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Abstract: This paper provides a typological survey of Mano, a Mande language of Guinea and Liberia. It sketches a linguistic portrait of Mano as a representative member of the Southern branch of the Mande family. The family features shared by Mano include S-Aux-O-V-X word order, the parallelism between nominal and verbal syntax, and the ubiquity of passive lability. The branch features include rich tonal morphology, the unstable character of nasal consonants, and rich pronominal paradigms, including auxiliaries that index the person and number of the subject. Some of the features presented here have not been sufficiently analyzed in the Mandeist literature, so it is unclear how unusual Mano is in comparison to other Mande languages in terms of the large class of inalienably possessed nouns, or the clause-level nominalization that may include another clause as its constituent. Finally, some properties are almost certainly specific to Mano, such as the dedicated tonal forms used in conditional clauses. This paper puts Mano in its typological context, elaborating on those features which are cross linguistically well attested versus those which are cross linguistically rare.
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1 Introduction

Mano (Ethnologue language name: Maan, ISO code: mev, glottolog code: mann1248) has 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 exhibits several peculiar characteristics of its own. This paper provides an outline of the most original linguistic features of the language both from a Mande perspective and in the context of broader cross-linguistic comparison. Although an exhaustive typological analysis is beyond the scope of this paper, the Mano data is presented against a minimal set of relevant typological and/or areal overviews, as well as the descriptive and comparative literature on Mande languages.

The work on Mano presented in this analysis 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 were elicited, especially those illustrating morphological contrasts, and all examples are marked correspondingly (nat. and el.). A grammar can be found in Khachaturyan (2015), and some typological findings were shown in Khachaturyan (2014).1

Mano belongs to the Southern branch of the Mande language family, whose status within the Niger-Congo phylum is debated. Thus, while Greenberg’s original classification of African languages included Mande languages, the point of view which is still supported by some scholars, such as Vydrin (2016), Dimmendaal and Storch (2016) argue that Mande languages do not belong to Niger-Congo, as they do not share with it one of its most outstanding typological features – noun classes (an attempt to reconstruct noun classes in Mande was done by Vydrin 2006). The Mande languages are divided into Eastern and Western branches. The Eastern Mande languages include Southern Mande (Mano, but also Dan, Tura, Beng, Guro, Mwan, and Wan 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. This latter group includes the Bamana-Maninka-Jula dialect continuum, the most spoken and the best described Mande varieties, as well as Mandinka, Kassonke, and some others. The Western branch also includes the Southwestern Mande group and in particular, the Kpelle language, 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 analysis begins with an overview of the sociolinguistic situation, including the patterns of multilingualism and issues of language contact (Section 2). It then proceeds with a sketch of Mano phonology with its typologically original features. These include the existence of labial-velar consonants, a syllabic nasal and the unstable phonologization status of nasal consonants (Section 3.1), as well as some

---

1 The present article goes beyond these works by incorporating material on Mano collected in subsequent years and offers a more detailed typological background by consulting recent publications in Mande, broader African linguistics and typological literature.
issues in phonotactics, such as distributional asymmetries within stems and the exceptional status of labialized and non-labialized velar consonants with respect to vowel harmony (Section 3.2). Section 4 is dedicated to the morphosyntax of NPs, with its several cross-linguistically outstanding features: rich pronominal paradigms (Section 4.1), the existence of a dedicated series of inclusory pronouns (Section 4.2), the expression of number (Section 4.3) and the possessive split (Section 4.4). Section 5 presents a selection of features in the verbal syntax: SOVX word order (Section 5.1), nominalization (Section 5.2), the status of postverbal arguments (Section 5.3) as well as transitivity and lability (Section 5.4). Section 6 introduces some interesting features of the tense, aspect, mood and polarity (TAMP) system, including a rich verbal morphology, especially tonal, with TAMP values (Section 6.1), a rich auxiliary system (Section 6.2), asymmetric negation (Section 6.3) and the polysemy of the prospective auxiliary (Section 6.4). Finally, Section 7 presents some issues on clause combining such as the syntax of the conjoint form (Section 7.1) as well as the morphology and semantics of conditional clauses (Section 7.2). Section 8 concludes.

2 Sociolinguistic situation

The Mano (or máámià) populate a mountainous area in South-Eastern Guinea and Northern Liberia. Guinean Mano has approximately 85,000 speakers and is one of the 34 indigenous languages spoken in Guinea. In Liberia, Mano is spoken by about 305,000 people. Out of the 27 indigenous languages in Liberia, Mano is the fifth most spoken language.

Native speakers in Guinea distinguish between three Mano dialects which correspond to clan names: Zaan (zung), the easternmost dialect spoken around the town of Bossou, Maa (màà), the central dialect spoken in the city of Nzérékoré and to the south of it, and Kpeinson (kpéïnsì), the Western dialect spoken around the town of Diécké. Liberia also has three dialects that speakers distinguish: the Northern dialect Maalaa (máá láá), which is spoken around Sanniquellie; the Central dialect Maazein (máá zèj), spoken in Ganta; and the Southern dialect Maabei (máá bèí), which is spoken in Saklepea. It is likely that several other varieties are spoken to the south of Saklepea. While conducting a dialect survey of Liberian varieties (Khachaturyan 2018), I traveled with a speaker of the central Guinean dialect, Maa. This speaker did not encounter problems in understanding Liberian Mano, with the obvious exception of borrowings from English, a language he did not speak. The basic lexicon of Liberian Mano (at least within the limits of the 100-word Swadesh list) is predominantly the same in all Mano dialects that I have data on. Due to the few lexical differences between dialects, it is not possible to postulate sharp dialectal boundaries, but rather
place different varieties on a North to South continuum beginning with Zaan, Maa and, presumably, Maalaa, followed by Kpeinson and Maazein. In contrast, the southernmost Liberian dialect, Maabei, has a highly distinctive phonology and in part lexicon which distinguishes it from other Mano varieties.

Most Mano speak, at least to some extent, either French (Guinea) or English (Liberia). Many of the Mano in Guinea are fluent in the local majority languages, such as
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**Figure 1:** Mano and the main contact languages: Kpelle, Dan, Manding, adapted from Vydrine et al. (2000).
as Kpelle and Maninka, while in Liberia, particularly in the South of the Mano zone, many Mano speak Dan. The dialect variation may be partially due to the influence of Kpelle on Guinean varieties and Dan on Liberian varieties (see Figure 1 for a language map). Evidence suggests that the contact with Kpelle has shaped several aspects of the phonology and grammar of Guinean Mano. These influences include agreement patterns (Konoshenko 2015), as well as the phonologization of nasal consonants and patterns of vowel assimilation in suffixes (Khachaturyan 2018). Guinean Mano has multiple borrowings, especially in the cultural lexicon, from Kpelle. Many of these borrowings 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). There have been several independent initiatives to promote literacy, with the main actors including a protestant missionary in Guinea, Samantha Mero, who worked on the translation of the Old Testament. In addition to her translation work, Mero produced literacy materials and organized literacy workshops. In Liberia, the Liberian Translation and Literacy Organization (LIBTRALO) has, among its affiliated members, Leelamen Zarwolo, an active Mano speaker who produces literature in Mano and works to promote literacy. However, Mano has never been the language of education in either of the countries. There is regular radio broadcasting in Mano in Nzérékoré and several Mano radio stations broadcast in Liberia.

3 Phonetics and phonology

3.1 Phoneme inventory

The consonant and vowel inventories of Mano are provided in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. Three features of the phonemic inventories deserve special attention: labial-velar consonants, the syllabic nasal and nasal consonants.

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

In many languages of Sub-Saharan Africa, such as Baoulé (Atlantic), nasal consonants are not fully phonologized, so that nasal stops are considered allophones of oral stops (Creissels 1994: 132). The same applies to nasal vowels, which in many languages do not correspond to nasal phonemes, but rather are part of combinations of the type VN or VNV (Creissels 1994). Mano, among many other Mande languages, has nasal vowels on the phonological level. In contrast, the
The phonological status of nasal consonants in Mande is somewhat debatable. For half of the Southern Mande languages, such as Goo (Aplonova and Vydrin 2017), different varieties of Dan (Vydrin 2017; Vydrin and Kessegbeu 2008), or Mwan (Perekhvalskaya 2017), it is claimed that nasal stops are not phonologized and receive their nasal quality in nasal contexts, especially in combinations that have nasal vowels. In Mano, as in Tura (Idiatov and Aplonova 2017) and Beng (Paperno 2014), evidence suggests that nasal vowels do not trigger the nasalization of the consonants on the surface level, but rather that nasal consonants are phonologized. For a discussion of this, see Khachaturyan (2015: 10–11).

