

Carsten Peust
Konstanz

Supplements to West Dangla grammar

Abstract

This is a sequel to Peust (2014). Based on the examination of more text material, several additions and corrections to the presentation of West Dangla grammar are provided.

Keywords

Chadic, Dangla, Grammar, Morphology, Tone.

In volume 51 of this journal, I published an article “A morphological sketch of West Dangla (Chad)”¹. When preparing that grammar sketch, I was not yet aware of a major text collection elaborated by Akouya (1983), evidently the one whose publication had been announced by Fédry (1971b: 127). I have meanwhile gotten access to this monograph of 156 pages, filled equally with West Dangla text and a French translation. Most of what I wrote in the mentioned article remains valid, but I will provide here a number of additions and corrections that can be made in the light of these texts. Again, the focus will be on morphology, even though the way would now be open to delve into various topics of syntax as well.

Akouya’s text documentation is extremely valuable, but the transcription is not absolutely consistent, particularly as concerns the marking of tone. While most of the tone marks are presumably correct, they seem to be not as reliable as in Fédry’s documentation. Several times, the overall tone contour is right, but the precise locations are not written where they should be phonemically. For example, Fédry’s dictionary provides the phrase *iddin tá lókúmi* “troupeau de chameaux” (D33)², which I assume to represent the tones in a correct way. The

¹ Peust (2014).

² Throughout this paper, I use the two shorthand notations A (+ page.paragraph) = Akouya (1983) and D (+ page) = Fédry (1971a).

(§22) **Plural: Suffixed.** The plural of *ódò* “œil” is given as *ódìnà* in Fédry’s dictionary (D41). But the texts also contain instances of a shorter stem *ódà-* (always with possessive suffix): *ódà-r* [my eyes] (A134.10), *ódà-y* [his eyes] (A130.7). This could be either a colloquial contraction or a more archaic plural formation. I prefer the latter view since it is supported by East Dangla where we have *ùdā* sg. – *ūdā* pl. (de Montgolfier 1976: 325).

(§25) **Genitive.** Even though local relations are most commonly expressed by a preposition followed by a noun in the genitive case, the bare genitive case with no preposition is sometimes sufficient for this purpose, e.g.: *nìn pààytì gér-cì* [we descended (to) your home] “nous sommes venus chez-toi” (A4.4, *gér* “maison”) • *ḡá díyì-c tùmkir* [he put her (on) the legs] “il la déposa sur ses jambes” (A132.6, *tùmké* “cuisse”, pl. *tùmki*).

The preposition *ák* (local meanings, indirect object marker) has an alternative form *dūk*, with no obvious functional distinction between both forms. Examples for the variation: *ák Kórmó* (A140.22) ~ *dūk Kórmó* (A138.21) [to Kormo (proper name)] (both after *dīyè* “dire”) • *ák róm-tù* (D349) ~ *dūk róm-tù* (A134.12) [to my daughter].

(§28) **Genitive in -r.** The texts provide a number of new genitive forms, among them the interesting couple *mícò* “petit garçon” – gen. *mìcòr* (D374, A116.18, A120.30; but Fédry 1974: 13 gives *mìcòr*) • *mìcà* “petite fille” – gen. *mìcàr* (A134.8, A136.16). But the new forms have not guided me to any new insights in addition to the rules already known. It should be noted that the genitive of *gèè* “gens” is firmly attested as *gèèmìr* (A64.9, A66.13, A70.6, A154.2), a form that is somewhat irregular and contradicts the tone rule given in my article that L nouns generally form L genitives.

The noun “sauce” in fact appears as *tìw* (A132.4), as was postulated in my footnote 12.

(§34) **Subject proclitics.** The subject proclitic of the 1st sg. consistently appears as *nà* in the texts. Fédry’s alternative form *nò* must have been taken from a different dialect and is in fact close to the East Dangla form *nō* (de Montgolfier 1976: 218bis; Shay 1999: 123).

Fédry’s most precise explanation of the 1st pl. inclusive–exclusive distinction is to be found in Fédry (2010: 235): “il y a deux formes différentes de «nous»: *gè tè* «nous avons mangé (moi et toi, ou moi et vous)» et: *nì tè* «nous avons mangé (nous autres, c’est-à-dire moi et lui, ou moi et eux, sans toi ou sans vous)»”.

(§40) **Her-pronouns.** We can probably state as a rule that H nouns commonly become L when a her-pronoun is attached. Consider the following

new examples: *ádi* “ventre” – *àd-tì* [her belly] (A16.8, A28.4, A60.2, D13), the form *àd-tì* (D8) is not confirmed • *ándé* “boule” – *àndì-tì* [her porridge ball] (A40.8) • *děngé* “oreille” – *děngì-tì* [her ear] (A90.18) • *sérpé* “moitié” – *sèrpì-t* [her half] (A6.2, A8.5, context form).

The texts support the stem *bóó-* or *bóò-*, but not *bòò-*, of the noun “sœur”: *bóó-r* [my sister] (A88.15, A92.21), *bóò-n* [your.M sister] (A96.29).

(§42) **Possessive suffixes on genitive nouns.** The noun *wèèr* “lieu”, genitive *wéérdí*, attests a genitive form *wèèr-cí* [at his place] (A76.8, A76.10); the form *wèèr-cì* (D46), which would be irregular by all standards, is not confirmed.

(§45) **Direct object clitics: me-pronouns.** The following passage demonstrates that the context form of the me-pronouns is less used than of the him-pronouns: *gém gìngì-cì sèllè, kɪŋk gìngì-g sèllè* “Celui qui vous fait du bien, vous lui faites du bien” (A114.11, *gínè* “faire”). In essentially the same context, the clitic *-gà* “him” loses its terminal vowel but the clitic *-cì* “you” preserves it.

(§46) **Direct object clitics: him-pronouns.** While the tone of these enclitics is L after most verbal tenses, him-pronouns following a singular imperative usually have a H tone, which may or may not extend onto the verb stem: *pèccè* “décapsuler” – *pèccì-gú* [thresh them (grains)!] (A114.11) • *kóòcè* “frapper” – *kóòcì-gà* “tape-le” (A150.8) • *dùùnè* “attacher” – *dùún-gú* [attach them!] (A108.7) • *gìdìyè* “faire une transaction d’achat ou de vente” – *gìdìy-gà* [buy him!] (A102.14) • *óbé* “prendre” – *ób-cá* “prends-la” (A126.4) • *icè* “prendre” – *icí-g* [take him!] (A150.5) – *icí-c* [take her!] (A86.5, context forms) • *kòlè* “appeler” – *kòlí-g* “appelle-le” (A72.2, A82.18) • *rásè* “laisser” – *rásì-c* [leave her!] (A124.36). This does not seem to apply to the me-pronouns, at any rate not to the 1st person clitic *-nò* “me”: *kòlì-n* “appelle-moi” (A44.4) • *rásì-n* “laisse-moi” (A48.3, A106.3) (both context forms). Cf. also §76 below.

(§47) **Indirect object clitics.** I gave no examples of context forms (with the final vowel lost) of indirect object clitics in my article. But such forms are possible, e.g.: *há dīyì-j àn* [he told him that] (A150.6, *dīyè* “dire” + *-jì*) • *káàwì-k* [told you.F] (A22.10, *káàwè* “parler” + *-kè*) • *tá gínì-d tìw* [she made me the sauce] (A86.7, *gínè* “faire” + *dù*).

(§47a) **Expanded object clitics.** Two object clitics, *-tì* (3rd sg. fem. indirect object) and *-nì* (1st pl. excl. direct or indirect object), were cited in my article in these forms as given by Fédry (1974: 11). While the texts attest them, expanded by-forms *-tìtì* and *-tìnì*, respectively, seem to be used more often. I will start with examples of *-tìtì* (context form *-tìt*) as the 3rd sg. fem. dative clitic: *dīy-it* (A138.21) ~ *dīy-tìt* (A140.22) ~ *dīy-tìt* (A152.10) [tell her!] (*dīyè* “dire”,

imperative, all context forms) • *kì dīy-tìt* “tu lui as dit” (A54.10, perfect) • *ḡá dēē-tìt zúgá* “il lui construisit enfin une case” (A24.12, *dēē* “achever”, perfect) • *kà pákìi-t àmáy* “tu lui as versé de l’eau” (A62.5) ~ *yáá-cò àn ásù pákìi-tìt* [her mother said “come” and poured (water) for her] “sa maman (...) l’obligea à se laver” (A64.10, *pákè* “verser”, subjunctive) • *iyá nààmì-tìt* “il lui servit donc” (A134.7, *nààmè* “envoyer”, subjunctive) • *ḡá iyì-tìt* [and he brought to her] (A126.3, *iyè* “apporter”, subjunctive) • *ḡá bérì-tìt* “il lui donna” (A8.6, A118.26, *bérè* “donner”, subjunctive) • *ḡá gáàrì-tìt* “il lui indiqua” (A8.6, *gáàrè* “montrer”, perfect). But only the shorter form *-tì* can be used within a clitic complex. This applies (1) to the habitual tense, where the clitic is accompanied by a *-g*-element (see §76 below), and (2) to the co-occurrence together with a direct object clitic (§49).

Attestations of the 1st pl. excl. clitic are much scarcer, but I can point out *téen-tìni* [ate us] (A120.31, A122.32, *tèè* “manger”), contrasting with *téèḡ-kò* [ate you.Pl] (A120.31, A122.32) with no such increment in the same context, and *àsìn-tìni* [came to us] (A38.4, A108.6, *ásè* “venir”).

(§49) **Indirect and direct object clitics together.** The texts contain several new examples of verbs with indirect and direct object clitics at the same time. The indirect object clitic, which comes first, is then usually written with a long vowel, and its L tone may change to LH or H, but not consistently so: *nà iy-kèé-gù* [I brought them to you.F] (A130.8, *iyè* “apporter” + *kè* + *gù*) • *kì iy-dùù-g* [you brought him to me] (A70.6, context form) • *i-dùù-c* [bring her to me!] “donne-moi celle” (A42.4) • *gáàr-dùù-g* [show him to me!] (A94.25, *gáàrè* “montrer”) • *ób-kèè-cà* [took her for you] (A18.3, *óbé* “prendre”) • *sààybìn-cóó-g* [explained it to them] (A54.10) • *bùḡ bér-jù-g* [God gave them to you] (A110.9, *bérè* “donner”) • *pákì-tíi-g àmáy* “et lui versa de l’eau” (A64.10, *pákè* “verser”). This tone rise does not seem to occur with verbs in the subjunctive tense (§74), e.g.: *ḡú iyì-còò-gù* [and they brought them to them] (A40.7) • *ḡá iyì-tì-gà* [and he brought him to her] (A70.5) • *tá bérì-jì-cà* [and she gave her to him] (A6.3, A8.5) • *ḡá bérì-tì-gà* [and he gave him to her] (A122.35) • *bérì-tì-cà* [and (she) gave her to her] (A60.4, A62.7). See also §71a below.

