A typological portrait of Mano, Southern Mande

Abstract

The present article sketches a linguistic portrait of Mano as a representative member of the Mande family and its Southern branch. The family features shared by Mano include S-Aux-O-V-X word order and the parallelism between nominal and verbal syntax, the ubiquity of passive lability, and the parallelism between relative clause formation and information structure. The branch features include rich tonal morphology, unstable character of nasal consonants, and rich pronominal paradigms, including auxiliaries indexing person and number of the subject. Some of the features presented here have not been sufficiently studied in the Mande material, so it is unclear how unusual Mano is in comparison to other Mande languages: such as the large class of inalienably possessed nouns, or the clause-level nominalization which may include another clause as its constituent. Finally, some properties are almost certainly specific to Mano, such as dedicated tonal forms used in conditional clauses or the extended use of topicalization markers derived from demonstratives and used as a clause-linker in all varieties of preposed dependent clauses.
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Mano (Ethnologue language name: Maan) counts 390 000 speakers in Guinea and Liberia and is one of the several dozen languages spoken in these countries. Belonging to Mande, a major family of languages spoken throughout West Africa, Mano shares many of its distinctive typological features but also has several peculiar characteristics of its own. This paper gives an outline of the most original linguistic features of the language both from a Mande perspective and in a context of broader cross-linguistic comparison, giving at the same time necessary background for the grammar. Although an exhaustive typological analysis is beyond
the scope of this paper, the presentation of Mano data is done against a minimal set of relevant typological
and/or areal overviews, as well as descriptive and comparative literature on Mande languages.

The work on Mano is based on fifteen months of fieldwork conducted by the author between 2009 and
2019. The core of the fieldwork materials is a multi-genre collection of spontaneous texts in Mano which
includes narratives, as well as conversations and ritual speech, Christian and traditional. Many examples are
drawn from the spoken corpus, but some, especially those illustrating morphological contrasts, are elicited,
all examples are marked correspondingly (el. and nat.). A grammar sketch can be found in Khachaturyan
(2015), some typological findings were exposed in Khachaturyan (2014).

Mano belongs to the Southern branch of the Mande language family, which has a debated status
within the Niger-Congo phylum¹, not sharing with it one of its most outstanding typological features – noun
classes (Vydrin 2006). Mande languages are divided into Eastern and Western branches. Eastern Mande
languages include Southern Mande (Mano, but also Dan, Tura, Beng, Guro, Mwan, Wan, which will be
mentioned throughout the paper). Western Mande languages include Northwestern Mande, such as Soninke,
as well as Central Mande and, in particular, the Manding group (which, in turn, includes the Bamana-
Maninka-Jula dialect continuum, the most spoken and the best described Mande varieties, as well as
Mandinka, Kassonke, and some others) but also Southwestern Mande, including Kpelle, with which Mano is
in contact and shares many of its structural features. For an overview of the family, see Vydrin et al. (2017)
and Vydrin (2018).

The paper begins with an overview of the sociolinguistic situation, including the patterns of
multilingualism and issues of language contact (Section 1). It then follows a sketch of Mano phonology with
its typologically original features: the existence of labial-velar consonants, a syllabic nasal and an unstable
phonologization status of nasal consonants (Section 2.1), as well as some issues in phonotactics, such
distributional asymmetries within stems and the exceptional status of labialized and non-labialized velar
consonants with respect to vowel harmony (Section 2.2). Section 3 is dedicated to the morphosyntax of NPs,
with its several cross-linguistically outstanding features: rich pronominal paradigms (Section 3.1), the
existence of a dedicated series of inclusory pronouns (Section 3.2), the expression of number (Section 3.3)
and the possessive split (Section 3.4). Section 4 gives a selection of features in the verbal syntax: SOVX

¹ The Mande language family has a controversial status within the Niger-Congo phylum, see Dimmendaal and Storch
(2016) and Vydrin (2016).
word order (Section 4.1), nominalization (Section 4.2), the status of postverbal arguments (Section 4.3) as well as transitivity and lability (Section 4.4). Section 5 introduces some interesting features of the TAMP system: rich verbal morphology, especially tonal, with TAMP values (Section 5.1), rich auxiliary system (Section 5.2), asymmetric negation (Section 5.1) and the polysemy of the prospective auxiliary (Section 5.4). Finally, Section 6 presents some issues of the syntax and morphology of clause combining: the syntax of the conjoint form (Section 6.1), the morphology of conditional clauses (Section 6.2), and the relationship between information structure and subordination (Section 6.3), especially in the case of relativization (Section 6.4).

1 Sociolinguistic situation

The Mano (or máámià) populate a mountainous area in South-Eastern Guinea and Northern Liberia. The area used to be covered in dense tropical forest, which has almost disappeared due to extensive agriculture and industrial plantations, with the exception of some natural reserves, such as the Diécké forest or the Nimba natural reserve, which has been declared a World Heritage Site. In Guinea, the Mano way of life combines subsistence agriculture, animal husbandry, fishing, and some hunting, although game has become scarce with the disappearance of the forests. Cash crops have become more and more important in the local economy: historically, cola nut was the main object of trade with the northern Mandingo population, to which coffee, cacao, rubber and palm oil were later added. Traditional crops include rice, cassava and wild palm trees whose nuts give a precious red oil, very valued in the region.

In Guinea, traditional social institutions, such as initiation societies or local chiefry, largely persist. The majority of the rural population still send their children to initiation which, instead of lasting several years, as it used to by tradition (Harley 1970), is usually finished in several weeks during the summer school break. Most Mano still practice the cult of ancestors, although some have converted to Christianity: Catholicism and several Protestant denominations, including the Evangelical church. Conversion to Islam is rare and is generally badly looked upon by the community.

Guinean Mano counts about 85 000 speakers being one of 34 indigenous languages spoken in Guinea. In Liberia, Mano is spoken by about 305 000 people, it is the fifth, out of 27, most spoken indigenous language of the country.
In Guinea, Mano counts three “dialects”, which are most certainly clan names: Zaan (zung), the easternmost “dialect” spoken around the Bossou town, Maa (máá), the central “dialect” spoken in the city of Nzérékoré and to the south of it, and Kpeinson (kpeïnson), the Western dialect spoken around the Diécké town. In Liberia, the dialect variation is much more important. Native speakers distinguish three dialects: the Northern dialect, Maalaa (máá lāā), spoken around Sanniquellie, the Central dialect, Maazein (máá zèj) spoken in Ganta, and the Southern dialect, Maabei (máá bèí), spoken in Saklepea, which is the most distinct of all three compared to Guinean varieties. The dialect division provided by the language speakers, however, seems very approximate. It is likely that there are several other varieties spoken to the south of Saklepea.

While doing a dialect survey of Liberian varieties I traveled with a speaker of the central Guinean dialect, máá, and he had no trouble understanding Liberian Mano, with the obvious exception of borrowings from English, the language he does not speak.

Most Mano speak, at least to some extent, either French (Guinea) or English (Liberia). In Guinea, many Mano are fluent in local majority languages, such as Kpelle and Maninka, while in Liberia, especially in the South of the Mano zone, many Mano speak Dan. The dialect variation may be in part due to the influence of Kpelle on Guinean varieties and Dan on Liberian varieties. Arguably, the contact with Kpelle has shaped several aspects of phonology and grammar of Guinean Mano, including agreement patterns (Konoshenko 2014), as well as the phonologization of nasal consonants and patterns of vowel assimilation in suffixes (Khachaturyan 2018a). There are multiple borrowings, especially in the cultural lexicon, from Kpelle in Guinean Mano, many of them are originally Manding (Khachaturyan 2020).
The only written source in Mano in large circulation is the translation of the New Testament published in Liberia (UBS 1978). Several independent efforts have been undertaken to promote literacy. The main actors include a protestant missionary in Guinea working on the translation of the Old Testament who, along with her translation work, has produced literacy materials and organized literacy workshops. In Liberia, the Liberian Translation and Literacy Organization (LIBTRALO) has, among its affiliated members, an active Mano speaker who produces literature in Mano and works on promoting literacy. Mano has never been the language of education in neither of the countries. There is regular radio broadcasting in Mano in Nzérékoré and there exist several Mano radio stations in Liberia.

2 Phonetics and Phonology

2.1 Phoneme inventory
The inventories of Mano vowels and consonants are given in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. Three features of the phonemic inventories deserve a special attention: labial-velar consonants; syllabic nasal; and nasal consonants.

Labial-velar consonants are a feature identified by Güldemann (2008a: 156–158) as typical for languages of the North-Western area of sub-Saharan Africa (which is also called Macro-Sudan Belt) and common to Mande languages but extremely rare outside Africa. Mano has two of these consonants: voiced, /gbl/ (gbéè ‘to cry’), and voiceless, /kp/ (kpèè ‘neck’).

Mano, among many other Mande languages, has nasal vowels, the phonological status of nasal consonants is somewhat debatable. In half of the Southern Mande languages, such as Goo (Aplonova & Vydrin 2017), different varieties of Dan (Vydrin 2017; Vydrin & Kessegebeu 2008), or Mwan (Perekhvalskaya 2017) nasal contoids are not phonologized and receive their nasal quality in nasal contexts, especially with nasal vowels. In particular, Dan distinguishes between two sets of vocoids, nasal and oral, which can be clearly contrasted in some contexts, which allows to postulate a phonological distinction between oral and nasal vowels (/kɔ́/ ‘house’ vs /kɔ̲́/ ‘astonish’). At the same time, oral vocoids do not combine with nasal contoids. According to the analysis, nasal vowels trigger nasalization of consonants /ɓ/,

/l/, /ʃ/ and /w/ which are then realized as nasal ([m], [n], [ŋ] and [w], respectively). Thus, labial nasal [m] and implosive nasal [ɓ] are considered allophones: /ɓuŋ/ [mûŋ] ‘be’ vs /ɓuŋ/ [ɓûŋ] ‘shine’. In Mano, just like in Tura (Idiatov & Aplonova 2017) and Beng (Paperno 2014), there are reasons to believe that it is not nasal vowels which trigger nasalization of the consonants on the surface level, but rather that nasal consonants are phonologized. As in Dan, there are minimal pairs where vowels are clearly contrasted by nasality ([ká] ‘house’ vs [ká] ‘to cut’). Unlike Dan, however, there is a contrast on the phonetical level between oral and nasal vocoids after a nasal contoid: [mɛ́ŋ] ‘behind’ vs [mɛ́i] ‘sea’

2. Again, unlike Dan, the degree of nasalization of the vocoid following a nasal contoid can be very low and may be due to coarticulation rather than the ‘phantom nasalization’ of the contoid. It should be noted that nasalization is frequent in the CVV context (see, e.g., Mano /mɛ́ŋ/ ‘behind’ vs /mɛ́i/ ‘sea’), which is common for Mande languages. The explanation proposed is that the nasalization is due to the presence of a pre-nasal glide in the CVV context, which can be realized as a nasal in word-initial position. However, in contrast to Dan, nasalization is not universal in Mano, and there are cases where nasalization is absent (e.g., /mɛ́ŋ/ ‘behind’ vs /mɛ́i/ ‘sea’).

The nasal contoid [m] is an underlying nasal, too (/m/). The phonological representation of both words is therefore /mɛ́ŋ/ [mɛ́i] ‘behind’ and /mɛ́i/ [mɛ́i] ‘sea’, respectively. From that we should conclude the existence of phonologized nasal consonants.
than its underlying nasal quality: thus, the vocoids in [mɛ̃] ‘sea’ and in [ɓɛ́ ̀i] ‘friend’ may appear very similar on the phonetic level. Finally, [m] and [n] seem to be able to combine with all four degrees of openness of the vowels, and in particular allow for contrasts between semi-closed and semi-open vowels ([pánë] ‘bowl’ vs [pénë] ‘today’; [môtồ] ‘motorbike’ < French moto vs [mɔ] ‘on’). Given that nasal vowels distinguish only three degrees of openness, such contrast would have been impossible if one postulated nasal consonants on the underlying level.

Nasal consonants are not fully phonologized in many languages of Sub-Saharan Africa. Creissels mentions Baoulé where only /m/ is phonologized, while [n]/[l], [ɲ]/[j] and [ŋ]/[w] are allophonic (1994: 132). The same goes for nasal vocoids, which in many languages do not correspond to nasal phonemes, but rather are part of combinations of the type VN or VNV (Creissels 1994).

