

## A sketch of Mandinka

**Denis Creissels**

Université Lumière (Lyon 2)

denis.creissels@univ-lyon2.fr

<http://deniscreissels.fr>

### 1 Introduction

#### 1.1 The Mandinka language and its speakers

Mandinka is spoken by approximately 1.5 million speakers in the Gambia, Senegal, and Guinea Bissau. Speakers of Mandinka call themselves *Màndìnkòolú* (singular: *Màndìnkôo*) and designate their language *Màndìnkàkányò*. *Màndìnkôo* is an inflected form of the noun stem *Màndìnká*, resulting from the addition of the derivational suffix *-nká* ‘people from ...’ to the geographical term *Màndìŋ*, which primarily refers to the region that constituted the starting point of the Manding expansion (see §1.3 and §1.4). *Màndìnkàkányò* is literally ‘language of the people from Manding’.

#### 1.2 Genetic affiliation

Mandinka is the westernmost member of the Manding dialect cluster, included in the Western branch of the Mande language family:

Mandinka  $\subset$  Manding  $\subset$  West Mande  $\subset$  Mande

The Mande language family was included by Greenberg in the Niger-Congo phylum, but the evidence for a Niger-Congo affiliation of Mande is rather slim; Dimmendaal (2011), for example, argues that Mande is best treated as an independent language family.

It is commonly admitted that the time distance between the most ancient branches of the Mande language family exceeds 5 millennia, whereas the time depth of the Manding dialect cluster does not exceed 8 centuries. On the classification of Mande languages, see Vydrin (2009).

Within the Manding dialect cluster, Mandinka is particularly close to the Maninka varieties of Eastern Senegal and Western Mali, but is nevertheless sufficiently different to be considered a distinct language.

### **1.3 A note on terminology**

Etymologically, Mande, Manden, Manding, and Mali are variants of a toponym designating the upper valley of the Niger River and a state located in this region, whose capital was Kangaba. In the 13<sup>th</sup> century the Manding prince Sunjata Keita founded an empire, known as the Manding, Mande(n), or Mali empire, that extended over a large area and flourished until the 16<sup>th</sup> century.

A risk of confusion may arise from the fact that, in linguistic terminology, Mande and Manding are conventionally used with meanings that must be carefully distinguished: Manding refers to a set of closely related languages or dialects resulting from the evolution of the language that was spoken in Manding before the expansion of Sunjata's empire, whereas Mande refers to a language family containing languages that have only a remote relationship with Manding and are spoken by communities that historically had nothing to do with the Manding empire.

### **1.4 The historical context**

The area where Mandinka is spoken largely coincides with the area of influence of the pre-colonial state of Kaabu, which according to oral traditions originated as a province of the Manding empire; it was conquered by a general of Sunjata Keita called Tiramakhan Traore, and after the decline of the Manding empire became an independent kingdom. Mandinka hegemony in the region lasted until 1867, when the Kaabu capital (Kansala) was taken by the armies of the Fula kingdom of Fuuta Jaloo.

### **1.5 Language contact**

Since the foundation of the Kaabu kingdom, Mandinka has been relatively isolated from the other Manding varieties, and this may explain why it does not share certain grammatical phenomena commonly found across Manding varieties (for example, a system of preverbs such as Bambara *lá-*, *mǎ-*). In contrast, as a result of the dominant position of Mandinka, many speakers of Ñun and other Atlantic languages in contact with Mandinka have assimilated to Mandinka, and the influence of this substratum, although relatively limited, is

nevertheless discernible in the lexicon of Mandinka and in some aspects of Mandinka morphosyntax. Even for some basic notions, such as ‘work’ or ‘village’, the usual Mandinka word (*dòo(kíuu)* ‘work’, *sàatée* ‘village’) is not cognate with the words used in other Manding varieties and can be identified with certainty as an Atlantic borrowing (cf. Ñun Guñaamolo *dohó* ‘work’, Seereer *saate* ‘village’). In morphosyntax, one may mention the development of a venitive marker (*nǎŋ*), which has no equivalent in other Manding varieties (Creissels 2014), and the development of the use of *sòtó* ‘get’ as a transitive verb of possession (‘have’).

A Soninke influence, attributable to the prominent role played by Soninke preachers in the Islamization of the former Kaabu kingdom, is also obvious in Mandinka. Many Soninke borrowings found in Mandinka (for example *wùtú* ‘take’) are not found in other Manding varieties, and in syntax, some details of the relativization strategy of Mandinka might well be calques from Soninke. The presence of geminate stops in some Mandinka varieties is also probably due to Soninke influence.

As regards the influence of European languages (or their Creole varieties), Portuguese and French borrowings are found throughout the Mandinka territory, whereas English borrowings are rare in the Mandinka varieties of Senegal and Guinea Bissau.

## 1.6 Bibliographic information

The literature on Mandinka is relatively small, but includes a comprehensive reference grammar (Creissels and Sambou 2013), to which the reader is referred for additional references and a detailed discussion of the questions briefly presented in this sketch.

## 1.7 The data

Like Creissels and Sambou (2013), this sketch describes Mandinka as spoken in Middle-Casamance (administrative region of Sédhiou). Creissels and Sambou (2013) was based on investigations conducted in Sédhiou, and my opinion now is that we underestimated the fact that the relative heterogeneity of idiolects in an urban center like Sédhiou could affect some aspects of the description.<sup>1</sup> In general, variation in Mandinka is relatively limited and easy to identify, with however the exception of the tonal system, whose description is made difficult by a complex system of sandhi rules. I must confess that I am not satisfied now with the way

---

<sup>1</sup> The point is that the population of Sédhiou includes a significant proportion not only of ethnic Mandinka who originate from other Mandinka-speaking areas (Kaabu, Woyi, etc.) and may maintain at least some particularities of their original dialects, but also of ethnic Ñun, Balant, Mandjaku, Mankanya, etc., whose families shifted to Mandinka not earlier than two or three generations ago.

some aspects of the tonal system were analyzed in Creissels and Sambou (2013), and by some of the decisions we made about tonal notation. For this reason I decided to check all the data quoted in this chapter with a consultant whose speech is representative of a rural variety of Middle-Casamance Mandinka (Yaya Dramé, from Dassilamé Pakao). The tonal notation adopted in this sketch, which does not always coincide with that found in Creissels and Sambou (2013), reflects the speech of this consultant as analyzed in Creissels (2019b).

## 2 Phonology

### 2.1 Consonants

The consonant phonemes of Mandinka are summarized in the following chart, using the standard orthography of the languages of Senegal, with the corresponding IPA symbols in square brackets:

Table 1. Consonant inventory of Mandinka

	labial	dental	palatal	velar	laryngeal
voiceless plosives	<i>p</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>c</i> [tɕ]	<i>k</i>	
voiced plosives	<i>b</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>j</i> [dʒ]		
fricatives	<i>f</i>	<i>s</i>			<i>h</i>
nasals	<i>m</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>ñ</i> [ɲ]	<i>ŋ</i>	
lateral approximant		<i>l</i>			
vibrant		<i>r</i>			
glides	<i>w</i>		<i>y</i> [j]		

### 2.2 Vowels

Mandinka has 5 distinctive vowel qualities, summarized in Table 2 below:

Table 2. Vowel inventory of Mandinka

	front	back
close	<i>i</i>	<i>u</i>
mid	<i>e</i>	<i>o</i>
open	<i>a</i>	

As evidenced by minimal pairs such as *sàrá* ‘water-melon’ vs. *sàará* ‘first-born’, vowel length is distinctive. Long vowels are written by doubling the letters representing short vowels: *ii*, *ee*, *aa*, *oo*, *uu*.

### 2.3 Syllable structure

Three types of syllables regularly occur in Mandinka words: CV (consonant +short vowel), CVV (consonant + long vowel), and CVD (consonant + short vowel +nasal coda). In some varieties (but not all), closed syllables with long vowels are possible in underived words such as *fǎaŋ* ‘cutlass’, and in words formed by means of certain derivational affixes, such as *báantáŋ* ‘motherless’ < *báa* ‘mother’.

Null onsets are mainly found in Arabic borrowings beginning with *a*. Complex onsets are exceptional. Syllables with consonants other than nasals in coda position are regularly found in ideophones, but are exceptional in other contexts.

In coda position, the place of articulation of nasals is not distinctive: if the nasal coda is immediately followed (word-internally, or at a word junction) by a consonant other than *w*, *y*, or *h*, its place of articulation copies that of the following consonant; otherwise (particularly before a pause) it is realized as velar (*ŋ*). ‘Nasal coda + *l*’ is realized as a geminate *l* with more or less perceptible nasalization. In the transcription used here, word-internal nasals are transcribed as they are pronounced (for example, *bàmbá* ‘crocodile’, *kàndí* ‘be hot’, *súñjù* ‘breast’, *dìŋká* ‘hole’), whereas nasals in word-final position, whose realization varies depending on the context, are systematically written *ŋ* (which constitutes their default realization before a pause).

In most Mandinka varieties, syllabic nasals are only found in two words: *í* ‘I’ and *è* ‘we’. With respect to their place of articulation and interaction with *l*, they behave exactly like nasal codas. A particularity of the Pakao variety on which the transcription used in this sketch is based is the existence of low-toned syllabic nasals in words such as *m̀bǎanà* ‘a tree whose fermented fruits are used to treat leather’.

### 2.4 Tone

As evidenced by minimal pairs such as *í* ‘I’ vs. *è* ‘we’, and *í* ‘you (sg)’ vs. *ì* ‘they’, Mandinka has two contrasting tones, high and low. Contour tones (rising, falling, and rising-falling) are analyzable as sequences of level tones (LH, HL, and LHL) associated with single syllables. Tones on long vowels are written as follows:  $\acute{V}V$  (high),  $\grave{V}V$  (low),  $\check{V}V$  (rising),  $\hat{V}V$  (falling),

and  $\hat{V}\hat{V}$  (rising-falling). Note that the falling tones indicated in the transcription are not necessarily realized as such, since in rapid speech, their L element tends to manifest itself as a downstep.

