the referents of such pronouns given that they do not stand in opposition to some other referents. They are context-bound and do not point to any other referent outside of the discourse situation itself.

The case of the third person is more complex and the debate on its status is yet to be conclusively resolved. As can be seen in (1) above, it is only in this instance that there is a H(igh) tone on the pronouns (ó, wón); the first and second persons both bear mid tones. A related fact of the language is that all full NPs in subject position are also marked by a H tone (often referred to as the High Tone Syllable - HTS) in affirmative sentences, as illustrated in (3):

3. Ayọ̀ ˊ ti jẹun   'Ayọ̀ has eaten'
      HTS Perf eat

Some of the discussion in the literature has centred around whether the H tone of the third person pronoun is the same as the HTS or not (Bamgbose 1967, Oyelaran 1971, Stahlke 1974). Without entering into a lengthy consideration of the issue here, the point of view adopted in theis article is that the H tone of the third person is indeed the HTS. That is, the HTS is viewed as a marker of the third person category in general, and its function may be understood as that of marking discourse referents that are outside of the immediate, deictic situation of the interlocutors. The participants in the discourse, via the use of non-emphatic pronouns, signal to each other not to seek to identify some person outside of the immediate context but rather to focus on the predicate.

2.1.2 Emphatic pronouns. The major point to be underscored here is that emphatic pronouns, as shown in the second column of (1) above, are a third person category in Yoruba. Even in the case of the first and second persons, what the emphatic pronoun conveys is that the speaker is expressing a consciousness of the self, which is different from the case of non-emphatic pronouns. Here, the speaker takes a distance from himself in his role as speaker and becomes, as it were, an "object" of the utterance itself, or its topic, to use a more familiar terminology.

Underlying the occurrence of the emphatic pronoun is the notion of contrastiveness. That is, the emphatic pronouns are used to single out particular discourse referents from among a set of possible candidates. Thus, if in response to the question in (4a) the answer in (4b) is given, the speaker singles out himself out of the group of possible people who wish to eat at that particular time:

4. a. ta ló   fẹ́ jẹun ?   'Who wants to eat ?'
       who FOC:3s want eat

   b. èmi ˊ   fẹ́ jẹun   'I want to eat'
      EMPH:1s HTS want eat

This, clearly, has to do with identification, with the entity filling the subject slot being identified as having the property expressed by the predicate; whether it also involves contrastiveness is a matter that might be debated. Chafe's (1976) discussion of contrastiveness deals mostly with cases where a particular entity is identified as the only correct one which possesses the property

involved, as in his example, Rónald made the hamburgers. He states that "what is communicated by a contrastive sentence is that a certain focus item rather than other possible ones is correct" (1976:35) and identifies three factors which are involved in contrastive sentences. In respect of the above example they are: (1) an awareness by the interlocutors that someone made the hamburgers, (2) a realization that there is a set of possible candidates, and (3) the assertion of a particular candidate as being the correct one.

In example (4) above, factors (1) and (2) are clearly present: there is an assumption (on the part of the one who asks the question) that one or more people might have the desire to eat at that point in time, and this represents the set of possible candidates. It is at the level of the third factor that there is a problem, since no particular individual is being identified as the only one fitting the description. This, of course, is due to the nature of the predicate involved; wanting to eat can admit of more than one person being identified, and indeed it is possible that all the candidates are actually identified. As for having made hamburgers, on the other hand, it is more natural to imagine that only a subset of the possible candidates will be identified. It would seem to us that there is contrastiveness in both cases, but that, depending on the type of predicate involved, it may be present more as a potential (as in wanting to eat) or be actually maifested (as in making hamburgers).

Laying the matter of contrastiveness aside, we return to the notion of identification and note that this may be non-exclusive or non-uniquely determined (that is, permitting a certain number of alternatives), or it may be exclusive or uniquely determined (admitting of no alternatives). In (4) above there is non-exclusive identification because the speaker who gives the response in (4b) does not have to be the only one with the property indicated. As has been stated above, it may actually turn out that everyone present in the discourse situation has that property.

The structure in Yoruba for expressing non-exclusive identification is a combination of the emphatic pronoun (or a proper name) and the High Tone Syllable: the emphatic pronoun serves to identify or pick out the individual, while the HTS signifies that the particular property is not necessarily being uniquely predicated of that individual.

