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Starting with the fundamental assumption that every linguistic form is a coding means for a function, this study examines the structural motivation for the existence of two or more tense and/or aspectual systems in selected West and Central African languages. The study claims that the multiple tense/aspectual systems, in addition to their tense and aspectual functions, also carry pragmatic functions. Evidence for the proposed pragmatic functions is grammatical, in the sense that the tense/aspectual forms are in complementary distribution across languages with other means coding the same pragmatic functions. The study demonstrates that although the use of tense and aspectual systems is a widespread phenomenon in West and Central Africa, its use in individual languages is dictated neither by genetic affiliation nor areal influences, but rather by language-internal characteristics. The presence of this coding means in languages in the area, however, makes it readily available to be borrowed by other languages.

Le point de départ de cette étude est l’hypothèse fondamentale que toute forme linguistique est un moyen de coder une fonction, de là on examine la motivation structurelle pour l’existence de deux ou de plusieurs systèmes temporels et/ou aspectuels dans certaines langues de l’ouest et centre-africaines. L’étude propose que ces systèmes temporels/aspectuels multiples, outre leurs fonctions temporelles et aspectuelles, exercent des fonctions pragmatiques. L’évidence de ces fonctions pragmatiques réside dans le système grammatical, en ce sens que les formes temporelles/aspectuelles sont en distribution complémentaire en diverses langues ayant d’autres moyens de coder les mêmes fonctions pragmatiques. Cette étude démontre que, bien que l’utilisation de systèmes temporels et aspectuels soit un phénomène très répandu en Afrique Occidentale et Centrale, son utilisation dans une langue particulière n’est dictée ni par une affiliation génétique, ni par des influences areal, mais plutôt par des caractéristiques internes de la langue même. La présence de ce moyen de codage dans certaines langues d’une région rend toutefois plus aisée son emprunt par d’autres langues.

0. INTRODUCTION: THE PROBLEM AND THE STATE OF THE ART

Descriptive studies of various Niger-Congo and Chadic languages have often reported the existence of two tense and/or aspectual systems, whereby each aspectual or tense function has a different formal realization in a different syntactic environment. Studies differ considerably with respect to the interpretation of such phenomena. For example, in studies of Hausa the two aspectual systems have been said to be selected by different types of clauses (Gouffé 1966, 1967, 1968, Caron 1986, Newman and Schuh 1974, Newman 2000, Pawlak 1993). Robert 1991 has postulated for Wolof that there are different aspectual forms, each coding a focus on a different constituent of a clause.

Hyman and Watters 1984 postulate a typology consisting of two focus domains: one is focus on tense-aspect, modality, and polarity, and the other is focus on a nominal constituent of a proposition. Hyman and Watters’s study requires an extensive commentary, for which there is no space in the present work. Suffice it to say for the time being that the categories that Hyman and Watters consider to be in focus in some

---

1 The work on this paper and my participation at the Workshop on Typology of West African Languages was supported by the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Much of the data used in this paper were gathered over the period of many years while doing field work with the support at various times of the National Endowment for the Humanities, National Science Foundation, Fulbright-Hays Grant for Foreign Research. The most recent fieldwork during which much new data were gathered was supported by the University of Colorado and the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.
languages are considered to be out of focus by other writers. In addition, Hyman and Watters assume that every specific question has the question word in focus. That assumption is not justified by empirical data, as shown below for Gulfe Kotoko, where the specific interrogative marker may be focused or not.