The tonal system of Mandinka, like that of the other Manding languages, is characterized by strict restrictions on the possible tone sequences within the limits of various types of units (roots, complex lexemes, words) and by a complex system of tone sandhi. The general tendency is that the non-final tones of polysyllabic words tend to remain stable, whereas the tone of monosyllabic words and of the final syllable of polysyllabic words undergoes contextual variations that are described in detail by Creissels (2019b) for the Pakao variety on which the transcription used in this sketch is based.

The division of lexemes into tone classes is quite stable across Mandinka varieties. By contrast, the dialectal variation in tonal realizations is much more significant than in any other area of phonology or morphosyntax, and even geographically close varieties, that in all other respects are virtually identical, may be very different in certain aspects of tonology.

### **3 Canonical predication and major lexical categories**

#### **3.1 Verbal predication**

The most striking characteristic of clause structure in Mande languages is the extreme rigidity of the typologically unusual SOVX constituent order in verbal predication, and Mandinka is no exception. No operation, such as focalization or questioning, triggers a change in constituent order, and with the exception of certain types of adjuncts, noun phrases or adpositional phrases cannot occur in topic position (on the left edge of the clause) without being resumed by a pronoun occupying the position they would occupy if they were not topicalized.

For a detailed discussion of grammatical relations in Mandinka, readers are referred to Creissels (2019a).

In the basic transitive construction, the NPs representing the agent (A) and the patient (P) obligatorily precede the verb, and A obligatorily precedes P. Assertive and interrogative transitive clauses always include an auxiliary-like element inserted between A and P, called a *predicative marker* in the Mandeist tradition. Predicative markers are portmanteau morphemes encoding aspectual and modal distinctions and expressing polarity. Obliques follow the verb. A and P bear no marking of their syntactic role and are not indexed on the

verb. Pronouns occupy the same positions as lexical NPs and show no variation related to their syntactic roles.

(1a) *Jàtôo yè dánóo bàràamá.*

lion.D CPL.TR hunter.D hurt

‘The lion hurt the hunter.’

(1b) *Dánòo yè jàt-óo bàràamá.*

hunter.D CPL.TR lion.D hurt

‘The hunter hurt the lion.’

(1c) *Ì yè bànkôo-lú táláa kâbũlòo-lú lè tēemá.*

3PL CPL.TR land.D-PL divide clan.D-PL FOC between

‘They divided the lands between clans.’

(1d) *Wùlôo yè dǐndǐńó tàńkàndí òmbâa má.*

dog.D CPL.TR child.D save fire.D POSTP

‘The dog saved the child from the fire.’

(1e) *Kàmbàanôo máń bèrôo fáyí pàlàntéeròo tó.*

boy.D CPL.NEG stone.D-PL throw window.D LOC

‘The boy did not throw the stone at the window.’

(1f) *Kěe kà à téerímáa máakóyì kódoò tó.*

man.D ICPL 3SG friend help money.D LOC

‘The man helps his friend financially.’

Obliques are standardly encoded as postpositional phrases. Two postpositions are particularly common in the function of oblique argument markers: *lá* and *má*. *Lá* is also fully productive in the encoding of non-spatial location (as in *dòokúwòo lá* ‘at work’) and instrumental adjuncts (*mùrôo lá* ‘with a knife’); cause and purpose adjuncts marked by the postposition *lá* are common too.

The other specialized postpositions are *tí* (productively used in equative, functive, transformative, and comparative functions, and also marginally found in the comitative

function), *tó* (a spatial postposition which does not refer to any particular type of spatial configuration), *yé* (benefactive), *kâŋ* ‘on’, *fêe* ‘as regards, with respect to’, *kàlamà* (mainly used in combination with the adverbial copula to express ‘be aware of’), and *kámà* ‘for the purpose of, against’.

Postpositions cognate with nominal lexemes include, among others, *kótò* ‘under’ (cf. *kótò* ‘meaning’), *bálà* ‘in contact with, against’ (cf. *bálà* ‘body’), *búlù* ‘in the sphere of, under the responsibility of’ (cf. *búlù* ‘hand’). Mandinka also has a number of compound postpositions: for example *dáalà* ‘beside’ < *dáa* ‘side’ + *lá* (specialized postposition).

There are also a few prepositions, mainly used in combination with postpositions, such as *díinà ... tí* ‘more than, rather than’.

In intransitive predications, the NP representing the unique core argument precedes the verb. It bears no marker of its syntactic role and is not indexed on the verb. Obliques behave in exactly the same way in transitive and intransitive clauses. With the exception of the completive positive (encoded by the predicative marker *yé* in transitive predications, and by the verbal suffix *-tá* in intransitive predications), aspect, modality, and polarity are encoded by the same predicative markers as in transitive predications.

(2a) *Yíróo bùyí-tà sílòo kâŋ.*

tree.D fall-CPL.ITR road.D on

‘The tree fell down on the road.’

(2b) *Nèw-óo kà kómôŋ jíyòo kónò.*

iron.D ICPL rust water.D in

‘Iron rusts in water.’

(2c) *Kèê mâŋ kúmá mùsòo yé.*

man.D CPL.NEG talk woman.D BEN

‘The man did not talk to the woman.’

A notion of subject conflating the agent of transitive predications and the unique core argument of intransitive predications is not problematic in the description of Mandinka, although the only coding property they share is their position preceding the predicative markers, and contrasting with the position of P between the predicative markers and the verb.

Using the notions of subject (S) and object (O), verbal predication can therefore be schematized as follows:

S PM (O) V (X) (X') ...

This formula makes apparent that, in contrast with languages in which the most obvious contrast is between the subject NP and all other NPs, and the distinction between object and oblique NPs may be problematic, the most clear-cut contrast in Mandinka morphosyntax is between core NPs (subject and object) and non-core (or oblique) NPs: core NPs invariably precede the verb, and oblique NPs invariably follow it.

In this respect, it must be emphasized that not all semantically bivalent verbs are syntactically assimilated to prototypical action verbs. As illustrated in (3), some bivalent verbs that do not refer to prototypical actions (for example, ‘want’), occur in an extended intransitive construction in which one of the two arguments is an oblique argument encoded as a postpositional phrase that cannot be distinguished from postpositional phrases in adjunct function.<sup>2</sup>

- (3) *Kěe lãfi-tà kódòo lá.*  
 man.D want-CPL.ITR money.D POSTP  
 S V X  
 ‘The man wants money.’

It must also be emphasized that Mandinka clauses cannot include more than two core NPs.<sup>3</sup> One of the three arguments of trivalent verbs such as ‘give’ must necessarily be an oblique argument encoded as a postpositional phrase in post-verbal position. For example, Mandinka has two possible equivalents of English ‘give’: with *dii* (which implies nothing more than transfer), the object NP represents the gift, whereas with *só* (which implies a change of possession) the object NP represents the recipient.

---

<sup>2</sup> The existence of relatively important classes of bivalent verbs with an extended intransitive construction is one of the typological features that distinguish the Mande language family from most other West African language families.

<sup>3</sup> The absence of so-called ‘multiple-object constructions’ is one of the features that distinguish the Mande languages from most language families included by Greenberg in the Niger-Congo phylum.

(4a) *Kèê yè kódòo díi mùsòo lá.*  
 man.D CPL.TR money.D give woman.D POSTP  
 S PM O V X  
 ‘The man gave money to the woman.’

(4b) *Kèê yè mùsòo só kódòo lá.*  
 man.D CPL.TR woman.D give money.D POSTP  
 S PM O V X  
 ‘The man gave money to the woman.’

### 3.2 Nouns and verbs

Nominal lexemes are characterized by their ability to function without any restriction as heads of NPs occupying the S or O slots in the verbal predication. As discussed by Creissels (2017), verbal lexemes can be found in the V slot of the verbal predication, but with the exception of *sǎa* ‘die’ (which nominalizes as *sàayáa* ‘death’), they can also be used as event-denoting nouns without any specific morphological marking, with genitival modifiers representing their core arguments (see §5.10).

In addition to this fully predictable morphologically unmarked use of verbal lexemes as event-denoting nouns, some lexemes have the ability to be used verbally and nominally with other types of semantic relationships between their verbal and nominal uses (for example, *búsà* ‘hit’ is used nominally with the meaning ‘whip’); this constitutes an unpredictable property of individual lexemes.

## 4 Constructional morphology

### 4.1 The formation of nominal lexemes

#### 4.1.1 Compound nouns

Noun compounding is very productive in Mandinka. In the commonest type of compound nouns, two nominal lexemes are juxtaposed with a modification of their tonal contour known as ‘tonal compacity’: the tone of the first syllable of the first component spreads up to the boundary between the two components, and the second component takes a H or HL contour (all-H if the last syllable is heavy, H with a L tone on the last syllable if the last syllable is light), irrespective of its lexical tone. Semantically, the first component is interpreted as a



-*ñjáj* ordinal suffix, as in *lúulúñjáj* ‘fifth’ < *lúulù* ‘five’

## 4.2 The formation of verbal lexemes

### 4.2.1 Verbal compounds (incorporation)

As illustrated in (6b), Mandinka has constructions in which a nominal lexeme in verb modifier function does not behave as the head of a noun phrase and can be analyzed as incorporated.

(6a) *Á yè mòô-lú jàní kó tìyóo.*  
3SG CPL.TR person.D-PL roast like peanut.D  
‘He roasted people like peanuts.’

(6b) *Á yè mòô-lú tìyà-jáni.*  
3SG CPL.TR person.D-PL peanut-roast  
‘He roasted people like peanuts.’  
lit. ‘He peanut-roasted people.’

The productivity of incorporation is, however, limited. In particular, intransitive verbs resulting from object incorporation, particularly common in languages in which incorporation is very productive, are not common in Mandinka. As illustrated in (7), in Mandinka, object incorporation creating new transitive verbs is less rare.

(7a) *Á yè jíyóo bǒŋ.*  
3SG CPL.TR water.D pour  
‘He poured the water.’

(7b) *Á yè sàláatò jíi-bôŋ.*  
3SG CPL.TR lettuce.D water-pour  
‘He watered the lettuce.’  
lit. ‘He water-poured the lettuce.’

