

Creissels, Denis. 2023. Logophoricity and reflexivity in Soninke (West Mande). In Rose-Juliet Anyanwu (ed.), *Logophoricity, pronouns, and pronominals in African languages*. Frankfurter Afrikanistische Blätter. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag. 69-83.

## Logophoricity and reflexivity in Soninke (West Mande)

Denis CREISSELS  
Université Lumière (Lyon2)  
denis.creissels@gmail.com  
<http://deniscreissels.fr>

### 1. Introduction

Soninke (*sòonìnkànnqánnè*), spoken by approximately 2 million speakers living mainly in Mali, Mauritania, Senegal, and The Gambia, belongs to the Soninke-Bozo sub-branch of the western branch of the Mande language family. The major dialectal division in Soninke is between western and eastern varieties. The data analyzed in this article come from two eastern varieties geographically distant but linguistically very close to each other, for which I had the opportunity to work with consultants: the Kaedi variety and the Kingi variety.<sup>1</sup> The Kaedi variety is by far the best-documented Soninke variety, with two reference grammars (O.M. Diagana (1984, 1995) and Y. Diagana (1990, 1994)), which, however, do not provide a proper analysis of logophoricity, and use transcriptions characterized by a number of shortcomings. The transcriptions in this article follow the phonological analysis put forward by Creissels (2016). The data from the Kaedi variety have been checked with the help of Yacouba Diagana, and the data from the Kingi variety come from my own work in collaboration with Ismael Diawara.

Logophoricity can be defined as the regular use of a marking device that distinguishes whether a pronoun in a reported utterance is coreferential or not with the speaker to which the reported utterance is attributed (the original speaker, usually encoded in the construction introducing the reported utterance).

Example (1) shows that Soninke has a mechanism of logophoric marking, since *Míusá* can be interpreted as the antecedent of the 3rd person pronoun *à* in (1a), but not in (1b). In (1b), the fact that *à* occurs in a clause introduced by the quotative verb *ʔí* ‘say’ blocks the possibility of interpreting it as representing the original speaker. In the reported utterance, another pronoun (*i*) must be used to refer to the original speaker, as in (1c).<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Somewhat paradoxically, the Kaedi variety is located at the extreme west of the Soninke-speaking area, but belongs linguistically to the eastern dialectal area. The reason is that the Kaedi variety, like the other Soninke varieties of Fuuta Tooro, is spoken by populations whose ancestors migrated two or three centuries ago from zones where eastern varieties of Soninke are spoken.

<sup>2</sup> In the examples, the vowels between parentheses are final vowels that are normally elided if the following word is a pronoun with an empty initial onset. Note also that, tonally, the verb *ʔí* ‘say’ belongs to a class of monosyllabic items that systematically surface with a tone opposite to that of the last syllable of the preceding word, and are analyzed as having an underlying ‘floating H plus L’ tone pattern (Creissels 2016).

- (1a) *Múusá ntá yéré lènkí, qà à wá ríi-ní qùnbàné.*  
 Moussa LCOP.NEG here today but 3SG ICPL come-GER tomorrow  
 ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> is not here today, but he<sub>i/j</sub> will come tomorrow.’
- (1b) *Múusá t(i) à wá ríi-ní qùnbàné.*  
 Moussa say 3SG ICPL come-GER tomorrow  
 ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> said that s/he<sub>j/\*i</sub> will come tomorrow.’
- (1c) *Múusá t(i) í wá ríi-ní qùnbàné.*  
 Moussa say í ICPL come-GER tomorrow  
 ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> said that s/he<sub>i/\*j</sub> will come tomorrow.’

However, marking coreference between a term of a reported utterance and the subject of the speech verb introducing the reported utterance is not the only function fulfilled by *í*, and this is precisely the reason why, in (1c), it is not glossed LOG. The use of a gloss that does not refer to the function fulfilled by *í* in particular constructions, and simply reproduces its phonological form, aims to avoid the misunderstandings that could result from the use of a gloss evoking one of its possible uses only. As will be described in detail in the remainder of this article, the pronoun *í* is a coreference marker whose domain includes reported speech, but is not limited to it.<sup>3</sup>

This article is organized as follows. §2 provides some basic information on Soninke clause structure. §3 describes the morphology of the personal pronouns and of the pronoun *í* involved in logophoric marking. §4 describes the use of *í* in reported speech. §5 describes the other uses of *í* in complex constructions. §6 describes the use of *í* in the marking of intra-clausal coreference relationships. §7 discusses some theoretical implications of the distribution of *í* described in the previous sections. §8 puts forward some concluding remarks.

