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A Study of Fula Dialects: Examining the Continuous/Stative Constructions

RITSUKO MIYAMOTO

Abstract

Due to the complex distribution of its speakers, Fula is difficult to explore in its dialectal aspects. However, it is well recognized that there is a great dialectal difference between the language as spoken westward from northwestern Nigeria and as spoken eastward, i.e. the so-called Adamawa dialect. This paper attempts to find exactly where the west/east boundary of Fula dialects lies, through examining the elements which mark continuous/stative aspect, such as personal pronouns (mido, emi, hidu, etc.) and constructions with na/no. In the course of the study it becomes quite evident that the continuous/stative markers can be a good indicator for Fula dialect studies. As a result, although we need more data to draw a clearer demarcation line, it seems from this research the line is somewhere around the Sokoto area of Nigeria.

1. Introduction

When discussing ethnicity, language is one of the crucial elements. Consequently, we have to investigate linguistic aspects of the Fulbe when we consider the "Fulbeness" or the Fulbe identity.

Fula (a term adopted by many, mainly English-speaking scholars to refer to the language of the Fulbe), supplies linguists with various kinds of interesting data. It is probably the most widely spread indigenous language in sub-Saharan Africa, being spoken by the Fulbe from Senegal in the west to as far east as the Sudan. It drew the attention of many European administrators, missionaries, travelers, and researchers, resulting in a fairly good amount of detailed description of various Fula dialects.

Despite the availability of data, it is, not surprisingly, extremely difficult to draw clear lines of dialect boundaries, because of (a) the difference between political

1) I am grateful to all the participants who gave me comments on the preliminary paper I presented at the symposium. My special gratitude should go to Professor D. W. Arnott, who gave me detailed comments on my work and all of his original data on the continuous/stative paradigms. I deeply admire his generous attitude. I hope I can contribute something to Fula linguistics as Professor Arnott has so much. I also owe much to Professor P. K. Eguchi, who read the draft and gave me a lot of practical advice.

and cultural boundaries; and (b) the complicated movements of the Fulbe people, including the mixture of major and old migrations and smaller-scale, recent movements and seasonal transhumance. There are social dialects as well as geographical ones, for example, within the same society the difference in speech between aristocratic Fulbe and commoner Fulbe who live in urban areas.

D. W. Arnott has proposed six main geographical dialects of Fula, to which no objection, as far as I know, has been made so far (see above map).

Arnott's study (1974) is perhaps the only linguistic work which considers the dialectal differences of the whole Fula-phone area (excluding the area east of Adamawa). It is an overall survey of the Fula dialects, although in rather a sketchy style, and gives us clues to further investigations of Fula dialectology. One of the features that Arnott suggests as indicators of the dialectal differences is the continuous tense subject elements, that is, the long form of personal pronouns such as *mido, emi, hida, emo*, etc.\(^3\)

---

This paper attempts to show the diversity and the unity of the Fula language, through the examination of one of the important linguistic elements just mentioned. I will focus mainly on the continuous/stative constructions, although I am aware that it is necessary for the dialectal survey of a language to examine as many linguistic factors as possible, namely, phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic, and lexical aspects. The reason I have chosen this topic is that in the Fula verbal system the subject elements involving e, don and other morphemes show one of the most diverse variations.

First, we will see the patterns of the so-called “short forms” and “long forms” of personal pronouns in Fula. Secondly, the historical development of the latter forms will be investigated, and, finally, a point about dialect division will be mentioned.

2. Short Forms and Long Forms

In all dialects of Fula, there are four types of personal pronouns that function as subject elements in a sentence structure, viz. (a) independent or emphatic; (b) short; (c) long; and (d) inverted forms. For example, Pulaar, a dialect in Senegal has the following sets:

(1) Subject Personal Pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>inde./emph.</th>
<th>short</th>
<th>long</th>
<th>inverted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) 1st.sg.</td>
<td>miin</td>
<td>mi</td>
<td>mid'o</td>
<td>-mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) 2nd.sg.</td>
<td>aan</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ada</td>
<td>-aa/-aa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) 3rd.sg.</td>
<td>kan'ko</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>omo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) 1st.pl.ex.</td>
<td>minen</td>
<td>min</td>
<td>amin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) 1st.pl.in.</td>
<td>enen</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>eden</td>
<td>-den/-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) 2nd.pl.</td>
<td>onon</td>
<td>on</td>
<td>odon</td>
<td>-don/-on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) 3rd.pl.</td>
<td>kambe</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>abe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before turning into the analysis of long and short forms, each type of personal pronouns should be briefly explained.