### 4.2.2 Affixal derivation of verbs

Causative verbs can be derived by means of the suffixes *-ndí* and *-rí-ndí*. The suffix *-ndí* is fully productive with intransitive verbs, as in *bòyìndí* ‘make fall’ < *bòyí* ‘fall’, but is also used with some transitive verbs, as in *mìndí* ‘make drink’ < *míy* ‘drink’. The suffix *-rí-ndí* is exclusively used to causativize transitive verbs, as in *jéeríndí* ‘make see’ < *jé* ‘see’. Interestingly, a causative suffix *-ndí* is also found in Soninke and Songhay, but not in most other Manding languages.

Verbs can be derived from nouns by means of the abstraction suffix *-yáa* ‘acquire/possess the quality of’. The use of *-yáa* to derive abstract nouns is also quite common, but this can be viewed as a mere consequence of the general ability of Mandinka verbs to be used as event-denoting nouns: for example, *téerì* ‘friend’ > *téeríyáa* ‘become friends’ (V) or ‘friendship’ (N).

#### 4.3 The antipassive marker

Mandinka has a suffix *-rí* (with the allomorph *-díri* in combination with stems ending with a nasal) that operates on valency in such a way that it can be analyzed as an antipassive marker, although it does not straightforwardly convert transitive verbs into intransitive ones, as would be expected from a canonical antipassive marker. The precise status of this suffix in the Mandinka system of word formation is not easy to define, and this is why a special section is devoted to it.

The identification of *-rí* as an antipassive marker follows from the fact that it is found exclusively in combination with transitive verbal lexemes in constructions in which the P argument is left unexpressed, cannot be identified with the referent of a noun phrase included in the same construction, and is interpreted as non-specific. However, *dómò* ‘eat’ is the only verb whose antipassive form *dómórì* can be used as the verbal predicate of finite clauses. With other transitive verbs, the antipassive form can only be used as an antipassive event-denoting noun, as in (8c), or as a stem to which the following suffixes can be attached: the suffix *-tôo* of non-finite verb forms expressing simultaneity, as in (9b); the agent nominalization suffix *-láa* ~ *-náa*, as in (10b); the instrument nominalization suffix *-ráŋ* ~ *-láŋ* ~ *-dán*, as in (11b); and the causative suffix *-ndí* (see §7.3.3).

- (8a) *Mùsôo bé màani-túwòo lá.*  
 woman.D ADV COP rice-pound.D POSTP  
 lit. ‘The woman is at the rice-pound(ing).’

→ ‘The woman is pounding rice.’

(*màani* ‘rice’ saturates the P valency of *tũu* ‘pound’, and the subject of the copula is identified to the A argument.)

- (8b) *Màanôo bé tũwôo lá.*  
rice.D ADV COP pound.D POSTP  
lit. ‘The rice is at the pound(ing).’  
→ ‘The rice is being pounded.’

(If P is not expressed as a modifier of *tũu* ‘pound’, in the absence of the antipassive suffix, the subject of the copula is identified with the P argument.)

- (8c) *Mùsôo bé tũu-rôo lá.*  
woman.D ADV COP pound-ANTIP.D POSTP  
lit. ‘The woman is at the pound(ing).ANTIP.’  
→ ‘The woman is pounding.’

(The antipassive suffix saturates the P valency of *tũu* ‘pound’, and the subject of the copula is identified with the A argument.)

- (9a) *ǀ́ ǀ́á mùsôo màani-tũu-tôo jé.*  
1SG CPL.TR woman.D rice-pound-GER see  
‘I saw the woman pounding rice.’

- (9b) *ǀ́ ǀ́á mùsôo tũu-rì-tôo jé.*  
1SG CPL.TR woman.D pound-ANTIP-GER see  
‘I saw the woman pounding.’

- (10a) *màani-tũu-láa*  
rice-pound-AGNM  
‘person who pounds rice’

(10b) *tùu-rì-láa*  
pound-ANTIP-AGNM  
'person who pounds'

(11a) *màani-tùu-ráŋ*  
rice-pound-INSNM  
'rice-pestle'

(11b) *tùu-rì-láŋ*  
pound-ANTIP-INSNM  
'pestle'

## 5 The nominal system

### 5.1 NP structure

The structure of Mandinka noun phrases can be schematized as follows, with two possible positions for determiners:<sup>6</sup>

(GEN) (DET<sub>1</sub>) N (QUAL) (NUM) (DET<sub>2</sub>)

Mandinka has no agreement mechanism between head nouns and their dependents, and more generally, head-dependent relationships within NPs are not morphologically marked, with the exception only of indirect possession (see §5.5).

### 5.2 Noun classification

Mandinka has nothing similar to the phenomena described cross-linguistically as classifiers, noun classes, or grammatical genders.<sup>7</sup>

### 5.3 Nominal inflection

---

<sup>6</sup> On relative clauses, see §8.1.

<sup>7</sup> Most scholars of Mande languages agree that the total lack of grammaticalized noun classification systems (either in full-fledged or vestigial form) is one of the features that distinguish the Mande languages from most language families included by Greenberg in the Niger-Congo phylum. A different opinion on this issue is, however, expressed by Vydrin (2006).

Strictly speaking, Mandinka nouns do not have inflectional morphology in the sense of morphological variations specific to the nominal lexemes acting as the nucleus of NPs. The default determiner =*ò* (see §5.4) and the plural marker =*lú* are written as if they were suffixes, but in fact they are enclitics occupying the DET<sub>2</sub> position in the template put forward in §5.1, which means that their host is not necessarily the head noun. For example, *díndíŋ* ‘child’ combines with the default determiner as *díndíŋò*, but in *díndíŋ màlùbálòò* ‘the/a shameless child’, the default determiner attaches to the qualifier *màlùbálí* (and fuses with its last vowel)

#### 5.4 The default determiner

Mandinka has an enclitic determiner =*ò*, sometimes labeled *definite marker*, which in fact behaves in most contexts as a *default determiner*. It originates from the grammaticalization of the demonstrative *wǒo*, and at some stage in the history of Manding, it probably had functions similar to those of the determiners commonly designated as definite articles. Synchronically, it carries no particular semantic specification in most contexts, and must simply be present if the speaker does not consider it useful to select a determiner with a more specific meaning. The combination of nouns with the default determiner tends to behave as the default form of nouns, whereas the absence of the default determiner must be licensed by grammatical features of the noun phrase or of the clause in which it occurs. In particular, Mandinka speakers invariably use the *ò*-form of nouns for citation.

In plain positive assertive clauses, NPs normally contain the default determiner unless another determiner licenses its absence. Negative clauses, interrogative clauses, and NPs containing a numeral constitute the main contexts in which =*ò* still contrasts with its absence and has a clear impact on the meaning of the construction; see the examples in (12).

(12a) *ǀ́ ɲá mùsòo jé.*  
 1SG CPL.TR woman.D see  
 ‘I saw the/a woman.’

(12b) *\*ǀ́ ɲá mùsú jè.*  
 1SG CPL.TR woman see

(12c) *ǀ́ máŋ mùsôo jé.*  
 1SG CPL.NEG woman.D see  
 ‘I did not see the woman.’

(12d) *ǀ́ máŋ mùsú jè.*  
 1SG CPL.NEG woman see  
 ‘I did not see any woman.’

The default determiner is an enclitic, but it interacts with its host in a way that is more typical of affixes than of clitics. Tonally, it adds a final L tone to the tonal melody of its host, unless a final L tone is already present.

Table 3. Interaction of the default determiner with the ending of its host<sup>8</sup>

<i>ŋ</i>	+ <i>o</i> → <i>ŋo</i> or <i>ŋoo</i>	<i>kúlúŋ</i> ‘boat’	+ -ò → <i>kúlúŋò</i>
		<i>sũŋ</i> ‘thief’	+ -ò → <i>sũŋòo</i>
<i>a</i>	+ <i>o</i> → <i>oo</i>	<i>básà</i> ‘lizard’	+ -ò → <i>básòo</i>
<i>e</i>	+ <i>o</i> → <i>oo</i>	<i>kèlé</i> ‘war’	+ -ò → <i>kèlòo</i>
<i>i</i>	+ <i>o</i> → <i>oo</i>	<i>jàlì</i> ‘griot’	+ -ò → <i>jàlòo</i>
<i>o</i>	+ <i>o</i> → <i>oo</i>	<i>bòotó</i> ‘bag’	+ -ò → <i>bòotòo</i>
<i>u</i>	+ <i>o</i> → <i>oo</i>	<i>kúlù</i> ‘bone’	+ -ò → <i>kúlòo</i>
<i>aa</i>	+ <i>o</i> → <i>aa</i>	<i>kùcáa</i> ‘sorrel’	+ -ò → <i>kùcáa</i>
<i>ee</i>	+ <i>o</i> → <i>ee</i> ~ <i>ewoo</i>	<i>sàatée</i> ‘village’	+ -ò → <i>sàatée</i> ~ <i>sàatéwòo</i>
<i>ii</i>	+ <i>o</i> → <i>iyoo</i>	<i>jíi</i> ‘water’	+ -ò → <i>jíyòo</i>
<i>oo</i>	+ <i>o</i> → <i>oo</i>	<i>móo</i> ‘person’	+ -ò → <i>mòò</i>
<i>uu</i>	+ <i>o</i> → <i>uwoo</i>	<i>súu</i> ‘house’	+ -ò → <i>súwòo</i>

The default determiner has an optional variant =`ŋ, originating from the demonstrative *ñĩŋ* and used exclusively in combination with the demonstrative *ñĩŋ*, as in *ñĩŋ mùsôo* ~ *ñĩŋ mùsú-ŋ* ‘this woman’.

<sup>8</sup> The possibility of a long *o* in the realization of the default determiner with stems ending with *ŋ*, *ee*, *ii*, or *uu*, is not mentioned in the descriptions of Mandinka published so far (including Creissels and Sambou 2013), but this realization is systematic in the speech of the consultant with whom I checked the examples quoted in this sketch, and I have found the same phenomenon in the speech of some other consultants with whom I had the opportunity to work recently. With stems ending with *ŋ*, the rule in the speech of these consultants is that *o* is long with monosyllabic CVŋ stems, and short in all other cases.