The Mano system also includes a syllabic nasal /ŋ/ which can function as the nucleus of a syllable. It appears in the position of the only stem syllable or of two identical stem syllables ñ(ñ) (ŋ, first person singular pronoun of the past series, ŋŋ, first person singular negative auxiliary) or in the CVŋ position, where the syllabic nasal is preceded by a vowel (wōŋ ‘tail’, pēŋ ‘forge’). The syllabic nasal always has a distinctive tone: mēŋ ‘dream’, mēŋ ‘behind’. In the former case, ñ(ñ), it is realized as a nasal stop that assimilates to the following consonant to the place of articulation and, in certain cases, causes assimilation by nasality: ŋ lō [ŋnō] ‘I went’. In the CVŋ position, it takes the form of a nasal vowel: a back vowel [y] if the previous vowel is back or central (wōŋ [wōû] ‘tail’) or a front vowel [j] if the previous vowel is front (pēŋ [pēj] ‘forge’). Syllabic nasals are not uncommon in Sub-Saharan African languages: Creissels mentions a few, including Swahili, Igbo and some varieties of Manding (Creissels 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>ñ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>ñ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>æ</td>
<td>ñ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>ñ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Mano consonants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>labial</th>
<th>alveolar</th>
<th>palatal</th>
<th>velar</th>
<th>velar labialized</th>
<th>labio-velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>implosive</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unvoiced plosives</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k̕</td>
<td>kp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced plosives</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g̕</td>
<td>g̕</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unvoiced fricatives</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced fricatives</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oral sonorants</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasal sonorants</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>ñ</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the representation of Mande phonology, I adopt the orthographic notation that is common for Mande (or, broader, African) linguistics: y stands for /j/, ŋ stands for /w/, kw for kʷ, gw for gʷ, kp for k̃p and gb for g̃b. ŋ with a tonal diacritic corresponds to the syllabic nasal and ŋ without a tonal diacritic corresponds to a nasal velar sonorant.

### 3.2 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 and Storch 2013). Mano has three level tones, low (kèè ‘year’), mid (kè̀ ‘in order to’), and high (kè́ ‘refuse’). Extra-high tone is marginal in the system, as it appears only in ideophones, expressive adverbs, and interjections (sɔ́ ‘all and all’, ɛ̃́ ‘interjection’, etc.) In contrast to Manding languages and some other languages with two tones, including Kpelle, downstep is not attested in Mano. Rich tonal inventories of 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 or a syllabic nasal; 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). Unlike some Southwestern Mande languages, such as Kpelle (Konoshenko 2014), no tonal spreading occurs in Mano, and grammatical tonal marking is hosted by specific words rather than phrases. Furthermore, Mano does not have stress accent, which is often (but not always) the case for tonal languages (Hyman 2009). Utterance-level prosodic operations include the lowering of the tone on final vowels in affirmative utterances and a general downdrift.

The syllable seems to be of limited analytical salience (on that point, see Hyman 2011). By contrast, it is often claimed that Mande languages, including Mano and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Tonal contrasts in VV sequences.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
other Southern Mande languages, such as Guro (Kuznetsova 2007), possess “metric feet”, mono- 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. The domain of application of grammatical tones is the metric foot. This means that the rules of tonal assignment in grammatical contexts apply to the entire metric foot, rather than to a syllable or a mora. Finally, as a matter of statistical observation, non-derived lexemes tend to possess only one metric foot. Metric feet appear to be a special case of distributional asymmetries between the stem-initial and non-stem-initial syllables that are widely attested in the languages of the Macro-Sudan Belt (Hyman et al. 2018).

Metric feet in Mano can only occur as one of the following structures: V (ē ‘3SG.PST’), CV(ŋ) (sɔ ‘cloth’; sɔŋ ‘price’), CVV (sɔɔ ‘teeth’, bɛ ‘friend’) and CVCV(ŋ) (bɛlɛ ‘respect’, bɛlɛŋ ‘tree sp.’). In the CVV structures, a combination of back and front vowels is disallowed, as well as nasal and non-nasal vowels, and vowels should be identical in CVCV structures. The intervocalic consonant should be either /n/, /l/, or /ŋ/; /l/ is not allowed with nasal consonants /m/, /n/, /ɲ/, /ŋw/ in the initial position (yɛlɛ ‘manner’, wɔlɔ ‘tear out’) while /n/ is not allowed with /b/, /l/, /y/ and /w/ in the initial position (mɛnɛ ‘snake’, ɲwànà ‘truth’), all other consonants in the initial position freely combine with both /l/ and /n/ in the intervocalic position. As a rule, grammatical tone applies only to one metric foot. Thus, the verb pɛlɛ ‘to wash’, which consists of one metric foot, according to the aforementioned parameters (CVCV structure; identical vowels; /l/ as an intervocalic consonant), takes the form with low tones on both vowels in the imperfective: pɛlɛ:IPFV(1). However, the verb lóní ‘to count’ (2) 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, lóní:IPFV. The same pattern of change applies to verbs of CV structure with lexical high tone: bí ‘to shine’ and bì ‘shine:IPFV(3).

(1) a. āà sɔ pɛlɛ.
   3SG.PRF cloth wash
   ‘She has washed the clothes.’ (el.)

   b. lɛlɛ sɔ pɛlɛ.
   3SG.IPFV cloth wash:IPFV
   ‘She washes the clothes.’ (el.)

(2) a. āà wɛlɛ lóní.
   3SG.PRF money count
   ‘She has counted the money.’ (el.)
b. lèè wělì lónì.
   3SG.IPFV money count:IPFV
   ‘She counts the money.’ (el.)

(3) a. pèäre lè bì-pèlè.
   sun 3SG.EXI shine-INF
   ‘The sun is shining.’ (el.)

b. pèäre lèè bì.
   sun 3SG.IPFV shine:IPFV
   ‘The sun shines.’ (el.)

An interesting feature of Mano phonotactics is that combinations of back and front vowels within one metric foot, which are generally disallowed, are nevertheless possible after an (optionally) labialized velar consonant: k(ɔ̃)i ‘firewood’, k(ɔ̃)i ‘behind’, and k(ɔ̃)nè ‘eggplant’. (The last word, k(ɔ̃)nè ‘eggplant’, could potentially be analyzed as containing two monosyllabic feet. And yet the intervocalic consonant /n/ is characteristic of metric feet with the CVCV structure, so the interpretation in terms of a single metric foot is also possible.) 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, V₂ is usually /i/, with one exception: k(ɔ̃)ɛ ‘near’.² During fast speech, these combinations are pronounced with both front vowels and a strong labialization: [k(ɔ̃)ɛ] ‘firewood’, [k(ɔ̃)i] ‘behind’, [k(ɔ̃)nè] ‘eggplant’, and [k(ɔ̃)ɛ] ‘near’. This type of process is especially salient in the Guinean dialects of Mano which are in contact with Guinean Kpelle in which 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 [kɔɪ] ‘firewood’), which suggests a micro-areal phenomenon.

4 Morphosyntax of NPs

Mano has relatively limited nominal morphology, with only one productive derivational suffix (-là, suffix of abstract nouns) and two tonal forms: high tone forms used in particular when the noun is followed by a demonstrative (lèè ‘woman’, lèè wè ‘this woman’) and low tone construct forms. The term “construct forms” was coined by Creissels to designate a type of head marking which includes, but is not

² The only CVV word that does not begin with a velar consonant and that has a combination of a front and a back vowel is sɔ̃ɛ ‘all’. It is an emphatic adverbial quantifier used with the quantifier sèŋ ‘all’. It is unusual in yet another respect: it has an extra-high tonal contour that is typical for expressive entities. See above for additional information on this.
limited to, the construct state forms introduced in Semitic linguistic (Creissels 2017). Construct forms are used in Mano as heads of noun phrases with certain types of dependents, excluding possessors, but including nominal or verbal attributes. In (4), the lexical form of ‘woman’ is lēē, the construct form is lēè; in (5) the lexical form of ‘person’ is mī, the construct form is mì.

(4)  
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
gí & lēè \\
stomach & \textbf{woman:CSTR} \\
& 'pregnant woman' (el.)
\end{array}
\]

(5)  
\[
\begin{array}{llll}
dɔ̀ & wálà & lē & lā & mì \\
stop:NMLZ & God & mouth & on & \textbf{person:CSTR} \\
& 'prophet' (nat.)
\end{array}
\]

Construct forms are typical in Mande, particularly in the Southern branch, but these forms are also attested in Soninke (Creissels 2016). Construct marking is often expressed by a low tone and is likely to have existed in proto Mande (Creissels pers. comm.). On replacive tonal patterns in Mande, including the construct form, see Green (2018) and Konoshenko (2018).