Bisang and Sonaiya (1997b) analyse the presence, alone, of the HTS in utterances as signifying a "neutral" context, one characterised by a very low level of presuppositionality and interactionality. Such a context is found typically in newspaper headlines, proper names, sports commentaries and official announcements, where the statements are made without reference to some specific background knowledge among the interlocutors, nor is there any particular reaction expected on the part of the addressee beyond the fact of being merely informed.

Within the current discussion too, one can say that the presence of the HTS signals an absence of specific presupposition and exclusivity of identification. The question asked is an open one (given the predicate involved) and the emphatic pronoun in (4b) is used to identify a particular individual who possesses the expressed property.

Now, identification, on the other hand, may be exclusive or uniquely determined. In such an instance, Yoruba uses the emphatic pronoun (the identifier) and the so-called focus particle ni which Bisang and Sonaiya (1997b) analyse as a marker permitting identification without alternatives. Thus, while the emphatic pronoun in conjunction with the HTS (as in 4b) may be interpreted as signifying "at least X, and possibly others", the meaning conveyed by the emphatic pronoun plus ni is "X, and none other". Again, it is the kind of predicate involved that partly determines what occurs, for example:

5. a. ta ló fọ́ àwo yìi ?   'Who broke this plate?'
      Q FOC:3s break plate this

b. èmi ni mo fọ́ ọ   'I (am the one who) broke it.'
   EMPH:1s FOC 1s break OBJ:3s

Here, out of the number of possible candidates one person is being uniquely identified as the one who broke the plate and, as such, it is in this instance that one can talk of contrastiveness without any reserve. The presence of ni cancels out the possibility of any other entity filling the same slot.

This distinction between exclusive and non-exclusive identification is not so clearly formalised in languages like English and French, for example. It can only be inferred from the specific predicate in the utterance and based on one's knowledge of how things function in the world. Thus, if the questions were asked 'Who would like to go to the movies? / Qui aimerait aller au cinéma?' or 'Who broke this plate? / Qui a cassé cette assiette?', there is no formal way of seeing, from the answers given, that the first set of answers invlove non-exclusive identification (I would like to go / J'aimerais y aller, moi) while the second pair deal with exclusive identification (I did / C'est moi).

In English, the response in both cases involves stressing the pronoun, while in French the stressed or emphatic pronoun (pronom tonique) is used. In both languages too, the construction "It is X who.../C'est X qui..." may be used for exclusive identification, but we see that this is not as clearly demarcated as in Yoruba . This leads us to conclude that part of the function of the High Tone Syllable, to return to that issue, must be to allow entities to be identified in a non-exclusive way.

2.2 Identifiability and definiteness of referents

The identifiability of referents has a lot to do with their definiteness and specificity (Chafe 1976, Lambrecht 1994). Lambrecht defines an identifiable referent as "one for which a shared representation already exists in the speaker's and the hearer's mind at the time of utterance" (1994:78). He further specifies that with respect to information structure, "the relevant property of an identifiable referent is not that it is presupposed to exist, but that the speaker assumes that it has a certain representation in the mind of the addressee which can be evoked in a given discourse". In this section, we will examine how the issue of identifiability interacts with the definiteness and specificity of referents in the Yoruba language.

In Bisang and Sonaiya (1997b) the determiners kan 'one' and yìí 'this' are described as markers permitting the speaker to assess the degree of activity of an entity in the hearer's mind. The factor determining the use of one or the other is identified as the "degree of preconstruction" of the entity mentioned in the utterance; an entity assumed by the speaker to show low activity in the hearer's mind has the parameter [- preconstruction] and is qualified by kan, while one assumed to show high activity has the feature [+ precontruction] and is marked with yìí. In other words, the referent of NP kan would be indefinite while that of NP yìí would be definite.