## 5.5 Number

Mandinka has a plural marker *-lú*, which however tends to be omitted if plurality is implied by the context, and an associative plural marker *-ñòlú* (as in *Sùñjátáñòlú* ‘Sundiata and associates’).

## 5.6 The distributive form of nouns

Mandinka nouns have a distributive form, in which the noun in its bare form is reduplicated, and *wôo* ‘each, every, any, (or, in negative contexts) no’ is inserted between the two occurrences of the reduplicated noun, as in *lúŋ wôo lúŋ* ‘every day’. Interestingly, the same construction with a formally similar marker is found in many West African languages belonging to various families (it is found for example in Mende, a Mande language spoken in Sierra Leone).

## 5.7 Determiners

In addition to the default determiner, the plural marker, and the distributive marker, the grammaticalized expression of the referential status of NPs involves the following determiners:

- *fěŋófěŋ* ‘each, every, any’ and *dóowóodòo* ‘no’ (*wôo*-phrases that have grammaticalized as emphatic variants of the distributive marker *wôo* – cf. *fěŋ* ‘thing’, *dóo* ‘some’)
- *běe* ‘all’
- *míŋóomìŋ* (*wôo*-phrase grammaticalized as an emphatic variant of *běe* ‘all’; synchronically, *míŋ* is exclusively used as a relativizer, but there is comparative evidence that it was originally a demonstrative)
- the demonstratives *ñíŋ* and *wǒ(o)*<sup>9</sup>
- *dóo* ‘some’
- *kótè* ~ *kótéŋ* ‘other’
- *jì máa* ~ *jù máa* ‘which?’
- *mǔŋ* ‘which kind of?’

---

<sup>9</sup> The possibility of a long *o* in the realization of this demonstrative is not mentioned in the descriptions of Mandinka published so far (including Creissels and Sambou 2013). In the speech of the present consultant, the short form *wǒ* occurs in combination with the plural suffix *-lú* and the focus marker *lè*, with the long form *wǒo* in all other contexts.

Note that *jimáa* and *mũŋ*, used pronominally, mean ‘who?’ and ‘what?’ respectively.

### 5.8 Personal pronouns

The emphatic vs. non-emphatic contrast distinguishes personal pronouns from all other nominals.

	n.emph.	emph.
1SG	<i>í</i>	<i>ń-tè</i>
2SG	<i>í</i>	<i>í-tè</i>
3SG	<i>à</i>	<i>à-té</i>
1PL	<i>ì</i>	<i>ń-tè-lú ~ ń-tò-lú</i>
2PL	<i>áí ~ álú</i>	<i>áí-tè-lú ~ álú-tò-lú</i>
3PL	<i>ì</i>	<i>ì-tè-lú ~ ì-tò-lú</i>

As illustrated in (13), the 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronouns encode no masculine vs. feminine or animate vs. inanimate distinction.

(13a) *Kèè yè kódoò díi mùsòo lá.*  
 man.D CPL.TR money.D give woman.D POSTP  
 ‘The man gave the money to the woman.’

(13b) *À yè à díi à lá.*  
 3SG CPL.TR 3SG give 3SG POSTP  
 ‘He/she gave it/him/her to him/her.’

As also illustrated in (13), personal pronouns share with other nominals the absence of any morphological encoding of their syntactic role, nor do they occupy special positions. The only differences between emphatic and non-emphatic forms are that non-emphatic forms (a) cannot be focalized, and (b) are proclitics, which prevents them from accessing positions in which they would necessarily be followed immediately by a pause (in particular, they cannot feature as left-dislocated topics, nor can they be used in the vocative function).

### 5.9 Qualifying modifiers and the notion of adjective

Qualifying modifiers can be defined as noun modifiers that follow their heads and that cannot be separated from them by any morphological material (which means, in particular, that when a qualifying modifier is present, the default determiner =*ò* and the plural marker =*lú* follow the modifier). An important property of qualifying modifiers (which distinguishes them from numerals and determiners) is that their presence has no effect on the use of the default determiner. However, in other respects, the lexemes that can be used as qualifying modifiers do not constitute a homogeneous set. They differ in their tonal interaction with their heads, in their ability to license the elision of their heads, in their relationship with nouns and verbs expressing related meanings, and in the ways the properties they encode can be expressed predicatively, which makes problematic the identification of a part-of-speech ‘adjective’ in Mandinka.

Some of the forms used as qualifying modifiers are synchronically unanalyzable roots (*kóyì* in *nìnsì-kóyò* ‘white cow’, *kàndí* in *jíi-kándò* ‘hot water’, etc.); others are derived from verbs (in *tìyá mòo-ríyò* ‘ripe peanut’, *mòo-ríy* being the resultative form of the verb *móo* ‘ripen’) or compounds (*túlú-jáŋ* ‘long ear’ can also be used as a compound adjective ‘long-eared’, as in *wùlù túlú-jáŋò* ‘long-eared dog’). A limited number of verbs, such as *kóyì* ‘be/become white’ or *kàndí* ‘be/become hot’, are used in predicative function in exactly the same way as the other verbs, but also have the ability to modify nouns in their underived form.<sup>10</sup> The other underived qualifying modifiers are basically nominal lexemes, but some of them are also productively used as nouns, whereas others are found mainly in modifier function and can be used as nouns in anaphoric contexts only.

Qualifying modifiers can take the selective suffix *-máa*, indicating that, within the limits of the situation referred to, the referent of the noun is either the only entity possessing the property expressed by the modifier, or is the entity that possesses it at the highest level.

## 5.10 Numerals

In NPs containing a numeral, plural marking is optional in the presence of =*ò*, but impossible in its absence, as shown in (14).

---

<sup>10</sup> In this respect, Mandinka behaves differently from most other Manding languages, which have special predicative markers used only with quality-denoting verbs. In Mandinka, verbs such as *kóyì* or *kàndí* do not combine with special predicative markers; their combination with completive markers allows for a stative reading, but this property is not restricted to quality-denoting verbs.

(14a) *Díndíŋ fùlá bè túlúŋò lá dándáŋò kónò.*

child two ADV COP play.D POSTP garden.D in

‘Two children are playing in the garden.’

(14b) *Díndíŋ fùlò(-lù) bè túlúŋò lá dándáŋò kónò.*

child two.D(-PL) ADV COP play.D POSTP garden.D in

‘The two children are playing in the garden.’

Mandinka numeration is decimal. The simplex numerals are *kíliŋ* ‘one’, *fùlá* ‘two’, *sàbá* ‘three’, *náani* ‘four’, *líulù* ‘five’, *wóorò* ‘six’, *wórowùlá* ‘seven’, *sáyì ~ séyì* ‘eight’, *kònoŋtò* ‘nine’, *tâŋ* ‘ten’, *mùwâŋ* ‘twenty’, *kémé* ‘hundred’, *wúli ~ wíli* ‘thousand’, and *míliyóŋ* ‘million’.

Multiples of ten from 30 to 90 are formed by combining *tâŋ* ‘ten’ with numbers from three to nine: *tâŋ sàbá* ‘thirty’, *tâŋ náani* ‘forty’, etc. Multiples of 100 and 1000 are formed in the same way: *kémé fùlá* ‘two hundred’, *wúli sàbá* ‘three thousand’, etc. The other numerals are decomposed as illustrated below, with *nîŋ* ‘and, with’ marking addition:

13	<i>tâŋ nîŋ sàbá</i>	10 + 3
28	<i>mùwâŋ nîŋ sáyì</i>	20 + 8
46	<i>tâŋ náani nîŋ wóorò</i>	(10 x 4) + 6
257	<i>kémé fùlá nîŋ tâŋ líulù nîŋ wórowùlá</i>	(100 x 2) + (10 x 5) + 7

Other adnominals referring to quantity include *jámáa ~ jámáa* ‘much, many’ (cognate with the noun *jámáa* ‘crowd’), *dántàŋ* ‘several’, and *jàlí ~ jèlú ~ jòlú* ‘how much?, how many?’. *Mùŋ ñóŋ* ‘which amount?’ can be decomposed as ‘the equivalent (*ñóŋ*) of what (*mùŋ*)?’. Note also that the diminutive and augmentative suffixes (*-ndíŋ*, *-báa*) may express quantity rather than size, as in *kódí-ndíŋ* ‘a little money’ or *kódí-báa* ‘much money’.

With the exception of *fólóo* ‘first’ (cognate with the verb *fólóo* ‘begin’), ordinals are formed by adding the suffix *-ñjáŋ* to cardinal numbers. Syntactically, they can be used in the same form not only as noun modifiers, but also as verbs, for example *fùlàñjáŋ* ‘second’ (noun modifier), ‘occur a second time’ (intransitive verb), or ‘do something a second time’ (transitive verb).

## 5.11 The genitive

NPs in the genitive function precede their heads. Mandinka has a distinction between direct genitives, simply juxtaposed to their heads, and indirect genitives, followed by the postposition *lá* serving as a genitival linker. The direct construction is used particularly when the head noun refers to a body part or blood relative of the referent of the genitive (15a-b), whereas the indirect genitival construction is particularly used when the head noun refers to a concrete object that the referent of the genitive has at his/her disposal (15c).

(15a) *kěe kùŋôo*  
man.D head.D  
'the man's head'

(15b) *díndíńó màmàmúsòò*  
child.D grandmother.D  
'the child's grandmother'

(15c) *kèê lá kódòò*  
man.D GEN money.D  
'the man's money'

In comparison with many other languages that have two variants of the genitival construction with a similar contrast, it must be noted that, in Mandinka, the direct construction is not limited to a small class of relational nouns. Both variants of the genitival construction are productive. The main regularities are that:

- The direct construction is the default construction with inanimate genitives (unless the genitival relationship is the transposition of a subject-verb relationship); it is obligatory if the genitival relationship is the transposition of an object-verb relationship, regardless of the semantic nature of the object, and is also found with animate genitives if the head noun refers to a body part or kinship relationship.
- The indirect construction is the default construction with animate genitives (unless the head noun refers to a body part or kinship relationship, or if the genitival relationship is the transposition of an object-verb relationship); it is obligatory if the genitival relationship is the transposition of a subject-verb relationship, regardless of the semantic nature of the subject.