Adjectival morphology includes the derivational suffix of adjectives (-zɛ̀), as well as reduplication with values of intensity and plurality (Section 4.3). Numerals can also reduplicate with a distributive meaning. However, nouns and verbs do not reduplicate. The word order in the noun phrase is typically a genitival modifier (an alienable or inalienable possessor, as well as the dependent in the constructions with construct forms), followed by the head noun, and followed by an adjective, a numeral, and a determiner. I present a detailed analysis of several properties of Mano nominal morphosyntax: rich pronominal paradigms (Section 4.1), inclusory constructions and pronouns (Section 4.2), the expression of plurality (Section 4.3) and the possessive split (4.4).

4.1 Pronominal paradigms

A distinctive feature of most Southern and Southwestern Mande languages is their rich pronominal paradigms that include several syntactic series of personal pronouns, as well as several series of auxiliaries which index a subject’s person and number. Personal pronouns typically distinguish between non-subject pronouns that occur in most argument positions (an inalienable possessor, 6a, direct object, 6b, or an argument of postposition), possessive pronouns that express alienable possession (ex. 6c) and emphatic pronouns used in non-argument positions (ex. 6d). Besides these three positions, Mano also has high tone pronouns, a functional parallel of the high tone nominal forms mentioned above, which are used with demonstratives and
with focalization markers (example 6e), and the inclusory pronouns (example 6f), the most typologically unusual of all, which will be discussed in Section 4.2. Mano does not have pronouns that are used in the syntactic position of the subject but has auxiliaries agreeing in person and number with the subject (see Section 6.2). Personal pronouns in Mano are listed in Table A1 of the appendix.

(6)  

a. \( kō \) \( dādā \)  
\( 1PL \) father  
‘our father’ (nat.)

b. \( Pêé \) \( ê \) \( kō \) \( gê. \)  
P.N. 3SG.PST 1PL see  
‘Pe saw us’ (el.)

c. \( kò \) ká  
1PL.POSS house  
‘our house’ (el.)

d. \( lèè \) \( lō \) \( kō \) \( bêê \) kō \( wèlè-ê \) \( lèì. \)  
3SG.IPFV go:IPFV 1PL.EMPH too 1PL get.up-GER sky  
‘He will raise us, too, to the sky.’ (nat.)

e. \( kó \) \( tê \) \( kō \) \( yàá \) \( kélè \) \( zêë \) \( wàá. \)  
1PL.H ATT 1PL.EXI sit>GER>with room here BKGR  
‘We who are sitting in the church here…’ (nat.)

f. \( kò \) Pêé  
1PL.IP P.N.  
‘me and Pe (lit.: we [including] Pe)’ (el.)

4.2 Inclusory constructions and pronouns

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

(7) \( Ñññ \) \( nàà \) \( kò \) Òì Òì kō kō \( fòtòò \) \( sì. \)  
1SG.IPFV want:IPFV 1PL.IP 2SG.EMPH 1PL.CONJ 1PL photo take  
‘I want that you (sg.) and I OR you (sg.) and we, we take a picture of us (lit.:  
1/we [including] you (sg.) we take our photo).’ (el.)

In (7), \( kò \) ‘we’ refers to the entire set of participants, while \( Òì \) ‘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 two possible interpretations: either you (sg.) and I, or you (sg.) and we. The whole group of those whose picture is to be taken is indexed again by the non-subject pronoun kō in kō fótóó ‘our picture’.

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 the Mande family typologically outstanding is that inclusory pronouns in some of the Mande languages, including Mano, are represented by a separate series3 (see Table A1 of the appendix). This property does not exist outside this language family (for more detail on inclusory constructions in Mande, see Khachaturyan 2019).

4.3 Expression of plurality

In Mano, when a noun that has a non-human referent is unmarked for number, it can correspond to one or many entities in the world. Thus, the form gbá ‘dog’ can denote one or several dogs. The number of referents can be specified by specialized number determiners, number words (gbá vɔ dog pl ‘dogs’) or numerals (gbá dōō ‘one dog’, gbá pèèlè ‘two dogs’). The typological literature claims that this unmarked form expresses 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): gwēkōlō ‘old man’; NOT ‘old men’; but gwēkōlō vɔ ‘old men’. Mano pronouns also distinguish between singular and plural forms. This means that Mano referents split into two categories depending on their position on the Animacy Hierarchy (Smith-Stark 1974): pronouns, as well as noun phrases that denote humans distinguish between singular and plural, while an unmarked form of non-human referents has a general interpretation.

---

3 The fact that inclusory pronouns coincide in form with possessive pronouns notwithstanding, their syntactic behavior is distinct, each covering a specific syntactic domain. There are other cases of homonymy in plural pronominal markers, such as in the basic series and in non-portmanteau past series of auxiliaries, which are clearly two distinct syntactic series. Most importantly, inclusory pronouns do not coincide in form with other pronouns which, crosslinguistically and in Mande languages, are expected to have the inclusory function: such as the emphatic or the basic series.
Plurality in Mano is most often expressed by the number words vɔ and nì. The vɔ 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, but the semantic interpretation is not the same for all nouns (see below). This means that the Animacy Hierarchy again plays a role, the division occurring in a different position of the hierarchy, separating kin from other human referents (on that point, see Dahl and Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001).

The nì marker is typologically rather rare semantically, 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 that includes 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 (Sêë nì 'Se and his family/friends'), but it also can be used with other types of referents (yúzóloyàà nì 'jaundice and other sicknesses', see also example 8b). The associative marker is typically used with proper names, 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 discrete entities (mótoò nì ‘motorbikes here and there’). While both values, associative and distributive, are known from descriptive and typological literature, their combination in one marker appears to be cross-linguistically rare.

The following examples contrast additive and non-additive plurality. Example (8a) illustrates the usage of nɔɔ ‘catfish’ with vɔ triggering an additive reading. Example (8b) shows the usage of the same noun with nì and this triggers an associative reading. Example (9a) illustrates the incapability of the mass noun wéŋ ‘salt’ to combine with the additive marker vɔ. Finally, in (9b), the same noun combines with the marker nì, triggering a distributive reading.

(8) a. nɔɔ vɔ
   Catfish PL
   ‘(several) catfish’ (el.)

b. nɔɔ nì
   catfish PL
   ‘catfish and company’ (‘catfish and them’ in some varieties of English)
   (*‘several catfish’) (nat., modification)

(9) a. *wéŋ vɔ
   salt PL
   intended reading: ‘salts’
While number words are the most common means to express plurality, a few nouns express plurality (with or without a number word) by an irregular inflection and this can be considered a case of suppletion (Veselinova 2006; Corbett 2009). These nouns include names of humans and kinship terms with a most general meaning (mī/mī ‘person’, mīă/mīă ‘persons’; lēē ‘woman’, lōă/lōō ‘women’; gō ‘man’, gōgō ‘men’; nē/nēfū ‘child’, nōō/nōōbé ‘children’; and mī ‘parent’, mīă ‘parents’) and the noun pē ‘thing(s)’, pɔɔ/pɔɔbé ‘things’. Suppletion displays some patterning: the labialization of mid-low or mid-high vowels and an additional formant: -à -ā or -é; some part of the nominal stem remains unvaried – minimally, the initial consonant. As a consequence, nominal suppletion in Mano could be characterized as “weak” (Dressler 1985) or “partial” (Corbett 2009).

Finally, plurality can also be expressed in adjectives. Of Mano adjectives, approximately one-half can undergo reduplication and this includes most non-derived adjectives. While non-reduplicated adjectives can freely combine with the 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 versus 10d) and trigger a plural reading when combined with nouns that do not distinguish between such forms, which is illustrated in (11). These reduplicated forms express nominal plurality. For some other adjectives, the value of reduplication is to express quality intensity (12) or both intensity and plurality (13).

(10) a. pē tīī
    thing black
    ‘black thing/black things’ (el.)

b. pɔɔ tīī
    thing,PL black
    ‘black things’ (el.)

c. *pē tīī–tīī
    thing black–PL
    intended reading: ‘black things’

d. pɔɔ tīī–tīī
    things,PL black–PL
    ‘black things’ (el.)