## 2. The basics of Soninke clause structure

In Soninke, as in the other Mande languages, verbal clauses are characterized by a rigid constituent order that can be schematized as *S pm (O) V (X)*.<sup>4</sup> The subject (*S*) is the only nominal term of the construction whose presence is an absolute requirement in independent assertive or interrogative clauses. Predicative markers (*pm*) are grammatical words occupying a fixed position immediately after the subject. They express grammaticalized TAM distinctions and polarity (positive vs. negative), and also participate in transitivity marking. There is no indexation of the core syntactic terms *S* and *O*, and core term flagging is limited to an enclitic *-n* that attaches exclusively to interrogative phrases or focalized noun phrases in subject function. Predicative constructions with two or more terms encoded in the same way as the patient of typical monotransitive verbs (so-called ‘multiple object constructions’) are not possible. Obliques are marked by postpositions, prepositions, or a combination of both.

<sup>3</sup> O.M. Diagana’s (1984, 1995) comments on *í* suggest that *í* is a dedicated logophoric pronoun, but it is clear from the data he provides that this position is not tenable. Another mistake in O.M. Diagana’s account of logophoricity in Soninke is his suggestion that *ín* could be analyzed as a 1st person singular logophoric pronoun. In fact, *ín* and *ń* are simply phonologically conditioned allomorphs of the 1st person pronoun – see §3.

<sup>4</sup> *S* = subject, *pm* = predicative marker, *O* = object, *V* = verb, *X* = oblique.

Ex. (2) and (3) illustrate intransitive and transitive verbal clauses with the following two predicative markers: *má* ‘completive, negative’, and the locational copula *wá* (negative *ntá*) fulfilling the function of incomplete auxiliary. With the locational copula used as an incomplete auxiliary, the verb is in the form I call gerundive, otherwise it occurs in its bare lexical form. Some predicative markers trigger the replacement of the lexical tones of the verb by an all-low tone pattern (indicated by superscript L in the glosses).

(2a) *Ké yúgó má qàrà.*  
 DEM man CPL.NEG study<sup>L</sup>  
 ‘This man did not study.’

(2b) *À wá táaxú-nú dàagó-n kànmá.*  
 1SG ICPL sit-GER mat-D on  
 ‘He is sitting on the mat.’

(3a) *Lémúnù-n má qálisí kità.*  
 child.PL-D CPL.NEG money get<sup>L</sup>  
 ‘The children haven’t got money.’

(3b) *À wá dòròkè-n qóbó-nó yàxàré-n dà.*  
 1SG ICPL dress-D buy-GER woman-D for  
 ‘He will buy a dress for the woman.’

### 3. The personal pronouns and the pronoun *í*

In Soninke, the personal pronouns and the pronoun *í* share a morphological property that is found with no other nominal, namely the existence of a contrast between two forms that can be characterized as non-emphatic and emphatic.

The non-emphatic form cannot be immediately followed by a pause, and consequently cannot be used in isolation, or as a left-dislocated topic, but apart from the exclusion of the non-emphatic form from immediate pre-pausal position, the two forms have the same distribution, and their positions in the clause are consistently the same as those in which NPs referring to the same participants could be found. For example, in (4b), the emphatic form of *í* occupies the same subject position as the non-emphatic one in (4a).

(4a) *Múusá t(í) í wá ríi-ní qùnbàné.*  
 Moussa say *í* ICPL come-GER tomorrow  
 ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> said that he<sub>i</sub> will come tomorrow.’

(4b) *Múusá t(í) í-ké wá ríi-ní qùnbàné.*  
 Moussa say *í*-EMPH ICPL come-GER tomorrow  
 ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> said that HE<sub>i</sub> will come tomorrow.’

