

DOI: 10.2478/linpo-2013-0001

ARTICLES

NOMINAL *KAD* FORM IN BASSE MANDINKA – ITS COGNITIVE MAPPING AND TAXONOMICAL STATUS (PART 1)

ALEXANDER ANDRASON

ABSTRACT: Alexander Andrason. *Nominal KAD Form in Basse Mandinka – Its Cognitive Mapping and Taxonomical Status (Part 1)*. *Lingua Posnaniensis*, vol. LV (1)/2013. The Poznań Society for the Advancement of the Arts and Sciences. PL ISSN 0079-4740, ISBN 978-83-7654-273-7, pp. 7–19.

Purpose: The present study, divided into a series of two papers, provides a detailed empirical description and cognitive-grammaticalization analysis of the meaning of a Mandinka verbal expression compounded of the non-verbal predicator *be* ‘be’, a verbal noun expressing a given action and the postposition *kaj* ‘on, at’ (so-called the Nominal KAD form).

Method: The author follows the cognitive approach to verbal semantics which consists first of determining the exact range of contextually induced senses and next of unifying such values into a consistent map based upon certain diachronic universals or grammaticalization paths.

Results: The synchronic inventory of senses of the Nominal KAD form (i.e. progressive, continuous, progressive-iterative, iterative, habitual and durative values) shows that this construction can be mapped using the imperfective path as a template of chaining. This mapping, hypothesized on the ground of synchronic semantic evidence and typological diachronic laws, is next corroborated by the structural properties of the Nominal KAD locution, especially by its locative and nominal character.

Conclusion: All the evidence enables the author to semantically define the NomKAD form as a non-advanced imperfective path.

Part 1: In the first article of the series, the author deals with methodological issues and with an empirical study where he determines the precise extent of the semantic potential of the Nominal KAD form.

Alexander Andrason, University of Stellenbosch, South Africa, aleksand@hi.is

1. INTRODUCTION

The present study (which due to its extensiveness has been divided into two articles) aims at providing a detailed description and cognitive-grammaticalization analysis of the semantic properties of a verbal periphrasis commonly found in the Mandinka language. This construction is composed of the non-verbal predicator *be* ‘be’ (in the negative *te* ‘not be’), a verbal noun expressing a given action and the postposition *kaj* ‘on, at’ (see example 1.a, below). In order to avoid any connotation with the meaning of this formation – which, as will be demonstrated, is highly polysemous –, we will employ a denomination that makes an exclusive reference to its structure, the Nominal KAD locution or, in an abbreviated version, NomKAD. As will be evident from a subsequent discussion, the notion ‘nominal’ in our label makes an obvious reference to the *original* nominal character of the entity, which conveys the sense of an activity, i.e. to the

verbal noun (for instance, *pasiroo* ‘ironing’ in example 1.a). Besides examples such as that in 1.a, the construction also appears with entities which in the English translation may be rendered as “direct objects”.¹ In such cases, it can be found in three morphosyntactic varieties (cf. 1.b-d).²

- (1a) M baamaa **be paasiroo kaŋ**³
 my mother be ironing at
 ‘My mother is ironing’⁴
- (1b) M baamaa **be dendikoo paasiroo kaŋ**
 my mother be shirt ironing at
 ‘My mother is ironing the shirt’
- (1c) M baamaa **be dendikopaasiroo kaŋ**
 my mother be shirt-ironing at
 ‘My mother is busy with ironing shirts’ (lit. ‘she is at shirt-ironing’)
- (1d) M baamaa **be dendikoo la paasiroo kaŋ**
 my mother be shirt of ironing at
 ‘My mother is busy with the ironing of my shirt’

A description and, especially, an analysis of the semantic attributes – and related to them, morphosyntactic properties – of the NomKAD construction are absent in almost all studies devoted to the Mandinka language (cf. MACBRAIR 1842; HAMLYN 1935; ROWLANDS 1959; GAMBLE 1987; LÜCK & HENDERSON 1993; WILSON 2000; WEC 2002; DRAMÉ 2003). Uniquely CREISSELS (1983) discusses the NomKAD periphrasis. First, as to its meaning, this author defines the construction as a typologically common progressive category, e.g. *A be domoroo kaŋ* ‘He is eating’. More specifically, in his view, the gram regularly conveys ongoing or actual actions at a given reference time. Second, in respect to morphosyntactic features, Creissels classifies the formation as a nominal locative periphrasis built on verbal nouns – the entity that expresses the action being in progress is invariably a nominal one. In his book, however, Creissels limits the discussion to two classes of sentences: a) those that only include verbal nouns (cf. 1.a, above) and b) those where bare stems of the noun are employed (see, example 1.c, above) instead of the definite (singular in *-(o)o* or plural in *-(o)olu*) forms (see, examples 1.b and 1.d, above). In the examples with bare-stem nouns, the entire complex formed by a noun (*dutu*) and a verbal noun (*domoroo*) constitutes a compound noun. Inversely, the analysis of cases where definite forms and pronouns are used – relatively common in our database – is missing (cf. example 1.b).⁵

¹ On the functional status of these “objects” see section 3.1, in part two.