As for independent or emphatic forms of pronouns, they function as emphasized elements in a sentence, e.g.

\[
\text{miin waddi-dum} \quad \text{‘(it was) I (who) brought it’}
\]
\[
\text{to ’aan njahat-aa?} \quad \text{‘where are you going?’}
\]

(The terms “short” and “long” personal pronouns are not commonly used. They are rather my own usage. It should be noted that these terms are not adopted

4) 1), 2)...7) indicates 1st person singular; 2nd person singular, and so forth, respectively. The same convention is adopted for the rest of the paper.)
on the basis of their functions or features as emphatic and inverted forms, but only for the sake of convenience. The short forms are “basic forms” in Arnott’s term (Arnott 1970, § 25. 1), indicating that they are not specialized forms, such as independent and inverted ones, which are used in verbal complexes of certain types and certain aspects. The long forms occur in stative and continuous aspects (series 2 and 3 of subject elements in Arnott’s term, cf. Arnott 1970, § 33). In terms of aspects, the short forms can be used in completives, that is, to refer to actions that are already completed, while the long forms are manifested in incompletives, especially progressive, continuous, or stative aspects. In fact, there is a diversity among dialects with respect to which aspect is associated with the long forms. However, among the dialects researched here, the common feature of the aspect is “continuity” or “progressiveness”, that is to say, a certain action or a certain state of the situation is in process.5) To compare the two forms, see:

(3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>completive:</td>
<td>o ronndake</td>
<td>she (has) put her headload on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incompletive:</td>
<td>e-mo ronndii</td>
<td>she is carrying a headload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(McIntosh 1984: 123)

Finally, as to inverted froms, they appear in relative and subjunctive clauses, e.g.

(4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>relative clause</td>
<td>ndaa nagge (qge) shoodu-mi</td>
<td>This is the cow (which) I (have) bought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subjunctive clause</td>
<td>sey ngurto-đaa</td>
<td>you ought to come out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Arnott 1970: 319)

(Arnott 1970: 302)

The sets other than the long forms are fairly homogeneous throughout all the dialects with some slight phonological differences. The following are the sets of the short-form personal pronouns (“short forms” below) of the dialects I checked.6) They are listed in west-east order from left to right. The original orthography from the source is slightly modified, in particular the glottal stop before the initial vowels is not marked as such:

5) For discussion of the theoretical terminology including the tense-aspect distinction in Fula, refer to McIntosh 1984.

6) The sources of the data are as follows:

(5) Short Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F.T.</th>
<th>Gambia</th>
<th>F.J.</th>
<th>Liptaako</th>
<th>Sokoto</th>
<th>Zaria</th>
<th>Gombe</th>
<th>Dageeja</th>
<th>Adamawa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>mi</td>
<td>mi</td>
<td>mi</td>
<td>mi</td>
<td>mi</td>
<td>mi</td>
<td>mi</td>
<td>mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o/mbo</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>min</td>
<td>men/min</td>
<td>men</td>
<td>min</td>
<td>men/min</td>
<td>min</td>
<td>min</td>
<td>min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>en/en</td>
<td>eg/en</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>el</td>
<td>en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>on</td>
<td>on/on</td>
<td>on</td>
<td>on</td>
<td>on</td>
<td>on</td>
<td>ol</td>
<td>on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The list shows that the short forms are quite clearly uniform, even with some slight phonological differences. On the other hand, the long forms show a greater variation:

(6) Long Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F.T.</th>
<th>Gambia</th>
<th>F.J.</th>
<th>Massina</th>
<th>Liptaako</th>
<th>N.W. Niger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>mido</td>
<td>mido</td>
<td>mido</td>
<td>mido</td>
<td>mido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>ada</td>
<td>ada/ado</td>
<td>hida</td>
<td>ada</td>
<td>ada/ada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>himo/omo/ombo</td>
<td>mbodi/mbo'i</td>
<td>himo</td>
<td>omo</td>
<td>omo/omo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>meden/amin/emin</td>
<td>miden</td>
<td>meden</td>
<td>miden</td>
<td>miden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>hiden/eden</td>
<td>eden</td>
<td>hiden</td>
<td>eden</td>
<td>eden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>hidon/odon</td>
<td>odon</td>
<td>hidon/ hidon</td>
<td>odon</td>
<td>odon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td>hibe/abe</td>
<td>bedi</td>
<td>hibe</td>
<td>ebe</td>
<td>ibe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benin (2 sets)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Massina</th>
<th>Niger</th>
<th>Sokoto</th>
<th>Zaria</th>
<th>Gombe (2 sets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mi ($\hat{a}$)/emi</td>
<td>mido</td>
<td>mido</td>
<td>mido</td>
<td>emi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>ada/a'do</td>
<td>ada/a'do</td>
<td>aaf (&lt; e + a)</td>
<td>e'a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>omo</td>
<td>omo</td>
<td>emo</td>
<td>emo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>eden</td>
<td>eden</td>
<td>edon</td>
<td>endon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The list shows "falling tone."

8) The vacant column means either there is no entry in the dialect or I could not find any from my source.
Seeing the patterns of the long forms in (6), any one who is familiar with the language should immediately recognize the words, *do, don, hi* and *e/i*. Especially in eastern dialects, such as Gombe, Dageeja and Adamawa, it is easy to identify the elements, *e* or *don*. Indeed, I could have shown the eastern patterns of long forms as “*e* + short form” and “short form + *don*.” Then, one may wonder if these *e* and *don* elements are the same lexiques as those originally meaning “and, in, with, etc.,” or “here.” In fact, quite a number of linguists have already noticed it.9)

While the eastern dialects show easily identifiable patterns, in western dialects, the situation is more complicated, thus, *mido, hidu, omo, himo, adu*, etc.

Among historical linguists, there is a consensus that the Fula language came from the Senegambia area where all the related West Atlantic languages are found. Thus, the fact that there is more diversity in certain kinds of linguistic elements in western dialects than in eastern ones suggests that it is easier and more fruitful to consider the case diachronically (historically) than synchronically. We will thus consider the historical development of the long form personal pronouns in the following section.

3. Diachronic Development

Compare the following expressions:

(7)