Morphologically, the emphatic form differs from the non-emphatic form by the addition of a suffix *-ke(n)* (singular) / *-ku(n)* plural:

	non-emphatic	emphatic
1SG	<i>ín/ń</i>	<i>ín-ké/ń-ké</i>
2SG	<i>án</i>	<i>án-kèn</i>
3SG	<i>à/á</i>	<i>à-kèn</i>
1PL	<i>ó</i>	<i>ó-kú</i>
2PL	<i>qá/qà/áxá</i>	<i>qá-kùn/áxá-kùn</i>
3PL	<i>ì/í</i>	<i>ì-kùn</i>
Í	<i>í</i>	<i>í-ké (sg.), í-kú (pl.)</i>

Table 1. Emphatic and non-emphatic forms of pronouns

It can be observed that the presence vs. absence of a final *n* underlyingly associated with a low tone in the emphatic marker *-ke(n)* (sg.) / *-ku(n)* (pl.) distinguishes the 2nd and 3rd persons, in which the emphatic marker is *-ken* (sg.) / *-kun* (pl.), from the 1st person, in which it is *-ke* (sg.) / *-ku* (pl.). In the selection of a particular form of the emphatic marker, *í* patterns with the 1st person. However, I have no explanation to put forward for this observation.

The variants noted in Table 1 have the following distribution:

- In the first person singular, the choice between *ín* and *ń* is conditioned by the position of the pronoun within the intonation unit: *ń* in initial position, *ín* elsewhere.
- In the second person plural, the low-toned form *qà* occurs in subject function in the imperative construction; in all other contexts, *qá* and *áxá* vary freely.
- In the non-emphatic third person (singular and plural), the low-toned form is selected if the pronoun immediately precedes the predicative marker, the verb, or some postpositions, whereas the high-toned form occurs in all other contexts (for example, in genitive function immediately before a noun, immediately before *`dó* ‘with’, immediately before the focus marker *`yá*, immediately before an adjective in predicate function, etc).

Note that ambiguity may arise in the contexts that trigger the choice of the high-toned form of third person pronouns, since the high-toned form of the third person plural pronoun is phonologically identical with the pronoun *í*.

## 4. The use of *í* in reported speech

### 4.1. The quotative verb *`tí* ‘say’

The use of *í* in reported speech has already been illustrated in the introduction by example (1b-c), reproduced here as (5).

- (5a) *Míusá t(í) à wá rii-ní qùnbàné.*  
 Moussa say 3SG ICPL come-GER tomorrow  
 ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> said that s/he<sub>j/\*i</sub> will come tomorrow.’

(5b) *Múusá t(í) í wá ríi-ní qùnbàné.*  
 Moussa say Í ICPL come-GER tomorrow  
 ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> said that s/he<sub>i/\*j</sub> will come tomorrow.’

(6) shows that the same configuration is found when the original speaker is represented by a plural NP.

(6a) *Múusá dò Úmàrú t(í) ì wá ríi-ní qùnbàné.*  
 Moussa and Oumarou say 3PL ICPL come-GER tomorrow  
 ‘Moussa and Oumarou<sub>i</sub> said that they<sub>j/\*i</sub> will come tomorrow.’

(6b) *Múusá dò Úmàrú t(í) í wá ríi-ní qùnbàné.*  
 Moussa and Oumarou say Í ICPL come-GER tomorrow  
 ‘Moussa and Oumarou<sub>i</sub> said that they<sub>i/\*j</sub> will come tomorrow.’

In examples (5) and (6), the original speaker is resumed as the subject of the reported utterance, but the use of *í* is not conditioned by the grammatical role of the term of the reported utterance referring to the original speaker. For example, the original speaker is resumed by *í* in object role in (7), and by *í* in oblique role in (8).

(7a) *Múusá t(í) ín d(à) à ká.*  
 Moussa say 1SG CPL.TR 3SG insult  
 ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> said that I insulted him<sub>j/\*i</sub>.’

(7b) *Múusá t(í) ín d(à) í kà.*  
 Moussa say 1SG CPL.TR Í insult  
 ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> said that I insulted him<sub>i/\*j</sub>.’