² For a detailed discussion of differences in the structure of these three varieties, see section 3.2 in the second part of the article.

³ The relevant Mandinka forms in the NomKAD construction will be given in bold type.

⁴ The author employs the rules of orthography that have been established for Gambian Mandinka in *A Practical Orthography of Gambian Mandinka* (cf. WEC 1988a). It shall be noted that this official spelling convention – commonly employed in grammatical studies (LÜCK & HENDERSON 1993; COLLEY 1995; WEC 2002; see also GAMBLE 1988), dictionaries (WEC 1988b, 1995 and PEACE CORPS 1995) and scientific articles (cf. WILSON 2000) – does not indicate the tone (only two words are marked with a tonal diacritic, i.e. the pronouns *n̄* ‘we’ and *i* ‘they’ in order to differentiate them from *n* ‘I’ and *i* ‘you’).

⁵ It should be noted that linguists have thus far focused on another form built on the auxiliary *be* and the postposition *kaŋ* – an analytical expression which instead of the verbal noun employs a bare stem of the verb:

The present study aspires to rectify the above-mentioned deficiency in the grammatical analysis of the Mandinka tongue, providing a detailed description and explanation of the semantic potential of the Nominal KAD construction, as well as its most salient morpho-syntactic characteristics. In other words, the paper will show and explain all possible uses in which different semantic – and functional – properties of this formation are activated.

It should be observed that the evidence introduced in this article corresponds to a regional variety of the Mandinka language spoken in the capital city of the Upper River Region, Basse, and in neighboring villages. Henceforth, this area-bounded vernacular will be referred to as Basse Mandinka in order to differentiate it from Standard Gambian Mandinka – a relatively normalized language which is used in dictionaries and wordlists (e.g. WEC 1988b, 1995), in grammars and learning manuals (e.g. GAMBLE 1987; WEC 1988a, 2002; LÜCK & HENDERSON 1993; COLLEY 1995), in literary texts (especially, in translations of several positions in the Christian and Muslim religious literature, e.g. WEC 1989, 1998; IIP 1988) and in texts released in the Internet (e.g. www.mandinka.org). Basse Mandinka, although profoundly similar to the normalized language, does in fact display certain peculiarities. Due to the limitations imposed by the cannon of a possible extension of academic papers and by a specific topic of the present study, we cannot discuss the dialectological situation of Mandinka spoken in the Upper River Region in depth. For a comprehensive treatment of the differences between Standard Gambian Mandinka and the vernacular employed in Basse, see ANDRASON (2013: 11–12).⁶

A M baamaa **be** dendikoo **paasi kaŋ**
 my mother be shirt iron at
 ‘My mother is ironing the shirt’

This locution has received more – although still limited – attention of scholars, being regarded as one of the core verbal grams in the Mandinka verbal system. Traditionally, the formation has been defined as a prototypical progressive (cf. CREISSELS 1983; DRAMÉ 2003; COLLEY 1995: 8, 14) or continuous category (cf. LÜCK & HENDERSON 1993; WEC 1995: 77, 2002: 16–7). In a more thorough study, ANDRASON (2012a) proposes various refinements in the classification of the gram as a progressive aspect. Namely, he observes that the progressive value is restricted to the present and past temporal spheres – inversely the gram cannot be employed with the force of a future progressive. The progressive meaning may be portrayed as frequentative, without however triggering habitual or customary uses. Furthermore, adjectival verbs (as well as various static predicates of cognition and emotions, e.g. *a loŋ* ‘know’; on static/adjectival verbs see ANDRASON 2012a; see also CREISSELS 1983 and LÜCK & HENDERSON 1993) consistently convey dynamic meaning, indicating transitory and ingressive processes. ANDRASON (ibid.) also demonstrates that, although the progressive character is prevailing, the periphrasis may likewise express other shades of meaning. First, a group of process or situation verbs (e.g. *siinoo* ‘sleep’ or *loo* ‘stand’) in this formation may denote continuous non-dynamic situations. Second, the gram can approximate Indo-European “simple” tenses, denoting general and durative activities whose extension in time surpasses the enunciator’s here-and-now. And third, the periphrasis is sometimes employed as an inclusive perfect.