(16) illustrates the particular case of genitival constructions whose head is a verb used nominally: irrespective of the transitive vs. intransitive distinction, subjects are transposed into indirect genitives, whereas objects are transposed into direct genitives.

(16a) *Ñiŋ kèê yè dindinò-lú dóoyâa kúnùnŋ.*  
 DEM man.D CPL.TR child.D-PL scold yesterday  
 ‘This man scolded the children yesterday.’

(16b) *Ñiŋ kèê lá dindinò-lú dóoyàa mâŋ diyáa ń yè.*  
 DEM man.D GEN child.D-PL scold.D CPL.NEG be.pleasant 1SG BEN  
 lit. ‘This man’s scold(ing) of children is not pleasant for me.’  
 → ‘I don’t like the way this man scolds children.’

Mandinka does not have specialized possessives, and uses personal pronouns in the genitive function exactly in the same way as it uses ordinary NPs.

### 5.12 Noun phrase co-ordination and the associative construction

The Mandinka  $N_1$  *nîŋ*  $N_2$  construction (‘associative construction’) occurs in contexts in which the two NPs linked by *nîŋ* are interpreted as sharing the same semantic role, as in (17a). However, in contrast with the English construction in which two NPs are linked by *and*,  $N_1$  *nîŋ*  $N_2$  is also found in contexts that exclude semantic role sharing; see (17b-d).

(17a) *Jàlôo níŋ à lá mùsóo nǎa-tà.*  
 griot.D with 3SG GEN woman.D come-CPL.ITR  
 ‘The griot and his wife came.’

(17b) *Kèê nîŋ kódóo nǎa-tà.*  
 man.D with money.D come-CPL.ITR  
 ‘The man brought money.’

(17c) *Kàmbàanôo níŋ bòróo nǎa-tà.*  
 boy.D with running.D come-CPL.ITR  
 ‘The boy came running.’

- (17d) *Súnkútò níη kùmbóo nǎa-tà.*  
 girl.D with crying.D come-CPL.ITR  
 ‘The girl came crying.’

Consequently, in spite of the fact that *níη* N occurs exclusively in positions where no other type of adpositional phrase can occur, *níη* is better analyzed as a comitative preposition assigning the role of ‘companion’ (taken in a very broad sense).

The fact that this construction has only a superficial resemblance with NP coordination as found in European languages is confirmed by the autonomy of its two terms in operations such as focalization (see (18)), and by its interpretation in negative contexts: in (19), the only term of the construction under the scope of negation is the second one.

- (18a) *Í-tè lè níη Àwáa bé kúwòo táamándì-lá.*  
 2SG-EMPH FOC with Awa ADV COP matter.D settle-INF  
 ‘YOU will settle the matter with Awa’.

- (18b) *Í níη Àwáa lè bé kúwòo táamándì-lá.*  
 2SG with Awa FOC ADV COP matter.D settle-INF  
 ‘You will settle the matter WITH AWA.’

- (19) *Mòò níη Álà té kèlé nǎo-lá.*  
 person.D with God ADV COP.NEG struggle be.able-INF  
 ‘Men cannot struggle with God.’

The asymmetric nature of the associative construction is also apparent in the possibility of moving the second term to clause-final position, preceded by a pronoun resuming the first term, which for its part cannot move from the position in which it is assigned a semantic role by the verb; see (20).

- (20a) *Àlikáalóo<sub>i</sub> nǎa-tà, à<sub>i</sub> níη à lá mùsôo.*  
 chief.D come-CPL.ITR 3SG with 3SG GEN woman.D  
 ‘The chief came with his wife.’

- (20b) *Súḡkútóo; nǎa-tà, à; níḡ kùmbôo.*  
 girl.D come-CPL.ITR 3SG with crying.D  
 ‘The girl came crying.’

For a more detailed discussion of this question, readers are referred to Creissels (2016).

## 6 The verbal system

### 6.1 Verb inflection

In the absence of a predicative marker, the bare verbal lexeme can only be used in the imperative positive function (see §6.2.8), or as a kind of infinitive (see §8.2.2). The predicative use of the bare verbal lexeme in combination with predicative markers has already been amply illustrated, and the inventory of the predicative markers with which the bare verbal lexeme can combine will be given in §6.2.

The other forms that constitute verbal inflection in the strictest sense of this term are *V-tá* (the completive positive in intransitive predications, already illustrated in (2a) and many other examples above), and the following non-finite forms:

- *V-lá* (*lá*-infinitive, used in combination with the adverbial copula in predicative marker function (see §6.2), and in non-finite complementation (see §8.2.2));
- *V-ríḡ* (resultative participle);
- *V-tôo* (a non-finite form expressing simultaneity, designated here as gerundive).

The resultative participle and the gerundive differ in some aspects of their distribution, but both are found in secondary predicate function, as in (21) and (22).

- (21) *Ì yè kěe tàrá bàrà-mà-ríḡ làaráḡò kâḡ.*  
 3PL CPL.TR man.D find wound-RESULT bed.D on  
 ‘They found the man wounded on the bed.’

- (22) *Súḡkútóo kùmbòo-tóo nǎa-tà.*  
 girl.D cry-GER come-CPL.ITR  
 ‘The girl came crying.’

Some Mandinka varieties also have a non-finite form V-*kâŋ* expressing progressive aspect, found exclusively in combination with the adverbial copula.<sup>11</sup>

Mandinka also has an infinitive marker *kà* (see §8.2.2), but for the same reason as predicative markers (the placing of object NPs between it and the verb), it cannot be analyzed as an inflectional affix.

## 6.2 Predicative markers and verb inflection in independent clauses

In independent assertive or interrogative clauses, with only the exception of the completive positive in intransitive predications (marked by a suffix), a predicative marker must be present in post-subject position. With the exception of *bé/té*, also used in non-verbal predication as a adverbial copula (see §7.2), the predicative markers are grammatical words specialized in this function. Specialized predicative markers combine with the bare form of the verb, whereas the adverbial copula in its predicative marker function requires a suffixed form of the verb.

### 6.2.1 The completive

- positive: S  $yè^{12}$  O V (X) (transitive) / S V-*tá* (X) (intransitive)
- negative: S *mâŋ*<sup>13</sup> (O) V (X)

In general, the predicative markers labeled ‘completive’ and the suffix *-tá* have the same perfect or narrative readings as French ‘*passé composé*’ or Latin ‘perfect’; however, Mandinka has a relatively important class of verbs with which the completive markers may have a stative reading. This class includes, among other verbs, *lôŋ* ‘know’, *sòtó* ‘get/have’, and quality-denoting verbs such as *kàndí* ‘be hot’, *bétéyâa* ‘be good’, etc. With some of these verbs, the stative reading is the only possible reading with completive markers, whereas with others, the completive markers are ambiguous between a stative reading and a narrative/perfect reading.

### 6.2.2 The subjunctive

- positive: S  $yè^{14}$  (O) V (X)

---

<sup>11</sup> In the Mandinka varieties that do not have this progressive form, the progressive aspect can only be expressed by means of the periphrasis presented in §7.2.

<sup>12</sup>  $yè$  (CPL) immediately preceded by  $\acute{y}$  (1SG) or  $\grave{y}$  (1PL) has a variant  $\eta\grave{a}$ .

<sup>13</sup> In normal or rapid speech, *mâŋ* CPL.NEG immediately followed by a personal pronoun or by the demonstrative *wôo* loses its final  $\eta$ . This alternation is not usually indicated in written texts, and the transcription used here follows this convention.

- negative: S *kánàa* (O) V (X)

The subjunctive occurs in independent clauses with a jussive function.

### 6.2.3 The potential

- positive: S *sì* ~ *sè* (O) V (X)

The potential has no negative counterpart. *Sì* and *sè* are dialectal variants.

### 6.2.4 The incompletive

- positive: S *kà* (O) V (X)
- negative: S *búkà* (O) V (X)

The predicative markers labeled ‘incompletive’ are mainly used in habitual contexts. *Búkà* is also found as *múkà* or *bíkà* in some Mandinka varieties.

### 6.2.5 The resultative

- positive: S *bé* V-*ríŋ* (X)
- negative: S *té* V-*ríŋ* (X)

The verb form labeled ‘resultative’ can only be used intransitively; with transitive verbs, it is interpreted as patient-oriented.

### 6.2.6 The future

- positive: S *bé* (O) V-*lá* (X)
- negative: S *té* (O) V-*lá* (X)

### 6.2.7 The progressive

- positive: S *bé* (O) V-*kâŋ* (X)
- negative: S *té* (O) V-*kâŋ* (X)

---

<sup>14</sup> *yè* (SBJV) has a variant *ŋà* in the same conditions as *yè* (CPL).

As already mentioned, this progressive form exists only in some Mandinka varieties.

### 6.2.8 The imperative

As illustrated in (23), the imperative shares the negative predicative marker *kánàa* with the subjunctive, but no predicative marker occurs in the positive imperative. The other particularity of the imperative is the zero coding of 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular.

(23a) *Díndínò yè táa kàràmbúñò tó!*  
 child.D SBJV go school.D LOC  
 ‘Let the child go to school!’

(23b) *Táa kàràmbúñò tó!*  
 go school.D LOC  
 ‘Go (sg.) to school!’

(23c) *Álí táa kàràmbúñò tó!*  
 2PL go school.D LOC  
 ‘Go (pl.) to school!’

(23d) *Kánàa táa kàràmbúñò tó!*  
 SBJV.NEG go school.D LOC  
 ‘Don’t go (sg.) to school!’

(23a) *Álí kánàa táa kàràmbúñò tó!*  
 2PL SBJV.NEG go school.D LOC  
 ‘Don’t go (pl.) to school!’