Jungraithmayr (1994:119) states that in the Chadic languages Mubi, Bidiya, and Dangaleet (Dangla) aspectual markers distinguish between semantically independent and semantically dependent clauses, and that a similar situation exists in Hausa. Jungraithmayr, like several writers before him, also states that the movement of an element to clause-initial position triggers the use of a different aspectual form, a fact not confirmed in languages that have multiple aspectual tense forms. Caron 1998 and 2000a, and studies in Caron 2000b, postulate that in some languages there are special aspects used in focus constructions. A cross-language typological comparison (see table 1) clearly indicates that the functions of one of the tense/aspectual systems are not limited to focus constructions. Frajzyngier (2001, 1997) postulates that in some languages the two aspectual systems code different types of clauses, namely, a clause that must be interpreted in connection with another proposition, thus pragmatically dependent; and a clause that can be interpreted on its own, thus pragmatically independent. The present study, based mainly on data gathered by the author in the field and supplemented by published studies, examines the validity of this hypothesis cross-linguistically within Niger-Congo and Chadic languages. Because of the limitations of space, the bulk of what follows is the argumentation for the hypotheses to be proposed. The detailed discussion of the previous scholarship must await another opportunity. A full typological picture of the relevant areas of grammars of various languages is also beyond the scope of the present study.

The present study examines several types of clauses where one usually finds one set of tense/aspectual markers: comments on focus, polarity, specific interrogatives, relative clauses, and sequential clauses. These are contrasted with another group where one usually encounters a different set of tense/aspectual markers: indicative affirmative clauses, comments on topic, questions about the truth of the proposition. The temporal and conditional protases and apodoses may belong to one or the other group.

The bulk of the data comes from languages spoken in a relatively compact area of northern Cameroon, north-eastern Nigeria, and southern Chad. These languages belong to: Chadic (Afroasiatic family) represented by languages from all four branches; West Atlantic, represented by Fula, and Adamawa-Ubangi represented by Tupuri.² The last two groups belong to Niger-Congo. The geographic proximity and genetic relationship may be a reason for similarity among languages. But the differences among languages belonging to the same family and spoken within the same area must be attributed to factors other than areal influences or common retention. They may indicate the presence of relevant structural characteristics.

² Sources of data: Poro, Frajzyngier 1989; Mapari (West Chadic), Frajzyngier 1993; Lele (East Chadic), Frajzyngier 2001; Hdi, Frajzyngier and Shay 2002, Mina and Gidar (Central Chadic), author’s fieldwork; Fula (Fulfulde, West Atlantic), Noye 1974 and author’s fieldwork; Wolof, Robert 1991 and 2000; Tupuri (Adamawa), author’s fieldwork and Raelland 2000; Masa (Musa Branch), Kapsiki, Mandara, Mafa, Meri,

²Gulfe Kotoko and Gitiga (Central Chadic), author’s fieldwork.
1. HYPOTHESES

1.2 HYPOTHESIS 1

If a language has two tense and/or aspectual systems with identical temporal or aspectual values coded by each system, the two systems also have functions other than the coding of aspect or time.

1.3 HYPOTHESIS 2

In a language with multiple aspectual and tense systems one system participates in the coding of one or several of the following functions: specific interrogative clauses, comment-on-focus clauses, relative clauses, sequential clauses, temporal or conditional protasis or apodosis, and negative clauses. These types of clauses share a pragmatic status in that they must be interpreted in connection with another proposition or event. Aspects and tenses coding such clauses are referred to as ‘dependent’. The other system does not code the pragmatic status of the clause, and such clauses can be interpreted independently of any other proposition or an event, or they can be interpreted in connection with another proposition. Such aspects and tenses are referred to as pragmatically unmarked.

2. THE NATURE OF PRAGMATIC DEPENDENCY ACROSS DIFFERENT TYPES OF CLAUSES

2.1 SPECIFIC INTERROGATIVE CLAUSES

Such clauses are pragmatically dependent because the question about a specific element of the clause must be interpreted with the assumption that the whole proposition is true, and that the only unknown element is the element that the question is about. Questions about the truth of a proposition do not have to have any presupposition and accordingly have the unmarked aspects. In Mina (Central Chadie) in specific interrogatives one cannot use a reduplicated form of the verb, which is used in pragmatically independent clauses.³

(1) mò mbọ́̀f ví
    REL⁴ surpass who
    Who is superior?