⁶ All the examples quoted in the present paper have been provided by ten native Mandinka speakers, inhabitants of Basse and the following surrounding villages: Mansajang, Bassending, Kaba Kama and Manneh Kunda. Most of the informants have lived in the Basse area since they were born. Two persons, however, are originally from other parts of Gambia. Nevertheless, they have lived in the capital of the Upper River Region (or in its vicinity) for an extended period of time. All the examples were recorded during the field research conducted by the author in 2011. Below we offer a list including the names of our informants, their age, occupation/profession and place of residence: Keba Suso (13 years old, primary school student, Bassending), Malick Suso (18, high school student, Bassending), Musa Yaffuneh (24, watchman, Basse), Lamin Manneh (25, university student, Manneh Kunda), Mamanding Sanyang (27, nurse assistant, Basse), Musa Sanneh (29, driver, Kaba Kama), Baba Kamara (30, teacher, Mansajang), Saikou Drammeh (44, nurse, Basse – originally from Serekunda but living in Basse for

2. MODEL AND RESEARCH STRATEGY

The issue of describing and analyzing the meaning of a verbal form is not an uncomplicated and straightforward task. Quite the reverse, it constitutes a demanding and multifaceted enterprise which is profoundly influenced by the scientific framework within which the linguist develops his or her research. In this study, the understanding and modeling of the semantic (as well as morphosyntactic) properties of a verbal construction as defended by cognitive and grammaticalization schools in spirit of HEINE et al. (1991), HEINE (1997), DAHL (2000a, b) and BYBEE (2010) will be adopted.

2.1. POLYSEMY AS THE MEANING OF A FORM AND ITS COGNITIVE REPRESENTATION

The cognitive and grammaticalization approaches – both usage-based theories – part from the observation that, due to the inherent dynamics and extreme complexity of linguistic systems, any grammatical construction is a semantically and functionally complex “being” – to put it simply, a grammatical construction typically offers various senses and functions. This semantic polyvalence of a grammatical entity – or polysemy – is a norm in languages of the world. One grammatical entity usually provides various senses which are activated or become patent in specific contexts. In some cases, such values may be extremely different belonging to or making use of distinct and even opposite semantic domains. Since each one of the senses conveyed by a form is prompted in a specific environment, all of them depend on contextual – including pragmatic – factors. These senses, however, as dissimilar as they may seem, are in fact related. This relation – referred to as ‘relatedness principle’ – is both conceptual and chronological. On the one hand, one sense constitutes a conceptual foundation of another so that by applying universal human cognitive mechanisms (such as metaphor, image-scheme, metonymy etc.) it enables an extension to a new context where a new value is made active. On the other hand, the sense that represents a conceptual basis for another usage and for a novel value is obligatorily diachronically earlier. It must historically precede the use and sense which has been derived from it. Thus, in accordance with a cognitive or usage-based approach to grammar, the form’s meaning is understood as its entire and interrelated polysemy. It equals a semantic potential which, since *per vim* consistent and logical, is unified into a solid conceptual map. In this map, all the components or specific senses are connected or chained: a) conceptually, being derived by means of universal cognitive procedures which allow given meaning extensions; and b) diachronically, having historically arisen from one another. As a result, the meaning is represented as a cognitively consistent (both conceptually and diachronically) and well-ordered network of senses (HEINE et al. 1991: 224–225, 259–260; EVANS & GREEN 2006: 169, 328, 331–332, 352; LEWANDOWSKA-TOMASZCZYK 2007: 140; NIKIFORIDOU 2009: 17, 26; BYBEE 2010; VAN DER AUWERA & GAST 2011: 186–188).

While a “psychological” mapping of the components of a given polysemy (i.e., a chaining that represents an intuitive linkage of the constituents of a semantic grid) seems

ten years), Kumba Jallow (56, cook, Mansajang) and Mariama Mendi (32, nurse, Mansajang – originally from Fulla Bantang).

to be, to an extent, arbitrary and subjective – it clearly depends on the categorization and necessities of a researcher –, a mapping based on diachronic universals seems to be more scientifically “secure”. This stems from its empirical, testable and easily accessible or repeatable (and thus, objective) foundation. By tracing the exemplary development of a category from the beginning of its grammatical life to a final loss, they show (albeit, certainly, in a modelled and abstract manner) how formations belonging to a certain class evolve crosslinguistically. To be exact, they demonstrate how determined types of polysemies are modified over time by specifying an exact order of gradually incorporated senses. Accordingly, they determine the most plausible (or most common) evolution for certain classes of polysemies (see HEINE et al. 1991: 221–222, 225–228, 260–261; BYBEE et al. 1994 and DAHL 2000b).