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

In addition to reduplication, plurality in adjectives can be expressed by a tonal form. This applies to those adjectives that are reduplicated but whose non-reduplicated counterpart does not exist. Thus, the adjective in (14), *yɔsɔɔsɔɔ 'dirty', does not exist in a non-reduplicated form (*yɔsɔ). For adjectives such as the one in (14), the basic tonal pattern that is High–Low changes to High–High, so that the overall morphological process could be considered a case of partial reduplication: of a tonal pattern but not a segmental pattern.

5 I would like to thank Denis Creissels for this observation.
In addition, three adjectives are _pluralia tantum_, which only occur with plural referents: _dòló_ ‘similar.PL’, _kènèè_ ‘small.PL’, and _kélélélè_ ‘small.PL’ (15). Other adjectives occur in Mano that mean ‘small’: _béñ_, _tùkpè_, _néé_, and _pèèti_, so the adjectives _kènèè_ and _kélélélè_ could be considered suppletive plural forms.\(^6\) The adjective _gbòkò_ ‘1. numerous, 2. elderly, 3. fat’, when reduplicated, retains only one meaning: _gbòkògbòkò_ ‘fat.PL’. The adjective _gbúyụ_ has the meanings ‘1. other, 2. certain, 3. different.PL’, it is in the latter meaning that it behaves similar to a _plurale tantum_.

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

### 4.4 Inalienable vs alienable possession

Mano resembles most other Mande languages in that it has two types of possessive construction, inalienable and alienable. In the case of a pronominal possessor, a non-subject pronoun is selected, as in (16a). Example (16b) illustrates a construction that consists of a possessor juxtaposed to the possessum in absence of

---

\(^6\) Suppletion in the number form of adjectives is rather rare across languages, although not nonexistent. Vafaeian (2013) mentions Halkomelem (Salishan), Kashaya (Pomo), and Tariana (Arawak), whereas a somewhat different type of adjectival suppletion is attested in Swedish. Suppletive number forms of adjectives have been attested in Lavukaleve (Papuan isolate, Terrill 2003: 52-53), but note also that the number morphology of adjectives in the language is much more developed and regular as compared with Mano.
any formal marking. The second type consists of the possessor 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 the mid-tone (ŋ̄) and possessive pronouns have low tone (ŋ̀).

(16) a. ŋ̄ kī
   1SG skin
   ‘my skin’ (el.)
b. Pèé kī
   P.N. skin
   ‘Pe’s skin’ (el.)

(17) a. ŋ̄ kī
   1SG.POSS shoes
   ‘my shoes’ (el.)
b. Pèé là kī
   P.N. 3SG.POSS shoes
   ‘Pe’s shoes’ (el.)

An alienable possessor can be added to combinations of the former type:

(18) Pèé là wì wi k̄pákā̀
   P.N. 3SG.POSS animal leg
   ‘animal leg belonging to Pe’ (el.)

The existence of the distinction between alienable and inalienable possession is far from being cross-linguistically unusual (Nichols 1988; 1992; Dahl and Koptjevskaja-Tamm 1998), but several aspects of the distinction need to be clarified.

First, the class of inalienably possessed nouns in Mano is much broader than the typological prototype, which includes body parts and kinship terms, spatial terms, and some significant parts of objects and basic objects of material culture, such as cattle (Nichols 1988). Mano nouns that are inalienably possessed include, of course, kinship terms (dàà ‘father’, lèkè ‘younger sibling), but also other terms of social relations that are not related to kinship: bèá ‘contemporary, person of the same age group’, tọmá ‘namesake’, gélè ‘enemy’, gójá ‘equal’, kélá ‘witness’, and yókò ‘enemy’. By comparison, the noun né ‘child’ is alienably possessed. Body parts, excretions, physiological liquids are also inalienably possessed (zò ‘heart’, sèè ‘nail’, and lùà ‘blood’), together with some parts of objects (tò ‘source’, gbáà ‘ceiling’, and gbòlò ‘frame’). Not surprisingly, spatial terms, some of which give rise to postpositions, also belong to the inalienably possessed class (yálà ‘place’, wì ‘lower part’). This class also includes the names of measures, groups and assemblies (ŋwùnà ‘type’, kùù ‘number’, kòpàà ‘handful’, and kpinì ‘envelope’),
attributes, sicknesses (ɲɔ̀ ‘taste’, tɔ̀nɔ̀ ‘benefit’, fạnà ‘force’, zùo ‘paralysis’, tọ̀ ‘name’, and tẹ̀ ‘totem’), property, constant or provisory (fɔnɔ̀ ‘salary’, kêpè ‘heritage’, sàmà ‘gift’, sàlà ‘salary’, wɔlɔ̀ ‘sleeping place’, and kɔnɔ̀ ‘food’), some names of dishes (bɔ̀dà ‘(rice) porridge’, fìlì ‘pilaf’) and names that designate the age or sex of an animal (gɔ̀ ‘male’, mù ‘female’, and ɲɔ̀nɔ̀ ‘young’). Finally, another subclass of inalienably possessed nouns includes names of actions that occur in N + V complex predicates: sùò ‘calling (of someone)’, sùò kɛ̀ ‘call sb.’. Even so, nouns that denote objects of material culture are never inalienably possessed.

While it is well established 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. Thus, the repartition between the two classes is often arbitrary. For example, the noun fìlì ‘pilaf’ denotes a dish consisting of rice mixed with spices and either fish or meat. The noun is inalienably possessed: wìì fìlì ‘pilaf with meat’. However, the word bôò ‘sauce’, which is always distinguished by the type of the main ingredient, is alienably possessed. Should the main ingredient be specified, a different construction is used that has a head in the low-tone construct form: bëìlébôò < cassava + leaf + sauce:CSTR > ‘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 (approximately 75% of all inalienably possessed nouns), and some are optionally possessed, at least in certain contexts. The distribution into these two classes also seems arbitrary. Let us consider two synonyms, sàlà and fɔnɔ̀ ‘salary’. Both are inalienably possessed: àsàlà, àfɔnɔ̀ ‘her salary’. Nonetheless, sàlà can be used without a possessor, while fɔnɔ̀ cannot:

(19) sàlà té zèè wè lè sè.
    salary ATT here BKGR 3SG.EXI good
    ‘The salaries (which are) here are good.’ (el.)

(20) a. ò fɔnɔ̀ lè sè zèè.
    3PL Salary 3SG.EXI good here
    ‘The salaries are good here (lit.: their salaries)’ (el.)

b. *fɔnɔ̀ lè sè zèè.
    salary 3SG.EXI good here
    Intended reading: ‘The salaries are good here.’

7 On the relationship between the possession and valency of complex predicates, see Khachaturyan (2017).
8 A similar distinction is observed in Tariana (Aikhenvald 2003: 127–128).
5 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 5.1), which is typical of Mande, and its likely diachronic origin is 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 the argument treatment in nominalizations (Section 5.2). Postverbal arguments, and in particular, postpositional phrases, do not have the same level of embedding as direct objects. The distinction between direct objects and obliques is evident from nominalization. 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 5.3). Finally, Mano and other Mande languages exhibit properties of radical P-alignment and make extensive use of P-lability, which makes the family rather unusual typologically (Section 5.4).

5.1 Word order

Mano and other Mande languages observe a fixed S–AUX–O–V–X word order (21, 22), with the direct object preceding 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 in which both the recipient and the theme are expressed as patients of a prototypically transitive verb (Creissels 2018).

(21) ƚɛ̀ɛ́ pɛlɛ̄ ɛ̀ ɛ̄ \[i  kɛ̄lɛ]_x
     3SG.IPFV money give 2SG ADR
     ‘She gives you money.’ (el.)

(22) nɛfùs lɛɛ̄ ɛ̀ tuòv \[ɲ  lɛ̄kɛ]_x
     child 3SG.IPFV frighten:IPFV 1SG ADR
     ‘The child is afraid of me.’ (el.)

The Mande word order S–AUX–O–V–X probably emerged from a reanalysis of prior nominalizations which changed the typologically more common VOX word order to OVX (the analysis is presented in Nikitina 2011 along with an overview of alternative viewpoints). According to the hypothesis proposed by Nikitina, nominalization constructions were reinterpreted as verb phrases as part of finite constructions, and in particular, the patients expressed by the inalienable possessors
preceding deverbal nouns were reinterpreted as direct objects. This hypothesis explains the striking parallel between the syntax of verb phrases and possessive nouns phrases, the fact that postpositional phrases display a distinct behavior in nominalization (see below), and the aforementioned absence of double-object constructions. Reanalysis of prior nominalizations into finite clauses is not uncommon cross-linguistically (Yap et al. 2011); in particular, the emergence of a typologically rare word order as a result of reanalysis of nominalizations was claimed for Cariban languages (Gildea 1998).