(§50) **Relative pronouns.** The syntax of relative clauses can now be described in some detail. The relative clause immediately follows its head noun and is introduced by a relative pronoun (m. *ḡáá*, f. *táá*, pl. *ḡúú*). If there is also a demonstrative, it will be located to the right of the whole noun phrase, i.e. of the relative clause (see next section §51). There is no resumptive element within the relative clause, whether the head noun serves as the subject, direct object or oblique argument of the relative clause (no attestations for indirect object). The relative pronouns happen to be homonymous with the subject proclitics of the future tense (§82), but syntax usually makes it easy

to keep them apart. It seems that when the head noun is a direct object or an oblique argument, and the relative clause has a present tense reading, the verb of the relative clause will be in the subjunctive tense (§74), but the evidence is not abundant enough to show whether this is compulsory. Examples:

Head noun is the subject: *gém nàà Ø gádā āṅkirè* “l’homme qui court là-bas” (A98.4, symbol Ø added by me) • *míc taa Ø óbá bùùrì* “Une fille qui épouse un lion” (A28 title) • *yáá-kò taa Ø wéèṅ-kè* [your mother who gave birth to you] “celle qui t’a mise au monde” (A20.7).

Head noun is the direct object: *tìw nùù nà tèy Ø āṅkù* “la sauce qui je suis en train de manger” (A84.5, subjunctive of *tèè* “manger”, with final demonstrative, lit. [this sauce]) • *kúma nàà gárf dēè-tì Ø* [the animals that the elephant had killed] “la viande des animaux écrasés par l’éléphant” (A16.7, perfect of *dēè* “tuer” with past marker *-tì*, §80) • *dāṅàl nùù nà écirì-t Ø mín kēmèè* [the bed (pl.) that I dug long ago] (A66.12) • *sèrpi-t tá jègèr taa tá ʒp-ít-Ø-ít* [the half of the peanuts that she had portioned out DEM] “la moitié du grain d’arachides qu’elle lui avait donnée” (A6.2).

Head noun is the oblique argument: *wèèr nàà gāàg gōy-tì Ø* [the place (in) which the raven sat down] (A28.3) • *àsì-t kàt wáf ká mààrì taa tá gōy-tì Ø ità* [(he) came and arrived at that rock (on) which she had sat down] (A130.7) • *wèr-ṅ nàà kì báày-Ø-ik* [that place of yours (to) which you go] “là où [tu] désires aller” (A26.16) • *ùùdìn taa táár àsè Ø* [the moment (at) which she came] “au moment où elle vint” (A144.4) • *síg taa nà ipiriy káá-kè Ø* [the needle (with) which I unravel your head (i.e. hairs)] “le bout pointu du poinçon que j’utilise pour défaire tes cheveux” (A90.18).

Only if the head noun is a possessor, the relative clause will contain a resumptive element in the form of a possessive suffix: *gém nàà péélè-y yààrkò* “L’homme à la grande verge” [lit.: man who his-penis is-big] (A6 title) • *gèèm taa kác-tì sèèrò* [a woman whose heads are two] “une autre fée à deux têtes” (A72.3) • *gèè nùù báá-cò kò* [people whose bottom does not exist, i.e. who are weak] “gens sans fondement, sans force” (Fédry 1971b: 71).

Also an independent pronoun may serve as the head: *nòn nàà gááá-fá-r bólók ká* “moi, avec mon long cou” [lit.: I who my-neck is-long DEM] (A14.4). A relative clause may be headless and introduced by the relative pronoun alone: *taa ʒrāj* “celle qui écrase mal le mil” (A42.2, A44.5, *ʒrfè* “écraser à moitié”). Occasionally, there is a semantically weak head noun that would better be skipped in an idiomatic English translation: *mààbìn-ik nàà kà dórt-ik* [your thing that you heard DEM] “ce que tu as entendu” (A20.5).

The masc. sg. relative pronoun *nàà* has a frequent extended use as a temporal or conditional conjunction, the latter interpretation being indicated by a clause-final particle *sá* “if”: *nàà nù dēè-tì* [when they had departed] “quand ceux-ci furent partis” (A34.12) • *nàà kà ròkà óbé mít sá* [if you want to marry a man] (A70.6). This can be explained from an oblique relative clause in which some

head noun like “time” has been suppressed: “(the time at) which they had departed”. In this extended use, *yàà* may be found as an alternative to *ɲàà* with no evident functional distinction: *ɲàà nà ðīy-cò* (A102.14) ~ *yàà nà ðīy-cò* (A102.15) [when I tell them].

(§51) **Basic demonstratives.** In the light of the texts, the section on the basic demonstratives needs to be substantially rewritten. I will first discuss their form and then their function. The demonstratives are enclitics. The orthography of the texts usually attaches them to the preceding element by a stroke, but not with full consistency. I keep the spellings as in the original. The demonstratives have the forms *-ikà* (m), *-ità* (f), *-ikù* (pl): *mícò* “petit garçon” (D130) – *míc-ikà* [the boy] (A38.2, A108.6, A110.8) • *bùùrì* “lion” (D100) – *bùùr-ikà* [the lion] (A24.12) • *mìcà* “petit fille” (D130) – *míc-ità* [the girl] (A20.7, A22.10) • *àkò* “feu” (D14) – *àk ità* [the fire] (A26.15) • *gèè* “gens” (D318) – *gèè-ikù* [the men/people] (A4.10) • *tìw* “sauce” – *tìw-ikù* [the sauce] (A86.5, A136.15, with the usual plural for liquids).

The initial *i-* of the demonstrative may occasionally be dropped in what I call allegro forms, while the general tone contour is preserved: *wàà binà* “quiconque, quelqu’un” (D141) – *wààbin-ikà* [this one] (A24.12), but allegro *wààbín kà* (A14.3) • *gámò* “machine, affaire” (D310), pl. *gámìnà* – *gámìn-ikù* [these things, these ones] (A2.2), but *gámìn kù* (A34.11) ~ *gámìn kú* (A136.13) • *tòòrdā* “palissade de paille” (D166) – *tòòrdā-y-ità* [his fence] (A122.36), but *tòòrdā-ɲ tà* [your.M fence] (A124.36) instead of the expected **tòòrdā-ɲ-ità*.

The demonstratives drop their final vowel in the context form: *bùùr-ik* [the lion] (A24.12), *míc-ik* [the boy] (A100.10, A110.8, A148.4), *míc-it* [the girl] (A60.4, A90.19, A116.17). These context forms are in fact far more frequent than the free forms in the running texts. The tone of the thus shortened demonstrative is always H and never *HL as might have been expected. In the context form, the m. and pl. demonstratives become indistinguishable.

The element to which the demonstrative attaches assumes the context form, too. In more detail: (1) Words terminating in a consonant have no context form and thus remain unchanged: *bùɲ* “ciel” (D100) – *bùɲ-ik* [the sky] (A50.7, context form of the demonstrative). (2) Words terminating in a vowel usually drop it, as in most examples cited above. (3) Those exceptional words that preserve their final vowel in context (see §6 of my article and above) keep it also before the demonstrative, which creates a hiatus between this vowel and the *i-* of the demonstrative. The texts show some variation as to whether both vowels are retained as such, or whether there is an assimilation of quality (in which case the first vowel wins) or of tone (in which case the second vowel wins). This concerns, e.g., (1) the adverbs *isì*, *āɲsì* “ainsi”: *isì-ikà* (A24.14) and *āɲsì-ik* (A18.2, A60.3, A144.3); (2) the numeral *kidā* (m), *kààdā* (f) “one”: *kidā-ik* (A24.15), *kààdā-át* (A112.7); (3) monosyllabics such as the negation *dò*: *dòókà*

(A20.8, A126.2); (4) infinitive forms of verbs: *únyé* “entrer” (D47) – *únyéé kà* (A10.8) • *wààré* “danser” (D144) – *wààré-ík* (A116.16) ~ *wààré-ék* (A122.36).

Progressive forms of verbs in *-aw* assume their usual context form in *-a* (§65) also before a demonstrative clitic, e.g. *ásè* “venir” – progr. *àsàw*: *àsáákà* (A40.6) • *tàlè* “voir” – progr. *tàlàw*: *tàlá-ák* (A40.6) • *wààré* “danser”: *wàár-ák* “(Comme les gens) dansaient” (A12.13, for expected **wááráák*).

Among the possessive suffixes, those of the plural as well as the 3rd sg. fem. *-tì* do not lose their final vowels in the majority of the cases (cf. §43 of my article): *gàngìnà* [drums] (D314) + *co* + *ikù* > *gàngincó-ókù* [their drums. DEM] (A12.14) • *gámìnà* [things] + *co* + *ikù* > *gámincóók* (A54.11, context form) • *wèèr* “lieu” + *co* + *ikà* > *ák wèèrcó-ikà* [to their place] (A82.19) • *wèèr* + *te* + *ikà* > *ák wèèrtéék* [to our.INCL place] (A152.11) • *sìn-tì* [her brother] (D374) + *ikà* > *sintí-ikà* (A34.9) • *mít-tì* [her husband] (D358) + *ikà* > *mittí-ikà* (A142.27) • *ròn-tì* [her son] (D7) + *ikà* > *ròntì-ík* (A68.4, A148.3).

By contrast, the other possessives drop their vowel: *sín-dú* “mon frère” (D374) + *ikà* > *sind-ikà* (A30.6) • *dáá-cì* “son épouse” (D176) + *itá* > *dáác-ít* (A148.1) • *róm-kè* “ta fille” (Fédry 1971b: 15) + *itá* > *rómik-ít* (A22.9) • *kápn* [dogs] (D269) + *ke* (2nd fem) + *ikù* > *kápnk-ikù* “tes chiens-là” (A78.13).

Function: In my preliminary analysis that I can only offer at present, the “basic demonstratives” occur in two distinct syntactic environments: Either at the end of a noun phrase, or after a verb (perhaps better: at the end of a clause). When appended to a noun phrase, their meaning comes close to that of the definite article in European languages. The following usages can be singled out: (1) Previous reference marker, as in the tale on p. 14 where a witch (*mìmùùtà*) is introduced who is referred to with the demonstrative (*mìmùùt-ít*) on all subsequent occasions. (2) Implicit previous reference. One story is about a woman who was pregnant. Then we hear about *míc-ikà* (A38.2) [*the* boy] with the demonstrative because the existence of some child was presupposed. The accompanying French translation spells out this presupposition more explicitly: “l’enfant dans le ventre de sa mère”. (3) Generic use as in *gèè-ikù* [the men/people] (A4.10) in the closing phrase of a story “C’est depuis ce jour que le chien est resté parmi les hommes.” (4) Vocative, as in *gèèm-ít* “femme!” (A22.11), *gèè-k* “camarades!” (A38.5). (5) Together with certain nouns of time, the clitic has preserved its presumable original function as a proper demonstrative. See the examples in §51 of my article and add *mààkó* “soir” (D114, here said to be feminine) – *màák-ík* “ce soir” (A116.17, A120.28, with the masc. demonstrative). But the demonstrative does not appear in all instances where one of the said conditions applies, so more investigation of its use is certainly desirable.

The position of the demonstrative is not after the noun but at the end of the whole noun phrase following all other attributes including relative clauses: *séríp tàà géél-ità* [the side that is left.DEM = the left side] (A26.15) • *dóòyìn*

kú yààcò níùù dòòyít-íkù [the faeces of his mother which she defecated.DEM] (A16.8). The demonstrative can also be appended to a personal pronoun (*táár-ít wàà* “Qui est-ce” [she.DEM is who?], A22.10), to another demonstrative (*rómòr ãnt-ítà* “ma fille-là”, A144.3), or to a proper name (*Tògòròc-ít*, A88.14).