Given that paths demonstrate the most likely extensions which are typical of certain grammatical constructions, and given that the mapping of polysemies is both diachronic and conceptual, paths have commonly been used as templates for representation of concrete – synchronically measured – semantic potentials. In general, the polysemies of constructions that are members of determined grammatical classes arise following the order established by a path that governs the grammatical life of this class of formations. For this reason, they can serve as the most plausible (from the typological perspective) matrixes for chaining a polysemous space. By using this approach, a given polysemy can be modeled as a portion of a path or a cluster of them where each distinct sense, available synchronically, corresponds to a stage on the cline. It is assumed that given its synchronic extent, the polysemies under analysis should have arisen following the order established by the path. In this manner, the model presupposes to represent a realist diachronic development of the form under study. Thus, the proposed mapping is both universal (derived from available typological templates) and realistic (it shows how the meaning extension did actually happen; HEINE et al. 1991: 221–227, 1997: 10; ARIEL 2008; BYBEE 2010: 198–199).

As a result, the cognitive-grammaticalization framework bestows one with the possibility to design a model of the meaning of a form even though this form offers a wide range of senses and makes use of various semantic domains, so that it is impossible to classify it as belonging to one semantic taxonomical class. The path representation allows for a form’s meaning to span several values: it may range from a sense that is typical of one category (e.g. present perfect) to a sense that is characteristic of another category (e.g. definite past past). However, the model also makes room for values that are problematically classified with prototypical taxonomical classes or that can be located as partially belonging to two classes (cf. the sense of an indefinite perfect or indefinite past). In total, the model assures a more realistic treatment of grammatical entities and constitutes a useful tool in dealing with supposedly irregular formations. In this manner, the model develops dynamic formulae which define constructions in a more accurate manner than any structuralist definition. Such dynamic classifications, on the one hand, preserve the empirical richness of a form, and on the other, deliver unified and homogenous label-like definitions of a grammatical construction (HEINE et al. 1991: 225; HEINE 1997; DAHL 2000a: 15–17; BYBEE 2010).

2.2. STRUCTURE AS THE EVIDENCE OF THE FORM'S ORIGIN – COGNITIVE PLAUSIBILITY

It is important to emphasize that the path model of the meaning of a form is assumed to be not only typologically plausible but also, and necessarily realistic. An ordered representation of a given semantic potential is supposed to represent the actual history of the form in question. However, as far as the mapping is exclusively based upon on a synchronic array of uses and typological evolutionary scenarios – albeit it is fairly reliable and allows quite solid hypothesis on genetic motivation and relation among senses (HEINE 1997: 10) – it remains a mere, yet very plausible, hypothesis. In order to be accepted as a solid scientific *fact*, the posited linkage of the components of a given semantic potential must be verified by certain proofs.

The most straightforward manner to validate a typologically posited mapping – and thus to demonstrate that the construction acquired the senses as hypothesized by employing typological universals – is to directly trace the grammatical development of the formation, from its “birth” to the point where it displays the analyzed semantic potential. Of course, the access to diachronic evidence differs from a language to another. In some cases, old texts in the language under analysis (and in cognate tongues) are abundant and enable linguists to empirically confirm the posited map. Nevertheless, in others, it is impossible to trace the diachronic progress of the form and observe how the construction has “built up” its semantic potential. Although an absolute lack of historical and/or comparative evidence is rather uncommon, there are various languages where direct diachronic proofs (i.e. older texts) do not exist. However, even in cases where diachronic evidence is relatively scarce, the mapping based on paths or diachronic universal patterns may still be corroborated. In such instances, it is the structure and structural properties of the modelled construction that may confirm (or falsify) the hypothesized mapping.

Cognitive linguists generally agree that form and meaning are related. Grammar is understood as a literal or metaphorical conceptualization of a person's experience and thus the form of a given grammatical entity is *per vim* connected to its meaning and function. Lexicon and so-called “core” grammar constitute an inseparable continuum where central grammatical entities regularly originate in semantically transparent and possibly iconic lexemes and/or their compositions. Even more importantly, such input constructions are claimed to be semantically and functionally consistent with the entire evolutionary growth of a given form – they are cognitively plausible for this construction and its entire development at any stage of its history. Put simply, the form of the original periphrasis motivates all the senses conveyed by the formation during its entire grammatical life. Inversely, all the senses are *per vim* derivable from the original input form (HEIMAN 1985a: 1–7, 1985b: 8, 18; KIRSNER 1985: 250, 253; GIVÓN 1985: 213–215; BYBEE et. al. 1994: 9–12; CROFT & CRUSE 2004: 1–3, 255–256; HEINE & KUTEVA 2007: 58, 348; LANGACKER 2007: 421–422; VAN LANGENDOCK 2007: 396, 401–402).