The Mano system also includes a syllabic nasal /ŋ/ which can function as a syllabic nucleus of a syllable with a null onset η(ŋ) (ŋ, first person singular pronoun of the past series, ŋŋ, first person singular negative auxiliary) and appear in the position CVŋ (wông ‘tail’, pëŋ ‘forge’). The syllabic nasal always bears a distinctive tone: mëŋ ‘dream’, mëŋ ‘behind’. In the position of a syllabic nucleus, η(ŋ), it realizes as a nasal contoid assimilating to the next consonant by place of articulation and, in certain cases, causing assimilation by nasality: ŋɲ lò [ŋŋò] ‘I went’. In position CVŋ, it is realized as a nasal vowel: a back vowel [u] if the previous vowel is back or central (wông [wʊŋ] ‘tail’) or a front vowel [ i] if the previous vowel is front (pëŋ [pëi] ‘forge’). Syllabic nasals are not uncommon for languages of Sub-Saharan Africa: Creissels mentions a few, including Swahili, Igbo and some varieties of Manding (1994: 57–64).

Table 1. Mano vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>oral vowels</th>
<th>nasal vowels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>ŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>ŋ̯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>ŋ̱</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>ŋ̢</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Mano consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>labial</th>
<th>alveolar</th>
<th>palatal</th>
<th>velar</th>
<th>velar</th>
<th>labio-velar</th>
<th>labialized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


In the subsequent text I use orthographic notation common for Mande (or, broader, African) linguistics: y stands for /j/, ŋw stands for /ẁ̰/, kw for k\textsuperscript{w}, gw for g\textsuperscript{w}, kp for k\textsuperscript{p} and gb for g\textsuperscript{b}. ŋ with a tonal diacritic corresponds to the syllabic nasal and ŋ without a tonal diacritic corresponds to a nasal velar sonorant.

2.2 Suprasegmental phonology

Most of the languages of Sub-Saharan Africa and all Mande languages have tone (with the exception of some Mande varieties in contact with non-tonal languages, such as some varieties of Jalonke, Lüpke 2013). Mano has three level tones, low (kɛ̀ ɛ̀ ’year’), mid (kɛ̄ ’in order to’), and high (kɛ́ ɪ́ ’refuse’). Extra-high tone is marginal in the system, as it appears only in ideophones, expressive adverbs, and interjections (sɔ̰ɛ̰ ɛ̰ ’all and all’, ɛ̰ ’interjection’, etc.) Downstep (unlike Manding languages and some other languages with two tones) is not attested. Rich tonal inventories (three or more tones) are typical for the Macro-Sudan belt, so Mano is no exception here (Hyman et al. 2018). The tone-bearing unit is a vowel; long vowels and diphthongs are considered combinations of phonemes. Complex tonal contours appear only on VV sequences. All tonal combinations are possible (see Table 3). Grammatical tonal marking applies only to specific words and there is no tonal spreading (unlike some Southwestern Mande languages, such as Kpelle, Konoshenko 2014). Mano does not have stress accent, which is often (but not always) the case for tonal languages (Hyman 2009). Utterance-level prosodic operations include lowering of the tone on final vowels in affirmative utterances and a general downdrift.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>implosive</th>
<th>ɓ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unvoiced plosives</td>
<td>p, t, k, k\textsuperscript{w}, kp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced plosives</td>
<td>b, d, g, g\textsuperscript{w}, gb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unvoiced fricatives</td>
<td>f, s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced fricatives</td>
<td>v, z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oral sonorants</td>
<td>w, l, j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasal sonorants</td>
<td>m, n, ɲ, ŋ, ɲ, w</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Tonal contrasts in VV sequences
The syllable seems to be of limited analytical salience (on that point, see Hyman 2011). In contrast, it is often claimed that Mande languages, including Mano among other Southern Mande languages, such as Guro (Kuznetsova 2007), possess “metric feet”, one- or polymoraic units which have the following properties. First, specific phonotactic restrictions apply: vowel harmony, restrictions on the internal structure and on the inventory of intervocalic consonants. Second, it is metric feet, rather than syllables, that are the domains of application of grammatical tones: the rules of tonal assignment in grammatical contexts apply to the entire metric foot, rather than to one syllabic nucleus or mora. Finally, as a matter of statistical observation, non-derived lexemes tend to possess only one metrical foot. Metric feet seem to be a special case of distributional asymmetries between stem-initial and non-stem-initial syllables widely attested in the languages of the Macro-Sudan Belt (Hyman et al. 2018).

Metric feet in Mano can only be of the following structures: V (ē ‘3SG.PST’), CV(ŋ) (sɔ̆ ‘cloth’; sɔ̆ŋ ‘prix’), CVV (sɔ̆ j ‘teeth’, bɛ̀ ‘friend’) and CVCV(ŋ) (bɛ̀ lɛ̀ ‘respect’, bɛ̀ lɛ̀ ŋ̀ ‘tree, sp.’). In the CVV structures, a combination of back and front vowels, as well as nasal and non-nasal vowels is disallowed and in CVCV structures, vowels should be identical. The intervocalic consonant should be either /n/, /l/, or /ŋ/, where /n/ is used only when the initial consonant is nasal (mɛ̀ nɛ̀ ‘snake’, ŋwánà ‘truth’). As a rule, grammatical tone applies only to one metric foot. Thus, the verb péː lɛ̀ ‘to wash’, which consists of one metric foot, according to the aforementioned parameters (CVCV structure; identical vowels; /l/ as intervocalic consonant), in the imperfective takes the form with low tones on both vowels: péː lɛ̀ ‘wash:IPFV’. In contrast, the verb lɔ̀ nì ‘to count’ consists of two metric feet of the CV structure because the vowels are non-identical which violates the
rule of vowel harmony. The grammatical tonal replacement applies accordingly: in the imperfective form, the grammatical tone applies only to the second vowel, which then takes the mid tone, lónī ‘count:IPFV’. The same pattern of change applies to verbs of CV structure with lexical high tone: bī ‘to shine’ and bī ‘shine:IPFV’.

(1)

a. ā̀ ñ̒ sɔ̄ pɛ́lɛ́
   3SG.PRF cloth wash
   ‘She has washed the clothes.’ (el.)

b. lë̀ ñ̒ pɛ̀lɛ́
   3SG.IPFV cloth wash:IPFV
   ‘She washes the clothes.’ (el.)

(2)

a. ā̀ wɛ̀ lóni
   3SG.EXI money count
   ‘She has counted the money.’ (el.)

b. lë̀ wɛ̀ lónī
   3SG.IPFV money count:IPFV
   ‘She counts the money.’ (el.)

(3)

a. ṇé̀ nɛ́ lɛ̀ bì-pɛ̀lɛ̀
   sun 3SG.EXI shine-INF
   ‘Sun is shining.’ (el.)

b. ṇé̀ lë̀ bī
   sun 3SG.IPFV shine:IPFV
   ‘Sun shines.’ (el.)

An interesting feature of Mano phonotactics is that combinations of back and front vowels, which are generally disallowed, are nevertheless possible after an (optionally) labialized velar consonant: k[w]ɔ̀ ĩ ‘firewood’, k[w]ɔ̀ ĩ ‘behind’, k[w]ɔ̀ nẽ̀ ‘eggplant’. It is unclear why a velar consonant should provide an
exceptional environment for the violation of the general rule of vowel harmony. In the CVV combinations of this type, $V_2$ is usually /ɨ/, with one exception: $k^{[w]}{/}\text{bɛ} ‘near’^3$. In fast speech such combinations are pronounced with both front vowels and a strong labialization: [k$^{[w]}$/ɛ] ‘firewood’, [k$^{[w]}$/ɨ] ‘behind’, [k$^{[w]}$/ɛnɛ] ‘eggplant’, [k$^{[w]}$/ɛɛ] ‘near’. Such process is especially salient in the Guinean dialects of Mano which are in contact with Guinean Kpelle where a similar process is attested (Konoshenko 2017: 290). In Liberian Mano and Liberian Kpelle, the default variant seems to be with a back–front combination and the labialization of the velar consonant is much weaker (e.g. in Liberian Mano [k$^{[w]}$/i] ‘firewood’), which suggests a micro-areal phenomenon.

3 Morphosyntax of NPs

Mano has relatively poor nominal morphology, with only one productive derivational suffix (-là, suffix of abstract nouns) and two tonal forms: high tone form originating from the merger with the floating high-tone focalization marker used in particular when the noun is followed by a demonstrative (lēé ‘woman’, lēé wē ‘this woman’) and a low tone marking of construct state. Construct state is used in Mano as a head of noun phrases with certain kinds of dependents, typically excluding possessors, but including nominal or verbal attributes.

(4)

gí lèè

stomach woman:CS

‘pregnant woman’ (el.)

(5)

dɔ̀ wálà lè là mi

stop:NMLZ God mouth on person:CS

‘prophet’ (nat.)

^3 The only CVV word showing a combination of a front and a back vowels is s$^{w}$ɛ ‘all’, it is an emphatic adverbial quantifier used with the quantifier s$^{w}$ɛ ‘all’. It is unusual in yet another respect: it has an extra-high tonal contour typical for expressive entities, see above.
Construct state forms are typical in Mande and in particular in the Southern branch, but are also attested in Soninke (Creissels 2016). Construct state is often expressed by a low tone and is likely to have existed in proto Mande (Creissels p.c.). On replacive tonal patterns in Mande, including construct state, see Green (2018) and Konoshenko (2018), on construct state forms cross-linguistically, see Creissels (2017).

Adjectival morphology includes the derivational suffix of adjectives (-zɛ̀), as well as reduplication with values of intensity and plurality (Section 3.3). Numerals can also reduplicate with a distributive meaning. In contrast, nouns, and verbs, do not reduplicate. The word order in the noun phrase is typically genitival modifier (alienable or inalienable possessor, as well as the dependent in the constructions with construct state forms), followed by the head noun, followed by an adjective, a numeral, and a determiner. I analyze in some detail several properties of Mano nominal morphosyntax: rich pronominal paradigms (Section 3.1), inclusory constructions and pronouns (Section 3.2), expression of plurality (Section 3.3) and possessive split (3.4).

### 3.1 Pronominal paradigms

A distinctive feature of most Southern and Southwestern Mande languages are rich pronominal paradigms which include several syntactic series of personal pronouns, as well as several series of auxiliaries which index subject’s person and number. Personal pronouns typically distinguish between non-subject pronouns occurring in most argument positions (inalienable possessor, 6a, direct object, 6b, or argument of postposition), possessive pronouns expressing alienable possession (ex. 6c) and emphatic pronouns used in non-argument positions (ex. 6d). In Mano, in addition to these three, there are also focalized pronouns resulting from a merger with the focalization marker (ex. 6e, see also Section 5.2), and the inclusory pronouns (ex. 6f), the most typologically unusual of all, which will be discussed in Section 3.2. Personal pronouns in Mano are given in Table I of the appendix.

\[(6)\]

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>kō</td>
<td>dàā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>father</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘my father’ (nat.)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Pèé</td>
<td>ē</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mano does not possess pronouns used in the syntactic position of the subject but has auxiliaries agreeing in person and number with the subject (see Section 5.2).

### 3.2 Inclusory constructions and pronouns

Inclusory constructions are a type of conjunction strategy representing an adjunction of two sets: the whole set of participants, or the superset, usually represented by an inclusory pronominal, and a subset of participants expressed by a pronoun or a full NP (Lichtenberk 2000; Haspelmath 2004: 25–26), as in Mano below:

(7)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ŋ́ ŋ̀} & \quad \text{nàà} & \quad \text{kò} & \quad \text{ɓī} & \quad \text{kò} & \quad \text{kò} & \quad \text{fòtóò} & \quad \text{si} \\
1\text{SG.IPFV} & \quad \text{want:IPFV} & \quad 1\text{PL.IP} & \quad 2\text{SG.EMPH} & \quad 1\text{PL.CONJ} & \quad 1\text{PL.} & \quad \text{foto} & \quad \text{take} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘I want that you (sg.) and I OR you (sg.) and we, we take a picture (lit.: I we [including] you (sg.)).’ (el.)
In the example (7), kò ‘we’ refers to the entire set of participants, while bī ‘you’ refers to a subset. Another subset, implicitly referred to by kò ‘we’, is either the speaker or the speaker with some other participants. The literal meaning of the construction is ‘we [including] you (sg.)’ and there are two interpretations available: either you (sg.) and I, or you (sg.) and we.