Coming now to what I take as post-verbal or post-clausal demonstratives, my analysis is very tentative, their form, syntax and function all being in need of further research. There are instances in which the demonstrative takes a generic masc. sg. form, and this seems to be the most common case: *nàà bíjé àk-ikà* “que j’aïlle allumer le feu-là” (A136.14, agreement neither with the speaker, who is a woman, nor with *àkò* “feu”, which is fem.) • *iyà mát-ikà* “maman est morte-là” (A140.24, A142.25) • *tá óbìy mèèráám kà* “elle prend bien là” (D202) • *tá dīyt-ik* [she said.DEM] (A50.5) • *kà gédrá dō-ók* [you.F cannot.DEM] (A64.10) • *tá dòòyá-ák dòòyà kúm dī* “(A partir de ce jour,) même ses excréments n’étaient plus que de la viande” [lit.: she shits.DEM, shits meat only] (A16.7). In other examples, however, the post-verbal demonstrative appears to agree with some element of the clause, either with the subject: *ísì kàt gèè óbìy gòyìy-íkù* [this is how people marry and live.DEM] (A124.37, at the end of a story), or with the object: *nàà súkín-c-íkù* [I will collect them.DEM] (A136.13). The analysis is hampered by the fact that many instances only provide the ambiguous context form *-ík*.

When an adverb or ideophone follows the verb, the demonstrative may attach to the latter element rather than to the verb: *tá báàt pèy-ik* [she went again.DEM] (A138.19) • *táár tànkilè dī kèèt-ik* [she lingered long.DEM] “elle traînait beaucoup” (A22.9) • *tá yèèpìt yàw yàw yàw-ik* “elle courut rapidement” (A56.14) • *ñá sààlìt yùp-ik* “il tomba ‘vroum’” (A36.13). But this is not necessarily so: (Where is the toilet?) *bèè gòy-ik éáē* [a hole is.DEM over there] “Il y a un trou quelque part (il lui indique la direction)” (A12.12). When a demonstrative clitic follows a clause-final object, it may be hard to decide whether the clitic belongs to the noun phrase or to the clause as a whole.

The meaning of the post-verbal demonstrative remains rather opaque and is, in most cases, not evident from the French translation. It may sometimes be roughly equivalent to “there” as suggested by an occasional translation by Fédry: *kì gínà kà* “tu (le) fais là?” (D206), or by the French paraphrase of the following passage: (A boy was sent to a certain place to obtain an egg of a viper. He went on.) *zúgìl *wēf-ík⁴* [the viper slept.DEM] “Arrivé au lieu-dit, il trouva la vipère endormie” (A68.2; no agreement with *zúgìlè* “vipère”, which is feminine, D394). We may translate this as “The viper had fallen asleep there”. The demonstrative may also encourage a deictic interpretation of the clause as in the following example: (A voice is to be heard out of nowhere, then the question comes) *màà alá ísí-ikà* “Qui-est-ce-qui chante ainsi?” (A24.14). The term *ísì* “ainsi” clearly

⁴ The text has *wēj-ik*.

has a deictic reading here, whereas it is more usually non-deictic (“like what was said before”) in clauses with no demonstrative clitic.

(§52) **Complex demonstratives.** In a proper demonstrative function, one uses various expansions of the basic demonstratives. The most common one is the series *ǎṅkà* m. / *ǎntà* f. / *ǎṅkù* pl. (< **ǎn+íkà* etc.), which serves as a near demonstrative “this”. Like the basic demonstratives, it can appear in a vocative phrase: *òyí-kò mǐdày ǎṅkù* “Bonjour, les hommes!” (A76.9, similarly A94.24).

The demonstratives of the *ǎṅkààdē* / *ǎntààdē* / *ǎṅkùùdē* series, which are probably composed from the near demonstrative and the element *édē* “là” (D29), seem to be used in particular for items that the speaker presents to the addressee, and thus may imply a proximity to the 2nd person: (A mother sends out her son to bring her a mat [*árgá*, fem. gender]. Then he comes back:) *ǎntààdē íyà* “La voici maman” (A70.6) • *nòn ǎṅkààdē Mámamàt* [I DEM am Mammat] “c’est moi Mahamat qui te parle” (A70.7) • (A group of hyenas want to eat a girl. But they agree to first ask her mother for permission. Then the girl says to her mother:) *dúúyìn ǎṅkùùdē ròkíí-n téèn-dú* “Ces hyènes-là [i.e. that I have brought to you], veulent me manger” (A144.6).

The *ǎṅkírè* / *ǎntírè*⁵ / *ǎṅkùrè*-series expresses remote deixis, e.g.: (Eh! regardez,) *bàg pàày ǎntírè* “un criquet s’est posé là-bas” (A156.8, *bàgà* fem. “sauterelle”) • *nà tàlíí-g ǎṅkùrè* [I see-them DEM] “je vois un lit derrière notre case là-bas” (A66.12) (referring to *dáṅàl* “lit” which is a grammatical plural).

Finally, the texts attest a *kàré* / *tàré* / *kùrè*-series of demonstratives. These too have an implication of remoteness but are used for referents that are invisible: *kóógìn kàt góóǎíí-c kùrè* “les enfants là gardent là-bas” (A8.6, the speaker is in the house but the children are out in the bush for herding) • *báàwò jààkít gèr-ir ǎà èèrè kàré* [go first to my house which is there DEM] “Allez chez ma deuxième femme (, et vous verrez bien ce qu’il y a)” (A46.10). This pronoun is also used to introduce fairy tale characters like the English formula “once upon a time”: *àná, míc tàré* [they-say, that girl ...] “Il y a longtemps de cela, une fille ...” (A132.1).

(§55) **Verbal stem classes.** The list of monoradicals was confused during typesetting. Read: *dēē* “tuer, achever, plaire”, *dēē* “puer”, *ǎēē* “haïr”, *lēē* “mettre plusieurs choses”, *mēē* “exagérer”, *nēē* “être à point, mûr”, *nēē* “porter du fruit, être enceinte”, *sēē* “boire”, *tēē* “manger”, *wēē* “accoucher”.

(§56) **Verbal tone classes.** As was explained in that paragraph, West Dangla verbs are distributed across three tone classes: L, HLL, and (L)H (mostly H, but LH for certain long stems). As Fédry (1977: 102) shows, the West Dangla L and

⁵ But *ǎntírè* in A62.6. The evidence for the tones of this series is conflicting.

HLL classes regularly correspond to two tone classes of East Dangla, namely H and LM (M = mid tone) respectively. The third class of West Dangla, (L)H, has no consistent equivalent in East Dangla, but corresponds to either H or LM verbs (Fédry 1977: 103). This class comprises all verbs whose last consonant is a voiced or glottalized obstruent. Fédry came to the conclusion that the two-way distinction of East Dangla must represent the original state of affairs, and that verbs with particular final consonants were assigned to a newly formed (L)H class in West Dangla, losing their association with their original tone class. We may call this a terminal tone raising caused by the final consonant.

I agree with Fédry's general reconstruction, particularly with his conclusion that the West Dangla (L)H tone class emerged late and remained restricted to this dialect. But it seems that the original distinction between L and HLL verbs was not entirely obliterated by the effect of terminal tone raising. The texts contain sporadic traces of a fourth tone class HLH, not recognized by Fédry, which I take as representing former HLL verbs that were affected by terminal tone raising: The verb *únjé* "entrer" (D47) appears as *únjé* in A22.9 (= East Dangla *ònjē* "entrer", de Montgolfier 1976: 230), and there is a verb *jékidē* "regarder à travers le canari" (A34.8), which is to be identified with Fédry's *jèkidē* "se tenir sur la pointe des pieds, regarder par dessus un obstacle" (D241) (possibly = East Dangla *zikidē* "se pendre", de Montgolfier 1976: 348).

I thus assume a scenario of three diachronic stages: (1) Originally, there were two tone classes L (= East Dangla H) and HLL (= East Dangla LM). (2) Out of these, terminal tone raising gave rise to two new tone classes LH and HLH in West Dangla only. (3) Subsequently, there was a tendency for LH and HLH to merge into a single tone class (L)H. The shorter LH verbs were simplified to H, which may be by a regular sound law (consider cases such as *gēr* "maison" + *có* > *gér-có* [their home], §37). On the other hand, also the complex HLH contour was apt to be flattened to H. In the available documentation, the four-way distinction of stage (2) is on the verge of extinction but still occasionally traceable, perhaps only in very careful pronunciation, or with a few speakers.

(§59) **Infinitive with possessor.** It should be mentioned that HLL infinitives, when combined with her-suffixes (§40), usually keep their tonal contour: *ààwè* "goûter" – *ààwìn-tì* [to taste her] (A22.10) • *bérè* "donner" – *bérìn-tì* (A62.5) • *gásè* "obtenir" – *gásìn-tì* (A18.3) • *gójfè* "garder" – *gójfìn-tì* (A8.5) • *wéè* "accoucher" – *wéèn-tì* (A22.11). This is, of course, also true of L verbs, e.g. *tàlè* "voir" – *tàlìn-tì* (A8.6, A44.7). Evidence for H infinitives is not clear enough: *óbé* "prendre" – *òbìn-tì* (D5) ~ *òbin-tì* (A88.15).

We also have to note an irregularity of the L verb *tèè* "manger", whose tone class seems to change to HL in the infinitive when a possessive suffix follows: *téen-dú* [to eat me] (A144.5) • *téen-jí* [to eat him] (A114.9) • *téen-tì* [to eat her] (A144.7) • *téen-có* [to eat them] (A114.12).

(§64) **Progressive.** This tense most commonly refers to the present, but instances with past reference, which imply a progressive or conative interpretation, are also frequent in the texts, e.g.: *ìyá ñàà tá àmláw, kár àn* [and as she was leaving, then (she) said] “Quand elle voulut sortir, elle dit” (A48.2) • *ìyá tá ìcìlāw, gòrìn ìcāl dō* [and she was lifting (it), but the basket did not lift] “lorsqu’elle essaya de le soulever, elle n’y parvint pas” (A18.2). The verb *ròkè* “vouloir” is generally employed in the progressive tense, in both present and past contexts, because of its inherent imperfective semantics, e.g.: *ìyá ñá ròkà kàt sèè ámá-y-ík* [and he wanted then to drink the water] “Peu après, il eut soif et voulut boire de l’eau” (A122.34) • *yáá-cò ròkà óbé mítìkò* “Sa mère voulait se remarier” (A68.1).

In certain contexts, the progressive is syntactically equivalent to an infinitive. For example, the verb *bààgè* “se mettre à, commencer” (D79) may be combined with either the infinitive or the progressive, the latter evidently implying a longer duration of the action. With infinitive: *kòkir bààg cààcè* “le coq commença à chanter” (A2.4) • *ñú bààg-ìt sítè* “celles-ci (...) se mirent à sourire” (A88.10). With progressive: *tá bààg-ìt gààní-jì* [she began to prepare the meal for him] “depuis ce jour, elle lui prépara régulièrement de la boule” (A16.10) • *ádí-y bààg lééná kédèr* [his belly began to expand to the ground] “son ventre devint si gros qu’il toucha presque le sol” (A88.15) • *ñá bààg sítíí-cà* “il se mit à rire d’elle” (A58.9). I already mentioned in §82 of my article that the progressive can also substitute for the infinitive in the periphrastic future formation. The texts provide another example for that: (If I don’t like it) *náà dǎétá dō gá* [I-will go.PROG, won’t I?] “je voudrais bien partir, non?” (A8.6, *dǎètè* “quitter”).