(8a) *Múusá t(í) léminè-n dà killé-n kòyí à yí.*  
 Moussa say child-D CPL.TR way-D show 3SG to  
 ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> said that the child showed him<sub>j/\*i</sub> the way.’

(8b) *Múusá t(í) léminè-n dà killé-n kòyí í yà.*  
 Moussa say child-D CPL.TR way-D show Í to  
 ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> said that the child showed him<sub>i/\*j</sub> the way.’

A general property of *í* in all its uses is that it can only resume 3rd person antecedents. In reported speech, as illustrated in (9), if the original speaker coincides with a participant in the reporting speech act, it can only be resumed in the reported clause by the corresponding 1st or 2nd person pronoun.

(9a) *Ń t(í) ín ŋá ríi-ní qùnbàné.*  
 1SG say 1SG<sup>5</sup> ICPL<sup>6</sup> come-GER tomorrow  
 ‘I said that I will come tomorrow.’

<sup>5</sup> As already explained in §3, *ń* and *ín* are phonologically conditioned variants of the 1st person singular pronoun.

<sup>6</sup> When immediately preceded by a nasal, *w* automatically alternates with *ŋ*.

(9b) *Án t(ì) án ñá rii-ní qùnbàné.*  
 2SG say 2SG ICPL come-GER tomorrow  
 ‘You (sg.) said that you (sg.) will come tomorrow.’

(9c) *Ó t(ì) ó wá rii-ní qùnbàné.*  
 1PL say 1PL ICPL come-GER tomorrow  
 ‘We said that we will come tomorrow.’

(9d) *Qá tì qá wá rii-ní qùnbàné.*  
 2PL say 2PL ICPL come-GER tomorrow  
 ‘You (pl.) said that you (pl.) will come tomorrow.’

In the previous examples, the reported utterance is introduced by the quotative verb *`tí*. Morphologically, *`tí* is a verb, but syntactically, its construction is different from that of any other Soninke verb, since in addition to a subject NP representing the original speaker, the clauses it projects can only include a reported utterance or a proform referring to a reported utterance.

#### 4.2. Other verbs of speech

Reported utterances can be introduced by other verbs of speech, for example *`kó* ‘say’. In contrast to *`tí*, *`kó* is a regular transitive verb whose coding frame includes an object NP referring to the thing being said and an oblique NP representing the addressee, as in (10).

(10) *Ó wá tònñú-n kòo-nó Múusá dà.*  
 1PL ICPL truth-D say-GER Moussa to  
 ‘We will say the truth to Moussa.’

*`kó* ‘say’ may also introduce indirect questions or reported assertions. In both cases, a cataphoric 3rd person pronoun referring to the reported utterance must occupy the object slot. The difference is that reported assertions must be introduced by *`tí*, which is quite obviously a grammaticalized form of the quotative verb (11a), whereas no complementizer is required with indirect questions (11b).

(11a) *Úmàrú d(à) à k(ó) ín dà tí Múusá rí.*  
 Oumarou CPL.TR 3SG say 1SG to QUOT Moussa come  
 ‘Oumarou told me that Moussa came.’  
 lit. ‘Oumarou told it<sub>i</sub> to me, say [Moussa came]<sub>i</sub>.’

(11b) *Qá w(á) à kòo-n(ó) ín dà mànín cìgì múusá gà rí.*  
 2PL ICPL 3SG say-GER 1SG to what cause Moussa SBD come  
 ‘You’ll tell me why Moussa came.’  
 lit. ‘You’ll tell it<sub>i</sub> to me, [what caused that Moussa came]<sub>i</sub>.’

Example (12) shows that, in the construction illustrated in (11a), *í* fulfills the same logophoric function as in the previous examples.

(12a) *Míúsá d(à) à k(ó) ín dà t(i) í wá ríi-ní.*  
 Moussa CPL.TR 3SG say-GER 1SG to QUOT *í* ICPL come-GER  
 ‘Moussa told me that he (= Moussa) will come.’