Several Southern and Southwestern Mande languages have inclusory constructions. Although inclusory pronouns are especially common in Austronesian languages (Lichtenberk 2000; Bril 2004; Lee 2011) and languages from several language families spoken in Australia (Singer 2001), they are also attested in European languages, such as French dialects and some Slavic languages, including Polish and Russian (Tesnière 1951). What makes Mande family typologically outstanding is the fact that inclusory pronouns in some of Mande languages, including Mano, are represented by separate series (see Table I of the appendix), a property which is nowhere to be found outside this language family (for more detail on inclusory constructions in Mande, see Khachaturyan 2019).

3.3 Expression of plurality

In Mano, if a noun having a non-human referent is unmarked for plurality, it can correspond to a one or many entities in the world. Thus, the form gbú ‘dog’ can denote one or several dogs. The number of referents can be specified with the help of specialized number determiners, or number words (gbú vò dog pl ‘dogs’) or numerals (gbú dōó ‘one dog’, gbú pèèlè ‘two dogs’). In typological literature, such unmarked form is said to express general number (Corbett 2000: 9–10). In contrast, for human referents, an unmarked form is usually interpreted as singular (with the exception of non-referential noun phrases): gwëêkòlò ‘old man; NOT old men’; but gwëêkòlò vò ‘old men’. In addition, Mano pronouns distinguish between singular and plural forms. Therefore, referents in Mano split in two categories depending on their position on the Animacy Hierarchy (Smith-Stark 1974): pronouns, as well as noun phrases denoting humans distinguish between singular and plural, while an unmarked form of non-human referents has a general interpretation.

Most often, plurality is expressed in Mano by means of number words: vò and nì. The vò marker combines with all referents except kinship terms and pronouns and its semantic interpretation is additive plurality (‘X’ + ‘X’ + ‘X’...). Nì combines with all types of referents without restriction, although the semantic interpretation is not the same for all nouns (see below). Therefore, the Animacy Hierarchy plays a role again,
the split occurring in a different position of the hierarchy, separating kin from other human referents (on that point, see Dahl & Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001).

The semantics of the *ni* marker is typologically quite rare, as it combines the values of associative plurality and distributive plurality, which together I call “non-additive plurality”. The former indexes a set of objects including the referent of the host noun and some other objects connected to it (Daniel 2000: 4). Typically, the associative marker is used with human referents (*Sèc ni 'Se and his family/friends'), but can be used with other kinds of referents, too (*yìizólóyàà ni 'jaundice and other sicknesses', see also ex. 8b). It is typically used with pronouns and kinship terms, but can also be used with other nouns. Distributive plurality, in turn, indexes “...the separation of members of a group, whether entities, events, qualities or locations. Each is considered distinct in space, sort or time” (Corbett 2000: 111). In the distributive value, the marker is often combined with mass nouns (9b), but it can also be used with discreet entities (*mōtoò ni 'motorbikes here and there'). Although both values, associative and distributive, are known from descriptive and typological literature, their combination in one marker seems cross-linguistically rare, or at least not well-described.

The following examples contrast additive and non-additive plurality. (8a) illustrates the usage of *nòò* ‘catfish’ with *vɔ̀* triggering an additive reading. (8b) shows the usage of the same noun with *ni* triggering an associative reading. (9a) illustrates the incompatibility of mass noun *wèŋ̄* ‘salt’ with the additive marker *vɔ̀*. Finally, in (9b) the same noun combines with the marker *ni* triggering a distributive reading.

(8)

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. nòò vɔ̀
    \begin{flushleft}
      catfish \hspace{1cm} PL
    \end{flushleft}
  
  \begin{flushleft}
    ‘(several) catfish’ (el.)
  \end{flushleft}
  
  \item b. nòò ni
    \begin{flushleft}
      catfish \hspace{1cm} PL
    \end{flushleft}
  
  \begin{flushleft}
    ‘catfish and the company (*several catfish*)’ (nat., modification)
  \end{flushleft}
\end{itemize}

(9)

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. *wèŋ̄ vɔ̀
    \begin{flushleft}
      salt \hspace{1cm} PL
    \end{flushleft}
  
  \begin{flushleft}
    intended reading: ‘salts’
  \end{flushleft}
\end{itemize}
Although the most common means of expression of plurality are number words, in few nouns plurality is expressed by an irregular inflection which can be considered a case of suppletion (Veselinova 2006; Corbett 2009). These nouns include names of humans and kindred with a most general meaning (mî / mîî ‘person’, mîă / mîa ‘persons’; lëē ‘woman’, lôă / lôō ‘women’; g３ ‘man’, g3ă ‘men’; nê / nêfû ‘child’, nôô / nôôbê ‘children’; mîî ‘parent’, mîă ‘parents’) and the noun pê ‘thing(s)’, p3ă / p3ăbê ‘things’. Suppletion shows some patterning: labialization of mid-low or mid-high vowels and an additional formant: -à/-à̰̋ or -ê; some part of the nominal stem stays unvaried – minimally, the initial consonant. Therefore, nominal suppletion in Mano could be characterized as “weak” (Dressler 1985) or “partial” (Corbett 2009).

Finally, plurality can also be expressed in adjectives. About a half of Mano adjectives⁴, including most non-derived ones, can undergo reduplication. While non-reduplicated adjectives can freely combine with singular/general (10a) or plural forms of nouns (10b), some reduplicated adjectives combine only with the plural forms of those nouns that distinguish between singular and plural forms (10c vs 10d) and trigger plural reading when combined with nouns that do not distinguish between such forms (11). These reduplicated forms express nominal plurality. For some other adjectives the value of reduplication is quality intensity (12) or both intensity and plurality (13).

(10)

a  pê  tîî  
thing  black
‘black thing / black things’ (el.)

b  p3ă  tîî  
thing.PL  black
‘black things’ (el.)

---

⁴ Other entities that can reduplicate include numerals and some quantifiers, such as séį ‘all’. On the reduplication of numerals, see Khachaturyan (2015: 37).
Although adjective reduplication is not uncommon cross-linguistically, its typical value is intensity, a semantic property of which the adjective is a host (as in Hindi, Singh 2005; or Turkish, Sofu 2005). In contrast, it is
typical for Southern and certain Southwestern Mande languages that adjective reduplication expresses plurality, a semantic property which is proper to nouns and which may be expressed in adjectives if they are targets of agreement (Vydrine 2004). The plural value of adjective reduplication may be an areal feature which Southern Mande languages share with Kwa: the same phenomenon is observed in Akan (Winkler & Obeng 2003) or Baoulé (Creissels & Kouadio 1977: 274)5. Moreover, the adjective may be the only locus of expression of plurality. This is because in Mande, and in Mano in particular, few nouns have plural forms, so in cases like 11b, the apparent controller of agreement is unmarked for number.

In addition to reduplication, plurality in adjectives can be expressed by a tonal form. It applies to those adjectives that are reduplicated but whose non-reduplicated counterpart does not exist. Thus, the adjective given in (14), yɔ́ɔɔ́ɔ́ɔ́ɔ́ ‘dirty’, does not exist in a non-reduplicated form (*yɔ́ɔ). In adjectives such as the one in (14), the basic tonal pattern high – low changes to high – high, so the overall morphological process could be considered a case of partial reduplication: of the tonal, but not the segmental, pattern.

(14)

\[ a \quad s̄ \quad yɔ́ɔɔ́ɔ́ɔ́ɔ́

\begin{align*}
\text{cloth} & \quad \text{dirty} \\
\text{‘a dirty cloth / dirty cloths’ (el.)}
\end{align*}

\[ b \quad s̄ \quad yɔ́ɔɔ́ɔ́ɔ́ɔ́

\begin{align*}
\text{cloth} & \quad \text{dirty.PL} \\
\text{‘dirty cloths’ (el.)}
\end{align*}

In addition, three adjectives are pluralie tantum, which are used only with plural referents: dölô ‘similar.PL’, kë̀ǹé ‘small.PL’, kë̀lékélé ‘small.PL’ (15). There are other adjectives in Mano meaning ‘small’: bèŋ, tiìkpé, nèé, pééti, so the adjectives kë̀ǹé and kë̀lékélé could be considered suppletive plural forms6. The adjective gbòkò ‘1. numerous, 2. elderly, 3. fat’, when reduplicated, retains only one meaning: gbòkògbòkò ‘fat.PL’. The

---

5 I thank Denis Creissels for this observation.
6 Suppletion in number form of adjectives is quite rare across languages, although not inexistent. Vafaeian (2013) mentions Halkomelem (Salishan), Kashaya (Pomo), and Tariana (Arawak), a somewhat different type of adjectival suppletion is attested in Swedish.
adjective *gbiyu* has the meanings ‘1. other, 2. certain, 3. different.PL’, it is in the latter meaning that it behaves like a *pluralia tantum*.

(15)

a  *pɛ̄ kɛ̀ɛ̀*  
     thing  small.PL

intended reading: ‘small things’ (el.)

b  *pɔ̄ ɔ̀ kɛ̀ɛ̀*  
     thing.PL  small.PL

‘small things’ (el.)

Thus, number agreement between nouns and adjectives applies. Nouns which do not distinguish between number forms (11, 14) and plural-marked nouns (10b, 10d) combine with both plural-marked and plural-unmarked adjectives. In contrast, nouns which do distinguish between number forms and are unmarked for plurality combine only with plural-unmarked adjectives (10a, 10c, 15).

3.4 Inalienable vs alienable possession

Mano, like most other Mande languages, has two types of possessive constructions, inalienable and alienable. One construction consists of a possessor juxtaposed to the possessee in absence of any formal marking (16b). In the case of a pronominal possessor, a non-subject pronoun is chosen (16a). The second type is where the possessor is expressed by a possessive pronoun (17a), optionally preceded by a noun phrase (17b). Non-subject and possessive pronouns are clearly marked with a tonal contrast: non-subject pronouns have mid-tone (ŋ̄) and possessive pronouns have low tone (ŋ̀).

(16)

a  ŋ̄ kīī  
     1SG  skin

‘my skin’ (el.)

b  Pɛé  kīī
P.N. skin

‘Pe’s skin’ (el.)

(17)

a  ŋ̀ kīī
1SG.POSS shoes

‘my shoes’ (el.)

b Pèé là kīī
P.N. 3SG.POSS shoes

‘Pe’s shoes’ (el.)

An “external” possessor can modify combinations of the former type:

(18)

Pèé là wìì kpákáà
PN 3SG.POSS animal leg

‘animal leg belonging to Pe’ (el.)

Although the existence of the distinction between alienable and inalienable possession is far from being crosslinguistically unusual (Nichols 1988; 1992; Dahl & Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1998), several things should be pointed out.

First, the class of inalienably possessed nouns is much broader than the typological prototype, which includes body parts and kinship terms, but also spatial terms, some significant parts of objects and basic objects of material culture, such as cattle (Nichols 1988). In Mano, inalienably possessed nouns include, of course, kinship terms (dàá ‘father’, lēkè ‘younger sibling), but also other terms of social relations non-related to kinship: bèá ‘contemporary, person of the same age group’, tósmá ‘homonyme’, gèlè ‘enemy’, gɔ̰́á ‘equal’, kélá ‘witness’, yókò ‘enemy’. In contrast, the noun nè ‘child’ is alienably possessed. Body parts, excretions, physiological liquids are also inalienably possessed (zò ‘heart’, sèé ‘nail’, lìá ‘blood’), together with some parts of objects (tó ‘source’, gbɔ̀á ‘ceiling’, gbɔ̀lɔ ’frame’). Not surprisingly, spatial terms, some of which give rise to postpositions, belong to the inalienably possessed class, as well (yàlà ‘place’, wì ‘lower

Although it is known that the class of inalienably possessed nouns can include some non-prototypical items, in Mano, every third inalienably possessed noun could be considered non-prototypical. Needless to say, the repartition between the two classes is oftentimes arbitrary. Thus, the noun fìlí ‘pilaf’ denotes a dish which consists of rice mixed with spices and either fish or meat. The noun is inalienably possessed: wìì fìlí ‘pilaf with meat’. However, the word bòò ‘sauce’, which is always distinguished by the type of the main ingredient, is alienably possessed. Should the main ingredient be specified, a different construction whose head appears in the low-tone construct-state form is used: bèllëèbòò <cassava + leaf + sauce;CS> ‘cassava leaf sauce’.