(§66) **Progressive: Tone.** I claimed in my article that most HLL verbs form a H progressive. This has to be revised. Fédry’s materials indeed suggest a H contour, and such forms are well attested also in the texts. But at least as frequently, the texts provide a tonal variety HLH, e.g.: *ámìlè* “sortir” – *ámláw* (A48.2) ~ *ámláw* (A14.4) • *háàwè* “aller” – *háàwáw* (A48.3) • *dǎètè* “partir” – *dǎètáw* (A28.2) • *étìlè* “laisser couler” – *étíláw* (A52.7) • *gójǎfè* “garder” – *gójǎfáw* (A8.6) • *péèlè* “veiller” – *péèláw* (A130.7) • *kóòcìlè* “regarder en haut” – *kóòcìlá* (A112.7, context form). This also holds when an object clitic follows: *gójǎfè* – *gójǎfíí-c* “(les enfants) la gardent” (A8.6) • *kóòcìlè* – *tá kóòcìlíí-c pàà, pàà, pàà* “elle se mit à la regarder très longuement” (A18.5).

HLH is most likely the proper tone pattern of these progressive forms, whereas H, considered as the norm in my article, results from a contour levelling that may have originated in fast or careless pronunciation. A comparable case of tone levelling can be observed for the HLH-infinitives of verbs (see §56 above).

The fact remains true that a subset of HLL verbs form a L progressive, such as *ásè* “venir” – *àsàw* (A148.3, A150.5).

(§69) **Habitual: Tone.** The habitual tense of *ibìnè* “savoir” is confirmed to have a H tone: *ibán* [know(s)] (A16.8, A32.6, A104.15, A144.1). This must be regarded as an irregularity of this particular verb, since L verbs otherwise have a L habitual. Cf. also the addition to §76 below.

(§70) **Singular imperative.** The texts show clearly that the imperative makes no formal distinction of gender. For example, the form *ásù* [come!] (from *ásè* “venir”), the most frequent of all imperative forms, is well attested with both male subjects (A16.8, A98.6, etc.) and female subjects (A8.5, A28.4, etc.).

(§71) **Plural imperative.** The tone of the 2nd person pl. imperative shows some variation, but the most common contours are H for L verbs (probably also for H verbs): *còkìyè* “écouter” – *cókíyò* (A12.13, but *cókíyò* A128.7) • *dùunè* “attacher” – *dùúnò* (A54.11) • *nààlè* “empiler” – *náálò* (A116.17) • *tàlè* “voir” – *tálò* (A102.13, but *tàlò* A156.8), and HLL for HLL verbs: *ásè* “venir” – *ásò* (A44.7, A56.14, etc.) • *baàwè* “aller” – *baàwò* (A8.7, A46.10, A72.3, but *baáwò* A28.2) • *dīyè* “dire” – *dīyò* (A152.10) • *gálè* “tomber” – *gálò* (A102.13).

Before object clitics, *-o* changes to *-in-*. Examples with direct object clitics: *èrè* “attendre” – *èrìn-nò* “attendez-moi” (A144.8) • *ózilè* “féliciter” – *ózilìn-nò* “encouragez-moi” (A14.4) • *džódě* “marteler” – *džódīŋ-gà* “enchaînez-le” (A76.9) • *óbé* “prendre” – *óbín-cà* [take her!] “venez l’attraper” (A120.29) • *tìisè* “enterrer” – *tìsín-cà* (I expect **tìisín-cà*) [bury her!] “vous allez enterrer la maman” (A140.25); with indirect object clitics: *cààcè* “redire ce qu’on a entendu” – *cáácín-dù* [report to me!] “dites-le moi” (A2.2) • *káàwè* “parler” – *káàwìn-tì* [tell her!] (A152.10).

In monoradical verbs, the termination *-o* is absorbed by the *a*-vowel of the root, so that the plural imperative is kept distinct from the singular imperative only by tone, if at all: *děè* “achever” – *dáà* [stop!] (A144.5, context requires a plural). The form is better recognizable before an object clitic due to the then preserved nasal: *lěè* “mettre” – *láàŋ-g pís-kò* “posez vos mains” (A146.9).

(§71a) **Hortative.** When a sg. or pl. imperative takes the indirect object clitic *-tè* “us (inclusive)”, this has the semantic effect of including the speaker into the action. We thus get, respectively, “do (sg.) for us” > “let’s do (you.SG and me)” and “do (pl.) for us” > “let’s do (all of us)”. I adopt Lovestrand’s (2015) term “hortative” for this syntagm. I recognized the composite character of these forms only after having read Lovestrand’s paper who provides close typological parallels from four other East Chadic languages. This is obviously a common path of grammaticalization in the region. Examples of the singular-based hortative: (a man says to his wife:) *káàw ànt dáà-tée-c* [this word, let’s finish it] “gardons cette affaire entre nous” (A16.10, *děè* “tuer, achever”) • (one man says to another:) *yéèp-té* (I expect **yéèp-tè*) “retrons” (A98.5, *yéèpè*

“retourner”). Examples of the plural-based hortative: (he said to the villagers:) *yéèpín-tè* “retournons” (A70.6) • (he said to his people:) *dě̀tín-tè* [let’s go] (A40.6, *dě̀tè* “partir”) • (the inhabitants of a village say:) *gádín-tè rásìn-tée-gà* “fuyons, laissons-le” (A38.3, *gádé* “courir”, *rásè* “laisser”). As two of these examples show, *-tè* changes to *-tée-* before a direct object clitic, which is exactly the change expected for proper indirect object clitics (see §49 above).

Furthermore, there are hortative forms meaning “let’s go” from a defective verb stem *ag-/ak-* of which no other forms are attested and whose tone class cannot be determined with certainty. Singular-based: *ák-tè* “allons donc ensemble” (A36.12) ~ *ák-tè* “allons-y, dit l’homme à sa femme” (A64.9); plural-based: *ágìn-tè* “nous irons en brousse” (A116.18) ~ *ágìn-tè* “Allons-y! répondirent tous ensemble les autres” (A4.5). Even the Arabic expression *yállà* [come on!] “bon, allons-y” (D259), which is not a verb at all, can serve as the base of a hortative form *yállín-tè* (D259, A40.6) “allons-y”.

(§73) **Supine.** This form, called “directionnel” by Fédry (1990: 11) and occurring exclusively in periphrastic constructions together with one of the verbs *báàwè* “aller” or *ásè* “venir”, has now become well attested by the text collection since it is widely used in the narratives. I will discuss its function in more detail at the end of this paper and focus only on morphology in this paragraph.

The supine is segmentally identical with the habitual (§68) but may differ from it in tone. HLL verbs usually form their supine with a characteristic LH contour, e.g.: *ámìlè* “sortir” – *tá báà àmál* “elle arriva à s’en sortir” (A20.8) • *nòòmè* “transpercer” – *tá báà nòyám* “jusqu’à ce qu’elle trouât” (A10.10) • *dèè* “tuer” – *nò bá dàá* “je suis allé tuer” (Fédry 1990: 11) • *lèè* “mettre plusieurs choses” – *ńú báà-t làá* [they went and put down (the groundnuts)] (A8.6) • *gàsè* “obtenir” – *tá báà gās* “elle alla trouver” (A6.2, A8.5, context form) • *góyè* “s’asseoir” – *ńáár báá góy* “il était resté” (A40.9, context form) • *súkè* “ramasser” – *ńú báà-t súk* [they went and took] (A54.11, context form). I consider occasional other tone patterns as imprecise notations, e.g.: *tá báà-c gàsà* “elle alla la trouver” (A94.24, for expected **gàsá*) • *dèè* “tuer” – *ńá báá dàá bótál* “il tua plusieurs sortes de gibiers” (A30.5).

The supine of L verbs has a L tone so that there is no formal difference at all to the habitual: *tàlè* “voir” – *ńú báà-g tàlà* [they went and saw him] “l’une d’entre elles vit le garçon” (A120.27) • *kòlè* “appeler” – *báà-g kòlà* “ils allèrent donc les appeler” (A8.7) • *dòsè* “frapper” – *ńá báà-g dōyàs* “il alla le toucher” (A106.2) • *càlè* “accrocher” – *báà-g càyàl* “il (...) alla l’accrocher” (A100.9) • *kòkinè* “voler” – *ńá báà-t kòkàn* “il vola” (A126.4) • *dúkumè* “couper” – *ńá àsì-t dūkàm* “il sépara” (A76.8).

The supine of H verbs is attested with either L or LH tone. This might reflect the double origin of the H-verbs (see §56 above), but the material is

too sparse to be certain: *bóóbé* “verser” – *ḡáà-t bòyàb* “(Sidirko) alla verser” (A90.17) • *úṇjé* “entrer” – *tá ḡáá ṽṇác* “elle (...) y entra” (A130.7) • *ḡiibé* “s’enrouler” – *tá ási-t kàt ḡiýáb* “elle (...) revint s’enrouler” (A12.11).

(§74) **Subjunctive.** This is another tense for which I had only a few attestations, but which has now become amply attested by the texts, even more so than the supine. For the time being, I retain my tentative term “subjunctive” which, however, may need to be revised once the function of this tense will have been established more clearly in the future. The subjunctive terminates in *-iyo*, shortened to *-iy* in the context form. Object clitics attach to the context form which the texts then spell with *-ii-*. When there are clitics, the subjunctive becomes segmentally identical with the progressive, but both forms are often kept distinct by tone. This is well illustrated in the following passage involving the verb *òḡyè* “saluer”, which governs an indirect object: *tá òyìi-cò àn: òyìi-kò* [and she greeted them (subjunctive) saying: (I) greet you! (progressive)] (A44.5; similarly A6.2). Another case in point is: *kà pílii-g ḡò? (...) iyá ḡá pílii-g* [won’t you open it (the door) (progr.)? ... and he opened it (subj.)] (A46.9, *píle* “ouvrir”).

For monoradical verbs, the termination is just *-y(o)*. With an additional object clitic, the tense marker becomes entirely invisible so that the form coincides with the perfect and is hard to identify. I believe that *ḡá léè-gù* “il les installa” (A86.8, *léè* “mettre”; similarly A46.8), which forms part of a series of unambiguous subjunctive forms, should be interpreted as a subjunctive even though it could also be a perfect formally.

Tone: The subjunctive of L verbs has L tone: *tèè* “manger” – *tèèyò* (A30.5) • *àmire* “réconcilier” – *àmriyò* (A16.11) • *wàkilè* “poursuivre” – *wàkiliyò* (A66.12) • *ròkè* “vouloir” – *ròkiy* (A100.11, context form) • *còkiyè* “écouter” – *còkiyiy* (A4.3, context form) • *tàlè* “voir” – *tàliy* (A156.8, context form). Examples with object clitic: *tàlii-gà* “dès qu’il le vit” (A150.6) – *tàlii-cà* “en la voyant” (A8.5) • *ḡākè* “laisser la place” – *ḡākii-cò bòtòl* “pour leur laisser le passage” (A76.8).