However, there is a difference in Yoruba as to what definite marker to use in what context: in conversations, yìí has the force of a true demonstrative, used to "point at" referents that are physically (or cognitively) present in and pertinent to the discourse context. The same marker is a also used in narratives: a referent is first introduced as NP kan and then subsequently referred to as NP yìí, the reason being that a narrative is seen as a very actual thing, and referents in the world of this type of discourse are treated as being truly present. Otherwise, in conversations, náà is the marker used to indicate definiteness of referents that are merely being talked about but not present in the discourse situation. For example,

6. ọmọ kan ´ wá síbí lánàá   'A/One child came here yesterday'

child   one   HTS come to:here at:yesterday

7. ọmọ náà ni mo rí lọ́jà níjẹta   'It's the child I saw at the market
                                               the day before yesterday'
   child DEF FOC 1s see at:market at:2_days_ago

Lambrecht (1994) makes the point that identifiability is, in principle, a matter of degree, because the identifiability of referents depends on "a multitude of psychological factors" (p. 84). In Yoruba, referents that are easily identifiable, for instance, due to their uniqueness or their salience for the discourse participants are used bare, for example, words like òòrùn 'sun', òṣùpá 'moon', etc., as well as in utterances like

8. ṣé ọmọ   ́ ti sùn ?   'Has the baby slept?'
   Q child HTS PERF sleep

No determiner is needed here because both the speaker and the hearer know exactly which baby is being referred to. This is similar to the use of the definite article in English to refer to entities being mentioned for the first time, like 'the car' in the utterance 'Has the car been washed this morning?' The presence of kan would signify that the referent is unconnected to the interlocutors, lacking a pragmatic frame which would allow it to be anchored in the discourse world, for example,

9. àwọn ọmọ kan ń   ṣeré níwáju ilé
       PL   child one PROG do:play at:front house
'Some children are/were playing in front of the house'

The indefinite marker kan may, however, refer to a specific or a non-specific referent. Just like for the English example given by Lambrecht (1994:80), the sentence

10. mò ń wá   ẹnìkan   'I am looking for somebody'
    1s PROG look_for person:one

may involve a specific referent (i.e. I am looking for a particular person) or a non-specific one (just anybody would do).

In all these instances, we see that the speaker reveals definite perspectives taken with respect to the various referents in the utterances she makes.

3. ON PROCESSES

There are various ways in which a speaker demonstrates that a specific perspective is taken with respect to the processes that are expressed in utterances. Of course, the nature of the particular process would have important consequences for the types of other grammatical or aspectual markers that may co-occur with them in utterances. For instance, processes denoting states are normally incompatible with the perfective marker in a language like Yoruba, as demonstrated by the ungrammaticality of a sentence like *mo ti fẹ̀ràn è'"?I have loved him/her'. Such an utterance, for it to be rendered grammatical, would need the addition of further qualification, as in mo ti fẹ̀ràn è jù/tó 'I have loved him/her too much/enough' (Note that the acceptability of the

English glosses is not being discussed here. For an analysis of the perfective marker ti see Bisang and Sonaiya 1997a.)

We wish, in this section, to illustrate the various types of perspectives which a speaker might take in respect of processes by looking at iterative constructions in the Yoruba language. Iteration has to do with plurality and, for our purposes here, it is the plurality of actions or processes which will be focussed upon. Xrakovskij (1997) talks more, however, in terms of the plurality of situations, presumably because plurality of actions very often (though not always) involves plurality of situations: He states that "the concept of plurality of situations is a special case of the concept of quantity, one of the basic philosophical categories" (1997:3). Quantity, therefore, being a concept whose expression is inherent in language, it is interesting to examine how various languages express this basic concept. In this vein, this section of the present article may be seen as a further contribution to the volume edited by Xrakovskij which examines iterative constructions across various languages.

The factors involved in the context of plurality of actions or processes have to do with whether it is the same person or not that performs the action and whether this is carried out at the same time or not. Some of the markers that Yoruba employs which encode various combinations of these factors are: the numeral prefix èè-, the reduplicative numeral prefix mV- (i.e. 'm' followed by the first vowel of the numeral), the iterative marker tún, and the so-called progressive marker ń, which seems also to perform the function of iteration.

Another factor which may also be important for the expression of iteration is the existence or otherwise of a time interval delimiting the different occurences of the action. This might seem to be accountable for under the factor relating to time mentioned above, that is, the consideration whether the repeated action takes place at the same time (i.e. in the same situation) or not. However, the point of time interval has to do also with whether the series of repeated actions are even perceived as discrete points in time or not. This will be relevant in the characterisation of the marker ń, for example (see below).