- **a.** *e wuro* `at home`
- **b.** *baaba he/hi inna* `father and/with mother`
- **c.** *be cottori don* `They moved from there` (Adamawa)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>F.T.</th>
<th>Gambia</th>
<th>F.J.</th>
<th>Massina</th>
<th>Liptaako</th>
<th>N.W. Niger</th>
<th>Benin (2 sets)</th>
<th>S.W. Niger (W. of Nigeria)</th>
<th>Sokoto</th>
<th>Zaria</th>
<th>Gombe (2 sets)</th>
<th>Dageeja (2 sets)</th>
<th>Adam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>mido/mbofo</td>
<td>mido</td>
<td>mido</td>
<td>mido</td>
<td>mido</td>
<td>mido</td>
<td>mido</td>
<td>mido</td>
<td>mido</td>
<td>mido</td>
<td>mido</td>
<td>mido</td>
<td>mido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>hida/ada</td>
<td>ada/ado</td>
<td>ada</td>
<td>ada</td>
<td>ada</td>
<td>ada/ada</td>
<td>mido</td>
<td>mido/om</td>
<td>mido</td>
<td>ada</td>
<td>ada (&lt;e+a)</td>
<td>e'a</td>
<td>ada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>himo/omo/</td>
<td>mbofi/</td>
<td>himo</td>
<td>omo</td>
<td>omo</td>
<td>omo</td>
<td>omo</td>
<td>omo</td>
<td>omo</td>
<td>ada</td>
<td>adon</td>
<td>emo</td>
<td>adon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ombo</td>
<td>mbo'i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>modon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>meden/amin/</td>
<td>mido</td>
<td>medon</td>
<td>mido</td>
<td>emen/</td>
<td>mido/</td>
<td>mido</td>
<td>midon</td>
<td>emin</td>
<td>emin</td>
<td>emin</td>
<td>emin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>emin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>minon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>hidon/odon</td>
<td>odo</td>
<td>edon</td>
<td>odo/odon</td>
<td>odo</td>
<td>odo/odon</td>
<td>odo</td>
<td>odo</td>
<td>odo</td>
<td>edon</td>
<td>e'ol</td>
<td>e'ol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>hidon/odon</td>
<td>odo</td>
<td>edon</td>
<td>odo/odon</td>
<td>odo</td>
<td>odo/odon</td>
<td>odo</td>
<td>odo</td>
<td>odo</td>
<td></td>
<td>e'ol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td>hibe/abe</td>
<td>hede</td>
<td>hobe</td>
<td>hobe</td>
<td>hobe</td>
<td>hobe/abe</td>
<td>hobe</td>
<td>hobe</td>
<td>hobe</td>
<td>hobe</td>
<td>hobe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>locative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;in, at,&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;with&quot;</td>
<td>do/don</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do/don</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do/don</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do/ton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ina/</td>
<td>na/no</td>
<td>na/no</td>
<td>na/no</td>
<td>na/no</td>
<td>na/no</td>
<td>na/no</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>e+prn+don</td>
<td>don</td>
<td>don</td>
<td>don</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for cont./</td>
<td>di</td>
<td>ino</td>
<td>hi+prn</td>
<td>prn</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na/no</td>
<td>i+prn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prn+don</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stat. (after</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nouns)</td>
<td>e+prn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*prn : pronoun

Table 1
Dialectal Comparison of Continuous/Statative Constructions
(West → East)
d. défere dón
book here/exists
‘There is a book/A book exists’(Gombe)
(Arnott 1970 : 32)
e. Sheehu e Sifaawa
in/exists?
‘Shehu is in Sifaawa’(Adamawa)
(Lacroix 1963 : 51, as is 7. f below)
f. Sheehu dón Sifaawa
exists?
‘(almost the same as above, but a slight
difference in nuance)’
g. e’a joodi
you (are) seated
‘you are seated’(Gombe, Dageeja,
Adamawa, as is 7. h below)
h. adon joodi
you (are) seated
‘(same as above)’
i. hida joodi
you (are) seated
‘(same as above)’(F. J.)
j. omo joodi
he (is) seated
‘he is seated’ (F. T., Massina, Liptaako,
Sokoto)

Examples 7. a to 7. c show locative constructions in which e/he/hi functions as a
preposition or a conjunction, and dón as a kind of adverb. In 7. d, 7. e, 7. f, on
the other hand, e and dón are a kind of copula that has a verb-like function. In 7.
g and 7. h, e and dón seem to be a part of the verbal complex, but their syntactic
behaviors are different: e preposes the subject pronoun, dón follows the pronoun.
In 7. i and 7. j, moreover, it is hard to separate locative elements from the pro-
nouns10.

The above data indicate that the long-form pronouns show similarity to the
short-form pronouns and locative elements. Let us examine the possibility that the
long forms developed from locative constructions.

3. 1. Locative → Existential → Progressive

The locative preposition e, sometimes pronounced as i, is found in all dialects
of Fula. It is realized as he or hi in the areas westward of Sokoto (see Table 1). It
means “with, and, in, nearby,” usually conjoining nouns, as in 7. a and 7. b. above.
Don is also used all over the Fula-phone areas. It is the “referential form” (Ar-
nott’s term), meaning “the place referred to or known.”

It is quite reasonable to suppose that the expressions with locatives such as
defere dón ‘there is a book’, which is now a neutral phrase meaning “a book is in
existence,” used to have only a deictic meaning “here, in this place, is a book.”
English has a parallel expression to this, namely, “there is/are ...” which involves a
locative word “there,” but it no longer has a demonstrative meaning opposed to
“here.” If a speaker wants to put a locative meaning on “there,” there will be a
stress on the word, as in “there you are!” Possibly, in Fula, the semantic field has
been gradually extended from existential to other aspects including con-

10) There is a difference in stress, too: when don functins as a kind of verb, it is stressed as
in défere dón, on the other hand, when dón is a part of a long form, it is not stressed as
tinuous/stative/habitual, etc. Thus, a continuous sentence, o don defa or omo d'on defa ‘she is cooking’ could mean “she is here, cooking.”