The subjunctive of HLL verbs usually has a HLL pattern: *álè* “pleurer” – *áliyò* (A64.9) • *ḡīwsè* “éclabousser, s’amuser dans l’eau” [to bathe] – *ḡīwsiyò* (A20.8) • *pákè* “verser” – *pákiyò* (A66.13) • *sité* “rire” – *sítiyò* (A58.9) • *wààrè* “danser” – *wààriyò* (A56.13) • *léè* “mettre plusieurs choses” – *léèy* (A46.11, context form). Examples with object clitic: *rásè* “laisser” – *rásii-gà* “ils le laissèrent derrière eux” (A38.3) • *bérè* “donner” – *bérii-ji* “elle lui donna” (A8.4) – *bérii-cò* [and gave them] (A40.7). While indirect object clitics of the her-group generally have a tone-lowering effect, the HLL pattern of the subjunctive remains unchanged since it already terminates in L (examples above in §47a as well as below in this section).

But certain HLL verbs have a L pattern in the subjunctive, in particular *ásè* “venir”, some verbs beginning with a voiced obstruent, and (some?) monoradicals: *ásè* “venir” – *ásiyò* (A10.7, A130.7) • *góyè* “s’asseoir” – *gòyiyò* (A90.18) • *ḡiné*

“faire” – *gìnìy* (A54.10, context form) • *mée* “exagérer” – *mèèy* (A18.5, context form) • *wée* “accoucher” – *wèèy* (A16.11, context form). This is reminiscent of a similar distribution in the progressive tense (§66).

The subjunctive of H verbs has a HLL pattern: *gádě* “courir” – *gádìyò* (A18.3) • *únjé* “entrer” – *únjìy* (A10.10, context form) • *óbé* “prendre” – *òbìy* (A124.37, context form) – *òbìi-gà* “elle le prit” (A82.18). The only example of a LH verb is: *àsìdě* “couper seul un arbre” – *àsìdìi-g* [and cut them] (A146.10).

Function: The function of the subjunctive definitely deserves further research. I propose as a first approximation that it expresses an action subsequent to another action, or an action that is to be expected in the given context. I will render it as “and I/you/he etc. did” when glossing. This tense often combines with the conjunction *iyá* “and”, but there is no strict correlation between both.

One very characteristic usage of the subjunctive is to report the accomplishment of an action that was prompted by an imperative form. This is my major reason for assuming that it marks something of an “expected” action. This situation is amply attested, e.g.: *àn àà ób-cá, òbìi-cà* [he said: yes take her!, (and he) took (subjunctive) her] “D’accord prends-la. Il le prit” (A126.4, *óbé* “prendre”) • *àn bùñ ícìl-òl, iyá bùñ ícìlìi-tìtì* [she said: God, lift (it) for me!, and God lifted (subj.) (it) for her] (A48.2, *ìcìlè* “soulever”; similarly A50.5) • *kòlì-g dì gèy, iyá tá kòlìi-g àn* [just call them!, and she called them saying ...] (A80.16, *kòlè* “appeler”) • *gádù (...) iyá ná gádìy kée kée kée* [run! (...) and he ran long long long] “Fuis cette place (...) Alors l’homme se mit à courir. Il courut longtemps” (A98.4, *gádě* “courir”) • *rásin-tée-gà (...) nù rásìi-gà* [let’s leave him! (They mounted their horses) and they left him] (A38.4, *rásé* “laisser”) • *àn àà gídìy-gá, yállà iyá gídìyìi-gà* [he said yes buy it!, OK and (he) bought it] “je vais te l’acheter. D’accord si tu veux. Et il l’acheta” (A102.14, *gídìyè* “faire une transaction d’achat ou de vente”) • *ñààmin-d àkò, iyá kòògìn-tì ñààmìi-tìt àkò* [light me a fire!, and her children lit her a fire] “Allumez un feu je vais me réchauffer. Ils allumèrent donc un feu” (A152.9).

In a second group of examples, the subjunctive reports an action announced by some verbal form other than the imperative, e.g.: *míc táré, nù àmìl dīwsè ìñ èèn-tì, nù dīwsìyò* [that girl, they went out (perfect) to bathe with her friends, (and so) they bathed (subjunctive)] “Jadis, une fille alla se baigner avec ses camarades” (A28.1, *dīwsè* “éclabousser”) • *nù àmìl jòrìyè mīdày, nù jòrìyìy kée, kée, kée* [they went out (perf.) to search men, (and) they searched (subj.) long, long, long] “filles qui avaient quitté leur village pour aller à la recherche des hommes. Elles cherchèrent en vain” (A42.1, *ámìlè* “sortir”) • (I will give you something to eat) *iyá tá bérìi-j mààbìn* [and she gave (subj.) him something] (A150.5, *bérè* “donner”) • (She put her child on the ground,) *tá dīyìi-g kédèr* [(so after) she put (subj.) it on the ground, (she mounted the tree to pick fruits)] (A148.2, *dīyè* “mettre”). The French translation sometimes renders the

subjunctive by means of a subordinated construction. I am not sure whether this is an issue only of the translation language, in which an expected or backgrounded verbal action might be prone to be subordinated, or whether there are independent arguments for justifying the subordination from Dangla itself. Examples: *nàá-ŋ fápè ák gángàr, ńá fápiì-g ák gángàr* [‘I will enclose you within a drum’, and he enclosed (subj.) him within a drum] “‘(...) je vais t’enfermer dans un tambour’. Après l’avoir enfermé (...)” (A100.9, *fápè* “garnir d’une peau un tambour”) • *nàà tàlìn-t jà péélè-ŋ, òyá tá tàlì-cà* [I will / want to first see your penis, and she saw (subj.) it] “je vais d’abord voir ta verge! Après l’avoir vue (...)” (A6.3, *tàlè* “voir”).

In another large group of instances, the subjunctive expresses an action that is not announced as plainly as in the preceding examples. Nevertheless, I suspect that the tense still marks the action as being expected. Just one example for that: (Four animals lived together) *pákinc dǝēt màrtì, rásii-g gámìn-ikù* [the marabou went (on a) visit, (and so) he left (subj.) those folks] “Un jour, le marabout décida d’aller en voyage et laissa les trois compagnons” (A2.2, *rásè* “to leave”). It may be assumed that, when the marabou went away from home, this implies that he had to leave his friends, so the action of “leaving” counts as expected.

Finally, this tense is typically used for the aetiological conclusions presented at the end of several of the stories, possibly because they are to be marked as “expected” from the whole preceding story. This also shows that, even though most instances of the subjunctive in the texts occur in past narrative passages, no past meaning is inherent to this tense. Examples: (At the end of a story in which human bones were burnt by fairies:) *òyá ńú sùkii-g káás-ik ńú ńciyù-gù* [and (so) they collect (subj.) bones, (and) they burn (subj.) them] “C’est pourquoi aujourd’hui, le monde met des os au feu” (A46.11) • *òyá gǝè-k gǎllò ńàà yáá-kò dák ròkii-g sá, kink báày báà-t tá yáá-kò* [and (even) if it is bad people that your mother wants, you go (subj.) to your mother’s bottom] “C’est ainsi que, même si c’est votre mère qui vous propose un vilain garçon en mariage, vous l’acceptez” (A26.17). Another good instance of a subjunctive with a non-past interpretation is the following: (We want to buy your donkey,) *kì ròkii mààgá?* [(so) what do you want (subj.) (in exchange)?] (A100.11, *ròkè* “vouloir”; similarly A76.9).

(§75) **Repetitive.** The tense so called in my article is closely related to the subjunctive, though less frequent. It is formally identical to the subjunctive except for an additional *-g*-infix between the verb stem and the termination *-iyo*. L-verbs: *bìrè* “passer le long de” – *birgiyò* (A100.9) • *ǝmǝ* “manger” – *ǝmgiyò* (A4.8) • *jààwǝ* “marcher” – *jààwgiy* (A64.10, context form); HLL-verbs: *àlè* “pleurer” – *álgiyò* (A70.6) • *dǝēt* “partir” – *dǝētgiyò* (A2.8) • *sáàrè* “chercher” – *sààrgiyò* (A92.22) • *ǝlǝ* “repousser” – *ǝlǝgiy* (A94.25, context form) • *gínè* “faire” – *gìngiy* (A20.6, A104.17, A112.3, A118.23, context forms); H-verbs:

wéǵě “dormir” – *wéǵiyò* (A70.6, I expect **wéǵiyò*) • *déǵě* “puiser” – *déǵiyò* (A88.16). Examples with object clitics do not seem to exist; see §76 below for discussion.

The “repetitive” is thus a subjunctive formed from a verb enlarged by a -g-extension, which appears to add an imperfective nuance to the action. Like the subjunctive, the repetitive seems to include a notion of “expectedness”: *riy di, kà mààmóó? iyá dííd riyǵiyò* [just sing! where are you? and the bird sang (repetitive)] “Chante-moi que je me retrouve. Et celui-ci se met à chanter” (A92.22, *riyè* “chanter”) • *iyá ǵú wáàriy kàtè (...)* *iyá ǵú wáàrgiyò* [and they danced (subjunctive) then (...)] and they danced (repetitive)] “Alors elles se mirent à danser (...) Les autres fées ne cessèrent pas de danser” (A56.12, *wáàrè* “danser”).

The assumption that the repetitive entails an imperfective nuance is supported by passages in which this tense occurs in parallel with the habitual or the progressive tenses: *gèè tàtár dō, gèè òyǵiyò* [people don’t lie, people admit] (A66.13, habitual of *tàtirè* “mentir”, repetitive of *òòyè* “avouer”) • *kòṅk kàw ǵìngiy àṅsi gá?* (A118.24, repetitive of *ǵinè* “faire”) ~ *kòṅk kàw ǵinà àṅsi gá?* (A118.25, progressive of the same verb), for both of which the same translation is given: “Faites-vous comme ça aussi chez-vous?”.

(§75a) **Etymology of the subjunctive and the repetitive.** West Dangla verbs, whatever their tense, do not have any subject agreement. As expected, this is also true of the two tenses terminating in -(g)iyò. But for reasons that will become clear soon, I want to provide full evidence that these tenses indeed combine with any person with no change in form: 1st sg.: *nà báàyò* (imprecisely for **báàyyò*) [and I went] (A22.10); *nà góyǵiy kédèr* [and I put on the ground] (A66.12) • 2nd sg. m.: *kì ròkìy mààgá* [and what do you want?] (A100.11) • 2nd sg. f.: *kà àsiy* [and you came] (A150.5, context form); *kàṅk jààwǵiy* [and you walked] “d’habitude tu partais” (A64.10, context form) • 3rd sg. m.: *ǵá àsiyò* [and he came] (A24.14) • 3rd sg. f.: *tá àsiyò* [and she came] (A76.10); *tá étirǵiyò* [and she moved away] (A152.8) • 1st pl. excl. not attested • 1st pl. incl.: *gèntè àṅk gásǵiy* (context form, I expect **gásǵiy*) [and we here find] (A50.7) • 2nd pl.: *kò àmriyò* [and you reconcile] (A16.11); *kòṅk kàw ǵìngiy àṅsi gá* [and do you do thus?] “Faites-vous comme ça aussi chez-vous?” (A118.24) • 3rd pl.: *ǵú ǵóǵiyò* [and they guarded] (A106.1); *ǵú birǵiyò* [and they passed by] (A100.9) • nominal subject: *yáá-cò pákìyò* [and her mother poured] (A66.13); *gèè ósgiy* [and people tell] “on a l’habitude de dire” (A66.11, context form). The subject may sometimes be omitted by ellipsis, as with any other verbal tense: *áliyò* [and (she) cried] (A64.9).