Another interesting feature of the grammar of possession in Mano is that some inalienably possessed nouns are obligatorily possessed, that is, they always occur with a possessor (about 75% of all inalienably possessed nouns), and some are optionally possessed, at least in certain contexts⁸. Here the repartition in these two classes also seems arbitrary. Consider two synonyms, sàlà and fɔ̀nɔ̀ ‘salary’. Both of them are inalienably possessed: à sàlà, à fɔ̀nɔ̀ ‘her salary’. However, sàlà can be used without a possessor, while fɔ̀nɔ̀ cannot:

(19)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sàlà} & \quad \text{tì} \quad \text{zèè} \quad \text{wè} \quad \text{lì} \quad \text{sè} \\
\text{salary} & \quad \text{FOC} \quad \text{here} \quad \text{TOP} \quad 3\text{SG.EX1} \quad \text{good}
\end{align*}
\]

‘The salaries (which are) here are good.’ (el.)

---

⁷ On the relationship between possession and valency of complex predicates, see Khachaturyan (2017a).
⁸ A similar distinction is observed in Tariana (Aikhenvald 2003: 127–128).
The salaries are good here (lit.: their salaries)\(\text{'}}\) (el.)

\[\text{a} \quad \text{o} \quad \text{f\text{\text{n}ô} \quad lē \quad sè \quad zèè} \]

3pl. salary 3SG.EXI good here

\[\text{b} \quad \text{n\text{\text{f}ô} \quad lē \quad sè \quad zèè} \]

salary 3SG.EXI good here

Intended reading: ‘The salaries are good here’

4 Verb phrase

Many of the cross-linguistically unusual properties of Mano verb phrasal syntax are related to its peculiar S – AUX – O – V – X word order (Section 6.1), typical of Mande, and its likely diachronic origin in verbal nominalization, which makes the present-day expression of nominalization particularly interesting. The identical treatment of inalienable possessors and direct objects in Mano makes it difficult to classify the language with respect to the typology of argument treatment in nominalizations (Section 6.2). Postverbal arguments, and in particular, postpositional phrases do not have the same level of embedding as direct objects, which shows, again, in nominalizations. Unlike many other Mande languages, however, Mano makes use of a curious clause-level nominalization marker, which allows nominalization to occur with postpositional phrases (Section 4.3). Finally, Mano and other Mande languages show properties of radical P-alignment and make extensive use of P-lability, which makes the family quite unusual typologically (Section 4.4).

4.1 Word order

Mano, just like other Mande languages, observes a fixed S – AUX – O – V – X word order (21, 22), where the direct object precedes the verb, while all other arguments, expressed by postpositional phrases, follow it (Creissels 2005; on the SOVX word order as an areal feature of the Macro-Sudan Belt, see Güldemann 2008a). Unlike many languages of Sub-Saharan Africa, the Mande languages do not have double object constructions where both the recipient and the theme are treated as themes of a prototypically transitive verb (Creissels 2018).
In Mande, this word order is likely to have emerged from a reanalysis of prior nominalizations (Nikitina 2011). Reanalysis of prior nominalizations into finite clauses is not uncommon cross-linguistically (Yap, Grunow-Hårsta & Wrona 2011); in particular, the emergence of a typologically rare word order as a result of reanalysis of nominalizations was claimed for Caribbean languages (Gildea 1998).

4.2 Nominalization

Mano has three nominalization forms: zero-marked, gerund (–à, the vowel assimilates to the preceding vowel) and a low-tone form. They are used in all positions typical of nouns, such as arguments of verbs and postpositions, and may be used with derivational morphology, such as the adjectival suffix –zê (30d). In contrast with the former two forms, the latter form is used whenever the verb is nominalized with a postverbal argument adjacent to it. The distribution of nominalization forms in different contexts can be assessed in Khachaturyan (2015: 145–156).

The argument expression in nominalization roughly follows the Possessive-Accusative type suggested by Koptjevskaja-Tamm (1993): while the P argument is expressed exactly the same way as the direct object in finite constructions (25, 26), the S argument is expressed like an inalienable possessor (24) and the marking of the A argument is identical to the marking of the alienable possessor (26).
‘He has come.’ (el.)

(24)

à  nū-à  lē  sì.

3SG  come-GER  3SG.EXI  good

‘His coming is good.’ (el.)

(25)

āâ  sẫ̆ ā̃̆  kê.

3SG.PRF  work  do

‘He has worked (lit.: he has done work).’ (el.)

(26)

là  sẫ̆  kê-ê  lē  sì

3SG.POSS  work  do-GER  3SG.EXI  good

‘His working is good (lit.: his doing work is good).’ (el.)

The situation is complicated by the fact that in general the marking of the direct object is identical to the marking of the inalienable possessor (6a-6b), which makes a distinction between Possessive-Accusative and the Sentential type blurred in the case of direct object, but which is consistent with the mixed syntactic nature of verb phrases in Mande (Nikitina 2008; on mixed syntax of nominalizations, see also Lefebvre & Muysken 1987).

The possessive split in the treatment of subjects and the identical coding of inalienable possessors and direct objects is reminiscent of the Austronesian situation, and in particular, the Tolai language (Foley 2014). In contrast with Tolai, where the possessive split is motivated by the degree of agentivity of the subject, in Mano it is motivated purely by argument roles (on a similar subject, see van Lier & van Rijn 2013). In addition, the fact that intransitive subjects in nominalizations are expressed the same way as inalienable possessors which is identical to the direct objects expression can be compared with a situation in Southwestern Mande, where in certain grammatical constructions, including nominalizations (Konoshenko 2017: 333) the intransitive subjects are treated as direct objects. This situation is analyzed as an instance of the ergative/absolutive alignment (Vydrin 2011).
4.3 Postverbal arguments and clause-level nominalization

Postverbal and preverbal arguments do not have the same syntactic relationship with the verb, which can be seen in their behavior in nominalization. When the verb is nominalized, the nominalized constituent always includes the direct object, in case the verb is transitive, but not necessarily the oblique argument:

(27)  
\[\text{yékè} \quad 2\text{SG.CONJ} \quad \text{túó} \quad [\text{yíí} \quad \ddot{b}ō-\ddot{ɒ}] \quad \ddot{lẹ̄\ddot{ɛ}}] \quad \text{gūlù \quad yíl}]\]

better.not.to \quad \text{frighten} \quad \text{water} \quad \text{take.off-GER} \quad \text{ADR} \quad \text{hole} \quad \text{in} \quad \text{ADR} \quad \text{hole} \quad \text{in} \quad \text{ADR}

‘You shouldn’t be afraid to pump water from the pit.’ (el.)

In the example above, the verb \(\text{túó} \ ‘frighten’\) has a postpositional argument headed by the postposition \(\ddot{lẹ̄\ddot{ɛ}}\). The postpositional phrase contains a nominalized verb phrase \(\text{yíí} \ddot{b}ō \ ‘pump water’\), where the verb is in the nonfinite (gerund) form. The verb \(\ddot{b}ō\), in turn, also has a postpositional argument, \(\text{gūlù \ yí} \ ‘from the pit (lit.: in pit)’\), but this argument is situated outside the nominalized verb phrase and is separated from it by the postposition \(\ddot{lẹ̄\ddot{ɛ}}\).

A similar behavior of postpositional phrases in Wan, another South Mande language, led Nikitina (2009) to the conclusion that postpositional phrases in Wan are situated in the adjunct position to the IP (see also Nikitina 2018b). A crucial difference between Mano and Wan is that in Wan, postpositional phrases are always extraposed from the nominalized verb phrase, while in Mano, a verb can be nominalized together with its postpositional argument:

(28)  
\[\text{yékè} \quad 2\text{SG.CONJ} \quad \text{túó} \quad [\text{yíí} \quad \ddot{b}ō] \quad \text{gūlù \ yíl}] \quad \ddot{lẹ̄\ddot{ɛ}}\]

better.not.to \quad \text{frighten} \quad \text{water} \quad \text{take.off:NMLZ} \quad \text{hole} \quad \text{in} \quad \text{ADR}

‘You shouldn’t be afraid to pump water from the pit.’ (el.)

Note that in 28, which is similar to 27 in all respects but the position of the postpositional phrase, the form of the verb \(\ddot{b}ō \ ‘take off’\) is also different: while in 27, it occurs in the gerund form, in 28 it occurs in the special low-tone nominalization form used in nominalizations with oblique arguments. Dan-Gweetaa and Kla-Dan,
languages closely related to Mano belonging to the Dan language cluster, also have a low-tone form with a similar functioning (on Dan-Gweetaa, see Vydrin 2008).

Lexicalized nominalizations often occur with obligatory postpositional phrases. 29a is a finite construction with the verbal complex zò gélé <heart-burn> ‘to be angry’. In 29b the verbal complex is lexicalized to form a noun zógélégé ‘anger’, note the low tone of the head verb gélè ‘burn:NMLZ’. The argument of the postposition is omitted. 30a and 30b is a similar pair with the verbal complex zò dɔ́ <heart-lay> ‘to trust’ and the lexicalized nominalization zòdàmɔ̀ ‘belief, faith’; note the low tone in 30b on dɔ́ ‘lay:NMLZ’. The argument of the postposition in 30b is represented by a dummy pronoun à. In the nominalization in 30c the object of belief is precise, it is wàlà ‘God’. Lexicalized nominalization can further undergo adjectivization with the suffix –zɛ̀, as in 30d zòdàmɔ̀zɛ̀ ‘faithful’.

(29)

a kō zɔ̀ lè gélé-pélè kō gè
1PL heart 3SG.EXI burn-INF 1PL stomach

‘We are angry (lit.: our heart is burning in our stomach).’ (nat.)

b zò-gélè-gè

heart-burn:NMLZ-stomach

‘anger’ (nat.)

(30)

a kòò kō zɔ̀ dɔ́ à mɔ̀
1PL.IPfv 1PL heart lay:IPfv 3SG on

‘We trust in him (lit.: we lay our heart on him).’ (el.)

b zò-dɔ́-à-mɔ̀

heart-lay:NMLZ-3SG-on

‘belief’ (nat.)

c zɔ̀ dɔ́ wàlà mɔ̀

heart lay:NMLZ God on

‘belief in God’ (nat.)

d zòdàmɔ̀-zè
belief-adj

‘faithful’ (nat.)

In Mano, the nominalization form is used wherever the verb is nominalized with a postverbal element, be it a postpositional phrase or an adverb. Moreover, it can be used even with a specific type of finite predication, namely, a conjoint construction expressing either a consecutive action, or a simultaneous action (on conjoint constructions, see Section 6.1):

(31)

a ë nū áà pē séj wi
3SG.PST come 3SG.JNT thing all break:INT

‘He came and broke everything.’ (el.)

b [nū áà pē séj wi] wɔ̄ sè
come:NMLZ 3SG.JNT thing all break:INT COP.NEG good

‘To come and break everything is not good.’ (el.)

In (31b), the subject of the copula sentence is a construction nū áà pē séj wi which contains the verb nū ‘to come’ in the low-tone nominalization form and a finite predication áà pē séj wi ‘he breaks everything’ with a third person singular auxiliary áà⁹. Since the nominalized constituent with the low-tone form can contain finite clauses, this form should be considered a marker of clausal nominalization, in contrast to the VP nominalization marked (in certain contexts) by the gerund form, ex. 22. While nominalization with clausal dependents has nothing unusual (see in English nominalization with complement clauses: [Learning that everyone should be treated with respect] was hard for Mary), it is worth noting that in Mano, such dependents require the use of specific nominalization marking.

4.4 Transitivity and Lability

⁹The only finite construction used with nominalization is the so-called conjoint construction which is pragmatically subordinated, used in clause-chaining always following some situational anchor (see Section 6.1) and therefore should be situated lower on the finiteness scale than other constructions, which are freely used in main clauses.
Having quite poor inflectional and derivational morphology in general, Mano does not have any morphological marking of derived (in)transitivity, which puts it on the same scale as several other Southern Mande languages, such as Guro or Beng (Kuznetsova 2011; Paperno 2014). Some other Southern languages, such as Kla-Dan (Makeeva 2011), at least, have causative markers, which is also a typical trait of Western Mande, such as Kakabe (Vydrina 2011) or Mandinka (Creissels & Sambou 2013). To express valency changing, Mano employs two procedures: either analytic constructions, such as impersonal or reflexive, or lability, morphologically unmarked variation of argument structure, where the verb can be used in the same form in transitive or intransitive constructions. A striking feature of Mande, and Mano in particular, is the widespread P-lability, variation in argument structure where the patientive participant occupies the position of the subject. The following example illustrates morphologically unmarked causal vs. noncausal alternation where the verb ‘to (make) fall’ is used in a transitive construction and an intransitive one with no overt morphological marking.