5.2 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 that are typical of nouns, such as the arguments of verbs and postpositions and may be used with derivational morphology, such as the adjectival suffix –zè, as illustrated in (30d). Unlike the former two forms, the low-tone form is used whenever the verb is nominalized with a postverbal argument adjacent to it. The distribution of nominalization forms in different contexts is presented 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 precisely the same 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).

(23) ₃SG.PRF come
‘He has come.’ (el.)

(24) ₃SG come-GER ₃SG.EXI good
‘His coming is good.’ (el.)

(25) ₃SG.PRF work do
‘He has worked (lit.: he has done work).’ (el.)

(26) 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 all contexts, the marking of the direct object is identical to the marking of the inalienable possessor (6a-6b). This blurs the distinction between the Possessive-Accusative and the Sentential type in the case of the direct object. The complication can be explained by the aforementioned hypothesis that verb phrases in Mande derive from nominalizations.

Mano is reminiscent of Austronesian languages and in particular of the Tolai language, in terms of the possessive split in the expression of subjects and the identical coding of inalienable possessors and direct objects (Foley 2014). Unlike Tolai, in which the possessive split is motivated by the degree of agentivity of the subject, it is motivated in Mano purely by argument roles (on a similar subject, see van Lier and van Rijn 2013). In addition, in Mano nominalizations, intransitive subjects are expressed in the same manner as direct objects. In Southwestern Mande, the situation is similar: the intransitive subjects are treated as direct objects in certain grammatical constructions, including nominalizations (Konoshenko 2017: 333). This situation is analyzed as an instance of (split) ergative/absolutive alignment (Vydrin 2011).

5.3 Postverbal arguments and clause-level nominalization

Postverbal and preverbal arguments do not have an identical syntactic relationship with the verb, which can be observed by their behavior in nominalizations. When the verb is nominalized, the nominalized constituent always includes the direct object when the verb is transitive, but not necessarily the oblique argument:

(27) yeke i tuo [yii bo-ô] leê [gùlù yi].
better.not.to 2SG.CONJ frighten water take.off-GER ADR hole in
‘You shouldn’t be afraid to pump water from the pit.’ (el.)

The verb in the example above, tuo ‘frighten, to be afraid’, has a postpositional argument headed by the postposition leê. The postpositional phrase contains the nominalized verb phrase yii boô ‘pump water’, in which the verb is marked by the suffix -à. The verb boô, in turn, also has a postpositional argument, gùlù yi ‘from the pit (lit.: in the pit)’, but this argument is situated outside the nominalized verb phrase and is separated from it by the postposition leê.

Similar behavior of postpositional phrases in Wan, another South Mande language, led Nikitina (2009) to conclude that postpositional phrases in Wan are situated in the adjunct position to the IP (see also Nikitina 2018). A crucial difference between Mano and Wan is that in Wan, postpositional phrases are
typically extraposed from the nominalized verb phrase,\(^9\) while in Mano, a verb can be nominalized together with its postpositional argument:

(28) yékè i túó [yii bò [gùlù yí]] lèè.  
    better.not.to 2SG.CONJ frighten water take.off:NMLZ hole in ADR  
    ‘You shouldn’t be afraid to pump water from the pit.’ (el.)

It is important to note that in (28), which is similar to (27) in all respects but the position of the postpositional phrase, the form of the verb bò ‘take off’ is also different. While it occurs in the gerund form in (27), it occurs in (28) in the special low-tone nominalization form that is used in nominalizations with oblique arguments. Dan-Gweeta and Kla-Dan, languages closely related to Mano belonging to the Dan language cluster, also have a low-tone form that functions similarly (on Dan-Gweeta, see Vydrin 2008).

Lexicalized nominalizations often occur with obligatory postverbal arguments, including postpositional phrases. Example (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 the noun zógélègé ‘anger’. It is important to note the low tone of the head verb gélè ‘burn:NMLZ’. The argument of the inalienably possessed noun gé ‘stomach’ is omitted. Examples (30a) and (30b) are similar with the verbal complex zò dɔ <heart-lay> ‘to trust’ and the lexicalized nominalization zòdɔ́mɔ ‘belief, faith’; note the low tone in (30b) on dɔ́ ‘lay:NMLZ’. The argument of the postposition in (30b) is represented by the dummy pronoun à. For the nominalization in (30c), the object of belief is precise, wálà ‘God’. Lexicalized nominalization can further undergo adjectivization with the suffix –zɛ̀, as in (30d), zòdɔ́mɔ̀zɛ̀ ‘faithful’.

(29) a. kò̀ zò lè gélé-pèlè kò̀ gé.  
    1PL heart 3SG.EXI burn-INF 1PL stomach  
    ‘We are angry (lit.: our heart is burning in our stomach).’ (nat.)  

b. zò-gélè-gé  
    heart-burn:NMLZ-stomach  
    ‘anger’ (nat.)

(30) a. kòò kò̀ zò dɔ́ à mɔ́.  
    1PL.IPFV 1PL heart lay:IPFV 3SG on  
    ‘We trust in him (lit.: we lay our heart on him).’ (el.)  

b. zò-dɔ́-à-mɔ́  
    heart-lay:NMLZ-3SG-on  
    ‘belief’ (nat.)

\(^9\) In nominalized intransitive verbs in Wan, certain oblique arguments can also be situated in the inalienable possessor position. See Nikitina (2008).
In Mano, the nominalization form is used whenever the verb is nominalized with a postverbal element, be it a postpositional phrase or an adverb. Furthermore, it can be used even with a specific type of finite predication, namely, a conjoint construction that expresses either a consecutive action, or a simultaneous action (on conjoint constructions, see Section 7.1):

(31) a.  ë  nù  áà  pè  sé́ŋ  wì.
    3SG.PST come 3SG.JNT thing all break:JNT
    ‘He came and broke everything.’ (el.)

b.  [nù  áà  pè  sé́ŋ  wì]  wò  sè.
    come:NMLZ 3SG.JNT thing all break:JNT COP.NEG good
    ‘To come and break everything is not good.’ (el.)

In (31b), the subject of the copula sentence is the construction nù áà pè sé́ŋ wì, which contains the verb nù ‘to come’ in the low-tone nominalization form and a finite predication áà pè sé́ŋ wì ‘he breaks everything’ with a third person singular auxiliary áà. As 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, as in (22). While nominalization with clausal dependents has nothing unusual (see nominalization in English 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. To conclude, nominalizations in Mano are characterized by mixed syntax with partly nominal (expression of direct objects as inalienable possessors) and partly verbal properties (the expression of verbal complements and adjuncts; on mixed syntax of Mande nominalizations, see Nikitina 2008; the issue from a broader perspective is addressed in Lefebvre and Muysken 1987).

10 The only finite construction that occurs with nominalization is what is referred to as the conjoint construction, which is pragmatically subordinated, used in clause-chaining always following some situational anchor (see Section 7.1) and therefore should be situated lower on the finiteness scale than other constructions, which are freely used in main clauses.
5.4 Transitivity and lability

Mano does not have any morphological marking of derived (in)transitivity, which can also be observed in 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 and Sambou 2013). To express valency changing, Mano has two procedures: one is analytic, such as the impersonal or reflexive construction, the other is lability, with a morphologically unmarked variation of argument structure, in which the verb can appear in the same form in the transitive or intransitive constructions. A striking feature of Mande, and Mano in particular, is the widespread P-lability, a variation in the argument structure in that the patientive participant occupies the position of the subject. The following example illustrates morphologically unmarked causal versus noncausal alternation in which the verb ‘to (make) fall’ is used in a transitive construction and an intransitive one with no overt morphological marking.

(32) a. nɛ̀ ɛ̀ dà.
   child 3SG.PST fall
   ‘The child fell.’ (el.)

b. kòò kò nɛ̀ dà i ṭàkà.
   3SG.EXI 1PL.POSS child fall 2SG ADR
   ‘We are presenting our child to you (lit.: we are making our child fall to you).’ (nat.)

A far more cross-linguistically rare feature is passive lability in which the semantics of the verb have strong agent-oriented components. This is in contrast to an earlier prediction by Haspelmath (1993) that this type of lability cannot occur, it appears to be typical for Mande (Cobbinah and Lüpke 2009; Vydrina 2011; Creissels 2014), but also occurs elsewhere, such as in some Daghestanian and Austronesian languages (for a typology of lability, see Letuchij 2013).