(12b) *Míúsá d(à) à k(ó) ín dà t(i) à wá ríi-ní.*  
 Moussa CPL.TR 3SG say-GER 1SG to QUOT 3SG ICPL come-GER  
 ‘Moussa told me that he (= someone else) will come.’

The same pattern is observed with *tírindí* ‘ask’. If *tírindí* is taken in the sense of ‘ask to do something’, the reported utterance is in the subjunctive and must be introduced by *ʔí* (13a), whereas *ʔí* is not used if *tírindí* is taken in the sense of ‘request information’ (13b). However, in both cases, *í* is used to mark coreference with the subject of *tírindí*.

(13a) *Míúsá d(à) ó tírindí t(i) ó nà killé-n kòy(i) í yà.*  
 Moussa CPL.TR 1PL ask QUOT 1PL to way-D show *í* to  
 ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> asked us to show him<sub>i</sub> the way.’  
 lit. ‘Moussa asked us that we should show him the way.’

(13b) *Míúsá d(à) ó tírindí í gá killé bè bàttá.*  
 Moussa CPL.TR 1PL ask *í* SBD way which follow.GER  
 ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> asked us which way he<sub>i</sub> should follow.’

Other verbs of speech, such as *jàràgindí* ‘complain’, *kúná* ‘swear’, *tàkkí* ‘swear’, *lábándí* ‘clarify, explain’, *náwárí* ‘thank’, *sárátí* ‘agree’, can similarly be followed by a reported utterance introduced by *ʔí* in which their subject is resumed by *í*.

(14) *Míúsá jàràgindí t(i) ó m(á) í dèemà.*  
 Moussa complain QUOT 1PL CPL.NEG *í* help<sup>L</sup>  
 ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> complained that we didn’t help him<sub>i</sub>.’

(15) *Míúsá kúná t(i) í m(á) hàyi.*  
 Moussa swear QUOT *í* CPL.NEG steal<sup>L</sup>  
 ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> swore that he<sub>i</sub> didn’t commit a robbery.’

(16) *Míúsá tàkkí t(i) í w(á) ó dèemà-ná*  
 Moussa swear QUOT *í* ICPL 1PL help-GER  
 ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> swore that he<sub>i</sub> will help us.’

(17) *Míúsá lábánd(i) ó dà t(i) í ntá ríi-nì qùnbàné.*  
 Moussa explain 1PL to QUOT *í* ICPL.NEG come-GER<sup>L</sup> tomorrow  
 ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> made it clear to us that he<sub>i</sub> will not come tomorrow.’

- (18) *Í sárát(i) t(i) í wá dàgà-ná Bàmàkó dóòmé.*  
 3PL agree QUOT Í ICPL go-GER Bamako together  
 ‘They agreed to go to Bamako together.’

## 5. The use of *í* in other types of complex constructions

The pronoun *í* is used to express coreference with the subject of the matrix clause in several types of subordinate clauses. A historical link with reported speech can be imagined, since for example ‘He stood up to leave’ can be paraphrased as ‘He stood up saying that he will leave’, and ‘He remained silent as if he didn’t have a mouth’ can be paraphrased as ‘He remained silent, you would have said that he didn’t have a mouth’. However, the quotative linker *tí* can be used only in part of the constructions in question.

### 5.1. The complementation of verbs referring to cognition, perception, or psychological states

The pronoun *í* marks coreference with the subject of the matrix clause in complement clauses with verbs referring to cognition, perception, or psychological states, such as *tú* ‘know’, *sínmà* ‘imagine, believe’, *kùyí* ‘dream’, *séwó* ‘rejoice’, *wàrí* ‘see’, *kòyí* ‘show’. The use of the quotative linker *tí* is not general, but further investigation would be necessary to establish the rules according to which *tí* occurs in the complementation of this semantic type of verbs. Note also the use of a cataphoric pronoun in object role in (19) and (22).

- (19) *Míúsá nt(á) à tù í gá qáwà ké bè ñáa-ná.*  
 Moussa ICPL.NEG 3SG know<sup>L</sup> Í SBD be.obliged DEM which do-GER  
 ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> doesn’t know what he<sub>i</sub> should do.’  
 lit. ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> doesn’t know it<sub>j</sub>, [what he<sub>i</sub> is obliged to do]<sub>j</sub>.’