(32)

\[
\begin{align*}
a & \quad nɛ́ e dà \\
\text{child} & \quad 3SG.PST \quad \text{fall}
\end{align*}
\]

‘The child fell.’ (el.)

\[
\begin{align*}
b & \quad kóò kò nɛ́ dà ì ̀̀èè \\
3SG.EXI & \quad 1PL.POSS \quad \text{child} \quad \text{fall} \quad 2SG \quad \text{ADR}
\end{align*}
\]

‘We are presenting our child to you (lit.: we are making our child fall to you).’ (nat.)

Even more cross-linguistically rare is passive lability where the verb has strong agent-oriented components in its semantics. This is in contrast to an earlier prediction by Haspelmath (1993) that such a lability type cannot occur, it appears to be typical for Mande (Vydrina 2011; Cobbinah & Lüpke 2012; Creissels 2014), but also occurs elsewhere, such as in some Daghestanian and Austronesian languages (for a typology of lability, see Letuchij 2013).

(33)

\[
\begin{align*}
a & \quad òó gbàâ wɔ̀ lɔ̀ ñlɔ̀ ñbò \\
3PL.NEG & \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{sleeping.place} \quad \text{getting} \quad \text{implement}
\end{align*}
\]
‘They did not obtain a sleeping place.’ (el.)

b wɔ̀ lɔ̀ lɛ̀ gbāā sɔ̀ lɔ̄ bō

sleeping.place 3SG.NEG NEG getting implement

‘The sleeping place was not obtained.’ (nat.)

5 Tense, Aspect, Modality and Polarity

Mano predications are divided into two major types: copula clauses, where the head is a copula, and constructions with auxiliaries. Auxiliaries express TAMP and function as a site of subject indexation. However, the auxiliaries are not the only markers of TAMP. As it is typical for languages of Sub-Saharan Africa (Welmers 1973: 343), in Mano, the expression of TAMP values is not located in specific markers: it is rather expressed by a construction as a whole which contains auxiliaries together with predicative markers, particles, adverbs and verbs in a particular morphological form. Thus, (34) is an example of the durative construction which contains an existential 3SG auxiliary (lē) and a verb in the lexical tonal form with the suffix -pēlē.

(34)

lē nū-pēlē

3SG.EXI come-INF

‘(S)he is coming.’ (el.)

In (35), negative perfective, there is a negative 3SG auxiliary (lḗ), predicative marker of negation (gbāā) and a verb in the lexical form.

(35)

lḗ gbāā nū

3SG.NEG NEG come

‘(S)he did not come.’ (el.)
A description of the semantics of TAMP in Mano can be found in Khachaturyan (2011; 2015). Section 5.1 is dedicated to the rich tonal morphology of verbs used in various TAMP constructions, Section 5.2 explains the general patterns of use of auxiliaries, Section 5.3. is dedicated to the expression of negation, and Section 5.4 is dedicated to the polysemy of prospective markers.

5.1 Verbal forms used in TAMP constructions

Mano verb can boast a rich suprasegmental morphology. It has five grammatical tonal forms in addition to four affixes. Some of the affixes are used only in combination with a tonal form. There are in total 8 morphological distinctions in the verbal paradigms which are employed in various TAMP constructions, but also non-finite constructions: imperfective tonal form, conjoint tonal form homonymous with nominalization tonal form, real protasis tonal form (with suffix –á), counterfactual protasis tonal form (also with suffix -á), gerund homonymous with the counterfactual (with suffix –á) and infinitive (with suffix –pélè). In addition, there are regular contractions of gerunds with the postposition ká ‘with’. Table 4 gives example paradigms.

No verbs contrast all forms, there is always at least some syncretism. Mid-tone CV verbs, like pà ‘fill’, and high-tone CVCV verbs, like félè ‘become clear’, contrast the maximum of forms, 7 out of 8, while the low-tone CVa verbs, like nià ‘turn’, contrast the minimum of forms, 3 out of 8. Given that some of the forms have finite and non-finite usages which cannot be accounted for using the assumption of polysemy (nominalization homophonous with the conjoint form and gerund homophonous with the counterfactual apodosis), it would be more correct to state that Mano has 10 verbal forms, with obligatory syncretism in two pairs of forms.

Table 4. Example of verbal paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic form</th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Conjoint/ Nominalization</th>
<th>Real protasis</th>
<th>Counterfactual protasis</th>
<th>Gerund/ Counterfactual apodosis</th>
<th>Infinitive</th>
<th>Gerund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>félè</td>
<td>félè</td>
<td>félè</td>
<td>félèá, félèá, félá</td>
<td>félà</td>
<td>félàpélè</td>
<td>félà</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘become clear’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The syntax of the nominalization form in Mano is also typologically unusual, see Section 4.2. Conditional forms will be discussed in Section 6.1.

### 5.2 Auxiliaries

In Mande languages auxiliaries play an indispensable role in TAMP expression. A typologically remarkable feature of the TAMP system in Mano among other Southern Mande languages, as well as Southwestern Mande languages is the rich inventory of auxiliaries which, in addition to contributing to the semantics of a particular TAMP construction, index the subject’s person and number. As in many other Mande languages, the Mano verb occurs in its lexical form and the auxiliary is the only exponent of TAMP values in most TAMP constructions. Thus, TAMP constructions in (36a–c) differ only in marking of the auxiliary: auxiliary of the past (36a), perfect (36b), and conjunctive series (36c).

(36)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>ē</th>
<th>nū</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3SG.PST</td>
<td>come</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘He came’ (el.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b</th>
<th>āà</th>
<th>nū</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3SG.PRF</td>
<td>come</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘He has come’ (el.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c</th>
<th>mī</th>
<th>sḗ</th>
<th>dāá</th>
<th>d̀á</th>
<th>lē</th>
<th>ē</th>
<th>nū!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>person</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>father</td>
<td>duty</td>
<td>COP</td>
<td>3SG.CONJ</td>
<td>come</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Every person’s father has to come (lit.: Every person’s father’s duty is he come).’ (el.)

Together with expressing TAMP, Mano auxiliaries index subject’s person and number. In (36a), the form ē expresses past tense, but also the subject’s person (third) and number (singular). It co-occurs with the full noun phrase of the subject. Instead of treating forms like ē as subject pronouns inflected for TAMP, an argument has been made to treat them as TAMP markers (or auxiliaries) inflected for person and number and
agreeing with the subject (Hachaturyan 2010). On (subject) agreement in Mande, see Konoshenko (2013; 2014). For more examples of subject indexing in auxiliaries in African languages and, more generally, discussion of criteria allowing to distinguish free subject pronouns and bound pronominal markers, see Creissels (2005: 51–54). The full paradigm of Mano auxiliaries is given in Table II of the appendix.

5.3 Negation

In Mano, negation is expressed in copulas, in auxiliaries and in additional predicative markers which are used in certain negative constructions.

Negation in Mano is asymmetric (in the sense proposed by Miestamo 2005) both because negation involves a change in the TAMP constructions (constructional asymmetry) and because the inventory of negative constructions is reduced with respect to the inventory of affirmative constructions (paradigmatic asymmetry). Thus, for negative non-verbal constructions there is only one copula, \( w\ddot{o} \), while affirmative non-verbal clauses contain either an existential auxiliary (37, 38) or either of the three available affirmative copulas \( l\ddot{e} \), \( w\ddot{\dot{o}} \) or \( g\ddot{\dot{e}} \) (39, 40). While there are three affirmative presentative constructions (40), there is no negative correlate.

(37)

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
a & g\ddot{\dot{e}} & w\ddot{\dot{e}} & l\ddot{e} & \ddot{j} & d\ddot{e} & k\ddot{a} \\
\text{man:FOC DEM.PROX 3SG.EXI 1SG husband with} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘This man is my husband.’ (el.)

b \( g\ddot{\dot{e}} \ w\ddot{\dot{e}} \ w\ddot{\dot{o}} \ \ddot{j} \ d\ddot{e} \ k\ddot{a} \)

\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{man:FOC DEM.PROX COP.NEG 1SG husband with} \\
\end{array}

‘This man is not my husband.’ (el.)

(38)

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
a & b\ddot{\ddot{e}} & v\ddot{o} & \ddot{o} & b\ddot{\ddot{e}} \\\n\text{elephant PL 3PL.EXI EXI} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘Elephants exist.’ (el.)

b \( b\ddot{\ddot{e}} \ v\ddot{o} \ w\ddot{\ddot{o}} \ b\ddot{\ddot{e}} \)

\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{elephant PL COP.NEG EXI} \\
\end{array}

‘Elephants do not exist.’ (el.)
(39)

a  à  ɓɔ̄  ɔ̀  lɛ  GER  COP  
3SG  leave-GER  COP

‘He has left (lit.: his leaving is),’ (el.)

b  à  ɓɔ̄  ɔ̀  wáá  ká  
3SG  leave-GER  COP.NEG>3SG  with

‘He has not left (lit.: his leaving isn’t it).’ (el.)

(40)

a  wálà  lèwè  lè  
God  word  COP

‘This is the word of God.’ (el.)

b  wálà  lèwè  gɔ́  
God  word  COP.DEICT

‘Here is the word of God (the referent is visible).’ (nat.)

c  wálà  lèwè  wɔ́  wɛ́  
God  word  COP.DEICT  TOP.PROX

‘Here is the word of God (the object is present at the interactive scene).’ (el.)

In declaratives, there is only one negative auxiliary which, combined with different lexical and grammatical means, is used to form constructions of negative habitual, aorist, and perfect, while in the affirmative zone, there are three different auxiliaries used for these purposes (41). The inventory of affirmative modal constructions is much richer than the inventory of negative ones: thus, there is no direct negative equivalent of the prospective construction (see Section 5.3).

(41)

a  lèè  ló  lɔ́ ɔ́ í  vs  b  lèè  ló  lɔ́ ɔ́ yí  
3SG.IPFV  go:IPFV  market  3SG.NEG  go  market

‘She goes to the market’ (el.)  ‘She does not go to the market’ (el.)

c  ē  ló  lɔ́ ɔ́ í  vs  d  lèè  gbāā  ló  lɔ́ ɔ́ yí  
3SG.PST  go  market  3SG.NEG  NEG  go  market
In addition to auxiliaries with negative polarity (the negative series, 41, but also prohibitive) and the negative copula wo Mano employs negative predicative markers, including gbāā (41d) used in negative perfective constructions. Worth mentioning is another negative predicative marker, gɔ́, which is used only in negative conditional constructions. Conditional clauses in Mano employ a lot of dedicated morphology, see Section 6.2.

### 5.4 Prospective

In contrast with other auxiliary series, the prospective series is always used with another auxiliary: most often, with the conjunctive auxiliary (with which it regularly merges). The series also stands out phonotactically, since the markers have the form CVCV or CVCVCV, which is not attested elsewhere in the auxiliary paradigm.

The series also has quite an unusual polysemy, not attested elsewhere in the family. First, it is used in quotative constructions (42); second, when the prospective auxiliary is combined with a conjunctive auxiliary coreferential with it, the entire construction conveys the modality of intentionality (43, 44) and prospective aspectual value, whereas a future action or state is inferred from some present state of affairs (45, 46).

In the quotative construction the prospective marker is the sole means of introducing reported speech, there is no speech verb. The marker may optionally be followed by a conjunction kēlē. The quoted predication can take any form; in (42), it is represented by a copula construction.

(42)

```cookieline
Yēlē  āmɔ̃ŋwɔ̃ gbàlà mià yà–à lē lūū yì kpā kpā.
3SG.PROSP therefore Kpelle person.PL sit-GER COP bush in many
```

‘He says this is why there are so many Kpelle people in the forest. (lit.: he says therefore the Kpelle people are seated in the forest in big quantity).’ (nat.)
Gèwūlū yèlè gbāā é kpílì kē.

‘Gewulu wants to organize a celebration.’ (nat.)