(33) a. òò gbáà wɔ̀ lètɔ̀ sɔ̀ lɔ̀ bò.
   3PL.NEG NEG sleeping.place getting implement
   ‘They did not obtain a sleeping place.’ (el.)

b. wɔ̀ lètɔ̀ gbáà sɔ̀ lɔ̀ bò.
   sleeping.place 3SG.NEG NEG getting implement
   ‘The sleeping place was not obtained.’ (nat.)
6 Tense, aspect, modality and polarity

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

(34) lē nū-pèlè.
    3SG.EXI come-INF
    ‘(S)he is coming.’ (el.)

Example (35) contains the negative perfective and there is a negative 3SG auxiliary (lèē), the predicative marker of negation (gbāā) as well as a verb in the lexical form.

(35) lèē gbāā nū.
    3SG.NEG NEG come
    ‘(S)he did not come.’ (el.)

Section 6.1 is dedicated to the rich tonal morphology of the verbs used in various TAMP constructions; Section 6.2 explains the general patterns of the use of auxiliaries; Section 6.3 explores the expression of negation; and Section 6.4 presents the polysemy of prospective markers. A full description of the semantics of TAMP in Mano is provided by Khachaturyan (2011, 2015).

6.1 Verbal forms used in TAMP constructions

Mano verbs have rich suprasegmental morphology. The verbal morphology includes five grammatical tonal forms as well as four affixes. Some of the affixes only occur in combination with a tonal form. The verbal paradigms used in various finite and non-finite constructions have a total of ten forms, including a baer form with lexical tone and no segmental affixes; and three forms in which the only morphological exponent is grammatical tone (the imperfective form, conjoint form, and nominalization form). In addition, Mano has two forms that have grammatical tone combined with a segmental morpheme (real protasis and
counterfactual protasis forms, both with the suffix -ā) and three forms in which the exponent is a segmental morpheme (gerund and counterfactual, both with the suffix -ā, as well as the infinitive, with the suffix -pēlē). Finally, there are regular contractions of gerunds with the postposition kā ‘with’. No verbs contrast all forms; there is always at least some syncretism. Thus, conjoint forms are always homonymous with nominalization forms; gerunds are always homonymous with the counterfactual forms. Mid-tone CV verbs, such as pā ‘fill’, and high-tone CVCV verbs, such as fēlē ‘become clear’, have a maximum of seven contrasting forms, while the low-tone CVa verbs, such as nīā ‘turn’, contrast only three forms. Table 4 provides example paradigms.

6.2 Auxiliaries

The auxiliaries in Mande languages play an indispensable role in the expression of TAMP. A typologically remarkable feature of the TAMP system in Mano as well as in other Southern Mande languages and Southwestern Mande languages, is the rich inventory of auxiliaries. These not only contribute to the semantics of a particular TAMP construction, but they index the person and number of a subject. As in many other Mande languages, the Mano verb occurs in its lexical form and the auxiliary is the only exponent of the TAMP values in most TAMP constructions. Thus, TAMP constructions in (36a–c) differ only in their marking of the auxiliary: the auxiliary of the past (36a), perfect (36b), and conjunctive series (36c).

(36)  

a. ē nū.  

3SG.PST come  

‘He came’ (el.)

b. āā nū.  

3SG.PRF come  

‘He has come’ (el.)

c. mī nēj dāā ḍāā lē ē nū!

person all father duty COP 3SG.CONJ come  

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

Other than expressing TAMP, Mano auxiliaries also index the person and number of a subject. In (36a), the form ē not only expresses the past tense but also the subject’s person (third) and number (singular). The auxiliary co-occurs with the full noun phrase of the subject. Instead of treating forms such as ē as subject pronouns inflected for TAMP, an argument has been made to analyze them as TAMP markers (or auxiliaries) that are inflected for person and number and agree
### 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 $+ká$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>félé ‘become clear’</td>
<td>félé</td>
<td>félé</td>
<td>félé, félã</td>
<td>félé, félá</td>
<td>félã</td>
<td>félã</td>
<td>félépélé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa ‘fill’</td>
<td>pã</td>
<td>pã</td>
<td>pâá</td>
<td>pâá</td>
<td>pâá</td>
<td>pâá</td>
<td>pâpélé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nià ‘turn’</td>
<td>nià</td>
<td>nià</td>
<td>niá</td>
<td>niá</td>
<td>niá</td>
<td>niá</td>
<td>niâpélé</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conditional forms will be discussed in Section 7.2.
with the subject (Hachaturyan 2010). On (subject) agreement in Mande, see Konoshenko (2013; 2015). For more examples of subject indexing in the auxiliaries of African languages and more generally, for a discussion on the criteria used to distinguish free subject pronouns and bound pronominal markers, see Creissels (2005: 51–54). The full paradigm of Mano auxiliaries is given in Table A2 of the appendix.

6.3 Negation

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

Negation in Mano is asymmetric (in the sense proposed by Miestamo 2005). There are two reasons for this: negation involves a change in the TAMP constructions (constructional asymmetry) and the inventory of negative constructions is reduced with respect to the inventory of affirmative constructions (paradigmatic asymmetry). In particular, in negative non-verbal constructions, Mano only has one copula, wɔ́, while affirmative non-verbal clauses contain either an existential auxiliary (37, 38) or either of the four available affirmative copulas lɛ, lɛ́, wɔ́ or ɡɛ̀ (39, 40). While Mano has three affirmative presentative constructions (40), no negative correlate occurs.

(37) a. ɡɔ́ ɗɛ  lɛ  ɗ̄  dɛ  ká.
man:H DEM 3SG.EXI 1SG husband with
‘This man is my husband.’ (el.)

b. ɡɔ́ ɗɛ  wɔ́  ɗ̄  dɛ  ká.
man:H DEM COP.NEG 1SG husband with
‘This man is not my husband.’ (el.)

(38) a. ɓiɛ  ɗɔ  ɗ  ɓɛ.
elephant PL 3PL.EXI EXI
‘Elephants exist.’ (el.)

b. ɓiɛ  ɗɔ  wɔ́  ɓɛ.
elephant PL COP.NEG EXI
‘Elephants do not exist.’ (el.)

(39) a. à ɓɔ-ɔ  lɛ.
3SG leave-GER COP
‘He has left (lit.: his leaving is).’ (el.)

b. à ɓɔ-ɔ  wáá ká.
3SG leave-GER COP.NEG>3SG with
‘He has not left (lit.: his leaving isn't it).’ (el.)
(40) a.  Pèé là ká lé.  
P.N. 3SG.POSS house COP  
'It is Pe’s house.' (el.)

b.  Pèé là ká lé wè.  
P.N. 3SG.POSS house COP.ATT DEM  
'Here is Pe’s house.' (presentation, the object is visible and close)

c.  Pèé là ká wó wè.  
P.N. 3SG.POSS house COP.DEICT DEM  
'Here is Pe’s house (similar to b).' (el.)

d.  Pèé là ká gè.  
P.N. 3SG.POSS house COP.DEICT  
'Here is Pe’s house (presentation, the referent is visible, but may be distant).' (el.)

In declaratives, only one negative auxiliary combines with different lexical and grammatical means, and that auxiliary is used to form negative habitual, aorist, and perfect constructions, whereas in the affirmative zone, three different auxiliaries are used for these purposes (41). The inventory of affirmative modal constructions does not map into the inventory of negative ones: thus, there is no direct negative equivalent of the prospective construction (see Section 6.4).

(41) a.  lèè lò lòsi. vs b. lèè lò lòsi.  
3SG.IPFV go:IPFV market 3SG.NEG go market  
'She goes to the market.' (el.)  'She does not go to the market.' (el.)

c.  ë lò lòsi. vs d. lèè gbàa lò lòsi.  
3SG.PST go market 3SG.NEG NEG go market  
'She went to the market.' (el.)  'She did not go to the market' (el.)

e.  ãà lò lòsi. vs f. lèè lò lòsi nèñ.  
3SG.PRF go market 3SG.NEG go market yet  
'She has gone to the market.' (el.)  'She has not yet gone to the market.' (el.)

In addition to auxiliaries that have negative polarity (the negative series, as illustrated in (41), but also prohibitive) and the negative copula wó, Mano employs negative predicative markers, including gbàa (41d), which is used in negative perfective constructions. It is important to note that another negative predicative marker, gògà, is used only in negative conditional constructions. Conditional clauses in Mano use extensive dedicated morphology, see Section 7.2.
6.4 Prospective

In contrast to other auxiliary series, the prospective series is always used with a
nother auxiliary: it most often appears with the conjunctive auxiliary (with which it
regularly merges). The series also stands out phonotactically because the markers
have the form CVCV or CVCVCV, which is not attested elsewhere in the auxiliary
paradigm. The series also has a peculiar polysemy. First, the series is used in quo-
tative constructions (42); second, when the prospective auxiliary is combined with a
conjunctive auxiliary coreferential with it, the entire construction conveys the mo-
dality of intentionality (43, 44) and prospective aspectual value, whereas a future
action or state is expected to occur given the 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 kélé. The quoted predication can take any form; in
(42), it is represented by a copula construction.