In fact, in eastern dialects, it is clear that don in the continuous/stative sentence retains the adverbial character. As McIntosh (1984 : 188-189) points out, don in the Zaria dialect belongs to a paradigm of deictic adverbs, thus it can be replaced by other adverbs:

(8) a. tummbude e-don keewi
   calabashes fill (vi) ‘the calabashes are full’
   b. tummbude e ton keewi
   there ‘the calabashes are there, full’
   c. tummbude e d'oo keewi
   here ‘the calabashes are here, full’

(McIntosh 1984 : 188)

Moreover, don cannot co-occur with ton or d'oo:

(9) a. e-be — don — taar-a nga
   they (are) tie it ‘they are tying it up’
   b. *e-be — don — d'oo — taar-a nga
   c. e-mi-don — hedit-oo
   I (am) listen ‘I’m listening’
   d. e-mi-don-nii hedit-oo
   just
   e. e-mo-don — dur-a na'i
   he (is) graze cows ‘he is grazing cows’
   f. *e-mo-don — ton dur-a na'i

(McIntosh 1984 : 80)

The nii adverb in 9. d can co-occur with don because it has no locative meaning, whereas 9. b and f are unacceptable since a Fula speaker feels there is an unnecessary repetition of adverbs (McIntosh 1984 : 79-80). This fact clearly shows the locative feature of don.

As for he/hi/e/i, it functions exactly the same way as don in existential expressions, as in 7. d above, i.e. deftere don. However, it has different syntactic behaviors: he/hi/e/i always comes before the subject pronoun as in 7. g, i.e. e'a joodi whereas don comes after it as in 7. h, i.e. adon joodi. Moreover, e/i occurs independently without a pronoun in a certain clause, as in 10. e below, while don cannot. In Sokoto Fula, for example, i seems to convey the continuous/stative element alone, other than verbal suffixes. Thus:

(10) a. lekki i towi ‘it (the tree) is tall’
    b. tummu'de i biro ‘it (the calabash) is leaking’
       (Westermann 1909 : 245)
    c. i woodi ‘it is good’
d. \( i \ d' \text{uu} \text{di} \)
\( \text{it is too much, too many} \)  
(Miyamoto 1989: 28)

e. \( Bello \ wurtii \ e - \text{turii} \)
\( \text{Bello came out stooping} \)  
(Arnott 1970: 284)

The fact is, however, that \( i \) always appears when the "notional subject" has already been mentioned or understood in the context. Thus, in 10. c and 10. d, the nominal subjects are understood from the situation. This is found not only in Sokoto but in other dialects, including Gombe where \( e \) can be used alone in subordinate clauses.

It seems that \( \text{he}/\text{hi}/\text{e}/\text{i} \) is more integrated into the Fula morphology than \( \text{don} \) which retains the adverb-like feature. Incidentally, the above data remind us of the non-personal pronouns. Indeed, \( \text{he}/\text{hi}/\text{e}/\text{i} \) is used for non-personal pronouns. It is attached to class markers and makes the continuous/stative forms:

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{F. T.} & \text{Gambia} & \text{F. J.} & \text{Massina} & \text{Liptako} \\
\text{ende} & \text{nnde} & \text{hihnde} & \text{inde} & \text{inde} \\
\text{endi} & \text{nndi} & \text{hindii} & \text{indi} & \text{indi} \\
\text{eugel} & \text{ngel} & \text{hiugel} & \text{injgel} & \text{injgel} \\
\end{array}
\]

These are promising data in that even in western dialects where the personal pronouns are rather complex and the connection between \( \text{he}/\text{hi}/\text{e}/\text{i} \) and the long forms is clear, just as in eastern dialects, that is, long forms = \( \text{e}/\text{i}/\text{hi} + \text{short form} \) or short form + (')\( i \).