(2) báyzá ngwáy bàháman bákà bá dzán-á nób mí
    chief COMP people Bahaman today still find-OBJ 2PL what
    The chief said, “People, what else did Bahaman find us today?”

The dependent aspect codes the interrogative function, since the marker ví just codes an unspecified human.

---

³ Throughout the text, a translation in italics marks an elicited example. A translation that is not italicized marks an example drawn from natural discourse. The number of examples has been reduced to a minimum to save space.

⁴ For the meanings of abbreviations used in the interlinear glosses, please see the list on p. 66.
(3) kóó ví zá sò déyá ká mbéŋ
QUANT who COMP.1SG also 3SG like that
Each one of them said, “Same thing with me.”

Compare the reduplicated form, a characteristic of the perfective aspect in the pragmatically unmarked clause.

(4) sény ndɔ dzáŋ á dzáŋ-á kɔdɔm á d ámbù
so go find 3SG find-DIST calabash PREP bush
And then she found a calabash in the bush.

2.2 COMMENT-ON-FOCUS CLAUSES

The comment-on-focus clause is often the only marker of the informational nature of the clause. In languages in which both the focused and the topicalized constituents are fronted and there are no other systematic markers of focus, the comment clause with the dependent aspect is the only marker indicating that the fronted element is in focus. This is the case in Mina, where the coding of the subject in focus may be accomplished only through the use of the dependent aspect, as in (5a), where the only marker of focus is the dependent habitual rà. Compare the use of the unmarked habitual aspect in a pragmatically unmarked clause in (5b).

(5) a. à zá hidi wà á wàk rà
3SG COMP man DEM 3SG go.crazy D.HAB
She said, “This man is crazy.”

b. tûm à-ndí dál kò mbéŋ
always.(Ful.) 3SG-HAB do PREP ANAPH
She always did like that.

Similarly in Hausa, the dependent aspect may be the only marker of focus. In (6a) the clause is pragmatically unmarked, and in (6b) the adverb of time jiyà, ‘yesterday’, is in focus.

(6) a. jiyà sun sana-ř dà mu
yesterday 3PL.COMPL know-CAUS ASCC 1PL
Yesterday they informed us.5

b. jiyà suka sana-ř dà mu
yesterday 3PL.PRET know-CAUS ASCC 1PL
Yesterday they informed us. (Newman 2000:572; glosses added.)

A general characteristic that distinguishes the topicalization of the subject from the focus-on-subject functions is the use of the unmarked aspect, e.g. the unmarked habitual rather than the dependent habitual is used in the comment on topic.

(7) wål wà á ndí tål ngón dàpá ndí tål ngón dàp á d ámbù
wife DEM 3SG HAB walk 3SG only3SG HAB walk 3SG only PREP bush
The wife would still take walks in the bush. (Mina.)

5 See footnote 3 above.
2.3 RELATIVE CLAUSES

The dependent aspect may be the only marker of the function of the clause as the comment on the head, regardless of the position of the head.

(8) à zá í kà lu rò hidi gònák syí hà vù
    3SG COMP 3PL INF say D.HAB man person COMP 2SG Q
    He said, “That person that they are talking about, is it you?” (Mina.)

2.4 SEQUENTIAL CLAUSES (WHETHER $S_1$ OR $S_2$)

Coding of either clause as pragmatically dependent forces its interpretation in connection with another clause. No other marker of temporal sequence is needed. In the following example from Mina the second clause has the dependent aspect.

(9) zám zám zám á zám záá n kàdùn ngùn ñët
    eat eat eat 3SG eat be 3SG PREP calabash 3SG take
    She ate and ate and ate, then she took her calabash.

2.5 TEMPORAL PROTASIS OR APODOSIS, OR BOTH

Coding of either clause as pragmatically dependent forces its interpretation in connection with another clause. The dependent habitual aspect in Mina, without any other markers of subordination, codes temporal protasis.