### 6.2.9 Present vs. past

Predicative markers are not sensitive to the present vs. past distinction. A past marker *nǔñ* (cognate with the adverb *núntò* ‘formerly’) may be found in post-verbal or clause-final position, as in (24a), but it is normally omitted if the context implies past reference, as in (24b).

(24a) *Kódòò bé sàarêe-ríŋ nŋ̀j bàŋkòò kónò lè.*  
money.D ADV COP bury-RESULT PST ground.D in FOC  
'The money was buried in the ground.'

(24b) *Wǒo tùmòo, ñ kà ñòò fyì b́áakè.*  
DEM time.D 1PL ICPL millet.D sow much  
'Formerly, we sowed millet very much.'

### 6.3 Auxiliarization

In some bi-verbal constructions, the higher verb does not contribute to the representation of an event involving participants, and serves as an auxiliary expressing the temporal, aspectual, or modal specification of the dependent verb. For example, in (25), *b̀yí* 'fall' functions as an inchoative auxiliary.

(25) *Ì b̀yí-tá d̀òokúwòò ḱe-là.*  
3PL fall-CPL.ITR work.D do-INF  
'They started working.'

## 7 The clause

### 7.1 Verbal predication

On verbal predication, see §3.1 and §6.2.

### 7.2 Non-verbal predication

Morphologically unmarked predication is quite marginal in Mandinka. As illustrated in (26), Mandinka has two copulas, *bé* (adverbial copula) and *mú* (nominal copula), which differ from verbs in that the clauses in which they are found do not contain the predicative markers that are obligatory elements of independent verbal clauses. The structure of copular clauses can be schematized as S COP X, since the term that precedes the copula and the term that follows it behave in all respects like subjects and obliques in verbal predications.

(26a) *Díndíjò bé bújò kónò.*  
 child.D ADV COP house.D in  
 S COP X  
 ‘The child is in the house.’

(26b) *À-té lè mú mànsôo tí.*  
 3SG-EMPH FOC NOM COP king.D POSTP  
 S COP X  
 ‘He is the king.’

The adverbial copula *bé* (negative: *té*)<sup>15</sup> is followed by a postpositional phrase or adverb in predicate function, and is typically found in clauses expressing location, as in (26a) above. It is also found in a progressive periphrasis in combination with an NP headed by a verb used as an event noun, as in (27), and can be used to express possessive predication, if its complement is marked by the postposition *búlù* ‘in the personal sphere of’, ‘under the responsibility of’. As illustrated in (28), this expression of predicative possession is in competition with the transitive verb *sòtó* ‘get/have’.

(27a) *Mùsôo-lú bé kèlôo lá.*  
 woman.D-PL ADV COP struggle.D POSTP  
 ‘The women are struggling.’

(27b) *Mùsôo bé tábí-ròo lá.*  
 woman.D ADV COP cook-ANTIP.D POSTP  
 ‘The woman is doing the cooking.’

(27c) *Mùsôo bé sùbù-tábòo lá.*  
 woman.D ADV COP meat-cook.D POSTP  
 ‘The woman is cooking the meat.’

---

<sup>15</sup> The variants *bí* and *tí* can be found in contact with the following words: *jǎŋ* ‘here’, *jěe* ‘there’, *táa* ‘go’, or *nǎa* ‘come’.

(28a) *Wòtòo bé òj búlù.*  
 car.D ADV COP 1SG PSPH  
 ‘I have a car.’

(28b) *Ó òj wòtòo sòtó.*  
 1SG CPL.TR car.D get/have  
 ‘I have a car.’ or ‘I got a car.’

The predicative construction with the nominal copula *mú* (negative: *té* or *nté*) can be schematized as follows:<sup>16</sup>

$N_1 \text{ } \acute{m}\acute{u} \text{ } (N_2 \text{ } \acute{t}\acute{i})$

Independent assertive positive clauses whose nucleus is *mú* must obligatorily include the focus marker *lè* attached to the noun phrase in predicate function. The variant with a single core NP in  $N_1$  position expresses the identification of an entity suggested by the context. In constructions with two core NPs,  $N_2$  is the unmarked position for the term expressing the identification, but in independent assertive positive clauses, the term expressing the identification can also occupy the  $N_1$  position, the obligatory use of the focus marker preventing ambiguity.

(29a) *À-té lè mú.*  
 3SG-EMPH FOC NOM COP  
 ‘It is him.’

(29b) *Mànsòo lè mú.*  
 king.D FOC NOM COP  
 ‘He is the/a king.’

---

<sup>16</sup> *Tí* is a postposition whose uses include the expression of functive and transformative meanings (act *as an N*, transform something *into N*). The use of adpositions in identificational predication, rather rare in the languages of the world, is common among Mande languages.

(29c) *À-té lè mú mànsôo tí.*  
 3SG-EMPH FOC NOMCOP king.D POSTP  
 ‘HE is the king.’

= *Mànsôo mú à-té lè tí.*  
 king.D NOMCOP 3SG-EMPH FOC POSTP

(29d) *À-té mú mànsôo lè tí.*  
 3SG-EMPH NOMCOP king.D FOC POSTP  
 ‘He is THE KING.’

= *Mànsôo lè mú à tí.*  
 king.D FOC NOMCOP 3SG POSTP

When in contact with each other, *lè* and *mú* may fuse into *lǒŋ*.

### 7.3 Verbal valency

The questions briefly presented in this section are dealt with in more details in Creissels (2015).

#### 7.3.1 Uncoded valency alternations

In independent assertive or interrogative clauses, the subject position can never be left empty. By contrast, it is always possible to find transitive verbs in constructions containing no object, but such constructions are overtly marked as intransitive (since the completive positive marker is not *yè*, but *-tá*). In other words, Mandinka does not have strictly transitive verbs. However, the semantic implications of the intransitive use of verbs also found in transitive constructions are not identical for all verbs.

There are about 30 verbs that can be used transitively or intransitively without any change in the semantic role assigned to their subject (A-labile verbs), as in (30).

(30a) *Sùlòo sèlé-tà yíròo sántò.*  
 monkey.D climb-CPL.ITR tree.D on\_top  
 ‘The monkey climbed up the tree.’

- (30b) *Í búkà yíróo sélé à jàmbôo lá.*  
 3PL ICPL.NEG tree.D climb 3SG leave.D POSTP  
 ‘One does not climb a tree by the leaves.’

Apart from this restricted set of A-labile verbs, the verbs found in transitive constructions cannot be used intransitively with a subject fulfilling the same semantic role as the subject of the transitive construction. The strategy most commonly used to circumvent this impossibility is the antipassive periphrasis illustrated in (8c), reproduced here as (31).

- (31) *Mùsôo bé tùu-rôo lá.*  
 woman.D ADV COP pound-ANTIP.D POSTP  
 lit. ‘The woman is at the pound(ing).ANTIP.’  
 → ‘The woman is pounding.’

The general rule is that the verbs that can be found in transitive constructions can also be found in intransitive constructions in which the subject is assigned a semantic role similar to that assigned to the object in the transitive use of the same verb (P-lability). Two cases must be distinguished.

(32) illustrates the *causative / anticausative alternation*: the referent of the subject of the intransitive construction is presented as undergoing the same process as the object of the transitive construction, but without any hint at a possible external cause.

- (32a) *Máŋkóo jòlôn-tá bàŋkôo tó.*  
 mango.D fall/drop-CPL.ITR ground.D LOC  
 ‘The mango fell to the ground.’

- (32b) *Kèê yè mùróo jòlón bàŋkôo tó.*  
 man.D CPL.TR knife.D fall/drop ground.D LOC  
 ‘The man dropped the knife to the ground.’

The productivity of this alternation is limited not only by the possibility of conceiving events as more or less spontaneous processes affecting a single participant, but also by the existence

of a causative derivation encoding the same semantic relationship between intransitive and transitive constructions.

In the *active / passive alternation*, illustrated in (33), the intransitive construction is interpreted as implying the same participants as the transitive construction, but the subject encodes the same participant as the object of the transitive construction, whereas the participant encoded as the subject of the transitive construction is left unexpressed.

(33a) *Kèê yè wòtôo dádâa.*  
 man.D CPL.TR car.D repair  
 ‘The man has repaired the car.’

(33b) *Wòtôo dádâa-tá.*  
 car.D repair-CPL.ITR  
 ‘The car has been repaired.’

This alternation is fully productive, and the passive reading of intransitive clauses involved in this alternation is not bound to any particular condition on aspect, mood, or referentiality. However, in Mandinka, in contrast to other Manding varieties, the passive construction of transitive verbs cannot include an oblique representing the participant encoded as the subject of the transitive construction (agent phrase).

As illustrated in (34), some trivalent verbs have two alternative constructions differing in the selection of the participants encoded as object or oblique.

(34a) *Kèê yè bàtáyòo sáfée à dínò yé.*  
 man.D CPL.TR letter.D write 3SG son.D BEN  
 ‘The man wrote a letter to his son.’

(34b) *Kèê yè à dínò sáfée bàtáyòo lá.*  
 man.D CPL.TR 3SG son.D write letter.D POSTP  
 ‘The man wrote a letter to his son.’  
 lit. ‘... wrote his son with a letter.’

*Tú* ‘remain’ is the only Mandinka verb that can be found in an impersonal presentational construction (illustrated in (35b)) in which the argument canonically encoded as the subject is

expressed as an oblique (optionally marked by the postposition *lá*), and the subject slot is occupied by an expletive third person singular pronoun.

(35a) *Díndíngò-lú tú-tà síwòò kónò.*  
 child.D-PL remain-CPL.ITR house.D in  
 ‘The children remained at home.’

(35b) *Á tú-tà díndíngò-lú là.*  
 3SG remain-CPL.ITR house.D POSTP  
 ‘There remained the children.’