Dwɔ mɔlɔ ḣ̀ ḡ̀ ā...

problem FOC 1SG.PROSP 1SG.CONJ>3SG say TOP

‘The story that I want to tell...’ (nat.)

áà nù mais à zi nù kɔ̀ wɛ̀

3SG.INT come:INT but 3SG INT.POSS come way:CS DEM.PROX

lɛ lɛ̀ pɛ̀ lɛ́ yèlè dɔ̀

3SG.EXI like 3SG.PROSP>3SG.CONJ stop

‘He was approaching but the way he was approaching was like he was going to stop.’ (nat.)

yèlè gbāā é pɛ̀ lɛ́ sìnè dùò

3SG.PROSP now 3SG.CONJ penicillin throw

‘She was about to inject penicillin.’ (nat.)

Quotative indexes are not uncommon in Mande: they are particularly widespread in Manding (on quotative indexes in Mandinka, see Creissels & Sambou 2013: 441–443). In some languages, quotative indexes can be inflected for person and number. In Mano the same as in Tura (another Southern Mande language) inflected quotative indexes are used as quotative predicators, defined as a predicative element “similar to quotative verbs that cannot be classified as full-fledged verbs in a given language” (Güldemann 2008b: 15). In other Mande languages with quotative indexes reported by Idiatov (2010), in particular, Jula of Samatiguila or the Ko dialect of Mende (Western Mande), they are used non-predicatively as clause-linking markers. A polysemy like the one attested in Mano (quotative, intentionality) has been attested in Wan, Southern Mande (Nikitina 2018a), while Mandinka adds prospective to the range of meaning expressed by the quotative construction (Creissels
& Sambou 2013: 443–445). The same kind of polysemy is also widely attested outside the Mande family. On the development of intentionality meanings from quotatives, see Güldemann (2008b); on the development of future-related verbal meanings out of intentionality, see Bybee et al. (1994). Given the cross-linguistic tendencies in grammaticalization (quotative > intention > prospective), Mano prospective series most likely emerged out of a fusion of pronominal elements with some quotative index or a verb. However, the identity of that index or the verb and in general the origin of the series is still an unresolved question.

6 Information structure and the syntax of complex clauses

In clause-combining, Mano employs the following means: TAM categories and constructions, linkers, determiners, conjunctions, topicalizers. Certain pragmatically dependent clauses (such as purpose constructions) contain specialized TAM categories, such as conjunctive. For a series of consecutive or simultaneous events, the conjoint construction is used (Section 6.1). Conditional clauses are cross-linguistically unusual because they employ a lot of specialized morphology (see Section 6.2). Linkers are used for coordination (éto, ëë́ ‘and’, kéë, kélá ‘but’, lè ‘then (used in a narrative chain)’) and subordination (yé ‘when’, ké ‘so that (purpose constructions)’, bĩī ‘because’), typically occur in the beginning of a phrase and may occur after a pause. Determiners, and especially focus markers (lè, nè, té, hign-tone floating marker) are used in relative clauses following the relativized constituent. Conjunctions, and most prominently kélë are used in complement clauses and reported speech, usually form a prosodic unit with a preceding clause and occur before a pause. Finally, topicalizers are used as clause-linking devices and occur at the right edge of an utterance-initial dependent clause. In Section 6.3, I will summarize the origin and function of topicalization markers, which in many cases are the only clause linking devices used, and show that their primary function is information structuring, so in complex clauses their function is to mark pragmatic, rather than syntactic dependency. The level of syntactic embedding in subordination in Mano is generally very low, so in Section 6.4, where I analyze relative clauses, which in the literature are typically seen as primary examples of embedding, I show that in Mano they function as a pragmatic interpretation of a paratactic information structure construction.

6.1 Conjoint form
The conjoined construction in Mano, consisting of an auxiliary of the conjoint series and a verb in the low-tone conjoined form, is an example of a clause-chaining category commonly occurring in languages of Sub-Saharan Africa, where in a chain of clauses representing a sequence of events only one is finite and the rest exhibit some properties of non-finiteness\(^\text{10}\). The Mano construction is most commonly used in the narrative chain. The narrative is usually divided into micro-episodes, where the first event in the perfective, and the subsequent events in the conjoint construction, the subjects of the respective constructions are typically (but not always) coreferential.

(47)
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ê} & \quad \text{là} & \quad \text{pɔ̄} & \quad \text{sì} & \quad \text{kpēŋ̄} & \quad \text{àà} & \quad \text{nù} & \quad \text{à} & \quad \text{pàà} \\
3\text{SG.PST} & \quad 3\text{SG.PASS} & \quad \text{thing.PL} & \quad \text{pick.up} & \quad \text{directly} & \quad 3\text{SG.JNT} & \quad \text{come:JNT} & \quad 3\text{SG} & \quad \text{at}
\end{align*}
\]
\[
\text{sèlè} & \quad \text{sàlâpèèlè} & \quad \text{à} & \quad \text{à} & \quad \text{dòò} & \quad \text{yì} \\
\text{soil} & \quad \text{seven} & \quad \text{DEM} & \quad 3\text{SG} & \quad \text{one} & \quad \text{in}
\]
‘[When he heard these rumors,] he immediately took his affairs and returned home, to one of the seven villages.’ (nat.)

Speech verbs in the narratives more often than other verbs are put in the conjoint form. Moreover, switch reference of the subject is a norm, rather than an exception. (48) represents a reported dialogue, so in (48b-c), the subject of the speech verb is different from each preceding one.

(48)
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \quad \text{làà} & \quad \text{gèè} & \quad \text{wàá} & \quad \text{pèèlè} & \quad \text{nù} \\
3\text{SG.IPVF}>3\text{SG} & \quad \text{say:IPFV} & \quad \text{thousand} & \quad \text{two} & \quad \text{give}
\end{align*}
\]
‘He says: give 2000 (francs).’
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b} & \quad \text{àà} & \quad \text{gèè} & \quad \text{wàá} & \quad \text{pèèlè} & \quad \text{wɔ́} & \quad \text{ŋ̄} & \quad \text{kèlè}
\end{align*}
\]
\(^{10}\) Such forms with reduced finiteness are called consecutive (see Carlson 1994 for Supiyré, Atlantic) or sequential (see Frajzyngier 1996 for Chadic). The term “conjoint” is chosen for Mano because the marking in question is used not only to represent a sequence of events, but also simultaneous events. The term “conjoint” is also used in African linguistics – and especially in the studies of Bantu languages – to designate a morphological opposition between conjoint and disjoint forms which has a different functional load than the “conjoint” forms in Mano, see van der Wal and Hyman (2016).
The chain of conjoined constructions is rarely very long, maximum 3-4 clauses. A good balance between perfective and conjoined constructions creates a stylistic effect of narrative fluidity, and is a sign of a good narrator: overuse of perfective constructions in a narrative is typical of children, who have not yet fully acquired the story-telling art. The use of the conjoint construction in the Mano narrative is still much an object of a future study (for a brilliant analysis of variation in narrative structuring in Totela, a Bantu language, see Crane 2011).

The conjoint construction is also used to express events simultaneous with some other event:

(49)

\[
\begin{align*}
3SG.PST & \quad \text{kẹ́ nọ́ mì́jí́ zẹ́-pẹ́lẹ́ àà gbẹ́ à ká} \\
\text{È} & \quad \text{do just dream kill-INF} & \quad 3SG.JNT & \quad \text{put:JNT} & \quad 3SG & \quad \text{with} \\
\text{sàlápè} & \quad \text{mọ́yọ́mọ́.} \\
\text{meat} & \quad \text{because.of} \\
\end{align*}
\]

'He was just dreaming and it concerned meat.’ (nat.)

Note that while in the narrative, the conjoint construction is usually used as part of a chain of statements, in the conversation, it can constitute a turn all by itself and even occur in a question. One such case occurred in
an example suggested by my language consultant, where a question, containing a conjoint construction, asked by one (imaginary) participant in a conversation (50c) is a direct follow-up of a prior question framed in a regular non-verbal predication (50a).

(50)

a Speaker A  Jean-Pierre  lɛ̄ mɛ́ ?
   P.N.  3SG.EXI  where

‘Where is Jean-Pierre?’

b Speaker B  lɛ̄ dɔ̀ á dzèē
   3SG.EXI  stop.GER.with here

‘He is standing here.’

c Speaker A  áà mɛ́nɛ́ zàá  gɛ̰̀̋̋ ?
   3SG.INT  where  see:INT

‘What is he looking at? (Why doesn’t he see I am calling him?)’ (el.)

Thus, while the conjoint construction does not have to immediately follow a clause expressed by a full-fledged aspectual construction (perfective, in the case of a sequence of actions in the narrative, or some other construction, in the case of simultaneous events), it is always directly or indirectly related to some situational landmark. For an analysis of a similar construction, "null tense", in Wolof, Atlantic, employing the notion of discursive anchor point, see Robert (2010). Clause-chaining with the help of forms with reduced finiteness was classified by Givón (2001: 357) into two types: clause-chaining where the finite-most predication is the ultimate member of a chain, corresponding to the SOV word order, and clause-chaining where the finite-most predication is the first member of a chain, corresponding to the VO word order. As observed by Creissels (2018: 804), Mande languages, as exemplified by Mano, put the finite-most clause in the initial position of the chain and challenge this typology by not being VO but rather OV languages, or, to be more precise, SOVX languages. Therefore, as Creissels concludes, the relevant parameter in the typology of clause-chaining should be not OV vs VO, but rather verb-final vs verb-medial.

6.2 Conditionals
Mano conditional clauses contain a lot of dedicated morphology. Unlike the conjoint construction, there is no dedicated conditional auxiliary, but instead there is a rich inventory of verbal morphology. First, there are two tonal forms, combined with the conditional suffix –á. The first tonal form I dub conditional (51-43), and the second, irrealis (54). Furthermore, there is a counterfactual suffix –à (53, 54). The difference in verbal forms is illustrated with the verb lò ‘go’: lō-á go:COND-COND vs lō-á go:IRREAL-COND vs lō-á go-CNTRFCT. Finally, as noted in Section 5.3, some conditional constructions in Mano employ a dedicated negative predicative marker, gɔ́á, used in negative protasis (53), as well as in negative counterfactual apodosis (54).

(51)

[Làgĩnɛ̀ mì é nũ-á pě lō i kêlɛ̀ e.]

Guinea person:CS 3SG.CONJ come:COND-COND thing buy 2SG hand TOP

yěkè è è kò pà á mò.

better.not.to 3SG.CONJ 3SG.REFL arm touch 3SG on

‘If a Guinean person wants to buy something from you, he’d better not touch it.’ (nat.)

(52)

[kó lō-á bèi zàá] kòó lō á gɛ̀-ɛ́.

IPL.CONJ go:COND-COND downstream in IPL.IPFV go:IPFV 3SG see-GER

‘If we go downstream, we will see it.’ (nat.)

(53)

[i lō-á pɛ́lɛ́i ā] [lèè è gɔ́á]

2SG.CONJ go:COND-COND village TOP woman 3SG.CONJ NEG.CONG

wèà i wèlɛ̀i ā] kē kòó wàá ká

speak-CNTRFCT 2SG face TOP at.that.moment 1PL.EMPH COP.NEG>3SG with

kē kòó i yè.

that 1PL.CONJ 2SG.EXI give.birth

‘If you go to the village and no woman speaks to you, then we are not those who gave birth to you.’ (nat.)
If it had been (so that) they knew him, they would not have put him with nails on the cross.

Mano makes a formal distinction between real, imaginative, and predictive conditionals, on the one hand, and counterfactual conditionals, on the other hand (on the semantic classification of conditionals, see Thompson, Longacre & Hwand 1997). Indeed, in the first three examples, the protasis is formed with a conjunctive auxiliary with the conditional verbal form (é lōá ‘if he goes’), while the counterfactual protasis construction is formed with a subjunctive auxiliary and an irrealis tonal form (è lòá ‘if (s)he had gone’). The repartition of conditional types in these two categories does not correspond to a prototypical realis/irrealis distinction where actual situations are coded differently from hypothetical and counterfactual situations. Thus, in Nanti, Arawak, real conditionals contain realis marking and are thus different from all other types of conditionals containing irrealis (such as in hypothetical conditionals) or double irrealis marking (as in counterfactuals; see Michael 2014). On the other hand, special marking of counterfactual conditional clauses is not uncommon across languages: Lazard (1998) mentions a few. However, it seems common for languages to have the same marker for protasis and apodosis of counterfactual conditionals. This is the case, for example, in Rembarrnga, non-Pama-Nyungan (Verstraete 2005) or in Hausa, Chadic (Bagari 1976). In contrast, protasis and apodosis in conditionals are expressed by strikingly different constructions in Mano; in Nanti, the aforementioned Arawak language, both protasis and apodosis are marked with double irrealis, but the apodosis receives an additional marking (Michael 2014).