The subjunctive is a peculiar category of West Dangla that is not found in East Dangla. On the other hand, East Dangla makes very common use of a suffix conjugation which is curiously lacking in West Dangla. This suffix

conjugation employs distinct suffixes for each grammatical person and can be used in various tenses, even though the suffix conjugated perfect is attested best in the available materials. The function of the East Dangla suffix conjugation has been the subject of some discussion. The most detailed analysis to date is by Shay (2008), who comes to conclusions that are rather similar to what I proposed above as the function of the West Dangla subjunctive: “Marking the subject by means of a verbal suffix [= the suffix conjugation, C.P.] indicates that the clause describes an expected state or event, while marking the subject by a preverbal clitic indicates that the clause, or some component of the clause, is unexpected.” (Shay 2008: 90). The East Dangla subject suffixes go as follows (after Ebobissé 1979: 106, 108 and Shay 1999: 126): 1st sg. *-ĩnō*, 2nd sg. m. *-ĩnē*, 2nd sg. f. *-kē(n)*, 3rd sg. m. *-jĩ*, 3rd sg. f. *-tĩ*, 1st pl. excl. *-nĩŋ*, 1st pl. incl. *-yē(n)*, 2nd pl. *-kōŋ*, 3rd pl. *-ĩyō*. In the “present” tense, an element *-gĩ* is frequently inserted, so we get 1st sg. *-gĩnō*, ..., 2nd pl. *-kōŋ*, 3rd pl. *-gĩyō*.

I assume that both categories share a common origin, or more specifically, that the West Dangla *-iyo*- and *-giyo*-tenses derive from a former suffix conjugation of the East Dangla type.⁶ The tense distinctions, which are still more extensive in East Dangla, were reduced to only two in West Dangla, namely the subjunctive in *-iyo* and the repetitive in *-giyo*. Even more so, the distinctions of person were entirely lost in West Dangla, the West Dangla subjunctive/repetitive evidently originating from the earlier 3rd person pl. form. For compensation, it became possible in West Dangla to combine these tenses with subject proclitics. We can speculate that the merger of the personal endings may have proceeded in successive stages, perhaps first confusing phonetically similar suffixes such as *-ĩyō*, *-ĩnō*, *-ĩnē*, *-yē* until the whole paradigm finally collapsed, but it is out of reach to reconstruct the exact history of this process. In East Dangla, a “clause with a subject suffix is affirmative” (Shay 2008: 91). The same can be said of the West Dangla subjunctive/repetitive tenses: They are only attested in affirmative clauses and cannot be negated.

(§76) **Repetitive with object clitics.** As we have seen in the preceding sections, the *-iyo*-tense (“subjunctive”) can be combined with an imperfective stem extension *-g-* to form a *-giyo*-tense (“repetitive”). There is a second context in which a *-g-*marker is well attested, namely before object clitics. I considered these forms as repetitives in §76 of my article but now prefer the view that they are rather instances of the habitual tense (§67). My change of mind is for the following four reasons: (1) By analogy with the subjunctive whose marker *-iyo* contracts to *-ii-* before object clitics, the repetitive marker *-giyo* ought to become

⁶ The development of West Dangla was evidently shared by Central Dangla, for which Burke (1995: §3.6) documents two tenses in *-iyó* and *-giyó* that he calls “progressive past” and “progressive repetitive past” respectively.

*-gii-, which is unattested (we just find -gi-). (2) The verb “to know”, which typically occurs in the habitual tense (§69 above), appears with object clitics as *ibìn-gí-gá* [know him] (A70.7) ~ *ibìn-gí-c* [know her] (A92.23, A94.24), forms that are likely to be habituais too. A similar piece of evidence is provided by the two parallel expressions *kà tàl dō isì* [you don’t look thus] “d’habitude tu n’es pas comme cela” (A20.5, habitual of *tàlè* “voir”) and *kà tàl-gì-n dō isì* [you don’t watch me thus] “d’habitude tu ne me regardes pas de cette façon” (A18.5) in the same text. (3) The form in -gi- is compatible with the general negation *dō*, unlike the -(g)iyo-tenses: *tá tàl-gí-c dō* [she does not see her] (A18.4, similarly A100.10) • *nà ààw-gí-c dō* [I do not feel it] “Je sens le mal à peine” (A86.7, *ààwè* “goûter”). (4) And finally, analogy with the other Dangla dialects. For Central Dangla, Burke (1995: §3.5) states that the habitual marker changes to -gi- whenever an object pronoun is added: “the normal marker of the Habitual form is replaced by the suffix -gi (or -ig)”. In East Dangla, at least verbs of certain root classes add a -gi-increment to the habitual (“present tense”) when object clitics follow (Ebobissé 1979: 94f.; Shay 1999: 207).

I thus assume that verbs in the habitual tense, at least in many cases, insert a stem extension -g(i)- before object clitics. More examples with a direct object clitic: *gém gìn-gì-cì sèllè, kìnk gìn-gì-g sèllè* [a person treats you well, you treat him well] “Celui qui vous fait du bien, vous lui faites du bien” (A114.11, *gínè* “faire”) • (Ainsi, lorsqu’ils vont construire la maison du chef des oiseaux,) *ńáár dèl-gì-c* [he beats it] “c’est l’outarde qui frappe le tambour” (A154.6, *dèlè* “frapper”). Examples with an indirect object clitic: *tá káàw-gì-t* [she says to her] (A62.5, *káàwè* “parler”) • *ńá imìl-gì-t* [he brings to her] (A156.11, *imìlè* “faire sortir”). It can be observed that there may be a H tone towards the end of the word, but not consistently so; this issue would require further research (cf. also §46 above). But the g-infix is perhaps not fully obligatory since a few attestations of non-incremented habituais with object clitics also seem to be demonstrable (§§46, 47 of my article).

(§79) **Special verbs.** The imperative of the irregular verb *báàwè* “aller” may or may not append a root extension -g/-k of unclear function. So we get for the sg.: *báá* (A74.5, A86.7, A88.16) ~ *báák* (A28.4); for the pl.: *báàwò* (see §71 above, no example with extension), for the singular-based hortative: *bág-tè* (A8.5, no example without extension). Both varieties are attested for the plural-based hortative, in the following passage even side by side in the same context: *bágín-tè gèè báàn-tè bàriyín-c áwgi* [let’s go, folks, let’s go to search the goats] “Camarades, allons chercher les chèvres” (A106.3). The subjunctive (§74) of *báàwè* is *báàyyò* (A50.4, A62.6, A70.6, A72.2) rather than the theoretically expected **báàwiyò*.

The defective verb *àn* “to say” is extremely frequent in the texts, in fact the most frequent of all verbs. It can be used in a predicative function like

a proper verb, but is defective in three respects: (1) It occurs almost exclusively in the form *àn*, in the texts mainly with past reference. The infinitive and most other morphological forms are obsolete. (2) It never combines with subject proclitics; the subject is usually implicit and must be inferred from the context, only a noun or an independent pronoun may precede: *kàñ àn* [the dog said] (A2.7) • *nyúur àn* [they said] (A2.9). (3) Nor can any object clitics or the past marker *-tì* (§80) be attached.

Further, *àn* tends to be grammaticalized as a complementizer after various verbs of saying: *tá díy àn* [she said that] “La femme dit:” (A10.7) • *tá kòlì-g àn ásò* [she called them saying: come!] “elles les appela” (A56.14) • *éèn-tì wàrii-c àn* “ses camarades l’insultent en lui disant” (A22.11), and also after certain other verbs: *nà gìnà kòlàw àn* “j’avais eu peur que” (A84.5) • *ròkà dō àn* [does not want to] (A126 title). Furthermore, a clause introduced by *àn* can operate as a clause of purpose: (elle prit les calebasses) *àn tá báá tóòyín-c-ík* “pour les récupérer”, lit. [saying she is going to scour them] (A90.16).

As the only other form of this verb, Fédry’s dictionary (D10) documents a form *àná*, translated as “je dis que”, “il dit”, and “paraît-il”. He suggests that this is essentially the same word, the more frequent *àn* just being the corresponding context form. In the texts, *àná* is found several times as the very first word of a story (A14.1, A18.1, A42.1, A48.1 etc.), left without any translation; I assume that it here means “(they) say:”.

(§80) **The past marker -tì.** The narrative function of this suffix is well illustrated by the following passage: *tàc-cò mât-tì* (...) *báá díyit dūk Kórmó àn tàc-cò mâtè* [her father died (with -tì). (Next morning, a girl was sent:) Go and tell Kormo that her father has died (without -tì)] “le père de la fille mourut. Le matin, on envoya le plus petit de la famille pour aller appeler Kormo.” (A138.21).

(§82) **Future.** The complete paradigm of the subject proclitics contracted with the future auxiliary *yàà* can now be provided: 1st sg. *nàà* (A38.2), 2nd sg. m. *kii* (A110.8), 2nd sg. f. *kàà* (A88.14), 3rd sg. m. *ḡàà* (A20.8), 3rd sg. f. *tàà* (A152.10), 1st pl. excl. *nii* (A24.12), 1st pl. incl. *gèè* (A102.12), 2nd pl. *kòò* (A2.2), 3rd sg. pl. *nyùù* (A154.2). I also spotted an uncontracted *nà yàà* [I will] (A130.8).

The future tense frequently has a modal reading rather than a purely temporal one, as e.g. in *nòn tábrì-g àn ḡàà dǎàḡè idàm* [I sent him saying he.FUT cut hay] “je lui ai dit simplement de couper l’herbe” (A100.7).

(§83) **Object clitics in periphrastic constructions.** In my article, the 1st sg. and 3rd sg. m. of the post-auxiliary object clitics were given as *-t* and *-c*, respectively. However, the texts prefer spellings with the voiced symbols *-d*

and -j, e.g.: *yàá-d kòòcìn-dú* “(ma mère) va me rosser” (A28.2, *kòòcè* “frapper”) • *kàá-j òòyè* [you.F shall greet him] (A34.10, *òòyè* + indirect object “saluer”). This probably better represents the phonemes, even though the distinction of voice presumably tends to be blurred in this context. The full series should therefore be restated as follows: 1st sg. -d, 2nd sg. m. -j, 2nd sg. f. -k, 3rd sg. m. -j, 3rd sg. f. -t, 1st pl. excl. -ni, 1st pl. incl. -te, 2nd pl. -ko, 3rd pl. -co.

While the future tense remains the major context of use of these clitics, the texts also contain examples of the clitics being attached to other auxiliaries such as *ròkè* “vouloir”: *kà ròkii-d cààcè gá* “peut-être veux-tu me dire” (A20.5, *cààcè* “redire”) • *já ròkii-t kò òòyè* [he already wanted to greet her] “le garçon voulait déjà sortir pour la saluer” (A120.29, *òòyè* “saluer”); see also end of §88 below.

(§86) **Quantifier “all”.** The texts confirm the tone pattern HL of the quantifier *kâw-* and show that also singular possessive suffixes can be attached, e.g.: *kâw-kò* “vous toutes” (A54.12) • *ámáy kâw-cò* “toute cette eau” (A88.15) • *iyá jú mómbiì-g kâw-jì* [and they ate it all] (A100.7) • *kàà icìn-t kâw-titi* [you shall take it all] “(Ne t’ai-je pourtant pas dit) de prendre tout ce qu’il y a” (A84.5).