### 7.3.2 The middle construction, reflexivization, and reciprocalization

Mandinka has a variant of the transitive construction, called the *middle construction* in Creissels and Sambou (2013), in which the O slot is occupied by a morpheme *í* (with 1<sup>st</sup> person subjects) or *í* (with 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> person subjects). This morpheme was originally a reflexive pronoun. It is conventionally glossed REFL, but synchronically, the middle construction is available for certain verbs only, and does not always express reflexivization. The reflexive use of the middle construction is illustrated in (36), but with some verbs the middle construction is functionally an antipassive construction in which the P argument of the transitive verb is left unexpressed or demoted to oblique, as shown in (37).

(36a) *Mùsòo yè díndíngó kúu.*  
 woman.D CPL.TR child.D wash  
 ‘The woman washed the child.’

(36b) *Mùsòo yè í kúu.*  
 woman.D CPL.TR REFL wash  
 ‘The woman washed (herself).’

(37a) *Wùlòo yè jíyóo mĩŋ.*  
 dog.D CPL.TR water.D drink  
 ‘The dog drank the water.’

- (37b) *Wùlôo yè í mĩŋ (jĩyòo lá).*  
 dog.D CPL.TR REFL drink water.D POSTP  
 ‘The dog drank (the water).’

Reflexivization is productively encoded by means of intensive pronouns formed by combining *fãŋ* ~ *fãŋò* ‘self’ with personal pronouns, as in (38); reciprocity is expressed by means of the reciprocal pronoun *ñôo* ~ *ñôŋ*, as in (39).

- (38a) *Í ná dèndikôo kára í yè.*  
 1SG CPL.TR dress.D sew 2SG BEN  
 ‘I sewed a dress for you.’

- (38b) *Í ná dèndikôo kára í fãŋò yè.*  
 1SG CPL.TR dress.D sew 1SG self BEN  
 ‘I sewed a dress for myself.’

- (39a) *Dĩndĩŋò yè kèebáa kòntôŋ.*  
 child.D CPL.TR old\_man.D greet  
 ‘The child greeted the old man.’

- (39b) *Mòô-lú yè ñôo kòntôŋ.*  
 person.D-PL CPL.TR RECIP greet  
 ‘The people greeted each other’

### 7.3.3 Causative derivation

Causativization is particularly productive with intransitive verbs, for which the causative suffix is *-ndí*, as in (40).

- (40a) *Dĩndĩŋò bé sũ-lá bèrôo kâŋ.*  
 child.D ADV COP sit-INF stone.D on  
 ‘The child will sit on a stone.’

- (40b) *Kèé bé dindíjó sî-ndî-lá bèrôo kâŋ.*  
 man.D ADV COP child.D sit-CAUS-INF stone.D on  
 ‘The man will make the child sit on a stone.’

The causativization of transitive constructions is less productive. A limited number of transitive verbs can be causativized with the same suffix *-ndî* as intransitive verbs, as in (41), but most transitive verbs are causativized by the complex suffix *-(dí)rí-ndî*, whose first part can be analyzed as the antipassive marker; see (42). The presence of the antipassive marker is consistent with the fact that the causativization of transitive constructions implies the demotion of the initial object (encoded as an oblique).

- (41a) *Kàmbàanôo yè wòtóo nŋ.*  
 boy.D CPL.TR car.D learn  
 ‘The boy learnt driving.’

- (41b) *Kèé yè kàmbàanóo nî-ndî wòtóo lá.*  
 man.D CPL.TR boy.D learn-CAUS car.D POSTP  
 ‘The man taught the boy driving.’

- (42a) *Í ná kítáabòo jôo.*  
 1SG CPL.TR book.D pay  
 ‘I paid for the book.’

- (42b) *Ì yè í jóo-rí-ndî kítáabòo lá.*  
 3PL CPL.TR 1SG pay-ANTIP-CAUS book.D POSTP  
 ‘They made me pay for the book.’

#### 7.4 Focalization

NPs are focalized by the adjunction of the focus marker *lè* on their right edge, without any other change in the construction, as in (43b-d). The focus marker may also occur at the end of the verb phrase (either in clause-final position, or followed by right-dislocated constituents in an ‘afterthought’ or ‘antitopic’ function), with a meaning of verb focus or emphatic assertion; see (43e).

(43a) *Kèê yè kódòo díi mùsòo lá.*  
 man.D CPL.TR money.D give woman.D POSTP  
 ‘The man gave the money to the woman.’

(43b) *Kèê lè yè kódòo díi mùsòo lá.*  
 man.D FOC CPL.TR money.D give woman.D POSTP  
 ‘THE MAN gave the money to the woman.’

(43c) *Kèê yè kódòo lè díi mùsòo lá.*  
 man.D CPL.TR money.D FOC give woman.D POSTP  
 ‘The man gave THE MONEY to the woman.’

(43d) *Kèê yè kódòo díi mùs-óo lè lá.*  
 man.D CPL.TR money.D give woman.D FOC POSTP  
 ‘The man gave the money to THE WOMAN.’

(43e) *Kèê yè kódòo díi mùsòo lá lè.*  
 man.D CPL.TR money.D give woman.D POSTP FOC  
 ‘The man DID give the money to the woman.’

### 7.5 Questioning

Yes/no-questions do not differ from assertive clauses in their construction. Questioning is signaled either by a rising intonation at the end of the clause, or by the addition of an interrogative particle in clause-initial or clause-final position. The clause-final particle *bǎŋ* illustrated in (44) is particularly frequent.

(44) *Kèê yè kódòo díi mùsòo lá bǎŋ?*  
 man.D CPL.TR money.D give woman.D POSTP Q  
 ‘Did the man give the money to the woman?’

In wh-questions, interrogative phrases occupy the same position as the corresponding phrases in assertive clauses, and optionally combine with the focus marker, as in (45).

- (45) *Kèê yè kódòo dī jímáa (lè) lá?*  
 man.D CPL.TR money.D give who FOC POSTP  
 ‘Whom did the man give the money to?’

Mandinka has the following inventory of interrogative words: *jímáa* ~ *jùmáa* ‘who?’ or ‘which one?’, *mūŋ* ‘what?’ or ‘which kind of?’, *mùmmáa* ‘in the form of what?’, *dī* ‘how?’, *mùntóo* ~ *mìntóo* ‘where?’, *mùntòŋká* ~ *mìntòŋká* ‘person from where?’, *jàlí* - *jèlú* ~ *jòlú* ‘how much/many?’, *jàlĩnjáŋ* ~ *jèlũnjáŋ* ~ *jòlũnjáŋ* ‘at which rank?’.

Note that ‘why?’ can be expressed by combining *mūŋ* ‘what?’ with a postposition, but is more commonly expressed periphrastically as *Mú nè yè à tinnà* ..., literally ‘What caused that ...?’

## 8 Complex constructions

### 8.1 Relativization

In the most common relativization strategy, the relative clause is not embedded in the matrix clause. It may precede or follow it, but the order ‘relative clause – matrix clause’ is much more frequent than the order ‘matrix clause – relative clause’. Within the relative clause, the relativizer *mīŋ* (dialectal variants: *mēŋ*, *mūŋ*) occupies the position of the relativized NP, either alone or combined with the noun that constitutes the semantic head of the relative clause, as shown in (46).<sup>17</sup>

- (46a) *Mùsòo yè kèê lá kódóo tǎa.*  
 woman.D CPL.TR man.D GEN money.D take  
 ‘The woman took the man’s money.’

- (46b) *mùsòo mīŋ yè kèê lá kódóo tǎa*  
 woman.D REL CPL.TR man.D GEN money.D take  
 ‘the woman who took the man’s money’

---

<sup>17</sup> Comparative data show that the relativizer *mīŋ* originates from a demonstrative.

(46c) *mîŋ yè kèê lá kódóo tǎa*  
 REL CPL.TR man.D GEN money.D take  
 ‘the one who took the man’s money’

(46d) *mùsôo yè kèê mîŋ ná kódóo tǎa*  
 woman.D CPL.TR man.D REL GEN money.D take  
 ‘the man whose money was taken by the woman’

(46e) *mùsôo yè mîŋ ná kódóo tǎa*  
 woman.D CPL.TR REL GEN money.D take  
 ‘the one whose money was taken by the woman’

(46f) *mùsôo yè kòdòo mîŋ tǎa*  
 woman.D CPL.TR money.D REL take  
 ‘the money that the woman took’

(46g) *mùsôo yè mîŋ tǎa*  
 woman.D CPL.TR REL take  
 ‘the one that the woman took’, ‘what the woman took’

As illustrated in (47), the relativized NP is resumed in the matrix clause by a pronoun.

(47a) [*Mùsôo yè kèê<sub>i</sub> mîŋ ná kódóo tǎa*], *íj níŋ wǒo<sub>i</sub> bĕn-tà.*  
 woman.D CPL.TR man.D REL GEN money.D take 1SG with DEM meet-CPL.ITR  
 ‘I met the man whose money was taken by the woman.’  
 lit. something like ‘The woman took which man’s money, I met that one.’

(47b) [*Mùsôo<sub>i</sub> mîŋ yè kèê lá kódóo tǎa*], *íj níŋ wǒo<sub>i</sub> bĕn-tà.*  
 woman.D REL CPL.TR man.D GEN money.D take 1SG with DEM meet-CPL.ITR  
 ‘I met the woman who took the man’s money.’  
 lit. something like ‘Which woman took the man’s money, I met that one.’

Two other relativization strategies are found in Mandinka. In the first type, the relative clause precedes the matrix clause and is resumed by a pronoun, as in canonical relativization, but the

head noun is found on the left edge of the relative clause, immediately followed by the relativizer and resumed by a pronoun occupying the position of the relativized NP. This is shown in (48b), to be compared with the canonical construction in (48a).

(48a) [Í bè súwòò; mîŋ dâa tó], wó; lè mú í yââ tí.  
 2SG ADV COP house.D REL door.D LOC DEM FOC NOM COP 1SG home.D POSTP  
 ‘The house at whose door you are is my home.’

(48b) [Súwòò; mîŋ í bè à; dâa tó],  
 house.D REL 2SG LOC.COP 3SG door.D LOC  
  
 wó; lè mú í yââ tí.  
 DEM FOC NOM COP 1SG home.D POSTP  
 ‘The house at whose door you are is my home.’