As a result, all the semantic potential if it is mapped as a path should be reducible to the input which is cognitively compatible with the posited cline: it must motivate it and allow all possible meaning extensions that have been detected synchronically. The form of the source must be harmonious and congruent with the posited cline. Hence, given that structural properties – just like semantic ones – are frozen vestiges of the diachronic history of the form under analysis, they may be employed in order to reconstruct the diachronic origin

of the form and thus to posit the original input expression which could validate or falsify the posited mapping. If the structure of the form is cognitively compatible with its path mapping – the construction is supposed to have derived from an original expression which is fully compatible with the cline – the hypothesized mapping may be viewed as verified even if direct diachronic proofs are missing.

2.3. RESEARCH STRATEGY

Complying with the cognitive view of verbal meaning, where contextual diversity and its mapping are in focus, the research plan will consist in the following. First, in the remaining portion of the present paper, we will present a detailed review of the semantic content of the NomKAD form, specifying all of its – contextually induced – temporal, aspectual and taxis⁷ values and nuances.⁸ This meticulous empirical research will constitute the basis for the analysis, explanation and modeling of the meaning of the NomKAD formation offered in the second article. More specifically, in the second of the two papers, we will provide a unification of all the components of the semantic space traced by this Mandinka expression: we will model it into a consistent whole by means of one of the universal paths. This path mapping will account for the entire semantic richness of the construction, including values that reside on the boundary of standard taxonomical classes. Subsequently, we will corroborate the posited map by analyzing the form of the construction and verifying its cognitive compatibility with the hypothesized path mapping. Finally, main conclusions will be drawn and a plan of future study designed.

3. SEMANTIC POTENTIAL OF THE NOMKAD FORM – EMPIRICAL STUDY

The NomKAD periphrasis is commonly employed as a progressive aspect. It appears with typically dynamic predicates – i.e. with verbs which denote actions necessitating constant input of “energy” – and indicates actual currently ongoing activities, i.e. actions that are being performed at a reference time (cf. BYBEE et. al. 1994: 126). Within a present time frame, the expression approximates a progressive present (2), while, in a past temporal sphere, it equals a past progressive category (3):

(2a) M **be** **diyaamoo** **kaŋ** saayinj
 I be talking at now
 ‘I am talking now’

(2b) M **be** **safeeroo** **kaŋ**
 I be writing at
 ‘I am writing’

⁷ The term ‘taxis’ makes reference to the concepts of anteriority, simultaneity and posteriority (cf. MASLOV 1988) and embraces the category of perfects (ANDRASON 2012b: 78–81).

⁸ It must be emphasized that the semantic potential of the NomKAD form is not described from the perspective of the English language. The decomposition of the entire meaning of the construction into basis atomic senses follows typological principles and the senses used in this review correspond to cross-linguistically common semantic domains of taxis, aspect and tense.

- (2c) M **be seneroo kaŋ**
 I be cultivating at
 ‘I am cultivating’
- (3a) A **be taamoo kaŋ nuŋ**
 he be traveling on then
 ‘He was travelling’
- (3b) Wo watoo la a **be karandiroo kaŋ**
 that time at he be teaching at
 ‘At that time, he was teaching’
- (3c) Kunuŋ talaŋ fula m baamaa **be tabiroo kaŋ**
 yesterday hour two my mother be cooking at
 ‘Yesterday at two o’clock, my mother was cooking’

On the contrary, the NomKAD locution cannot appear in main clauses with a future temporal reference, offering a use where it would approximate a progressive future such as the English *will be doing*:

- (4) *Saama talaŋ luulu m **be safeeroo kaŋ**
 tomorrow hour five I be writing at
 ‘Intended meaning: Tomorrow at five, I will be writing’

However, it is possible to construct contexts where the whole “scene” locates the activity in the future. This especially holds for temporal clauses with *nij* ‘if, when’ (5.a) and for clauses introduced by *ko* (5.b). In the former case, the form is employed as an apodotic progressive future, while, in the latter, it approximates a relative progressive present introduced by a verb in the future tense.