In addition to dedicated markers, Mano makes extensive use of constructions employed elsewhere. Non-counterfactual apodosis is always expressed by a non-dedicated construction: future (42), non-verbal (53), etc. In (55), the negative counterfactual protasis is expressed by a negative copular construction with the linker yé ‘when’, the value of counterfactuality is expressed by the marker of retrospective shift këi, often used in counterfactual constructions. On the other hand, formally conditional constructions often receive a temporal,
non-conditional interpretation, as in (56). (On the lack of distinction between “if” and “when” clauses, in particular, in Papuan languages, see Thompson and Longacre (1997)).

(55)

\[ [yé \ yō \ wó \ këł \ à \ kà \ á] \]

when 3SG.EMPH COP.NEG RETR 3SG with TOP

\[ mî \ nôfè \ dô \ lië \ gû \ dô-ð ñ \ à \ pië \]

person any INDEF 3SG.NEG NEG.COND stop-CNTRFCT 3SG to

‘If it hadn’t been like this, no one would have supported him.’ (nat.)

(56)

\[ [Wëî \ è \ nû-à \ à], \ è \ là \ wëbà \ kë, \]

monkey 3SG.CONJ come:COND-COND TOP 3SG.PST 3SG.POSS salutation do

\[ è \ lô. \]

3SG.PST go

‘When the monkey came, it greeted and went away.’ (nat.)

The final observation concerns the fact that some examples were attested where a non-counterfactual construction was used in a semantically counterfactual context. No examples of the reverse kind have been attested.

(57)

\[ [fëî \ wëî \ këłë \ è] \ [i \ nûá \ à] \]

nothing NEG.COP>2SG hand TOP 2SG.CONJ come:COND-COND TOP

\[ mîá \ òò \ lô \ gbû-û \ í \ mò. \]

person.PL 3PL.IPVF go:IPFV gather-GER 2SG on

‘Even if you had nothing, if you had come, the people would have helped you (lit: you have nothing, if you come, people will help you).’ (nat.)
To conclude, the existence of dedicated conditional morphology notwithstanding, the formal and semantic
distinction between conditional and other types of constructions, as well as between counterfactual and non-
counterfactual conditionals is far from fixed, which contributes to blurring the distinction between realis and
irrealis. On the critique of the cross-linguistic validity of the notion of irrealis, see Bybee (1998) and Cristofaro
(2012).

6.3 Topicalization and subordination

As a rule, in complex clauses when the dependent clause precedes the main clause, it is framed by the marker
ä̃-yā or, somewhat less frequently, ũē̃-wē (see examples in the previous section). These markers appear across
dependent clauses of different semantic types and, in certain cases, are the only markers of clause linking. In
this section, I argue that they function more like information structuring devices and markers of pragmatic
backgrounding than markers of syntactic subordination.

Markers ä̃-yā and ũē̃-wē are also used in a regular adnominal demonstrative function with an
underlying pragmatic value of marking discourse-old and mutually known referents. Note that the discourse-
old value of referents is preserved even when the markers are used in the exophoric function of pointing to
objects present at the interactive scene (58).

(58)

ɓà lè wē gê è lô wê

2SG.POSS field DEM.PROX COP.DEICT 3SG.SBJV go:IPFV EXI

‘(An old man is showing his daughter-in-law a field that he offered her and her husband and which has been
much talked about in the family.) This field of yours, it goes like this.’ (nat.)

(59)

kóò lô dèèkpô yâ ŋwěyǒð̃ kē-e

1PL.IPFV go:IPFV ball DEM question do-GER

‘(Children were playing with a ball and accidentally threw it over the neighbor’s fence.) We will ask about
that ball.’ (nat.)
The same markers are used with left-extraposed topicalized nominal constituents (60), but also with non-nominal topics (61).

(60)

\[ mīī \quad lē \quad ā \quad gḕ\quad ī \quad lḕ? \]

person \quad FOC \quad 3SG.PST>3SG \quad say \quad 2SG \quad ADR

\[ ĕ̀ \quad ŋwò̀ \quad wè̀ \quad bā \quad sī \quad ī \quad diè \quad gḕ? \]

and \quad problem \quad DEM.PROX \quad 2SG.PST>3SG \quad take \quad 2SG \quad INT \quad stomach

‘Was it someone who told it to you? Or that problem, you invented it yourself (lit.: that problem, you took it from your own stomach)?’ (nat.)

(61)

\[ ā \quad ŋwè́́j \quad yā \quad ŋwò̀ \quad gā̀ \quad wò \quad kō \quad fū \]

3SG \quad because.of \quad TOP \quad thing \quad strong \quad COP.NEG \quad 1PL \quad between

‘Because of that, there is no hard problem between us.’ (nat.)

When the markers yā and wē are used utterance-finally, a position where they are almost never obligatory, they are used in contexts where the existence or a referent or an entire situation is presupposed. Thus, in the presentative construction, wē and yā are used to introduce a known referent (62) and are in a complementary distribution with the existential marker wē, which is used when the presentative construction introduces a new or unexpected referent (63).

(62)

\[ wálā \quad là \quad bā̀ \quad nɔ̀ nɔ̀ \quad gē \quad wē \]

God \quad 3SG.POSS \quad sheep \quad small \quad COP.DEICT \quad TOP.PROX

‘Here is the Lamb of God (that I told you about)!’ (nat.)

(63)

\[ dḕj \quad là \quad tì̀j \quad lè \quad wḕ? \]

who \quad 3SG.POSS \quad chicken \quad COP \quad EXI
'(A chicken, which does not belong to the family, unexpectedly entered a room.) Whose chicken is this?'

(nat.)

The markers are used at the terminal position of the focus construction, where the focalized constituent is left-extraposed and followed by the determiner lɛ́ ~ nɛ́ ~ tɛ́, its position in situ being taken up by a resumptive pronominal element (in 64, it is the 3SG past auxiliary ē).

(64)

\[ Yèí \ gbè \ Sèé \ lɛ́ \ ē \ ɲwɔ́ \ ā \ gɛ́ \ ā \]

P.N. son P.N. FOC 3SG.PST thing DEM say TOP

'It is Se, son of Yei, who said it.' (nat.)

Although most commonly, the focus construction contains one or the other marker, there are certain cases where they were not attested. The exact rules of distribution are yet unknown, but a preliminary assessment of the data suggests that the presence and the absence of marker create a meaningful contrast: the markers are present when the construction is used to introduce a focalized argument, typically chosen among the available alternatives, and absent when the entire predicate with its arguments is new to the discourse.

(65)

\[ ɲ \ bèí \ pɛ̰́̋ \ lɛ́ \ mā \ ɣà \ tièè \]

1SG.POSS cassava chunk FOC 1SG.PST>3SG put fire.LOC

'I PUT SOME MANIOC CHUNKS ON THE FIRE (lit.: it is CHUNKS OF MANIOC that I put on fire)’

(nat.)

Thus, the utterance-final use of the demonstratives wɛ́ and yā is consistent with their adnominal function, as they are used in contexts where referents (and sometimes entire propositions) are cognitively available, being known and presupposed.

Finally, the markers are used as clause-linking devices, framing a dependent clause typically preceding the main clause, as amply illustrated by the examples in the preceding and following sections. The
example below illustrates a situation where the order between the clauses is not fixed, but the clause-linker ā is used only when the dependent clause precedes the main clause (66a).

(66)

a [kê wàlà là lèvê è tàà ā], zéézù ê nù

so.that God 3SG.POSS speech 3SG.CNJ walk TOP Jesus 3SG.PST come

‘So that the word of God would spread, Jesus came.’ (el.)

b zéézù ê nù [kê wàlà là lèvê è tàà ā]

Jesus 3SG.PST come so.that God 3SG.POSS speech 3SG.CNJ walk

‘Jesus came so that the word of God spreads.’ (el.)

Finally, the markers wê and yā can be used as sole markers of clause-linking, again, with the dependent clause preceding the main clause.

(67)

[ŋī yíí kà nó kê ā], màà tié gī̀ mà

1SG.PST water cut just like.this TOP 1SG.PRF fire smell hear

‘When I just crossed the river, I heard the smell of fire.’ (nat.)

To sum up, the function of the markers wê and yā as clause-linking devices and their function as adnominal demonstratives, topic markers and utterance-final markers have a strong common denominator: marking pragmatically backgrounded referents and situations (Khachaturyan 2018b). Thus, the function of these clause-linking markers as markers of subordination is intrinsically related to their function as information-structuring devices. The polysemy of the markers wê and yā is not typologically unusual. In particular, the literature provides many examples of demonstratives used as (or diachronically grammaticalizing into) topic markers, and of topic markers (including with demonstrative origin) being used as clause-linking markers and markers of pragmatically dependent clauses (Diessel 1999): e.g. Belhare, Sino-Tibetan (Bickel 1993), or Mon, Austroasiatic (Jenny 2009). This kind of development is well described in Austronesian-Oceanic.
languages (Bril 2010). The same kind of development is attested in Mande, although it seems to be restricted to relative clauses (Nikitina 2012).

In the absence of dedicated marking of subordinate clauses, clausal subordination in Mano should be best presented in terms of pragmatic subordination and information structuring, rather than syntactic embedding. In particular, (67), where there is no marking of complex clauses except the marker ō, is best analyzed as a paratactic construction where the clause-linker ō introduces a topicalized, informationally backgrounded clause, which in this context receives a temporal interpretation. Such topicalized clauses can be analyzed as adsentential adjuncts which, together with the main clause, form a frame-comment construction (Van Valin 2005; see also Lambrecht 1994). More on the relationship between information structure and subordination, see Robert (2010). In the next section, I develop the argument of lack of syntactic embedding with respect to relative clauses.

6.4 Relative clauses

This section is dedicated to the relative clauses in Mano, which, as I argue, are of non-subordinating type but are best described in terms of high adjunction. Relative clauses in Mano are of the correlative type, which is defined as a subtype of non-reduction relativization strategy where “the head noun appears as a full-fledged noun phrase in the relative clause and is taken up again at least by a pronoun or other pronominal element in the main clause” (Comrie 1998: 62).

In Mano, the noun phrase occurring in the main clause (NP_{mat}) can be realized as a noun phrase or a subject index included in the auxiliary. The relativized noun phrase (NP_{rel}) is left-extraposed, its position within the relative clause is filled by a resumptive pronoun. NP_{rel} is followed by the marker té ~ lé ~ nɛ, which can also be realized as a floating high tone. The relative clause is followed by the topicalization marker ō ~ yā or wɛ̄ ~ ɓɛ̄, see the previous section.

Relative clauses in Mano can be left-adjointed (68), clause-internal (69) or, rarer, right-extraposed; the latter case constitutes a separate type and will not be analyzed here. The analysis suggested here equally
applies to both left-adjointed and clause-internal types\(^{11}\), but, for the sake of brevity, I focus only on the former type.

(68)

\[\left\{\text{gə̀ vɔ̀ yààkà lè Ȧ sèlë bè d5 3}\right\}\]

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllll}
\text{man} & \text{PL} & \text{three} & \text{FOC} & \text{3PL.PST} & \text{soil} & \text{DEM.PROX} & \text{stop} & \text{TOP}
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{óò} \quad \text{gèë} \quad \text{Ȧ lèë Bòòdà gbë ni.}\]

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{3PL.IPfv>3SG} & \text{say:IPfv} & \text{3PL} & \text{for} & \text{P.N.} & \text{son} & \text{PL}
\end{array}
\]

‘The three men who founded this village, they call them sons of Booda.’ (nat.)

(69)

\[\text{ā yì-gini} \quad \left\{\text{gwéèkòlò vò té Ȧ gbëy yi ā}\right\}\]

\[
\begin{array}{llllllllll}
\text{3SG.PST>3SG} & \text{interior-share} & \text{old.man} & \text{PL} & \text{FOC} & \text{3PL.EXI} & \text{block} & \text{in} & \text{TOP}
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{Ȧ mò.}\]

\[
\begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{3PL} & \text{on}
\end{array}
\]

‘He shared it [the animal] among the elders of his neighborhood (lit.: he shared it, elders who are in the block, among them)’. (nat.)