(42) yèlè  ámb:`nyɔ gbàlà mà yà-à lè luú yí kpɔkɔ.  
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.)

(43) Gewúlù yèlè gbàa é kpili kè.  
Gewulu 3 SG.PROSP now 3 SG.CONJ celebration do
‘Gewulu wants to organize a celebration.’ (nat.)

(44) gwɔ té mbɔ ń geë a…  
problem ATT 1 SG.PROSP 1 SG.CONJ>3 SG say BKGR
‘The story that I want to tell…’ (nat.)

(45) àà nù mais à zi nù kò wè  
3 SG.INT come:INT but[FR] 3 SG INT.POSS come way:CONN DEM
lè lèpèlè yèlè dɔ.  
3 SG.EXI like 3 SG.PROSP>3 SG.CONJ stop
‘He was approaching but the way he was approaching was like he was
going to stop.’ (nat.)

(46) yèlè gbàa é pèlèsìnè dùò.  
3 SG.PROSP now 3 SG 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 &
In some Mande languages, quotative indexes can be inflected for person and number (Idiatov 2010). Syntactically, in Mano, as in Mandinka or in Tura, another Southern Mande language, quotative indexes are used as quotative predicators, which are defined as a predicative element “similar to quotative verbs that cannot be classified as full-fledged verbs in a given language” (Güldemann 2008b: 15). Idiatov (2010) reported on other Mande languages with quotative indexes, in particular, Jula of Samatiguila or the Ko dialect of Mende (Western Mande) and observed that they are used non-predicatively as clause-linking markers. A polysemy such as the one attested in Mano (quotative, intentionality) has also been attested in Wan, Southern Mande (Nikitina 2018a), while Mandinka adds prospective to the range of meaning that is expressed by the quotative construction (Creissels and Sambou 2013: 443–445). The same type 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), the Mano prospective series most likely emerged from a fusion of pronominal elements with some quotative index or a verb. However, the identity of that index or that verb and in general the origin of the series remain unresolved questions.

7 The morphosyntax of complex clauses

To combine clauses, Mano often employs dedicated TAM categories and constructions. More specifically, for a series of consecutive or simultaneous events, Mano uses the conjoint construction (Section 7.1). Conditional clauses are cross-linguistically unusual because they employ extensive specialized verbal morphology, but also because their semantics are far from the prototype described in the literature (see Section 7.2). Other morphological means used for clause-combining are linkers, determiners, conjunctions, and clause-final markers. Linkers are used for coordination (étō, ɛ̀ɛ ‘and’, kēē, kēlā ‘but’, and lé ‘then (used in a narrative chain)’) and subordination (yē ‘when’, kē ‘so that (purpose constructions)’, ṃī ‘because’). Linkers typically occur at the beginning of a phrase and may occur after a pause. Determiners, and especially lé, nè, tè, high-tone floating marker are used in relative clauses following a relativized constituent. Conjunctions, and most prominently kēlè, are used in complement clauses and reported speech, usually form a prosodic unit with a preceding clause, and occur before a pause. Finally, clause final
backgrounding markers occur at the right edge of a sentence-initial dependent clause and are sometimes used as the only clause-linking devices.\textsuperscript{11}

\section*{7.1 Conjoint form}

The conjoined construction in Mano, which consists of an auxiliary of the conjoint series and a verb in the low-tone conjoined form, is an example of a clause-chaining category that occurs commonly in languages of Sub-Saharan Africa, where in a chain of clauses representing a sequence of events, only one is finite and the remaining clauses exhibit some properties of non-finiteness.\textsuperscript{12} The Mano construction is primarily used in the narrative chain. The narrative is usually divided into micro-episodes, with the first event in the perfective, and the subsequent events in the conjoint construction, and the subjects of the respective constructions are typically (but not always) coreferential.

\begin{quote}
(47) \textit{ē là p̄̀̄́ sī kpēŋkpēŋ áà nù à pàà}
3SG.PST 3SG.POSS thing.PL pick.up directly 3SG.JNT come:JNT 3SG at
sélè sălápèèlè à à dōô yì.
soil seven DEM 3SG one in
‘[When he heard these rumors,] he immediately took his affairs and returned home, to one of the seven villages.’ (nat.)
\end{quote}

Speech verbs in narratives more often than other verbs occur in the conjoint form. Furthermore, switching reference of the subject is a norm, rather than an

\textsuperscript{11} All the particularities of the syntax of complex clauses in Mano and Mande in general are beyond the scope of the present paper. More specifically, I do not include a discussion of the relative clauses that belong to the correlative type and have a typologically unusual clause-internal subtype (Nikitina 2012). In Khachaturyan (2017b), I analyze Mano relative clauses as a pragmatic interpretation of a paratactic construction with a pragmatically backgrounded dependent clause, similar to a topic-comment construction (Van Valin 2005; see also Lambrecht 1994). An analysis of correlatives as being non-embedding or as straightforwardly topicalized has been proposed in Mande for Maninka of Kita, Manding, in the former case (Creissels 2009) and in Wan, Kla-Dan and other Southern Mande, in the latter (Makeeva 2013; Nikitina 2012).

\textsuperscript{12} This type of forms with reduced finiteness are also referred to as consecutive (see Carlson 1994 for Supyire, Atlantic) or sequential (see Frajzyngier 1996; Hellwig 2011 for Chadic). The term “conjoint” is selected for Mano for semantic reasons, because the marking in question is used not only to represent a sequence of events but also simultaneous events, and also because of the particularities in the syntactic behavior: conjoint constructions can be used in independent clauses. The term “conjoint” is also used in African linguistics – particularly in the studies of Bantu languages – to designate a morphological opposition between conjoint and disjoint, the forms of which have a different functional load than the “conjoint” forms in Mano, see van der Wal and Hyman (2016).
exception. Example (48) represents a reported dialog, so in (48b) and (48c), the subject of the speech verb is different from each immediately preceding one.

(48) a. \( \text{láà } \text{gèè: } \text{wáà } \text{pèèlè } \text{nɔ.} \)  
3SG.IPfv>3SG say:IPfv thousand two give  
‘He says: give 2000 (francs).’

b. \( \text{áà } \text{gèè: } \text{wáà } \text{pèèlè } \text{wɔ } \text{ŋ } \text{kèlè.} \)  
3SG.Jnt>3SG say:Jnt thousand two COP.Neg 1SG hand  
‘He says: I don’t have 2000.’

c. \( \text{áà } \text{gèè } \text{gó } \text{wèlè } \text{bɔɔ } \text{nɔ } \text{mɔɔ.} \)  
3G.Jnt>3SG say:Jnt cola bone simple give PART  
‘He says: give me at least two cola nuts.’

d. \( \text{áà } \text{gèè } \text{gó } \text{wèlè } \text{wɔ } \text{ŋ } \text{kèlè } \text{ō,} \)  
3SG.Jnt>3SG say:Jnt cola bone COP.Neg 1SG hand INJ gbù ŋ mɔ wè.  
gather 1SG on DEM  
‘He says: I don’t have two cola nuts, help me!’ (nat.)

The chain of conjoined constructions is rarely very long, consisting of a maximum of three to four clauses. A good balance between perfective and conjoined constructions creates a stylistic effect of narrative fluidity, and is a sign of a good narrator. However, children typically overuse perfective constructions because often they have not yet fully acquired the art of storytelling. The use of the conjoint construction in the Mano narrative remains an object for future study (for an analysis of aspectual marking used for narrative structuring in Totela, a Bantu language, see Crane 2011).

The conjoint construction is also used to express events that occur simultaneously with some other event:

(49) \( \text{É } \text{kè } \text{nɔ } \text{mèŋ } \text{zę-pèlè } \text{áà } \text{gbè } \text{à } \text{kà} \)  
3SG.Pst do just dream kill-INF 3SG.Jnt put:Jnt 3SG with sàlàpè mɔŋwɔmɔ.  
meat because.of  
‘He was just dreaming and it concerned meat.’ (nat.)