- (5a) Sooma talaŋ seyɪ
 ‘Tomorrow hour eight’
 ‘Tomorrow at eight’,
 nij i **be leetaroo safeeroo kaŋ**,
 when you be letter write at
 ‘when are writing the letter’ (i.e. ‘when you will be writing’),
 m be naa la ite le yaa
 I be come to you EMPH at
 ‘I will come to your place’
- (5b) Sooma, a be a fo la ko
 tomorrow he will it say to that
 ‘He will say tomorrow that’
 a **be kuuraŋo kaŋ**
 he be being.sick at
 ‘he is getting sick’

Although the NomKAD gram is most frequently employed with dynamic predicates, it may also be found with verbs which denote non-dynamic situations. When formed with situational predicates such as *siinoo* ‘sleep’ or *loo* ‘stand’, the locution indicates that a giv-

en activity is being performed in an uninterrupted manner, approximating the category of a continuous aspect (BYBEE et. al. 1994: 127). Again, the reference time is typically present or past. Consequently, the formation can function as a present continuous (6.a) or as a past continuous (6.b):

(6a) M **be siinoo kaŋ**
I be sleeping at
'I am sleeping'

(6b) Kunuŋ talaŋ seyi m **be siinoo kaŋ**
yesterday hour eight I be sleeping at
'Yesterday at eight, I was sleeping'

Nevertheless, properly static stems (in particular, verbs of cognition and emotions such as *a loŋ* 'know', *a koŋ* 'hate', *a kanu* 'love') do not convey the continuous meaning of an ongoing situation comparable to the usage of the verb *siinoo* described above. Quite the contrary, they adjust to the properly progressive character of the gram and receive a clearly dynamic ingressive interpretation. Consequently in such cases, the formation is not used with the force of a continuous aspect – it is employed as an exemplary progressive category:

(7a) M **be a loŋo kaŋ**
I be its knowing at
'I am getting to know it'

(7b) M **be a kanoo kaŋ**
I be his loving at
'I am getting to love him'

Additionally, it is possible to use the NomKAD form to express iterative or repetitive activities that, although portrayed as in progress, correspond to recurrent events. Inversely, the iteration is depicted as consisting of a set of independent progressive activities (8.a). However, the NomKAD construction can also introduce simple iterative facts with no palpable progressive-ongoing nuances (8.b). In the case of non-dynamic situational predicates (cf. *siinoo* 'to sleep', above), the construction introduces iterative events presenting them as simply repeatable (8.c).

(8a) Suto-wo-suto talaŋ taŋ a **be tabiroo kaŋ**
every.night hour ten he be cooking at
'Every night at ten, he cooks' (lit. 'is busy with cooking')

(8b) A **be karaŋo kaŋ** soomanda-wo-soomanda
he be studying on every.morning
'He studies every morning' (lit. 'is busy with studying')
karambuŋo kono Basse to
school in Basse in
'in the school in Basse'

(8c) A **be siinoo kaŋ** suwo kono suto-wo-suto
he be sleeping at home in every.night
'He sleeps at home every night'

Moreover, in rather infrequent cases, the NomKAD locution may denote habitual present activities whose temporal extent spans periods of time significantly larger than the current actuality, i.e. the enunciator's here-and-now. In that manner, the gram approximates the use of Indo-European simple tenses, such as the English *Simple Present* and their usage in conveying the ideas of habituality.

(9a) Ninaj m **be** yiroolu **tutoo** **kaŋ** Basse
 this.year I be trees planting at Basse
 'This year, I plant trees in Base'

(9b) Ninaj a **be** **karajo** **kaŋ**
 this.year he be studying at
 'This year, he studies'

Besides being used with the force of progressive, continuous, iterative (or "repetitive progressive") and habitual categories, the NomKAD gram may likewise be employed as an inclusive perfect. In this function, the formation expresses activities that began in a determined – overtly uttered – moment in the past and have been continuing since then without interruption to the present reference time, e.g. *I have studied English for 10 years* or *I have been painting the room for two hours*:

(10a) M **be** **saferoo** **kaŋ** waati naani
 I be writing at hour four
 'I have been writing for four hours'

(10b) A **be** **domoroo** **kaŋ** luno bee
 he be eating at day entire
 'He has been eating the whole day'

(10c) A **be** **siinoo** **kaŋ** lunj saba
 he be sleeping at day three
 'He has been sleeping for three days'

The inclusive perfect value may similarly be detected in a past time frame, corresponding to the English *Past Perfect* (a pluperfect or past anterior category) in phrases such as *He had been writing*:

(11) A bataata nuŋ; a **be** **tabiroo** **kaŋ** suutoo bee
 she.was.tired then; she be cooking at night whole
 'She was tired; she had been cooking the whole night'

When the NomKAD construction is formed with adjectival verbs – i.e. verbs which indicate qualities and which, furthermore, most commonly correspond to the predicative use of adjectives in Indo-European languages – the value of the gram is consistently progressive as in the case of dynamic stems. This means that adjectival verbs are understood in a dynamic manner in the NomKAD formation, conveying the meaning of transition or ingression (cf. static predicates in example 7 above). Consequently, with a present temporal reference, the locution corresponds to the English periphrasis *he is getting* + adjective (12). Analogically, within a past time frame, the value of the gram approximates to the English expression *he was getting* + adjective (13):

- (12a) M **be bataa kaŋ**
 I be being.tired at
 ‘I am getting tired’
- (12b) A **be koyoo kaŋ**
 it be being.white at
 ‘It is getting white’
- (12c) Ì **be kuuraŋo kaŋ**
 they be being.sick at
 ‘They are getting sick’
- (13) A **be fiŋo kaŋ nuŋ**
 it be being.black at then
 ‘It was getting black’

Such ingressive progressive activities may also correspond to iterative occurrences. It must, however, be emphasized that, although expressing repetitive facts or customary events and situations, adjective verbs are quite invariably used with an ingressive value. It should also be noted that iterative actions may also be portrayed as a collection progressive-ongoing individual events (see an analogical behavior of dynamic predicates discussed above).

- (14a) N na dendikoo **be koyoo kaŋ** luŋ-wo-luŋ
 I of shirt be being.white at every.day
 ‘My shirt is getting white every day’
- (14b) Ninaŋ m **be kuuraŋo kaŋ** tariyaake baake
 this.year I be being.sick at quickly very
 ‘This year, I get sick very quickly’

4. INTERIM CONCLUSIONS

The evidence provided in this part of the article enables us to affirm that the NomKAD gram offers various types of meaning. First and most commonly, when derived from dynamic verbs, it indicates present and past progressive actions (the function of a present and past progressive aspect). In order to use the form with a future reference, special environments are needed (*nij* and *ko* clauses). In case of certain non-dynamic and/or situational predicates (e.g. *siinoo* ‘sleep’ or *loo* ‘stand’), the formation denotes present and past continuous activities and situations (the sense of a present and past continuous aspect). However, static verbs of cognition and emotions (e.g. *a loŋ* ‘know’) do not derive the continuous meaning of an ongoing situation but rather receive a dynamic ingressive reading in accordance with the dominant progressive character of the gram. The construction also denotes iterative or iterative-progressive activities (in the latter sense, the form portrays the iteration as a collection of progressive events; the sense of an iterative and “iterative progressive”). In rare instances, the form may also express habitual and time-extended activities (the sense of a habitual present). Moreover, it can denote situations or activities that have been occurring since a determined moment in the past (the sense of a present or past inclusive perfect).

Finally, when the locution is formed with adjectival verbs, its value is regularly transitory-ingressive – adjectival verbs are portrayed in a dynamic manner as a process of acquisition of given qualities (the sense of a present and past progressive, iterative-progressive, iterative or habitual; all of these senses always includes the ingressive component as well).⁹