3.1 èè-

This is a prefix that attaches to numeral determiners to indicate the number of times that a given process is carried out. Thus, it is a marker which changes the numeral determiners (which normally qualify nouns - e.g. ìwé méjì 'two books') into adverbs specifying how many times a particular action is performed, for example:

11. èèmejì ni mo rí Bólá lónìí   'I saw Bola twice today'
     two_times FOC 1s see Bola LOC:today

The marker is used in the context of a plurality of actions performed by the same individual(s) either at different times within a specified time frame, as in the above example, or successively within the same situation. In the following example, somebody's name is called successively, without any noticeable time lapse separating the occurences, as in

12. Bàbá pe Bólá ní èèmeta   'Father called Bola three times'
     father call Bola LOC three_times
(Note the tone change in the first syllable of the numeral from H(igh) to M(id): méjì > èèmejì; méta > èèmeta)

What we have here is, thus, a very specific marker, permitting the number of times that a process occurs to be counted. The condition attached to its use is that the subject of the action be identical in all the instances of the occurrence of the process.

The pragmatic function of this marker (i.e. of the fact of stating the number of times a process takes place) may vary depending on the particular process. For instance, if I tell a friend that I have tried to call her on the phone four times today but she was not at home, the force of my utterance could be a slight bewilderment (Where on earth could you have been all day?) or even repfoof (We had an appointment to discuss a matter over the phone, but you didn't stay at home!) There may also be some particular cultural meanings associated with stating the number of times that a particular thing occurs; for example, calling someone's name thrice in the person's presence signifies that he or she has done something considered to be rather grievous, and the person is being prepared or warned about the consequences which are about to follow.

3.2 ń

This is normally considered an aspectual marker denoting the progressive. One could question, however, whether such a characterisation is totally appropriate, since the sense of "action in progress" is not always present: this reading is available only with specific types of verbs and in particular contexts. Thus, if I ask to see a person and I am told ó ń jẹun or ó ń sùn 'S/He is eating' or 'S/He is sleeping', the most natural interpretation would be that the particular process was going on at that point in time. However, the same utterances could be used in a context where the person referred to is not actually engaged at that time in the actions stated. Someone, for instance, could ask a baby's mother Ṣé ọmọ ń jẹun? 'Does the baby eat? and the answer would be Ó ń jẹun 'S/He eats'. The question is really used to inquire about the baby's health, eating well being taken as evidence of good health.

The marker ń may be analysed as involving plurality of action withing an unspecified time frame, which gives it then a kind of habitual meaning. Its uses may be illustrated by the following examples:

13. Ìbàdàn ni mò ń gbé   'I live in Ibadan'
    Ibadan FOC 1s HAB live

14. Adé ń ṣiṣẹ́ ní bánkì   'Ade works in a bank'
    Ade HAB work LOC bank

15. ibẹ̀ ni mo ti ń jẹun ààrọ̀   'That is where I eat breakfast'
    there FOC 1s RPD HAB eat morning

('RPD' stands for 'Reference to a Preconstructed Domain', and this is the function that the so-called perfective marker ti is analysed as performing in utterances. See Bisang and Sonaiya 1997a.)

Plurality of action is certainly involved in all these cases, but the actions themselves seem to be perceived more as states characterising the subject rather than as dicrete actions consciously repeated. This phenomenon of certain tense-aspect forms acquiring an iterative meaning was discussed for Lithuanian by Geniusiene (1997). For Yoruba, just like for Lithuanian, this is determined primarily by the type of verb involved.

3.3 tún

The marker tún is employed in two different syntactic frames which represent two different perspectives taken by the speaker with respect to the processes conveyed by the predicate of the utterance. tún directly followed by a verb [tún V (NP)] is employed for the iteration of identical or cognitively related processes and gives a cumulative effect. When a NP intervenes between tún and the verb [tún NP V], that is, when it is directly followed by an object, it signifies an iteration that is effected due to some specific considerations. In such cases, one may say that

that the object represents in reality an objective. Thus, the use of tún in each of these syntactic frames represents a double perspective that a speaker might assume vis-à-vis a given process.