In western dialects, it is difficult to separate locative elements from the long pronouns. However, it can be observed that there are two types, mixed, namely, Type 1: short form + \( \text{do(n)} \), and Type 2: \( \text{e}/\text{he}/\text{hi} + \text{short form} \). Thus, for example, in the Futa Toro, the Futa Jallon and the Sokoto dialects, the whole long pronouns are as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{lllll}
\text{F. T.} & \text{F. J.} & \text{Sokoto} \\
1) \text{mido/mboco} & \text{mido} & \text{mido} & \text{mido} & \text{mido} \\
2) \text{hida/ada} & \text{hid} & \text{hid} & \text{hid} & \text{hid} \\
3) \text{himo/omo/ombo} & \text{himo} & \text{himo} & \text{himo} & \text{himo} \\
4) \text{meden/emin/amin} & \text{meden} & \text{meden} & \text{meden} & \text{meden} \\
5) \text{eden} & \text{hiden} & \text{hiden} & \text{hiden} & \text{hiden} \\
6) \text{odon} & \text{hidon/} & \text{hidon} & \text{bidon} & \text{pain} \\
7) \text{ebi} & \text{ebi} & \text{ebi} & \text{ebi} & \text{ebi} \\
\end{array}
\]

Example 12 shows there are three problems to be addressed in analysis of the connection between locatives and long forms. The first is the 1st. sg. and the 3rd. sg. pronouns in Futa Toro (Q1). In \( \text{mboco} \) and \( \text{ombo} \) we find a locative element.
do and the pronoun-like -o, but mbo- and omb- are unusual. According to Arnott, the m > mb change is certainly well attested for some speakers in Senegal and Gambia. It is found in cases such as,

(13)  
\begin{align*}
\text{ombo} & \quad \text{as against} \quad \text{omo} \\
\text{mbido} & \quad \text{as against} \quad \text{mido} \\
\text{mbedon} & \quad \text{as against} \quad \text{midon} \\
\text{mbeda} & \quad \text{as against} \quad \text{meda}
\end{align*}

He found among the Jombonko of Gambia and the Jenngelbe near Linguere in Senegal that mbo was used by some speakers (in place of mo and o) as a subject pronoun, an object pronoun and as a relative element.

There are two possible reasons for this variation. Since the distribution of this unusual type is restricted to Futa Toro and Gambia, it may be due to the influence of other languages surrounding Fula in the areas. Alternatively, it may be a phonological analogy to the non-personal pronouns of which the common form is “nasal + consonant + vowel,” that is, ndi, ndu, etc.

The second problem regarding location and long forms is the case of ada, odon, meden, and midon, which seem to be a modification of the combination of the short form and don (Q2). This must be purely phonologically motivated with ada achieving a kind of vowel harmony, and meden and midon dropping -n from men- and min- to avoid the irregular combination of syllables CVC'CVC ('C=implosive). This indicates that the boundary between the pronominal element and the locative element is phonologically fairly weak resulting in the merger of two separate morphemes.

The third problem is of the phonological form following e/hi (Q3). The forms eden, hidon, etc. can be simplified as e/hi + d' + short form. As for this form, Ard (1979) has presented a good analysis. It will suffice here briefly to restate his thesis. When subject pronouns beginning with a glottal stop + a vowel, 'a, 'en and 'on, which follows a verbal stem with the vowel ending, the subject pronouns have the d'V- form. Thus, in relative clauses, the subject pronoun is postposed to the verbal root:

(14) ndaa nagge (ŋge) shoodu-d'aa/den/d'on ‘This is the cow (which) you.sg./we.in./you.pl. bought’

(Arnott 1970: 319)

This analysis goes along well with the data of the hi-forms in F.J. and the forms for the non-personal classes as given in (11) above. This could also apply to ada as well as to eden and odon, with the shortening of -daa to -da. The possessive form maada, meeden, moodon would support this analysis, especially when compared with maagal, etc.