REFERENCES

- ANDRASON Alexander. 2011. “Semantics of the *ta* Construction in Basse Mandinka.” *Linguistica Copernicana* 6, 221–244.
- ANDRASON Alexander. 2012a. “The KAD Verbal Form in Basse Mandinka – Structure and Meaning.” *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Jagellonicae Cracoviensis* 129, 35–48.
- ANDRASON Alexander. 2012b. “When *imam* Perfect ‘Becomes’ a Past.” *Balkanistica* 25, 75–103.
- ANDRASON Alexander. 2013. *Introducción a la gramática descriptiva del mandinka de la región de Basse* (Introduction to the Descriptive Grammar of Basse Mandinka). Albacete: UNO.
- ARIEL Mira. 2008. *Pragmatics and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BRISARD Frank, ÖSTMAN Jan-Ola, VERSCHUEREN Jef (eds). 2009. *Grammar, Meaning and Pragmatics*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- BYBEE Joan. 2010. *Language, Usage and Cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BYBEE Joan, PERKINS Revere, PAGLIUCA William. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- COLLEY Ebrima. 1995. *Mandinka Grammar Manual*. Banjul: Peace Corps The Gambia.
- CREISSELS Denis. 1983. *Éléments de grammaire de la langue mandinka*. Grenoble: ELLUG.
- CROFT Willaim, CRUSE Alan. 2004. *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DAHL Östen. 2000a. “The Tense and Aspect Systems of European Languages in a Typological Perspective.” In: DAHL 2000b: 3–25.
- DAHL Östen (ed.). 2000b. *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin–New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- DRAMÉ Man Lafi. 2003. *Parlons mandinka*. Paris: L’Harmattan.
- EVANS Vyvyan, GREEN Melanie. 2006. *Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- GAMBLE David. 1987. *Elementary Mandinka* (Gambian Studies 20). San Francisco: Gamble.
- GEERAERTS Dirk, CUYCKENS Hubert (eds.). 2007. *Cognitive Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- GIVÓN Talmy. 1985. “Iconicity, Isomorphism, and Non-Arbitrary Coding in Syntax.” In: HEIMAN 1985c: 187–219.
- HAMLIN William. 1935. *A Short Study of the Western Mandinka Language*. London: The Crown Agents for the Colonies.
- HEIMAN John. 1985a. *Natural Syntax: Iconicity and Erosion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HEIMAN John. 1985b. “Introduction.” In: HEIMAN 1985c: 1–7.
- HEIMAN John (ed.). 1985c. *Iconicity in Syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- HEINE Bernd. 1997. *Cognitive Foundations of Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- HEINE Bernd, CLAUDI Ulrike, HÜNNEMEYER Friederike. 1991. *Grammaticalization. A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- HEINE Bernd, KUTEVA Tania. 2007. *The Genesis of Grammar: a Reconstruction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- IIP (Islam International Publications). 1988. *Selections from the Writings of the Promised Messiah*. Tilford: Islam International Publications LTD.
- KIRSNER Robert S. 1985. “Iconicity and Grammatical Meaning.” In: HEIMAN 1985c: 249–270.
- LANGACKER Ronald W. 2007. “Cognitive Grammar.” In: GEERAERTS & CUYCKENS 2007: 421–462.

⁹ The results of our study demonstrate that the semantic content of the Nominal KAD gram is identical to that displayed by the other construction built on the auxiliary *be* and the postposition *kaj*, i.e. the Verbal KAD periphrasis (cf. footnote 5 above). If we compare the semantic content of the Nominal KAD gram with the variant based on the infinitive, no differences in respect to tense, aspect and taxis values may be observed. Put differently, the two expressions are semantically equivalent (cf. ANDRASON 2012a).

- LEWANDOWSKA-TOMASZCZYK Barbara. 2007. "Polysemy, Prototypes, and Radical Categories." In: GEERAERTS & CUYCKENS 2007: 139–169.
- LÜCK Marlies, HENDERSON Linda. 1993. *Gambian Mandinka: a Learning Manual for English Speakers*. Banjul: WEC International.
- MACBRAIR Maxwell. 1842. *A Grammar of the Mandingo Language*. London: The Wesleyan-Methodist Missionary Society.
- MASLOV Jurij. 1988. "Resultative, Perfect and Aspect." In: NEDJALOV 1988: 63–85.
- NEDJALOV Vladimir (ed.). 1988. *Typology of Resultative Constructions*. Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- NIKIFORIDOU Kiki. 2009. "Constructional Analysis." In: BRISARD et al. 2009: 16–32.
- PEACE CORPS. 1995. *Mandinka – English Dictionary*. Banjul: Peace Corps.
- ROWLANDS Evan. 1959. *A Grammar of Gambian Mandinka*. London: SOAS.
- SONG Jae Jung (ed.). 2011. *The Oxford Handbook of Typology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- VAN DER AUWERA Johan, GAST Volker. 2011. "Categories and Prototypes." In: SONG: 2011: 166–189.
- VAN LANGENDOCK Willy. 2007. "Iconicity." In: GEERAERTS & CUYCKENS 2007: 394–418.
- WEC. 1988a. *A Practical Orthography of Gambian Mandinka*. Banjul: WEC International.
- WEC. 1988b. *Mandinka English Dictionary*. Banjul: WEC International.
- WEC. 1989. *Kabej Kutoo*. Banjul: WEC International.
- WEC. 1995. *Mandinka English Dictionary – Revised Edition*. Banjul: WEC International.
- WEC. 1998. *Kambej Kotoo*. Banjul: WEC International.
- WEC. 2002. *Mandinka Learning Manual*. Banjul: WEC International.
- WILSON William. 2000. "Creissels's Mandinka Grammar." *Journal of West African Languages* 28(2), 109–24.