- (20) *Míúsá kùyí í gá téré.*  
 Moussa dream Í SBD travel  
 ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> dreamed that he<sub>i</sub> was traveling.’

- (21) *Míúsá séwó t(i) ó gá d(à) í dèemá.*  
 Moussa rejoice QUOT 1PL SBD CPL.TR Í help  
 ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> rejoiced that we helped him<sub>i</sub>.’

- (22) *Míúsá nt(á) à sínmà-nà ó w(á) í dèemà-ná.*  
 Moussa ICPL.NEG 3SG believe<sup>L</sup> 1PL ICPL Í help-GER  
 ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> doesn’t believe that we are going to help him<sub>i</sub>.’  
 lit. ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> doesn’t believe it<sub>j</sub>, [we are going to help him<sub>i</sub>]<sub>j</sub>.’

### 5.2. The complementation of verbs of propositional attitude

The pronoun *í* marks coreference with the subject of the matrix clause in clauses completing verbs of propositional attitude such as *qànú* ‘want’, *mùndá* ‘want’, *dùnné* ‘accept’.



- (23) *Míusá d(à) à qànú í nà Hàatú yàxí.*  
 Moussa CPL.TR 3SG want Í SBJV.TR Fatou marry  
 ‘Moussa wanted to marry Fatou.’  
 lit. ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> wanted it<sub>j</sub>, [he<sub>i</sub> should marry Fatou]<sub>j</sub>.’

### 5.3. Adverbial clauses expressing purpose

Adverbial clauses of purpose may be introduced by the quotative linker *tí* (24) or by the conjunction *mà*, also used as a preposition with the meaning ‘until’ (25). They may also be simply juxtaposed to the matrix clause (26), but then the dependent clause must be in the subjunctive. In all cases, coreference with the subject of the matrix clause is marked by *í*.

- (24) *Míusá girí t(í) í wá dàgà-ná.*  
 Moussa stand.up QUOT Í ICPL go-GER  
 ‘Moussa stood up to leave.’  
 lit. ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> stood up saying he<sub>i</sub> is leaving.’

- (25) *Míusá rí m(à) í wá jàarè-né yà.*  
 Moussa come until Í ICPL be.healed-GER FOC  
 ‘Moussa came for treatment.’  
 lit. ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> came until he<sub>i</sub> will be healed.’

- (26) *Míusá qáarù sòró-n nàn l(í) í dèemá.*  
 Moussa shout person.PL-D SUBJV.INTR come Í help  
 ‘Moussa shouted for help.’  
 lit. ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> shouted so that people should come to help him<sub>i</sub>.’

### 5.4. Adverbial clauses expressing cause

Clauses expressing cause may be introduced by the quotative linker *tí* (27) or by the conjunction *báwò* ‘since’ (28). In the first case, as can be expected, coreference with the subject of the matrix clause is marked by *í*, whereas with *báwò*, *í* cannot be used to mark coreference with the subject of the matrix clause. This suggests that perhaps the construction with *báwò* should be analyzed as involving a looser type of link between the two clauses.

- (27) *Míusá sáxú t(í) í má sàhà.*  
 Moussa lie.down QUOT Í CPL.NEG be.healthy<sup>L</sup>  
 ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> is lying because he<sub>i</sub> does not feel well.’

- (28) *Míusá sáxú báwò à má sàhà.*  
 Moussa lie.down since 3SG CPL.NEG be.healthy<sup>L</sup>  
 ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> is lying because he<sub>i</sub> does not feel well.’

### 5.5. Adverbial clauses expressing similarity

In adverbial clauses introduced by the conjunction *qóyì ~ qóò* ‘as if’, coreference with the subject of the matrix clause is marked by *í*.

- (29) *Míusá táaxú qóò í gà ntáxà dàgà-ná.*  
 Moussa settle as.if *í* SBD not.anymore go-GER  
 ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> settled as if he<sub>i</sub> would not leave.’

### 5.6. Relativization

In Soninke, in addition to the subordination marker *gà* postposed to the subject, relative clauses are characterized by the presence of the relativizer *bè* (glossed ‘which’) marking the relativized term, as in (30).