It seems to be a phonological phenomenon that the insertion of d' is meant to avoid the consequence of two vowels with a glottal stop in-between. On the other hand, the -V'V- construction is quite often seen in Fula phonology at least where a
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The study of Fula dialects reveals that the glottal stop is root- or stem-final, e.g. verbal roots, such as fa’a, wa’a, sa’a, me’a, ne’a, re’a, te’a, wi’a, yi’a, si’a, nyo’a, in combination with any of the many vowel-initial verbal suffixes, and nouns, such as be’i, na’i, ga’i, ba’e (<waare), ko’e (<hoore), gi’al, le’al. Therefore, it might be easy just to consider this as a common alternation {d → ?} in Fula, viz. the implosive d and the glottal stop alternate quite often.

The remaining problem in this domain is that of -mo. Even in some of the eastern dialects in which it is fairly systematic to make the long forms combining the e and the short forms, the 3rd. sg. form is always e-mo instead of the expected form *e-’o with the subject pronoun. Moreover, mo appears as a subject in several dialects: it is the regular form in Dageeja as in mo wari, and in Jos Plateau and S. W. Niger (Arnott, personal communication); it appears occasionally as a subject in Gombe, especially after a syllable with e or ey; and it is a relative subject pronoun in Futa Toro, Liptaako, etc.

There is another datum to support the connection between the locative elements and the long forms. It is the fact that the distribution of the long form pronouns with hi, not e/i, coincides with that of the hi preposition, viz. only in western dialects. There is one problem here: e/he requires a ‘possessive’ pronoun to follow, both in the sense of “with” (e.g. e maad’a, e maako, e maabbe etc.) and in the sense of “and” (e.g. miin e maako, not *miin e mo). This fact counterargues our theory of the locative-origin of the long forms. However, it is true for most locative-based elements when they are used as a conjunctive, that is, followed by a sentential structure, it is a subject pronoun, not a possessive one that follows the locative element, e.g.

(15) o yehi haa maabbe ‘he went home’
at, to, until

but

o fiiyi mo haa o maayi ‘he beat him until he died’

(Taylor 1932: 69)

To summarize this section, I have tried to suggest that the development may have been something like this: locatives → existential (there is/are) → pronoun + locative → integrated pronoun (long forms). There is another kind of continuous/stative construction parallel to this, which is explained in the following section.

3. 2. na/no

An effect similar to that of the long-form pronouns can be obtained by the use of the particle na/no. Some examples are:

(16) a. Demmba no(11) laaroya gaynaako am.

11) Usually the Gambian regular form is dì as in: reedu am di muusa ‘my stomach is painful’, di bornii manna ‘he has put on a hat’, and no, where it occurs, is due to F.J. influence, according to Arnott (personal communication).
DEMBA is in the state of going to look for my shepherd
b. Demba no yaha ‘Demba is going’

(Swift and Tambadu 1965: 41)

It is sometimes attached to i in Futa Toro:

(17) dawaadi ina ngoodi ‘There are dogs’

<wood- ‘exist’

(Labouret 1955: 96)

This form is widely spread but only found in western dialects. According to Arnott, its distribution is as follows:

(18) ina and hina Futa Toro and the Ferlo in Senegal and edge of Mauritania and Mali (Massina, Bandiagara, and the Seno plain below Bandiagara
ana
na Burkina Faso (Barani, Tougan, Thiou-Ouahigouya, Djibo, Dori), Gaôbe in W. Niger
na and no Western Niger (Lamorde Bitinkoji, and near Niamey)
no Benin, Futa Jallon

Moreover, Eguchi adds the following information:12)

naa and noo Dapango (Northern Togo)

The na is used in the Seno plain below Bandiagara, Barani, Thiou-Ouahigouya-Tougan area in combination with the pronoun, to give mina, ana, ona etc. instead of mido, ada, omo/imo etc.

Interestingly enough, na/no functions as a “locative particle” meaning “in, at.” Thus:

(19) a. galle mum no to hedde marse o ‘his house is near the market’

b. wudere ne no to dow/yeeso/ley wakunde nde ‘the cloth is on etc.

the chest’

(ibid.: 304)

c. maccube ben no ka ruunde ‘the slaves are in their wet-season

compound’

d. lando on no ka mabbe ‘the chief is at home’

(c. and d. are from F. J.)