(10) mò mbir mbir vá n dù râ diy-á mbir nò
    REL jump jump rain fall D.HAB start-DIST jump PREP
    mòj cidék cidék cidék cidék cidék
    L.ANAPH ideophone
    The jumper, when the rain was falling, he started to jump in it.

2.6 CONDITIONAL PROTASIS OR APODOSIS, OR BOTH

Coding of a clause as pragmatically dependent may be used to code conditional protasis. In the following example there is no conditional protasis coding other than the dependent aspect.

(11) ã ndà ru skù mbí mó žebí ró tükóy
    3SG go D.HAB NEG ANAPH SUBJ follow GEN 2SG
    If she does not leave, she should follow yours. (Mina.)

2.7 NEGATIVE CLAUSES

These display considerable variation within and across languages. Coding of a negative clause as pragmatically dependent forces its interpretation in connection with a corresponding affirmative clause.
(12) á tük hà báŋ ró skù wùl béhl rù wa syї
PREP you 2SG think D.HAB NEG neck break D.HAB DEM COM
You are not thinking, you are crying with joy like that, i.e.,
You’re out of your mind and screaming and shouting. (Mina.)

The absence of dependent coding allows for an interpretation unrelated to a corresponding affirmative clause. This confirms the proposed function of the dependent aspect marker.

(13) màlhùm wà bəhá à tálá skù
marabout DEM also 3SG walk NEG
The teacher does not walk, i.e.:
That teacher is a sedentary one (as opposed to a travelling teacher).

Any clause may be marked as pragmatically dependent. An affirmative clause may have a dependent aspect or tense, thus signaling to the hearer that the clause must be interpreted in connection with another proposition.

3. COMPLEMENTARITY OF MEANS AS AN ARGUMENT FOR A FUNCTIONAL LOAD

The tense aspectual system is in complementary distribution with other coding means for the listed domains, in particular with external markers, i.e. markers that are not part of the verb. The external marker of focus is a marker that either precedes or follows the focused element. The external marker of relativization codes the relative clause. In some languages such markers code the features of gender, person, and number of the head of the relative clause. The external marker of specific interrogative is a marker that occurs in addition to question words indicating the scope of the question, such as ‘who’ or ‘what’. In many Chadic languages these additional markers occur clause finally. The following is an example of the absence of external coding for the specific interrogative (first clause) and for the focus (second clause). The dependent aspect codes the interrogative and the focus functions.

(14) à mísíl mì à mísíl wàdá
3SG steal what 3SG steal food
What did she steal? She stole food! (Mina.)

The external temporal or sequential marker is a marker that codes the general temporal relationship between clauses rather than some specific relationship. Forms corresponding to ‘when’ are external temporal markers; forms corresponding to ‘after’, ‘before’, ‘while’, etc., are specific temporal markers, and they co-occur with the dependent aspectual forms.

If focus, specific interrogative, sequential, temporal or conditional clauses are coded systematically (i.e. obligatorily) by external markers, they are not coded by tense/aspectual systems. If a language does not have obligatory external markers for a pragmatic function, such a function is coded by tense/aspectual systems.
4. LANGUAGES WITH FULL INTERNAL CODING

In some languages, the tense/aspectual coding extends to several pragmatic domains. There are no external markers for such domains. Consider the following data from Hdi, a VS PREP O language. In Hdi in pragmatically unmarked clauses the perfective aspect is coded by the reduplication of the verb. The third-person singular pronominal subject is unmarked.

(15)  **bá-f-bá tá xgá**
build-UP-build OBJ house
*He built a house.*

Reduplication in Hdi is not a coding means for the focus on the assertion (or ‘auxiliary focus’ as in Hyman and Watters 1984), because it can be used with hedging devices.

(16)  **hláx** bá-f-bá tá xgá
maybe build-UP-build OBJ house
*Maybe he built a house.*

In pragmatically dependent clauses the reduplicated form cannot be used. Instead the simple form of the verb is used. Following are various types of pragmatically dependent clauses.