Alongside this quantifier, one could have discussed a few other grammaticalized nominals that have a comparable syntax, all of them requiring a subsequent possessive suffix. These are, in particular, (1) *kèè-* “alone”, of which Fédry’s dictionary (D280) cites *kèè-dù* “moi seul”, *kèè-jì* “toi seul”, *kèè-cò* “eux seuls” and to which the texts supply the form *kèè-titi* [she alone] (A152.8), (2) a less frequent alternative of this *rásinè-r* [I alone], *rásinè-j* [you alone], etc. (D345, A82.19), and (3) *mèèn-* (sg.) ~ *màníí-* (pl.) “self”, which Fédry (D127) cites as *mèèn-dú* “moi-même”, *mèèn-jí* “toi-même (m.)”, *mèèn-ké* “toi-même (f.)” in the singular and *màniì-nì* “nous-mêmes excl.”, *màniì-tè* “nous-mêmes incl.”, *màniì-kò* “vous-mêmes”, *màniì-cò* “eux-mêmes” in the plural. The 3rd sg. m. must evidently be **mèèn-jí*, attested only as the context form *mèèn-j* (A30.5, A42.2, A150.6). A surprising variety of irregular forms is found for the 3rd sg. f. “elle-même”: *mòn-ti* (D127) ~ *mòòn-ti* (A94.25, A96.26) ~ *mònòy* (D127) ~ *mòònòy* (A14.2).

(§88) **Negation.** The negation of the imperative (= prohibitive) was only passed by within my §72, where I cited a pattern *dāk* + optative + *dò* for which Fédry had provided a number of examples. This construction does occur in the texts, though not frequently: *dāk óbé dò kò mítà* [don’t take a man!] “ne te remarie pas” (A126.2, *dāk* with unexpected tone) • *dāk kó tèè dò ándé* [do not eat the soup!] (A40.7, evident misspelling of the plural form *dākó*) • *dākin-tè nààmìn dò pèy* “ne l’envoyons plus” (A22.8), the verb here stands for *nààmìn-t(i)* [to send her]. The first element appears to be, originally, the imperative

or hortative of some verb, most probably *dākè* “empêcher de sortir, laisser la place à quelqu’un” (D202).

However, the more usual prohibitive construction in the texts is another one, consisting of (1) the particle *āk* ~ *dūk* (exactly like the dative preposition, see §25 above) + (2) the infinitive + (3) the general negation *dō*, e.g.: *āk gínè dō* “ne fais pas” (A114.9) • *āk sêê dō* “ne bois pas” (A116.14) • *āk báà dō* “n’y vas pas” (A48.3, A86.7; cf. §79) • *āk góyè dō* “ne t’asseois pas” (A90.16) • *dūk álè dō* “ne pleure pas” (A32.6) • *dūk àwìyè dō* (A32.8) ~ *āk àwìyè dō* (A34.8) “ne fais pas de bruit” (as free variants in the same text). There is an example in which the initial particle carries an indirect object clitic: *āk-tì òòyè dō* [don’t greet her!] “ne salue pas notre mère” (A114.9, A120.28).

(§89) **Questions.** Though perhaps a matter of style rather than grammar, I wish to mention here the popular use in West Dangla of a double question where both the positive and the negative alternative are spelled out, e.g.: *kà dáát gá, kà dáát dō gá* [are you my wife?, aren’t you my wife?] “accepteras-tu de m’épouser?” (A28.4) • *nà báá zúgàr gá, nà báá dō gá* [I go into the house?, I don’t go?] “Je vais dans la maison ou bien n’y vais-je point?” (A58.4) • *yáà-nì nèèwà gá, kóó gá* [my mother was pregnant?, (or) not?] (A98.3).

Overview of the verbal system. The following table is an attempt at a structured overview of the West Dangla verbal system with references to my paragraphs. I suggest a 3×3 matrix and an underlying binary opposition of aspects. I choose *pilè* “ouvrir” as the example verb; the asterisk * indicates that the form is unattested for this particular lexeme.

	infinitive	perfective	imperfective
base stem	<i>pilè(n)</i> “infinitive” (§58, §59)	<i>pilè</i> “perfect” (§60)	<i>pilá</i> “habitual” (§67), before clitics * <i>pil-g-</i> (§76 above)
progressive stem	<i>piláw</i> “progressive (with infinitive value)” (§64)	<i>piláw</i> “progressive” (§64)	perhaps <i>pil-g-ùwè</i> (only a single attestation, see §75)
former suffix conjugation	–	<i>pil-iyò</i> “subjunctive” (§74)	<i>pil-g-iyò</i> “repetitive” (§75)

Moreover, there are four forms that fall out of the matrix: *pilù* “imperative” (§70), **pilò(n)* “plural imperative” (§71), *pilé* “optative” (§72), *pilá* “supine” (§73).

I will now add a few additional paragraphs based on materials drawn from the texts. Needless to say, there are a lot more interesting syntactic issues in the language that would be worth investigating but cannot be treated here.

Word order. While the regular constituent order of a clause is S–V(–O), the order V–S is sporadically attested with intransitive verbs or verbs treated as intransitives, e.g.: *pìis nòn mēlmà* [remain I witch] “il ne reste plus que moi, qui suis une sorcière” (A44.5, *pìisè* “rester”) • *iyá ámil-tì géèm táà ód-tì kààdāy* [and came out a woman whose eye is one] “il en sortit de l’œuf une fille qui a un œil” (A122.34, *ámilè* “sortir”) • *gín-tì ménà* [there were days] “Quelques jours après, ...” (A12.13, *gínè* “faire, avoir, exister”).

Coordination. Three different coordinators are used in the language. The preposition *iy* “with” coordinates noun phrases (see §25 of my article). When more than two elements are coordinated, the marker appears between the last two as in European languages: *góllà, tàmgá iy diúyù* “L’orphelin, le bétail et l’hyène” (A106 title).

The conjunction *iyá* is used for clause coordination, usually implying a temporal or logical sequence “and then”, “and so”: (A husband and wife were eating) *iyá ná díy-tì⁷ àn* [and then he said to her] “Peu après, il demanda à Kormo” (A134.7) • *tá súkì-tìt jérgé ák bútkìnèr iyá tá èèm-tì* [she₁ brought her₂ peanuts in a shovel, and she₂ ate] “la fille lui servit des arachides dans un petit van et elle se mit à manger” (A94.25) • (formula at the end of a story:) *iyá báà-t gáàsè* [and so its bottom has been reached = and so it is finished] “Fin de conte” (A146.11).

A third coordinator *òò* also coordinates clauses, or more rarely phrases, but with no implication of a temporal succession: *kókàr às-tì ák wèèr-có gèèr òò zòpùl dǽèt-tì ák wèèr-tì yèèr* [the chickens came to their place in the village, and the guinea fowl went to her place in the bush] “le bruit fit revenir les poules à la maison et les pintades repartirent en brousse” (A116.19) • *nòn yàà mómbe dóòy ká pìsòr, òò dàndò-r yàà mómbe dóòy ká àwgìr* [I will eat excrements of the horse, and my co-wife will eat excrements of the goats] (A100.7) • *iy mìt-tì-ikà òò iy sítì-tì* [with her husband and with her brothers] (A142.27).

Plural pronoun construction. When a logically singular subject is complemented by a phrase with *iy* “with”, the subject may be spelled out as a plural form: *míc táré, nú ámil díwsè iy èèn-tì* [that girl, “they” went to bathe with her friends] “Jadis, une fille alla se baigner avec ses camarades” (A28.1, beginning of a story) • (A boy urges his mother: Don’t re-marry,) *gèè góyè iy nòn dī* [we will stay with me only] “nous allons vivre à deux seulement” (A126.2), the closest English rendering of which would be “you should stay with me only”. This resembles the so-called “plural pronoun construction” of Russian and other languages. Cf. in this context also the term of address *ròy-tè* “mon ami” (A102.14), lit. [our.INCL friend].

⁷ I expect *díy-tìt.

Verbs of movement as auxiliaries. Two verbs of movement, *báàwè* “aller” and *àsè* “venir”, also serve as auxiliaries. This usage is exceedingly frequent in the texts and deserves a discussion in some detail. Two major syntagms need to be distinguished: verb of movement + infinitive and verb of movement + supine.

(1) Verb of movement + infinitive. When *báàwè* or *àsè* is followed by an infinitive, the infinitive expresses an event that is posterior or intentional with respect to the movement verb. As for the movement verb, *báàwè* occurs more frequently than *àsè*, and it takes the shorter form without *-w-* in this syntagm (cf. §79). This formation competes with the future tense formed from the auxiliary *yàà* + infinitive (§82), but with two differences. First, a notion of movement is added. Second, the movement verb may itself take any tense, so that the entire combination is able to express nested tenses such as a future in the past or a future in the future.

I begin with examples where the movement verb takes the form *bá(á)*, which is either the progressive or the habitual form of *báàwè*, these two being formally indistinguishable. In this case, the time reference is that of a plain future tense: *nà báá màtè zúgí-tù* [I am going to die in my house] “je préfère encore aller mourir chez-moi” (A14.3, *màtè* “mourir”) • *gèè báá wààrè* [the people are going to dance] (A144.3, *wààrè* “danser”) • *nà báá gínè kásìk íy mààgá* [with what am I going to do business?] “avec quoi vais-je faire le marché?” (A82.18, *gínè* “faire”). The following is an example with the progressive tense of *àsè*: *kà àsà góyè ànnè* [you are coming to stay here] “tu viendras vivre ici parmi nous” (A54.11, *góyè* “s’asseoir”).

When the movement verb takes a perfect form, the whole construction expresses a future or intention in the past: *tá báá góǝǝ* [she went to heed (the animals)] (A60.2, *góǝǝ* “garder”). Or, the movement verb may take a future or imperative form: *kár nàà báá góǝǝ* [then I will go to heed (the animals)] (A60.2) • *gèè báàn-tè dǝǝnè kùymó* [let’s go to reap straw] “nous irons en brousse couper de la paille” (A116.18, *dǝǝnè* “tirer”). Finally, the movement verb may take a subjunctive form: *há báày gàsìn-jí* [and he went to find him] (A106.4).

When a pronominal object is added, the construction is the same as for the future tense formed with *yàà* (§83). That is to say, pronominal direct objects, those of the 3rd person in particular, may be expressed by a possessive suffix on the infinitive: *gè báàn-tè tàlìn-tì* [let’s go to see her] (A44.7, *tàlè* “voir”) • *gèè báá indìn-tì* [we are going to ask her] “nous allons lui demander” (A144.5, *indè* “demander”) • *gèè báá indìn-j tǎn-nì* [we are going to ask my father] “allons ensemble demander l’avis de mon père” (A144.7) • *nà às kàpiyìn-jí* [I’ve come to pay it] (A122.33, *kàpiyè* “payer”) • *kì báá tàlìn-c kùp yáà-nì* [you are going to see those of my mother?] “tu veux aller visiter ma famille?” (A36.12, *tàlè* “voir”).