It is important to note that while the conjoint construction in the narrative is usually used as part of a chain of statements, during conversation, it alone can constitute a turn and even occur in a question. This type of conjoint construction occurred in an example suggested by my language consultant, when a question that contained a conjoint construction was asked by one participant in a conversation (50c) as a direct follow-up of a prior question framed in a regular non-verbal predication (50a).
Thus, while the conjoint construction does not need 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). Givón (2001: 357) classified clause-chaining with the help of forms with reduced finiteness into two types: clause-chaining in which the finite-most predication is the ultimate member of a chain, which corresponds to the SOV word order, and clause-chaining in which the finite-most predication is the first member of a chain, and this corresponds 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 not be OV versus VO, but rather verb-final versus verb-medial.

7.2 Conditionals

Mano conditional clauses deserve typological attention due to the richness of dedicated conditional morphology and owing to semantic patterns that do not conform to typological prototypes. First, while Mano verbal paradigms have ten morphological distinctions, three of them are employed solely in conditional clauses, including two dedicated tonal forms, conditional and irrealis, combined with the conditional suffix –á and a counterfactual form with the suffix –à. The contrasts in verbal forms are illustrated by the verb ló ‘go’: ló-á go:COND-COND vs ló-á go:IRREAL-COND vs ló-à go-CNTRFCT. In addition, as noted in Section 6.3, of the two negative predicative markers, one, gɔ̀-gɔ̀, appears only in conditional constructions.
‘If a Guinean person wants to buy something from you, he’d better not touch it.’ (nat.)

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

‘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.’ (nat.)

On the semantic side, Mano makes a formal distinction between real (51), imaginaive (52), and predictive conditionals (53), on the one hand, and counterfactual conditionals (54), on the other. In the former, the protasis is formed by a conjunctive auxiliary with the conditional verbal form (é lōá ‘if he goes’), and in the latter, the protasis is formed with a subjunctive auxiliary and an irrealis verbal form (è lōá ‘if (s)he had gone’) (on the semantic classification of conditionals, see Thompson et al. 1997). The repartition of conditional types in these two categories, counterfactual and non-counterfactual, does not correspond to a prototypical realis/irrealis distinction with real situations coded differently from hypothetical and counterfactual situations. Thus, in Nanti, Arawak, real conditionals contain realis marking and are therefore different from all other types of conditionals containing irrealis (such as in hypothetical conditionals) or double irrealis marking (as in counterfactuals; see Michael 2014). While marking counterfactual conditionals as a distinct type is not uncommon across languages (Lazard 1998 mentions a
few), these cases often contain the same marker for the protasis and apodosis of counterfactual conditionals. For example, this occurs in Rembarrnga, non-Pama-Nyungan (Verstraete 2005) or in Hausa, Chadic (Bagari 1976). In contrast, in Mano, protasis and apodosis in conditionals, including counterfactuals, are expressed by strikingly different constructions. Yet in Mano, the distinction between counterfactual and non-counterfactual conditionals is far from fixed, because a non-counterfactual construction can be used in a semantically counterfactual context, as in (55) (no examples of the reverse type have been attested), which contributes to blurring the distinction between reals and irrealis. For a critique of the cross-linguistic validity of the notion of irrealis, see Bybee (1998) and Cristofaro (2012).

(55) [í nū-ā ă] mīā őò
   2SG.CONJ come:COND-COND BKGR person.PL 3PL.IPFV
   lō gbū-ù î mò.
   go:IPFV gather-GER 2SG on
   ‘(Given that you had nothing,) if you had come, the people would have helped you (if you come, people will help you).’ (nat.)

The existence of dedicated conditional morphology notwithstanding, no sharp boundary occurs between the conditional and other types of constructions. This means that non-counterfactual apodosis in Mano is always expressed by a non-dedicated construction (52, 53). Mano is similar to some Papuan languages (Thompson et al. 1997) in that it lacks a clear distinction between “if” and “when” clauses. Thus, on the one hand, temporal constructions may receive a conditional interpretation, as in (56), with the negative counterfactual protasis expressed by a negative copular construction with the linker yé ‘when’ which is typically used in temporal clauses. The value of counterfactuality in (56) is expressed by the marker of a retrospective shift, kɛì. On the other hand, formally conditional constructions often receive a temporal, non-conditional interpretation, as in (57).

(56) [yè yō wō kèí à ká ē]
   when 3SG.EMPH COP.NEG RETR 3SG with BKGR
   mi nṣfè dò lèk ɡòá d5-ɔ ē pié.
   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.)

(57) [wèi è nū-ā ē], è là wèbà kè,
   monkey 3SG.CONJ come:COND-COND BKGR 3SG.PST 3SG.POSS salutation do ē lò.
   3SG.PST go
   ‘When the monkey came, it did its greeting and went away.’ (nat.)
8 Conclusion

The present article sketches a linguistic portrait of Mano as a representative member of the Mande family and its Southern branch. I hope that it attracts the attention of typologists to the family. The family features shared by Mano include S-Aux-O-V-X word order, 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, and the narrative structuring of clausal sequences in which the most finite clause is the first in the chain. The Southern branch features include rich tonal morphology, the unstable character of nasal consonants, and rich pronominal paradigms, including auxiliaries that index the person and number of the subject. Some of the features presented here have not been sufficiently analyzed in the Mande material, so it is unclear whether Mano is unusual in comparison to other Mande languages in terms of 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 the dedicated tonal forms used in conditional clauses.
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Appendix

Table A1: 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>ḷ</td>
<td>và</td>
<td>ì/à/à̃</td>
<td>kò</td>
<td>kà</td>
<td>ò</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possessive pronouns</td>
<td>ḷ</td>
<td>bà</td>
<td>à</td>
<td>kò</td>
<td>kà</td>
<td>wà</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphatic pronouns</td>
<td>mà(e)</td>
<td>bà(e)</td>
<td>à, à̄yà, yò</td>
<td>kò(e)</td>
<td>kà(e)</td>
<td>ò(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focalized pronouns</td>
<td>mà</td>
<td>bà</td>
<td>à̄yà</td>
<td>kò</td>
<td>kà</td>
<td>ò</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inclusory pronouns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kò–kwà</td>
<td>kà</td>
<td>wà</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The marker in parentheses is a portmanteau marker. It represents an auxiliary fused with the non-subject pronoun of the third person singular which can occupy the position of the direct object (in this case, the portmanteau 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 both transitive and intransitive contexts without the pronominalized direct object of the third person singular 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

13 The tone of the 3sg non-subject pronoun optionally assimilates to the tone of the preceding vowel.
<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>I existential</td>
<td>ṇ (māā)</td>
<td>ṵ (bāā)</td>
<td>े–े–े (lāā)</td>
<td>k̄ (kāā)</td>
<td>kā (kāā)</td>
<td>ā (wāā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II past</td>
<td>ṇ (māā)</td>
<td>ṵ (bāā)</td>
<td>े (ā)</td>
<td>k̄ (kāā)</td>
<td>kā</td>
<td>ā (wāā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III perfect</td>
<td>māā</td>
<td>bāā</td>
<td>āā</td>
<td>k̄āā</td>
<td>kāā</td>
<td>wāā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV imperfective</td>
<td>ṇ</td>
<td>ṹ (bāā)</td>
<td>े (lāā)</td>
<td>k̄ō (k̄āā)</td>
<td>kā</td>
<td>ō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V conjoint</td>
<td>māā</td>
<td>bāā</td>
<td>āā</td>
<td>k̄āā</td>
<td>kāā</td>
<td>wāā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI negative</td>
<td>ṇ</td>
<td>ṹ (bāā)</td>
<td>े (lāā)</td>
<td>k̄ō</td>
<td>kā</td>
<td>ō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII conjunctive</td>
<td>ṇ</td>
<td>ṹ (bāā)</td>
<td>े (ā)</td>
<td>k̄ō</td>
<td>kā</td>
<td>ō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII prohibitive</td>
<td>māā</td>
<td>bāā</td>
<td>āā</td>
<td>k̄āā</td>
<td>kāā</td>
<td>wāā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX subjunctive</td>
<td>ṇ</td>
<td>ṹ (bāā)</td>
<td>े (ā)</td>
<td>k̄–k̄āā (k̄–k̄āā–k̄āā)</td>
<td>kā</td>
<td>ō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X prospective</td>
<td>māā</td>
<td>bāā</td>
<td>āā</td>
<td>k̄ō</td>
<td>kāā</td>
<td>wāā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI dubitative</td>
<td>māā</td>
<td>bāā</td>
<td>āā</td>
<td>k̄ō</td>
<td>kāā</td>
<td>wāā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(hin), Hittite (hit), Hungarian (hun), Kashaya (kju), Lavukaleve (lvk), 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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