All focused constituents are fronted in Hdi, but the fronting is not a focusing means, since all constituents are also fronted for topicalization. The fundamental marker of focusing is the use of the pragmatically dependent aspect. Focus on the subject and only on the subject, in addition to the dependent aspect, also involves the comment clause marker tá.

(17)  **tsátsí tá bá-f tá xgá**
3SG COM build-UP OBJ house
*It is he who built a house.*

Focus on constituents other than the subject is coded solely by the dependent aspect.

(18)  a. **xgá bá-f-tsí**
house build-UP-3SG
*It is a house that he built.*

b. **mà ndrük bá-f-tá-tsí (tá xgá)**
in Ndruk build-up-REP-3SG (OBJ house)
*It is in Ndruk that he built (a house).*

The relative clause also requires the dependent aspect, whether the subject or another constituent is the head.

---

*In order to facilitate a comparison of the data, the examples come from elicited material so that they contain only what is minimally required for the issue at hand.*

*This is different from the situation in related Lunang, where Wolff 1983 analyzes the reduplication as coding focus on aspect.*

*The digraph hl represents a lateral voiceless continuant.*
(19) ndá sn-í tsá ndú tá bá-f-tá xgá mghám ya²
STAT know-1SG DEF man COM build-UP-REF house GEN chief DEM
I know the man who built the house of the chief.

(20) ndá sn-í tá tsá xgá bá-f-tsí yá
STAT know-1SG OBJ DEF house build-UP-3SG DEM
I know the house that he built.

Specific questions have the question word in clause-initial position and a dependent aspect.

(21) wá tá bá-f tá xgá
who COM build-UP OBJ house
Who built a house?

In a negative clause only the dependent aspect can be used.

(22) bá-f-á tá xgá wá
build-UP-NFG OBJ house NEG
He didn’t build a house.

In sequential clauses, in addition to the dependent aspect, there is also the marker kà in between the two clauses.

(23) skwa-p-skwá vrúá tá gù kà skwá-p-tá ngárgwá tá hlà
buy-OUT-buy Vrua OBJ goat SEQ buy-OUT-REF Ngargwa OBJ cow
Vrua sold a goat and then Ngargwa sold a cow.

Compare the paratactic construction where independent aspect is used:

(24) skwa-p-skwá vrúá tá gù skwa-p-skwá ngárgwá tá hlà
buy-OUT-buy Vrua OBJ goat buy-OUT-buy Ngargwa OBJ cow
Vrua sold a goat and Ngargwa sold a cow.

On the face of it, the use of the marker kà with dependent aspect in a sequential clause would contradict the proposed complementarity of coding means. This, however, is not so, since the marker kà has a much broader function as evidenced by its use with conditional clauses where it does not require the dependent.

(25) kà skwá-p-skwá-tsí tá gù dzà’á skwá-skwá tá Igút
SEQ buy-OUT-buy-3SG OBJ goat FUT buy-buy OBJ cloth
If he sold a goat, he will buy cloth.

(26) kà ma skwá-p-skwá-tsí tá gù má dzà’á skwá-skwá tá Igút
SEQ HYP buy-OUT-buy-3SG OBJ goat HYP FUT buy-buy OBJ cloth
Had he sold a goat, he would have bought a cloth.

Hence, the dependent coding is a means to code the sequential clause.

¹ In native constructions in Hdi the object is not marked by the preposition tá.
5. LANGUAGES WITH EXTERNAL CODING

If a language has systematic and obligatory external coding means, the tense/aspectual forms do not participate in the coding of the pragmatic functions focus, specific interrogative, sequential relative clause, and temporal protasis. One such language is Gulfe Kotoko, Central Chadic. The language appears to have only a tense and not an aspectual system. Arguments are coded by configuration, SVO.