- (30) *Yítè ké bè gà dà Míusá jàará, à kité Bàmàkó yà.*  
 drug DEM which SBD CPL.TR Moussa cure 3SG be.obtained Bamako FOC  
 ‘The drug that cured Moussa was obtained in Bamako.’  
 lit. ‘Which drug<sub>i</sub> cured Moussa, it<sub>i</sub> was obtained in Bamako.’

In a construction similar in all other respects to that in (30), the use of *í* in the relativized position triggers a non-specific reading of the relative clause.

- (31) *Í bè gà má rì, á yà-n bàxù.*  
*í* which SBD CPL.NEG come<sup>L</sup> 3SG<sup>H</sup> FOC-SBJ be.wrong<sup>L</sup>  
 ‘Whoever did not come is wrong.’  
 lit. ‘S/he<sub>i</sub> who did not come, it’s s/he<sub>i</sub> who is wrong.’

This is the only construction in which *í* precedes the term with which it is coreferential.

## 6. The pronoun *í* and the expression of intra-clausal coreference relationships

After examining the logophoric use of *í* and its use in complex constructions possibly related to the reported speech construction, we now turn to a use of *í* that still has to do with coreference marking, but in different syntactic conditions, since in the use of *í* described in this section, no clause boundary separates *í* from its antecedent.

The only coreference relationships that can be marked by means of *í* and in which *í* and its antecedent are not separated by a clause boundary are those between a nominal term of a clause and the genitival modifier of another term of the same clause. In such coreference relationships, *í* invariably occupies the position of the genitival modifier, as in (32).<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> In Soninke, nouns in the role of head in the *noun + genitival modifier* construction lose their lexical tones and take a LH contour that can be analyzed as a construct form marker.

- (32) *Múusá d(à) í qàlìsí-n qàríh(à) í mènjànyé-n ñà.*  
 Moussa CPL.TR í money-D<sup>LH</sup> entrust í friend-D<sup>LH</sup> to  
 ‘Moussa<sub>i</sub> entrusted his<sub>i</sub> money to his<sub>i</sub> friend.’

Coreference between two nominal terms of the same clause requires the use of *dú* ‘self’, either alone, as in (33a), or combined with *í* in the role of genitival modifier, which formally brings us back to the previous case, as in (33b). These two possibilities are in free variation, and no semantic distinction can be detected between them. In (33a), *dú* acts as a strictly local reflexive pronoun, whereas in (33b), it acts as a mere support for the coreference marker *í* in the syntactic role of genitival modifier.

- (33a) *Múusá dà dú jóogi.*  
 Moussa CPL.TR self hurt  
 ‘Moussa hurt himself.’

- (33b) *Múusá d(à) í dù jóogi.*  
 Moussa CPL.TR í self<sup>LH</sup> hurt  
 ‘Moussa hurt himself.’

## 7. Discussion

It follows from the description of the uses of *í* in the previous sections that *í* is specialized in the marking of coreference relationships in a wide range of syntactically defined contexts, but cannot be characterized, either as a (dedicated) logophoric pronoun, or as a reflexive pronoun in the sense of the traditional definition of reflexive pronouns as marking coreference relationships within the limits of the clause. What is relevant for a general characterization of the functions fulfilled by *í* is the notion of SYNTAX-DRIVEN COREFERENCE MARKING, as opposed to coreference marking conditioned by discourse saliency. The syntactic configurations licensing the use of *í* include the relationship between a term of a clause and the genitival modifier of another term of the same clause (§6), several types of subordination (§5), and prototypical logophoric contexts (§4), with the general condition that *í* cannot refer back to 1st or 2nd person antecedents.