The analysis presented here is different from that proposed by Awobuluyi (1967), in that it sees the marker tún as a single element but which operates within two frames. Awobuluyi identifies two different elements: tún1, which he analyses as a preverb due to certain verbal properties it displays, and tún 2, which he calls a particle. Awobuluyi's analysis, it seems to us, loses some important generalisations that could be made regarding these 'two' elements (which are nonetheless identical in form) by being more fixated upon syntactic properties rather than on functional ones. The present analysis suscribes to an approach which seeks to tease out from linguistic data underlying unifying properties. We share Culioli's point of view that a vital part of the goal that linguists pursue must be to "find the invariants which found and regulate language activity, as this activity manifests itself through the meaningful configurations of different languages. In order to do this," he further states, "one must go beyond mere classificatory properties and labelling..." (Culioli 1990:72)

3.3.1 tún V (NP). When tún is used within this frame, it merely indicates that a process is repeated, and one gets the effect of cumulation:

16. a jẹ ẹ̀wà lánàá,   a tún jẹ ẹ̀wà lónìí
   1pl eat beans LOC:yesterday 1pl again eat beans LOC:today
   'We ate beans yesterday, (and) we ate beans again today'

One can imagine this sentence being uttered by a child to her mother. Since children, within the Yoruba culture, are known not to like beans in general, the utterance takes on the force of a complaint: "Mom, we're eating beans too much!" Of course, the meaning conveyed will depend on the type of process involved as well as on an understanding of human reaction to situations in general. Thus, if I say Adé tún fún mi ní owó lánàá 'Ade gave me money again yesterday' I would most likely not be complaining, but rather commenting on Ade's generosity.

The function of this particular syntactic frame is that tún, directly preceding the verb, serves to draw attention to it, thus making it the point of focus of the repetition. Apart from cases involving identical processes, tún V NP is also used for related processes, as in

17. ó wọ aṣọ, ó dé   filà, ó sì   tún fi ilẹ̀kẹ̀ sọ́rùn
   3s enter cloth 3s put_on_head cap 3s COORD plus put bead to:neck
   'He was (well-) dressed, wore a cap, and wore beads'

In such cases involving the iteration of a sequence of events or processes, the marker of coordination, sì, is often used. The presence of tún in such sequences shows the relatedness of the processes listed - in this particular case, they have to do with things that are worn on the body. The absence of tún would present the processes as a mere succession of facts. Such is the case in the following example; although the processes seem to be related in the physical world, tún is not acceptable:

18. mànàmáná kọ, àrá sán, òjò ´ sì bẹ̀rẹ̀ síí rọ̀
   lightening flash thunder strike rain HTS COORD start to fall
   'Lightening flashed, thunder struck, and it started to rain'

It would seem as if there is a condition placed on the subject of an utterance in which tún is used within a sequence of actions that this subject be human. This suggests that the bringing together of the (related) processes is a volitive act, and this needs to be distinguished from a mere

(fortuitous) succession of events for which no person may be held responsible. However, non-human subjects are acceptable with tún in single process utterances:

19. òjò ⸯ ti bèrè síí rò
    rain HTS PERF start to fall
    'It has started to rain'

We give a final example to show that a mere identity of the verb used in the sequence does not guarantee acceptability:

20. *ó wo bàtà, ó sì tún wo mótò
    3s enter shoes 3s COORD plus enter vehicle

That is, although it can be convincingly argued that the same verb wo is the one found in the context of wearing of clothes as well as entering a vehicle (signigying the act of introducing one's body or a part thereof into some object), yet the juxtaposition of these two contexts is unacceptable. It is required that the processes be conceptually and cognitively related.

3.3.2 **tún NP V**. This is the second syntactic frame within which tún is used, and it represents a context where there is an objective for which the process is repeated. The general meaning conveyed in this instance is one of correction: an action is judged not to have been well done, and has to be repeated in order for it to be ameliorated. tún in this context is usually glossed by the prefix re- or by 'over again' in English.

21. Adé tún ilè náà gbá
    Ade again floor DET sweep
    'Ade swept the floor (over) again'

That is, this sentence is different from its counterpart in which the verb would directly follow tún, Adé tún gba ilè náà, which would signify a mere repetition of the action of sweeping the floor by Ade, without any suggestion being made that the floor was not well swept in the first instance.