(27) mèdângò nà dùwà dâlgé tûdá
    Medangi 3M buy goat yesterday
    Medangi bought a goat yesterday.

The same form of the verb is used in the negative clause, coded by clause-final particle do.

(28) mèdângò nà dùwà dâlgé tûdá dô
    Medangi 3M buy goat yesterday NEG
    Medangi did not buy a goat yesterday.

Questions about the subject are coded by clause-initial yây ‘who’, followed by the subject pronoun.

(29) yây nà dùwà dâlgé tûdá
    who 3M buy goat yesterday
    Who bought a goat yesterday?

The specific interrogative without an additional marker is not in focus, as evidenced by the fact that the focus is coded by different means. The questioned subject may be focused through the focusing particle nà which follows the focused constituent.

(30) yây nà nô dâ nì
    who FOC 3M go L-ANAPH
    Who went there? (Referring to a place mentioned earlier.)

Questions about the remaining arguments and adjuncts are coded by the question word coding the features human, place, etc., and the specific interrogative marker -dî, glossed as SP.Q. The whole interrogative complex occurs in situ or is preceded by the appropriate preposition to code its grammatical role. Since there are systematic means to code the specific interrogative function, there is no motivation to use the tense/aspectual means to code this function.

(31) mèdângò nà dùwà dô-dî tûdá
    Medangi 3M buy what-SP.Q yesterday
    What did Medangi buy yesterday?

(32) mèdângò nà dùwà dâlgé á hô-dî
    Medangi 3M buy goat PREP where-SP.Q
    Where did Medangi buy a goat?

(33) mèdângò nà dùwà dâlgé á sô-dî
    Medangi 3M buy goat PREP when-SP.Q
    When did Medangi buy a goat?
Focus is coded by fronting the focused element and by the marker ná that follows the focused element. The verb and the tense and aspunctal system are the same as in the indicative clause.

(34) medángɔ ná ná dúwá dɔlgɛ tufá
Medangi FOC 3M buy goat yesterday
It is Medangi that bought a goat yesterday.

Objects and nouns not marked by prepositions have the suffix r, which otherwise is a feminine demonstrative.

(35) dɔlgɛ-r ná medángɔ ná dúwá tufá
goat-DEM.F FOC Medangi 3M buy yesterday
It is a goat that Medangi bought yesterday.

(36) tufá-r ná medángɔ ná dúwá dɔlgɛ
yesterday-DEM.F FOC Medangi 3M buy goat
It is yesterday that Medangi bought a goat.

The relativized subject is in clause-initial position, followed by the relative marker, which varies depending on the gender and number of the head. The relative pronoun for the masculine head is yɛŋ (R.M), and the relative pronoun for the feminine head is the form identical with the third-person masculine singular subject pronoun ná (R.F). The relative pronoun for the third-person plural is éŋ (R.PL). The relative pronoun is followed by the subject pronoun, coding the gender and number of the head. Since the relative clause is systematically and obligatorily coded by the dedicated relative forms, no tense/aspunctal means of coding is required.

(37) bìó yɛŋ ná dúwá dɔlgɛ-r gù ná dó nì
man R.M 3M buy goat-DEM.F 1SG 3M go out
The man who bought my goat left.

(38) grɔm ná dɔ dúwá dɔlgɛ-r gù dɔ dó nì
woman R.F 3F buy goat-DEM.F 1SG 3F go out
The woman who bought my goat left.

(39) mɛywɛ éŋ yɛ dúwá dɔlgɛ-r gù yɛ dó nì
men R.PL 3PL buy goat-DEM 1SG 3PL go out
The men who bought my goat left.