Reflexivity is traditionally defined as the marking of coreference relationships in which no clause boundary separates the pronoun expressing coreference from its antecedent. However, the term of long-distance reflexive, widely used in the literature, implies a broader conception of reflexivity encompassing other cases of syntax-driven coreference marking. According to a broad definition of reflexivity as syntax-driven coreference marking, *í* can be characterized typologically, in comparison with the reflexive pronouns of other languages, as a reflexive pronoun compatible with 3rd person antecedents only, whose specific distribution excludes strictly local reflexivity (i.e., coreference between two nominal terms of the same clause) but includes the relationship between a term of a clause and the genitival modifier of another term of the same clause, the types of complementation and adverbial subordination enumerated in §5, and reported speech,

## 8. Conclusion

In this article, after describing the uses of the pronoun *i* in Soninke, I have argued that it is best analyzed as a reflexive pronoun (taking reflexivity in the broad sense of syntax-driven coreference marking) whose range of possible uses excludes the most strictly local configurations but includes logophoric contexts.

Soninke is to the best of my knowledge the only West-Mande language in which logophoricity effects have been described. By contrast, several descriptions of Mande languages belonging to the southern and eastern branches mention the existence of logophoric pronouns. Particularly detailed accounts of logophoricity are available for the South-Mande language Wan (Nikitina 2020, Nikitina & Bugaeva 2021) and for the East-Mande language Boko (Jones 2000). Other references on logophoricity in South-Mande languages include Idiatov & Apolonova (2027) on Tura, Kuznetsova & Kuznetsova (2017) on Guro, and Perekhval'skaya (2020) on San. Interestingly, the situation described in detail by Jones (2000) for Boko is similar in crucial respects to that found in Soninke, with, in particular, the use of the same pronouns for logophoric marking and for the marking of coreference between a nominal term of the clause and the genitival modifier of another term of the same clause, but not for the marking of coreference between two nominal terms of the same clause. Jones' (2000) conclusion is that "logophoricity [should] be redefined to include the Boko coreferential pronouns". The conclusion I would like to propose is that a redefinition of reflexivity would also be in order for a proper typological characterization of systems of coreference marking such as those attested in Boko and in Soninke.

## Abbreviations

CPL = completive, D = definite, DEM = demonstrative, EMPH = emphatic, FOC = focus marker, GER = gerundive, ICPL = incomplete, INTR = intransitive, L (superscript) = low tonal overlay, LCOP = locational copula, LH (superscript) = low-high tonal overlay, NEG = negation marker, PL = plural, QUOT = quotative, SBD = subordination marker, SBJ = subject flag, SBJV = subjunctive, SG = singular, TR = transitive.

## References

- Creissels, Denis 2016. Phonologie segmentale et tonale du soninké (parler du Kingi). *Mandenkan* 55. 3-174.
- Diagana, Ousmane Moussa. 1984. *Le parler soninké de Kaédi, syntaxe et sens*. Habilitation thesis. Paris Descartes University.
- Diagana, Ousmane Moussa. 1995. *La langue soninkée: morphosyntaxe et sens*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Diagana, Yacouba. 1990. *Éléments de grammaire du soninké*. PhD thesis. Paris: INALCO.
- Diagana, Yacouba. 1994. *Éléments de grammaire du soninké*. Paris: Association Linguistique Africaine.

- Idiatov, D.I. & E.S. Aplonova. 2017. Tura. In Valentin F. Vydrin, Yulia V. Mazurova, Andrej A. Kibrik & Elena B. Markus (eds.), *Jazyki mira: Jazyki mande* [Languages of the world: Mande languages]. St. Petersburg: Nestor-Istoria. 583-616.
- Jones, Ross. 2000. Coreference marking in Boko – Logophoricity or not? *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 21: 135-59.
- Kuznetsova N.V. & O.V Kuznetsova. 2017. Guro. In Valentin F. Vydrin, Yulia V. Mazurova, Andrej A. Kibrik & Elena B. Markus (eds.), *Jazyki mira: Jazyki mande* [Languages of the world: Mande languages]. St. Petersburg: Nestor-Istoria. 765-877.
- Nikitina, Tania. 2020. Logophoricity and shifts of perspective: New facts and a new account. *Functions of Language* 27(1). 78-99.
- Nikitina, Tania & Anna Bugaeva. 2021. Logophoric speech is not indirect: Towards a syntactic approach to reported speech constructions. *Linguistics* 59(3).
- Perekhval'skaya, Elena. 2020. Logophoric strategy in San-Maka. *Language in Africa* 1(4), 2020, 115–130.