Second, the post-auxiliary object clitics can be attached to the movement verb in order to express an indirect object or (not with 3rd persons) a direct object (§83). Most available examples involve the progressive form of *báàwè* and then show a HL tone contour: *kì báà-t zúgé* [you are going to discharge (this load) for me] “viens m’aider à décharger ce panier” (A48.3, A148.4, *zúgé* “poser à terre”) • *nà báà-k sùkè* [I am going to assemble for you.F] “je vais te servir” (A52.10, *sùkè* “ramasser”) • *kì báà-nì gáàrè wèèr-tì* [you are going to show us her place] (A32.7, *gáàrè* “montrer”). The following instance has a progressive form of *ásè*: *àn kì ásíi-d léèsè* [(I was afraid) that you were coming to punish me] “que tu viennes me battre” (A84.5, *léèsè* “faire des remontrances”). There are also examples with a post-auxiliary clitic and a possessor on the infinitive at the same time: *nà báà-k náàmìn-ké* [I am going to accompany you.F] “je vais te conduire” (A94.24, *náàmè* “raccompagner”) • *kì báà-d kàpiyìn-jí* [you are going to pay it to me] “tu vas me le payer” (A112.2, *kàpiyè* “payer”).

(2) Verb of movement + supine. This is another important construction which is very much employed in the narratives of the text volume. It may again be built upon either of the two movement verbs *báàwè* “aller” and *ásè* “venir”. Conversely, this is the only context in which the supine (§73) is used. Unlike the infinitive, the supine does not contribute any temporal or modal value to the entire construction, but the temporal interpretation is provided by the tense of the movement verb alone. The difference as against using the simple tenses lies in the fact that a notion of movement is added. The supine paraphrasis is typically used with verbs that are not verbs of movement themselves, but which are thought of as involving a movement in the given context. One verb that frequently enters this construction is *gásè* “obtenir” [to find]. An expression such as *há báà gàs (...)* might be paraphrased as “he went and found ...” or “he, while being on the way, found ...” and implies that the person was moving around when he found something. Nevertheless, the plain translation “he found” without any explicit expression of movement often appears to be the best idiomatic translation into English. There is a major functional difference from the preceding construction: The supine paraphrasis implies that the person indeed found something, whereas the infinitive paraphrasis (*há báà gásè* “he went to find”) only reports the intention to act but does not state that the action was accomplished.

This brings the supine paraphrasis functionally very close to the simple verb. The following parallel passages both including and lacking the verb of movement demonstrate that the movement verb only makes a very slight contribution to the overall meaning of the clause: *tá báà-c díy ká bóórí, yáà tá diyì-c ká bóórí ...* [She went and put her into a net (supine paraphrasis). When she (had) put her into the net ... (perfect of the simple verb)] (A90.19) • *kì gási-g áwíg*

mààmóó? – nà báà-g gās gèèr ká dùúyùr [You found the goats where? – I went and found them in the home of the hyenas] (A110.9). In practically identical contexts, we find *tàc-cò mât-tì* [their father died] (A138.21) with the perfect tense and *yáá-cò bàà màtà* [their mother went and died] (A140.24) with the supine paraphrasis.

I will put the movement verb in brackets in my English glosses below. The French translations often attempt to render the notion of movement by combining a French movement verb with the infinitive of the primary verb, which unfortunately blurs the clear functional contrast as against the infinitive paraphrasis. Anyway, the contexts usually make it clear that the actions really took place and were not just intended. The difference between *báàwè* and *ásè* probably lies in the deictic orientation of the movement, but this is hard to prove from the texts. Again, as in the infinitive paraphrasis, *báàwè* is more frequent than *ásè*.

Owing to the narrative character of the texts, most examples are with the movement verb in the perfect tense: (Come and sit down on the mat!) *ìyá ñá báà gōy ká àrgàr* [And he (went and) sat down on the mat.] (He then in fact fell into a pit that was hidden below that mat.); less felicitous the French translation: “il vint pour s’asseoir” (A36.13, *gōyè* “s’asseoir”) • (A boy was sent to acquire a decorated mat.) *ñá báà gās gèè kùrè* [He (went and) found those people (that had such a mat, but they gave him an undecorated one).] “l’enfant ... alla trouver les possesseurs de la natte” (A70.6) • *máárit às pàyà* [travellers (came and) descended (into the village)] “des étrangers arrivèrent dans le village” (A4.4, *pàyà* “descendre”). The verb of movement may take the past marker *-tì* (§80) if there are no object clitics involved: *ñú báà-t gās gém ñàà (...)* [they (went and) found a man who (...)] “elles trouvèrent un homme qui (...)” (A42.2; similarly A92.23, A100.11, A112.3) • *ñá àsì-t sàà ámá* [he (came and) drank the water] (A84.5, *sèè* “boire”). But the verb of movement may also appear in the subjunctive: *àsì-c kàt ùnác zùgàr* [(she) (came and) entered her into the house] “la fille introduisit sa mère dans sa case” (A32.8).

The expression of pronominal objects is very different from the infinitive paraphrasis. No object clitics can be attached to the supine form. All clitics attach to the verb of movement instead, even though they belong to the other verb semantically. The regular object clitics (§§45–47) must be utilized rather than the post-auxiliary clitics of the infinitive paraphrasis. Direct and indirect objects therefore remain distinct for most persons. Most examples are with 3rd person direct objects, where the clitics are *-g* (masc. sg.; pl.) and *-c* (fem. sg.): *kààdā-át báà-g tàlà* [one.F (went and) saw him] “l’une d’entre elles vit le garçon” (A112.7, *tàlè* “voir”, similarly A120.27) • *ìyá ñá báà-g dōyàs* [and he (went and) touched it] “et il alla le toucher” (A106.2, *dōsèè* “frapper”) • *ñá báà-c kàràs* [he (went and) threw her down] “le béliet la fit tomber” (A108.7,

kàrsè “jeter à terre”) • *tá báà-c tiyàs yáá-cò* [she (went and) buried her mother] “elle alla avec les autres enterrer sa maman” (A142.27, *tùsè* “enterrer”) • *nà báà-g gās gèèr ká diúyùr* [(where did you find them? –) I (went and) found them in the home of the hyenas] “je suis allé les trouver dans la demeure des hyènes” (A110.9). An example with an indirect object: *tá báà-cò làá ámáý* [(she prepared a meal for herself and her husband,) she (went and) brought water for them] “elle partit puiser de l’eau” (A8.6, *léè* “mettre”). As with regular verbs, indirect and direct object clitics can occur simultaneously in this order (§49): *há báà-tù-g iyà* [he (went and) brought her it (= water, pl.)] (A126.3, *iyè* “apporter”).

(3) Verb of movement + subjunctive. Instead of the supine, I also find the subjunctive, apparently in a very similar function. All examples contain object clitics. I suspect that this may be just another option of expressing the object clitics, since these cannot be attached directly to the supine: *iyá tá báà-t gási-c míc-ítà* “(La femme sortit alors à la recherche de sa fille.) Elle alla la trouver [better: she found her daughter] (et lui demanda ...)” (A22.10, *gásè* “obtenir”, similarly A140.22) • *há ás-ít dǎǎsù-g* [he (came and) hit him] (A24.15, *dǎǎsè* “frapper”) • *báà iyì-gà gèèr* “(l’enfant) l’emmena à la maison” (A16.9, *iyè* “apporter”). With double expression of the object clitic: *iyá tá báà-g kòlì-g gáárfi* “elle s’en alla appeler l’éléphant” (A14.4, *kòlè* “appeler”) • *ájùùsìnc báà-c únjì-c* [the old woman (went and) put her in] (A18.4, *únjé* “entrer”).

(4) Parallel (serial verb) construction. Finally, there are a few cases in which a verb of movement is followed by another verb in the same tense. My examples are with both of them either being in the progressive, or in the perfect tense with the past marker *-tì*. I cannot tell what the precise function of this combination is nor to which degree it should be regarded as grammaticalized. Progressive: *tá báà gèémí-cà àn* [she (went and) approached her saying (...)] “peu après elle va encore lui demander” (A50.4) • *báà gáàrí-j dūk tàc-cò* [he (went and) showed his father] “(l’enfant alla donc trouver son père) et lui montra” (A148.4, *gáàrè* “montrer”) • *há pàà-y-tì, báà gási-gá, àn* [he descended, he (went and) found him, and (the other one) said] “L’enfant descendit, et comme il allait vers l’homme, celui-ci lui demanda” (A16.8, *gásè* “obtenir”). Perfect with *-tì*: *tá báà-t únjì-tì* (...) *iyá tá ási-t wéè-tì* [she (went and) entered (...) and she (came and) gave birth] “elle (...) y entra, et peu après, accoucha d’un enfant” (A14.2, *únjé* “entrer”, *wéè* “accoucher”) • *há báà-t dǎkìpì-t ámáý* [he (went and) drew water] “le garçon alla chercher de l’eau” (A26.15, *dǎkìpè* “puiser”).

References

- Akouya, Daye. 1983. *Contes dangaléat (Tyalo Idéba)*, avec la collaboration de Jacques Fédry, Sarh: Collège Charles Lwanga⁸ (= A).
- Burke, Lawrence R. 1995. *An introduction to the verbal system of Central Dangaleat*. Master of Arts thesis, University of North Dakota⁹.
- Ebobissé, Carl. 1979. *Die Morphologie des Verbs im Ost-Dangaleat (Guera, Tschad)*, Berlin: Reimer.
- Fédry, Jacques. 1971a. avec la collaboration de Jonas Khamis & Moussa Nedjei: *Dictionnaire dangaléat (Tchad)*. Thèse de 3ème cycle, Lyon: Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales (= D).
- 1971b. *Phonologie du dangaléat (Tchad)*. Thèse de 3ème cycle, Lyon: Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales.
- 1974. *pátò à l'Est, pátò à l'Ouest, ou l'énigme tonale des parlers dangaléat (Tchad)*, hand-out at XIème Congrès de la Société Linguistique de l'Afrique Occidentale, Yaounde 5th April 1974 (26 pages)¹⁰.
- 1977. Aperçu sur la phonologie et la tonologie de quatre langues du groupe «Mubi-Karbo» (Guera) (dangaléat-est, dangaléat-ouest, bidiyo, dyongor)", in Caprile, Jean-Pierre (ed.): *Études phonologiques tchadiennes*, Paris: SELAF, 87–112.
- 1990. Verbes monosyllabyques[sic] en Dangaléat, in Jungraithmayr, Herrmann & Tourneux, Henry (eds.): *Études tchadiques: verbes monoradicaux*, Paris: Geuthner, 9–13.
- 2010. *Anthropologie de la parole en Afrique*, Paris: Karthala.
- Lovestrand, Joseph. 2015. *From indirect object suffix to hortative suffix in four Chadic languages of the Guera*, hand-out at the 2nd Linguistics Research Student Conference, SOAS, 15th May 2015¹¹.
- de Montgolfier, Paul et al. [1976]. *Dictionnaire dangaléat (parler de l'est)*, Sarh: Collège Charles Lwanga.
- Peust, Carsten. 2014. A morphological sketch of West Dangla (Chad), *Folia Orientalia* 51: 201–255.
- Shay, Erin. 1999. *A grammar of East Dangla: The simple sentence*. PhD thesis University of Colorado.
- 2008. Coding the unexpected. Subject pronouns in East Dangla, in Frajzyngier, Zygmunt & Shay, Erin (eds.): *Interaction of Morphology and Syntax. Case studies in Afroasiatic*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 85–105.

⁸ Unpublished. I was able to access a copy held at Tozzer Library, Harvard University.

⁹ Unpublished. I am grateful to the author who shared a PDF file of his thesis with me.

¹⁰ Unpublished, on stock in the University Library Leiden, shelfmark Or. 26.692.

¹¹ Available on <http://www.academia.edu>.