The relativized object is in clause-initial position, followed by the relative marker, which varies according to the gender of the head noun. The verb is followed by a demonstrative coding the gender of the relativized object. The head of the relative clause is followed by the nominal or pronominal subject. But the nominal subject is itself coded by the focus particle ná. If the subject is masculine, it does not have to be followed by the subject pronoun; the focus particle alone is used. The focus particle after the subject is the coding means to indicate that the head of the relative clause is the object. The focus particle is the same for masculine, feminine, and plural subjects, and does not depend on the gender or number of the head of the relative clause.
(40) dàlgé nà błę-ŋ nò dúwá rò nò gù
goat R.F man-DEM 3M buy DEM.F 3M 1SG
The goat that the man bought is mine.

(41) dàlgé nà mèywè nò yè dúwá rò nò gù
goat R.F man FOC 3PL buy DEM.F 3M 1SG
The goat that the men bought is mine.

(42) dàlgé nà grém nò dà dúwá rò nò gù
goat R.F woman FOC 3F buy DEM.F 3M 1SG
The goat that the woman bought is mine.

(43) cà yèŋ błę-ŋ nò dúwá ŋ nò gù
cow R.M man-DEM.M 3M buy DEM.M 3M 1SG
The cow that the man bought is mine.

(44) wàlgé eŋ błę-ŋ nò dúwá nò éŋ gù
goats R.PL man-DEM 3M buy DEM.PL 3PL 1SG
The goats that the man bought are mine.

Guře Kotoko, unlike many other Chadic languages, has a dedicated coordinated clausal conjunction. Hence there is no motivation for the aspectual/tense coding of the sequential clause.

(45) nò dúwá dàlgé dú nò lé gà-də wàyà
3M buy goat CONJ 3SG cut GEN-3F neck
He bought a goat and slaughtered it.

The evidence shows that dú is a clausal conjunction, as it conjoins clauses that describe simultaneous events.

(46) nà nò yəm wà dú nà də l-ár
PROG 3M eat thing CONJ PROG 3F serve-3M
He is eating and she is serving him. (The conjunction dú cannot be omitted.)

The temporal protasis is coded by the form sàrtàn ‘when’ (Arabic?). The apodosis clause is unmarked. The verbs in both clauses have the same aspectual forms.

(47) sàrtàn nà wì dàlgé-r-gón nò dúwá tònár
when (Ar.) 3M sell goat-DEM-3M 3M buy cloth
When he sold his goat, he bought cloth.

The conditional protasis is coded by the form sòr followed by the simple or reduplicated form of the complementizer gi(ɡi). The conditional apodosis is coded by the form ádà. Hence there is no motivation for tense/aspectual coding of either the protasis or the apodosis clause.

(48) sòr gi(ɡi) nò wì dàlgé-r-gón ádà mò n dúwá tònár
if COMP 3M sell goat-DEM-3M then FUT 3M buy cloth
If he sells his goat, he will buy cloth.

The irrealis condition in the future is coded by the protasis marker ácà giɡi ‘if’; the apodosis clause is preceded by the form ádà, and the apodosis clause has the future tense.
(49) *âcâ gígi wàyá mé à málbè âdá mù gèy lèkól*

if COMP 1SG chief PREP Malbe then FUT 1SG build school

*If I had been the chief of Malbe, I would have built a school.*

6. CROSS-LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE

Table 1 summarizes the results of the cross-linguistic study of the interaction of tense and aspect marking and the external marking of various pragmatic functions. The entries within the columns are as follows:

In the column T/A (tense and aspect), the number 1 means there is only one system in the language and 2 indicates that there are two or more systems coding the same temporal and aspectual values.

The column FOC represents the coding of focus on any element of the proposition, be it an argument, adjunct, or the predicate, although this last element has not been checked systematically.

The column SPQ represents the coding of specific questions, i.e. questions that assume the truth of the rest of the proposition, and ask about the unknown element.

The column RC represents the domain of the relative clause.

TEMP represents temporal protasis clauses. In some languages, the same coding means are also used for temporal apodosis clauses.

COND represents conditional protasis clauses.

SEQ represents sequential clauses. The importance of sequential clauses for the present study is that they sometimes show the same properties as other clauses discussed, and yet they do not share any of the semantic or informational features with the focus or specific questions.