The subject of the repeated process does not have to be identical to that of its first occurrence; one may well ask another person to re-do something that was originally done by somebody else, as in

22. Jòwó bá mi tún ilè yen gbá
    please for me again floor DET sweep
    'Please help me sweep that floor (over) again'

A child may have failed in sweeping the floor properly, and an older and more competent person is now being asked to do it over again.

Indeed, there may not even have been any first occurrence of a process at all, which is regularly the case when tún is used in conjunction with the verb se 'to do'. In this conxtext, the primary function of tún is to signal that an existing situation is undesirable and needs to be corrected. Examples illustrating this use are:

23.   a. tún mótò/aago se   'repair a car/watch'
         b. tún yàrá se   'rearrange a room'
         c. tún orí omo se   'place a baby's head properly'
         d. tún ayé se   'make the world better'

(Example (c) is used in the context of a baby being carried on the back whose head has swung out of place.)

Awobuluyi (1967) had characterised tún within this syntactic frame as usable only with transitive verbs. This is not the case at all. For instance, as the next example demonstrates, intransitive verbs are acceptable within this frame as well:

24. Adé máa tún ọjà yẹn lọ
    Ade FUT again market DET go
    'Ade will have to go to the market again'

This sentence can be uttered in a context where the speaker had sent Ade to the market to buy a certain number of items and he returns without having purchased them all. The speaker therefore insists that he must return to the market because the objective has not been attained. Here is why we have characterised this use of tún as representing a context where an objective seems to have been grammaticalised into an object. ọjà cannot normally act as a direct object of the verb lọ; the locative marker sí is required in such contexts - mo lọ sí ọjà 'I went to the market'. The only kind of object possible in the language for an intransitive verb like lọ is the reduplicated nominalised form of the verb itself - a lọ lílọ kan 'We did some going'. However, we see this requirement being overthrown here in favour of the function of tún to signal the presence of some objective.

Finally, we make a brief comment concerning the similarity between the structures under consideration here and that of many serial verb constructions, for example:

25. mo sáré lọ
    1s run go
    'I went quickly'

26. Adé gbá ilẹ̀ náà mọ́
    Ade sweep floor DET clean
    'Ade swept the floor clean'

27. Adé gbé ọmọ wá kí mi
    Ade carry child come greet me
    'Ade brought the baby to greet me'

While (25) ressembles the structure tún V (NP), (26) and (27) are similar to that of tún NP V. It would be useful to study the relevant data more closely to see what new insights and conclusions might be drawn from them. Could the two syntactic frames in which tún is used be considered as instances of serial verb constructions, or could serial verb constructions themselves be analysed in terms of the interaction of the specific processes contained in them?

What has been demonstrated in this section is the fact that a speaker is able to make "comments" on processes via the specific perspectives that he or she assumes vis-à-vis these processes. That is, the analysis of certain linguistic phenomena reveals that language makes it possible for a speaker to act as a commentator on persons, on processes and, as shall be seen in the following section, on states of affairs.

4. ON STATES OF AFFAIRS

This section will present a brief analysis concerning the representation of a particular state of affairs, that of BE-ing, and what mechanisms are available in the Yoruba language to express different points of view relative to this state. The discussion will centre upon an analysis of the two verbs used in BE-predication in the language, jẹ́ and ni (also called the focus particle). We will not be concerned with cases involving attributive verbs like ga 'be tall', tóbi 'be big', sanra 'be fat', etc. (Adé ga 'Ade is tall).

Sonaiya (1993) analysed the function of ni as being that of expressing absolute or complete identity between the referents placed on either side of it. That is, it represents a one-to-one mapping between the two referents. The most common contexts in which it is employed are exemplified in the following:

28. Olú ni ó fọ́ àwo yìí
    Olu BE 3s break plate DET
    '(It was) Olu (who) broke this plate'

29. ẹranko ni kìnìún
    animal BE lion
    The lion is an animal'

30. Bísí ni ó lẹ́wà   jù nínú......
    Bisi BE 3s have:beauty most LOC:inside....
    'Bisi is the most beautiful among....'