In Khachaturyan (2017b) it is argued in much detail that the relation between the main clause and the relative clause in Mano is not of syntactic subordination. Here I briefly summarize the argument, showing that 1) from the syntactic point of view, relative clauses as generated clause-internally and are adjoined highly. 2) Set intersection semantics of relative clauses does not always apply to Mano correlatives, which suggests that the relationship between the relativized NP and its counterpart in the main clause is rather a pragmatic resolution of anaphora. 3) Finally, I extend the parallelism presented in the previous section between correlative clause-combining information structure constructions in Mano. All arguments taken together strongly suggest that correlatives are not a separate construction but rather a paratactic information structure

\(^{11}\) The analysis is based on a structural parallelism between relativization and topicalization. I argue that left-extraposed and clause-internal correlatives can be analyzed as a left-extraposed and clause-internal topic, respectively. See also a discussion at the end of the section.
construction with a more general information structuring function which, under certain conditions, is co-opted to have a relativization function.

In his analysis of Hindi correlatives, Bhatt (2003) explores two hypothesis: either 1) the (single-headed) correlative clauses are base-generated clause-internally and are optionally fronted to the IP-adjoined position, or 2) the correlative clauses are generated in the IP-adjoined position and their relation to the NP_{mat} is that of variable binding. The following tests were applied: 1. Island effects; 2. Impossibility to have two fronted correlative clauses; 3. Condition C effects. The results of all three tests pointed to a greater syntactic integration of relative and matrix clauses in Hindi and, subsequently, supported the first hypothesis. In Mano, on the contrary, all these tests gave the opposite result and corroborated the second hypothesis. The following example illustrates the possibility to have two fronted correlative clauses in Mano:

(70)

\[
\text{ɓī lɛ́ ī lēiwēlē wà tɔ̩̩́ ō bḗ̩̩ à̰̩̩} \]

2SG FOC 2SG.PST sky and earth 3PL make TOP

\[
\text{pɛ̄ nɔ́ fé lɛ́ ō fɔ̩̩̄ gã̰̩̩́ ḭ̩̩̄ niií lɛ̄ j à̰̩̩ j à̰̩̩} \]

thing every FOC 3PL between TOP 2SG soul 3SG.EXI 3PL PL

‘You who created sky and earth, your soul is on everything that is in between them (lit.: You who created sky and earth, everything that is in between them, your soul is on them).’ (nat.)

The standard semantics of relative clauses is set intersection (Partee 1976: 229), which, in case of correlatives, must be obtained through coreference between NP_{rel} and NP_{mat}. In Mano, however, there are less straightforward cases of coreference, where NP_{mat} and NP_{rel} do not have the same person. Moreover, correlatives in Mano allow partial coreference: split antecedence and bridging. The following example illustrates a bridging relation between NP_{rel} (school) and NP_{mat} (internship related to school). The bridging relation is indexed by the marker à\text{12}.

\[\text{12 The marker of referential status à grammaticalized from the 3sg pronoun and is used with situationally defined referents or referents mentioned in prior discourse. Markers with similar grammaticalization path are attested in some}\]
Following Belyaev and Haug’s analysis of Ossetic (2014), I suggest analyzing the relationship between NP_{mat} and NP_{rel} in Mano as a pragmatic resolution of anaphora, rather than variable binding.

Finally, there are examples that, from a formal perspective, look exactly like relative clauses, but in fact have a different function. In examples below, there are relativized noun phrases (à nū kɔ̀ ‘its way of approaching’ and yílíɲaágò ‘carpenter’) followed by the focus markers, lɛ̀ and tɛ̀, respectively. However, the relative interpretation is not obtained.

other Mande languages, such as Soninke (Creissels p.c.), but are rare crosslinguistically. A similar pattern can be found in Uralic languages (Simonenko 2014).
‘Joseph being a CARPENTER, here is his son (lit.: the CARPENTER that Joseph is, here is his son)
(meaning: Joseph is only a carpenter, an unimportant person, his son is also unimportant). (nat.)

In (72), there is in fact no NP_{mat} coreferential, or otherwise related to the NP_{rel}. In (73), the expected NP_{mat} is the 3sg pronoun ã, but it is not enough to obtain the relative interpretation: the relative clause is in fact a focus construction: Joseph is a CARPENTER, or, literally, CARPENTER who Joseph is (here is his son). In both cases, the first clause is a highly adjoined clause topicalized with the help of the marker ã.

I argue that relative clauses in Mano do not constitute a distinct syntactic type. The more “classical” correlative examples, like 68, belong to the same family of examples as 72 and even 67 from the previous section, which can be characterized as an information structure construction with one topicalized clause adjoined to the main clause and where the relative interpretation does not obtain. The availability of the relative interpretation depends on a formal factor (a left-extraposited NP marked with a focalizer) and (at least) two pragmatic factors: a) the existence of an NP_{mat} which is coreferential to the NP_{rel} or which can be connected to it via some bridging context, and b) that what appears to be NP_{rel} should not be a focalized constituent, and, subsequently, the entire relative clause should not be a mere topicalized cleft. The exact conditions for the relative interpretation to appear are subject to a further investigation, but at least it is clear that correlative clauses in Mano are best interpreted as a pragmatic subtype of a paratactic information structure construction.

The interpretation of relative clauses in Mande as non-embedded or straightforwardly topicalized has already been suggested in the literature: in Maninka of Kita, Manding, in the former case (Creissels 2009) and in Wan, Kla-Dan and other Southern Mande, in the latter (Nikitina 2012; Makeeva 2013), so Mano confirms the general tendency. Mande languages show asymmetries with respect to positions in which noun phrases can be topicalized: thus, in Wan, direct objects cannot be topicalized, and neither can they be relativized with the clause-internal strategy (Nikitina 2012). In Mano, clause-internal topics and clause-internal relative clauses can appear in all positions without exception. Another peculiar feature of Mano is a broader application of the topic analysis of dependent clauses, including not only relative, but also other types of clauses. Thus, in Dan-Gweetaa, the clause-linking topicalizer analyzed in the previous section appears only in relative clauses and only optionally (Vydrin p.c.). On a broader cross-linguistic level,
correlative topicalization has been studied in particular in Hungarian, Finno-Ugric (Lipták 2012). Finally, partial coreference was studied in Hittite, Indo-European (Probert 2006), and the analysis in terms of pragmatic resolution of anaphora was suggested by Belyaev and Haug on the Ossetic material, Indo-European (2014).

**Conclusion**

The present article sketches a linguistic portrait of Mano as a representative member of the Mande family and its Southern branch. If my sketch fails to present a comprehensive picture of a language, I hope at least that it attracts the attention of typologists to the family. The family features shared by Mano include S-Aux-O-V-X word order and the parallelism between nominal and verbal syntax, the possessive split, the expression of TAMP at the level of the auxiliary in addition to, or often instead of, verbal morphology, the ubiquity of passive lability, the parallelism between relative clause formation and information structure, and the narrative structuring of clausal sequences where the most finite clause is the first in the chain. The branch features include rich tonal morphology, unstable character of nasal consonants, and rich pronominal paradigms, including auxiliaries indexing person and number of the subject. Some of the features presented here have not been sufficiently studied in the Mande material, so it is unclear how unusual Mano is in comparison to other Mande languages: such as the large class of inalienably possessed nouns, or the clause-level nominalization which may include another clause as its constituent. Finally, some properties are almost certainly specific to Mano, such as dedicated tonal forms used in conditional clauses or the extended use of topicalization markers derived from demonstratives and used as a clause-linker in all varieties of preposed dependent clauses.

**Appendix**

Table I. Mano personal pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1SG</th>
<th>2SG</th>
<th>3SG</th>
<th>1PL</th>
<th>2PL</th>
<th>3PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>non-subject pronouns</td>
<td>ŋ̄</td>
<td>ĩ</td>
<td>à / ā / ă</td>
<td>kō</td>
<td>kā</td>
<td>ō</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 The tone of the 3sg non-subject pronoun optionally assimilates to the tone of the preceding vowel.
### Table II. Mano auxiliaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1SG</th>
<th>2SG</th>
<th>3SG</th>
<th>1PL</th>
<th>2PL</th>
<th>3PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I existential</strong></td>
<td>ṇ́ (māā)</td>
<td>ḣ́ (bāā)</td>
<td>ℓ́–ℓ́–ē</td>
<td>kō (kšāā)</td>
<td>kā (kāā)</td>
<td>ō (wāā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II past</strong></td>
<td>ṇ́ (mā)</td>
<td>ḣ́ (bā)</td>
<td>ē (ā)</td>
<td>kō (kšā)</td>
<td>kā</td>
<td>ō (wā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III perfect</strong></td>
<td>māā</td>
<td>bāā</td>
<td>āā</td>
<td>kšāā</td>
<td>kāā</td>
<td>wāā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV imperfective</strong></td>
<td>ṇ́̀́ (ì̀ (bāā)</td>
<td>ℓ́ (ā)</td>
<td>kō</td>
<td>kāā</td>
<td>ōō</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V conjoint</strong></td>
<td>māā</td>
<td>bāā</td>
<td>āā</td>
<td>kšāā</td>
<td>kāā</td>
<td>wāā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VI negative</strong></td>
<td>ṇ́́ (ì̀ (bāā)</td>
<td>ℓ́ (ā)</td>
<td>(lāā)</td>
<td>kō</td>
<td>kāā</td>
<td>ōō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VII conjonctive</strong></td>
<td>ṇ́ (bā)</td>
<td>ḗ (ā)</td>
<td>kō</td>
<td>kā</td>
<td>ō</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIII prohibitive</strong></td>
<td>māā</td>
<td>bāā</td>
<td>āā</td>
<td>kšāā</td>
<td>kāā</td>
<td>wāā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IX subjonctive</strong></td>
<td>ṇ́ (bā)</td>
<td>ḗ (ā)</td>
<td>kō (kšā)</td>
<td>kā</td>
<td>ō</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>X prospective</strong></td>
<td>mòlɔ̀ (~bòlɔ́)</td>
<td>yèlè</td>
<td>kò́lɔ́</td>
<td>kà́wòlò</td>
<td>wò́lɔ́</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>XI</strong></td>
<td>màà</td>
<td>bāā</td>
<td>āā</td>
<td>kōó</td>
<td>kàà</td>
<td>wàà</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**possession pronouns**  ṇ́  ḣ́  ā̀  ë̀  ë́  ë̀̀

**emphatic pronouns**  mā(ē)  bī(ē)  ā́, (ā)yē, (ā)yé, yōó  kō(ē)  kā(ē)  ō(ē)

**focalized pronouns**  má  bí  (ā)yé  kō  kā  ó

**inclusory pronouns**  kō~kwá  kà  wà

**dubitative**
The marker in parentheses is a portemanteau marker, it represents an auxiliary fused with the non-subject pronoun of the 3rd person SG who can occupy the position of the direct object (in this case, the portemanteau auxiliary will represent the result of the fusion with the direct object), as well as in the position of the possessor of inalienably possessed noun. If in a given cell there is no marker in parentheses (for example, in the series of the perfect, III, and in the conjoint series, V), it means that the marker in the cell can be used in the transitive and intransitive contexts without the pronominalized direct object of the third person sg being explicitly marked.

Abbreviations (not included Leipzig Glossing Rules):

ISO 639-3 codes of languages cited:
Mande languages: Bamana (bam), Beng (nhb), Dan (daf), Guinean Kpelle (gkp), Guro (goa), Jalonke (yal), Jula (dyu), Kakabe (kke), Kassonke (kao), Liberian Kpelle (xpe), Mandinka (mnk), Maninka of Kita (mwk), Mano (mev), Mende (men), Mwan (moa), Soninke (snk), Toura (neb), Wan (wan). Other languages: Akan (aka), Baoulé (bci), Belhare (byw), French (fra), Halkomelem (hur), Hausa (hau), Hindi (hin), Hittite (hit), Hungarian (hun), Kashaya (kju), Mon (mnw), Nanti (cox), Ossetic (os), Polish (pol), Rembarrnga (rmb), Russian (rus), Tariana (tae), Tolai (ksd), Totela (ttl), Turkish (tur), Wolof (wol).
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