NEG represents negative clauses. In some languages these clauses are marked by special tenses or aspects.

ASS represents the focus on the factuality of the event. This category, attested in only some languages, belongs to the domain of focus, as evidenced by the fact that it cannot co-occur with any other coding of focus in the clause (cf. also Hyman and Watters 1984).

The entry E means that the given function is coded externally, i.e. outside of the proposition, or by means other than tense or aspect. The entry TA indicates that the given function is coded inside the proposition, by a tense or an aspectual form. For Wolof, Bijogo, Banda-Linda, and Gbaya, i.e. for languages for which I have used only published sources, the entries in the table are incomplete because the relevant forms were not discussed by the authors. The second solid horizontal line in table 1 separates Chadic languages from Niger-Congo languages.
Table 1. The coding of selected functional domains in West-Central Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T/A</th>
<th>T/A</th>
<th>FOC</th>
<th>SP Q</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>TEMP</th>
<th>COND</th>
<th>SEQ</th>
<th>NEG</th>
<th>ASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gizi</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hdi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>E/TA</td>
<td>E/TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mere</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E/PRO</td>
<td>E/PRO</td>
<td>SEQ</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mafa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E/PRO</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E/PRO</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandara</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapsiki</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E/PRO</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulfe Kotoko</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lele</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>E + TA</td>
<td>E + TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fula</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>E/TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolof</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bijgo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>TA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E/PRO</td>
<td>E/PRO</td>
<td>E/PRO</td>
<td>E/PRO</td>
<td>E/PRO</td>
<td>E/PRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tupuri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E/PRO</td>
<td>E/PRO</td>
<td>E/PRO</td>
<td>E/PRO</td>
<td>E/PRO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. CONCLUSIONS

(1) Multiple tense and aspectual systems are also coding means for functions other than tense and aspect. In particular, one system may code one or more of the following functions: marking the comment on focus clause, and thereby indicating that one of the constituents is in focus; specific interrogative clause; relative clause; polarity coding; temporal or conditional protasis; sequential clause. For the domains examined, the following correlation obtains: the domains are coded either outside of the proposition or inside the proposition. In the latter case the double tense and aspectual systems are the coding means.

(2) The existence of two aspectual systems has been observed in languages from different families. Yet within the same family, and even within the same subgroup, only some languages have multiple aspectual systems. There exists a complementarity of coding means in that the tense/aspectual system is used when there are no obligatory external markers for the various functions coded. The pragmatic functions of the tense/aspectual system are therefore motivated by language-internal characteristics. The fact that the tense/aspectual system rather than some other means has been selected for the coding of the pragmatic functions may be motivated by the widespread use of those functions in languages of the area. The exact mechanism of how a language borrows a grammatical mechanism without its phonological realization is a topic for a different study.

10 Mapun has two future tenses, whose distribution appears to be along pragmatically dependent / pragmatically independent lines.
GRAMMATICAL ABBREVIATIONS

1............First person
2............Second person
3............Third person
A............Aspect
ANAPHE........Anaphor
AR............Arabic
ASS............Assertive
ASSC............Associative
CAUS............Causative
COM............Comment marker
COMP............Complementizer
COMPL............Completive
COND............Conditional
CONJ............Conjunction
D............Dependent
DEF............Definite
DEM............Demonstrative
DIST............Distal
E............External
F............Feminine
FOC............Focus marker
FUT............Future
GEN............Genitive
HAB............Habitual
L............Locative
M............Masculine
NEG............Negative
OBJ............Object marker
OUT............Extension coding movement 'out'
PL............Plural
PRET............Preterite
PROG............Progressive
Q............Question marker
R............Relative
RC............Relative clause
REF............Referential
REL............Relative marker
SEQ............Sequential
SP............Specific
STAT............Stative
T............Tense
TEMP............Temporal
UP............Extension coding movement 'up'
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