(Arnott, personal communication)

The aspect that na/no conveys is “stative” or “qualitative.” Thus:

(20) a. Demba no e jam ‘Demba is in peace’

b. do na rawni ‘he is white’

c. do no meerdi ‘that person is worthless’

(Swift et al. 1965: 41)

12) The form a don yaha is also common (Eguchi, personal communication).
The syntactic behavior of *na/no* is quite parallel to that of *he/hi/e/i*. It follows the subject, full noun, or pronoun\(^ {13}\). Another similarity is that *na/no* can appear independently in subordinate clauses. Compare the following with 10. c and 10. d.

\[
\begin{align*}
(21) \quad & a. \text{ na } d'\text{uudi} \quad \text{‘there is much’} \\
& b. \text{ na } \text{ woodi} \quad \text{‘it is good’}
\end{align*}
\]

(Bidaud et al. 1982:156)

In summary, this section shows that the syntactic behavior of *na/no* is quite similar to that of *he/hi/e/i*. It refers to both personal and non-personal subjects, and both seem to have some connection with locative elements. The interesting difference is that *na/no* paradigms are observed mainly in western dialects\(^ {14}\), while those with *he/hi/e/i* are found throughout all Fula-phone areas, as far east Cameroon.

4. Conclusion — A Dialect Division

As I mentioned in the introduction, it is not easy to draw clear boundaries for the Fula dialects. However, I would like to try to find a rough line between them. I have quite often used the terms “western dialects” and “eastern dialects” without clarifying which ones are western and which ones are eastern. By examining the linguistic constructions with *e, don* and *na/no*, it has become clearer that this is a major distinction between the western and eastern dialects. The question which then arises is, “Where should the boundary be located?”

With regards to the long form personal pronouns, there is a division between the dialects eastward of Zaria, namely Gombe, Dageeja and Adamawa, where the long form pronouns can be regarded as “*e + short pronouns*” and “*short pronouns + don,*” and those spoken in westward areas where the other forms are found (line \( \text{A} \) in Table 2).

As far as the locative elements are concerned, there is a line between Sokoto where *he* is observed and Zaria where only *e* is used. *Don* is fairly uniform throughout the whole areas (line \( \text{B} \) in Table 2).

As for *na/no*, the line falls between Niger and Sokoto. In the areas westward of Sokoto, *na/no* is very common, being used as an alternative to the long form pronoun for personal and non-personal subjects, sometimes together with the *i*-suffix. In the areas east of Sokoto, including Sokoto, there is no trace of *na/no*. Rather it is *i* in Sokoto and *don* in the eastern dialects that play a similar role after a noun (line \( \text{C} \) in Table 2).

\(^{13}\) According to Arnott, in the Fadan Gourma (Burkina Faso) and Kaya area of Benin some speakers gave *no* “preceding” pronominal forms in stative and continuous tenses, viz. *nom* (or *non*), *nàá*, *né* (*’* d, *nomin, nó’èn/nèen, nó’óñ, nóbe.

\(^{14}\) It is, however, found in eastern dialects, but in limited areas. I suspect it is due to the influence of western dialects as a result of recent migrations and so on.
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FJ GA</th>
<th>FJ M L N</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Z GO D A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Forms</td>
<td>mid'o (n)</td>
<td>ad'a/hida/ad'o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>omo/imo</td>
<td>mid'en/eden/med'en</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hid'en/eden</td>
<td>short + don</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>od'on/heid'</td>
<td>short + don</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ebe/hibe/ibe/bed'o</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(i)(hi)(a)na/no</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hi/he/e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<Abbreviations>

FT = Futa Toro
GA = Gambian
Z = Zaria
GO = Gombe
D = D'ageeja
A = Adamawa
N = Niger

As we have seen so far, the boundary of the east vs. west division is somewhere around Sokoto, although I am aware that there are a great many criteria for dialect division, some of which cut across this division. Whether Sokoto itself is western or eastern is still undecided (cf. Miyamoto 1989). When more data are collected, we will be able to draw a clearer map. One thing I would like to emphasize, in conclusion, is that the long forms of pronouns together with the constructions with na/no form a useful, and indeed a major diagnostic criterion for the dialect division of Fula.
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