31. ìyá   ni wúrà
    mother BE gold
    'Mother is gold'

In (28) Olu is identified as the individual who broke the plate; (29) involves a defining or categorising of the lion; (30) contains a superlative in which an idividual is identified as occupying that superlative position; (31) represents one of the many instances in which ni is used in proverbs and fixed sayings in Yoruba. The important point to note in all of these examples is that there is no alternative to the entity that is identified to the left of ni: the preconstruct is given on the right hand side of the utterance, and the referent identified on the left is the only one that can possibly fill that position.

jẹ́, on the other hand, identifies a referent in a non-exclusive manner; it merely states that the particular entity is a member of a particular set or possesses a particular quality. For example:

32. Olú jẹ́ akíkanjú ọkùnrin
    Olu BE brave   man
    'Olu is a brave man'

33. ìlera ´   jẹ́ ohun tí ó ṣe pàtàkì púpọ̀
    health HTS BE thing REL 3s do importance plenty
    'Health is a very important thing'

'Olu', in (32) is not assumed to be the only brave man in existence, and 'health', though recognised as a very important thing (33), is not so identified in superlative terms either.

These two verbs, jẹ and ni, can therefore be seen as permitting the expression of two perspectives on the state of BE-ing. Through them, the speaker communicates to the hearer that a certain point of view is taken with respect to the state of BE-ing that is predicated of a given referent. In one case, the referent is singled out as the unique individual able to fill a given slot, while in the other the speaker is content to merely identify the referent as one of whom a certain state of BE-ing might be predicated.

CONCLUSION

Languages permit the expression of different conceptual distinctions, and the differentiations that can be made are not the same from one language to another. In this article, the formal means of expressing some of these conceptual differentiations in the Yoruba language have been analysed, and they are perceived as the language enabling the speaker to "make comments", or in other words, to express different perspectives in relation to persons, processes and states of affairs.

We have sought, in this article, to contribute to the ongoing dicsussion which seeks to comprehend more fully the role that the speaker plays in communication. As has been earlier stated, the speaker constantly makes judgments concerning the state in which he assumes his hearer's mind to be with respect to the referents contained in the utterances he makes. At the same time, he seeks to communicate to the hearer specific points of view regarding what is being talked about. It is in looking at both sides of the coin, as it were, that we get a richer and more complete picture of what the speaker's role truly entails.

REFERENCES

Awobuluyi, O. (1967). *Studies in the Syntax of the Standard Yoruba Verb*. Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University.

Bamgbose, Ayo (1967). *A Short Yoruba Grammar*. Ibadan: Heinemann Educational Books.

Bisang, Walter; and Sonaiya, Remi (1997a). Perfect and beyond, from pragmatic relevance to perfect: the Chinese sentence-final particle *le* and Yoruba *ti. Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 50.2, 143-158.

Bisang, Walter; and Sonaiya, Remi (1997b). Information structuring in Yoruba. Paper presented at the 2nd World Congress of African Linguistics, University of Leipzig, Germany, 27th July - 3rd August, 1997.

Chafe, Wallace L. (1976). Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics, and point of view. In *Subject and Topic*, Li, Charles N. (ed.), 25-55. New York: Academic Press.

Culioli, Antoine (1990). *Pour une linguistique de l'énonciation: Opérations et Représentations*. Ophrys.

Franckel, Jean-Jacques; and Lebaud, Daniel (1990). *Les figures du sujet*. Ophrys.

Geniusienè, Emma S. (1997) The multiplicative and the iterative in Lithuanian. In Xrakovskij, ed.

Lambrecht, Knud (1994). *Information structure and sentence form. Topic, focus, and the mental representation of discourse referents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oyelaran, Olasope O. (1971). *Yoruba Phonology*. Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.

Prince, Ellen (1981). Toward a taxonomy of given-new information. In *Radical Pragmatics*, Cole, Peter, (ed.), New York: Academic Press.

Sonaiya, Remi (1993). Being in French and Yoruba. Paper presented at the 24th Conference of African Linguistics. Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Stahlke, Herbert (1974). Pronouns and Islands in Yoruba. *Studies in African Linguistics* 5: 171-204.

Vallduví, Enric; and Engdahl, Elisabeth (1996). The linguistic realization of information packaging. *Linguistics* 34.3, 459 - 519.

Xrakovskij, Viktor S. (ed.) (1997). Typology of iterative constuctions. München-Newcastle: Lincom Europa.