In the second type of non-canonical relative clauses, the internal structure of the relative clause is identical to that of canonical relatives, but it occurs as a constituent of the matrix clause. However, this is only possible if the relative clause occupies a peripheral position (either the subject position at the beginning of the clause, as in (49), or an oblique position at the end of the clause).

(49) [Sââ mîŋ mú súŋkútóo kèemáa tì] múrù-tá năŋ.  
 snake.D REL NOM COP girl.D husband POSTP come\_back-CPL.ITR CTRP  
 ‘The snake who was the girl’s husband came back.’

## 8.2 Complementation

### 8.2.1 Finite complementation involving the quotative *kó*

The quotative *kó* is an invariable word used to introduce reported speech in a construction in which it is followed by a quotation and preceded by an NP representing the person to which the quotation is attributed. A postpositional phrase representing the addressee may be inserted between *kó* and the quotation, in which case the quotative is optionally repeated, as in (50). The quotation may be direct or indirect, and there is no logophoricity marking.

(50) *Kèé kó dindinò yé (kò) “ń kòntô!”*

man.D QUOT child.D BEN QUOT 1SG greet

‘The man told the child to greet him.’

In the construction illustrated in (51), a finite clause is introduced by *kó* in complementizer function. The complement clause is not embedded within the matrix clause. Instead, it follows the matrix clause, within which it is represented by a cataphoric pronoun occupying the position that corresponds to its role in the argument structure of the main verb (in this example, the object position between the predicative marker and the verb).

(51) *Í ńá à<sub>i</sub> lôŋ [kó ì bé dòokíwóo sòtó-lá ń yè.]<sub>i</sub>*

1SG CPL.TR 3SG know QUOT 3PL ADV COP work.D get-INF 1SG BEN

‘I know that they will get work for me.’

### 8.2.2 Other types of finite complementation

As illustrated in (52), no complementizer is involved in the complementation of modal verbs with subjunctive clauses.

(52) *Í mán sŏŋ í yè táa.*

1SG CPL.NEG agree 2SG SBJV go

‘I don’t agree that you should go.’

With causation verbs, no complementizer is used, but the complement clause is anticipated by a cataphoric pronoun in object position.

(53) *Músáa lè yè à<sub>i</sub> sáabù [ń mán nǎa.]<sub>i</sub>*

Moussa FOC CPL.TR 3SG cause 1SG CPL.NEG come

‘It is because of Moussa that I did not come.’

lit. ‘It is Moussa who caused that I did not come.’

As illustrated in (54), indirect yes/no questions are introduced by *fó*, also used as an interrogative particle in independent interrogative clauses.

- (54) *À ñìnìṅkâa fò à yè kóóó sòtó.*  
 3SG ask Q 3SG CPL.TR money.D have  
 ‘Ask him whether he has money.’

### 8.2.3 Non-finite complementation

The following three types of non-finite clauses are found in control constructions in which their unexpressed subject is identified with the subject of the higher verb:

- (O) V (X) – see (55)
- *kà* (O) V (X) – see (56)
- (O) V-*lá* (X) – see (57)

Their distribution depends on the higher verb. The first one (a ‘bare infinitive’) is licensed by a very limited set of verbs, whereas the other two are quite productive (and often interchangeable).

- (55) *Í nãa-tá [kèebáa kòntôṅ].*  
 1SG come-CPL old.man.D greet  
 ‘I came to greet the old man.’

- (56) *Í fáṅkà-tá [kóóó sèyìndí-là].*  
 1SG do\_one’s\_best-CPL.ITR money.D give\_back-INF  
 ‘I did my best to give the money back.’

- (57) *Í làfí-tá [kà ñṅ sùṅkútòò fútúu].*  
 1SG want-CPL.ITR INF DEM girl.D marry  
 ‘I want to marry this girl.’

Note that, in addition to its use in complementation, *kà* (O) V (X) is also used for verb phrase topicalization, as in (58).

- (58) [*Kà fúlá-káṅó kàràṅ*]<sub>i</sub>, *wóo*<sub>i</sub> *kòlèyâa-tá báakè lè.*  
 INF Fula-language.D learn DEM be\_difficult-CPL.ITR very FOC  
 ‘Learning Fula is very difficult.’

### 8.3 Adverbial subordination

In addition to cases of adverbial subordination that can be analyzed as deriving from relativization, Mandinka has a large array of conjunctions (either specialized conjunctions or grammatical words with other possible functions) occurring on the left edge of adverbial clauses, whose internal structure is identical to that of independent clauses: *(kà)bíríŋ* ‘when, since’, *nîŋ* ‘if’, *jännîŋ* ‘before’, etc.; see (59) to (61).

- (59) *Sùŋóo cáawù-tá lè kàbíríŋ pòlísêe-lú nǎa-tà.*  
 thief.D panic-CPL.ITR FOC when policeman.D-PL come-CPL.ITR  
 ‘The thief panicked when the policemen came.’

- (60) *Jännîŋ kèê bé táa-là, à sî dómó-ròo ké.*  
 before man.D ADV COP leave-INF 3SG pot eat-ANTIP.D do  
 ‘The man should eat before leaving.’  
 lit. ‘Before the man leaves, he should eat.’

- (61) *Nîŋ à yè ñ báyíndì, à bé ñ sòtó-là lè.*  
 if 3SG CPL.TR 1PL chase 3SG ADV COP 1PL get-INF FOC  
 ‘If he chases us, he will catch us.’

Some other conjunctions occur at the right edge of adverbial clauses, as in (62). Other adverbial subordination strategies found in Mandinka are the use of a special predicative marker found exclusively in dependent clauses, as in (63), and the use of non-finite verb forms, as in (64).

- (62) *À fāamāa yè à háyínāŋ dórón, à yè à súutêe.*  
 3SG father CPL.TR 3SG see as\_soon\_as 3SG CPL.TR 3SG recognize  
 ‘As soon as his father saw him, he recognized him.’

- (63) *Kèe nàmánàŋ táa, à sî dómó-ròo ké.*  
 man.D before leave 3SG pot eat-ANTIP.D do  
 ‘Before the man leaves, he should eat.’

- (64) *Màanêe-lú bôo-ríjó Kàabú, ì nǎa-tá sǐ jǎŋ.*  
 Maanee.D-PL leave-RESULT.D Kaabu 3PL come-ACP settle here  
 ‘After the Maanees left the Kaabu, they settled here.’

#### 8.4 Clause co-ordination

Mandinka does not have a coordinating conjunction available to join clauses with an additive meaning similar to that expressed by *and* in English. The additive co-ordination of clauses can be expressed by juxtaposition, as in (65a), or by a clause-chaining construction formally identical to (and ambiguous with) adverbial subordination expressing purpose, with the non-initial clauses in the *kà*-infinitive (65b) or in the subjunctive (65c).

- (65a) *Díndíjò cípòn-tá yíròò sántò à táa-tà.*  
 child.D jump-CPL.ITR tree.D top 3SG go-CPL.ITR  
 ‘The child jumped from the tree and went away.’  
 lit. ‘The child jumped from the tree he went away.’

- (65b) *Díndíjò cípòn-tá yíròò sántò kà táa.*  
 child.D jump-CPL.ITR tree.D top INF go  
 1. ‘The child jumped from the tree and went away.’  
 2. ‘The child jumped from the tree in order to go away.’  
 lit. ‘The child jumped from the tree to go away.’

- (65c) *Díndíjò cípòn-tá yíròò sántò à yè táa.*  
 child.D jump-CPL.ITR tree.D top 3SG SBJV go  
 1. ‘The child jumped from the tree and went away.’  
 2. ‘The child jumped from the tree in order to go away.’  
 lit. ‘The child jumped from the tree he go.SBJV away.’

#### Abbreviations

A	agent
ADVCOP	adverbial copula
AGNM	agent nominalization

ANTIP	antipassive
BEN	benefactive
C	consonant
CAUS	causative
COP	copula
CPL	completive
D	default determiner
DEM	demonstrative
DET	determiner
EMPH	emphatic
FOC	focalization
GEN	genitive
GER	gerundive
H	high (tone)
ICPL	incompletive
INF	infinitive
INSNM	instrument nominalization
ITR	intransitive
L	low (tone)
LOC	locative
N	noun
NEG	negative
NOMCOP	nominal copula
NP	noun phrase
NUM	numeral
O	object
P	patient
PM	predicative marker
PL	plural
POSTP	postposition <sup>18</sup>
POT	potential

---

<sup>18</sup> The generic gloss POSTP is used for multifunctional postpositions with a range of uses that cannot be analyzed straightforwardly as extensions of an identifiable basic meaning.

PROG	progressive
PSPH	'in the personal sphere of'
PST	past
Q	interrogative
QUAL	qualifying modifier
QUOT	quotative
RECIP	reciprocal
REFL	reflexive
REL	relativizer
RESULT	resultative
S	subject
SG	singular
SBJV	subjunctive
TR	transitive
V	vowel, or verb
X	oblique

## References

- Creissels, Denis. 2014. Le développement d'un marqueur de déplacement centripète en mandinka. In Carole de Féral, Maarten Kossman & Mauro Tosco (eds.) *In and Out of Africa, Languages in Question, In Honor of Robert Nicolai, Vol. 2 Language Contact and Language Change in Africa*. Louvain-la-Neuve / Walpole MA: Peeters. 95-102.
- Creissels, Denis. 2015. Valency properties of Mandinka verbs. In Andrej Malchukov and Bernard Comrie (eds.), *Valency classes in the world's languages, volume 1*. De Gruyter Mouton. 221-260.
- Creissels, Denis. 2016. Problematic aspects of coordination and subordination in Mandinka. In Fernanda Pratas, Sandra Pereira and Clara Pinto (eds.), *Coordination and Subordination: Form and Meaning— Selected Papers from CSI Lisbon 2014*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing. 119-133.

- Creissels, Denis. 2017. The flexibility of the *noun* vs. *verb* distinction in the lexicon of Mandinka. In Valentina Vapnarsky & Edy Veneziano (eds.), *Lexical polycategoriality: Cross-linguistic, cross-theoretical and language acquisition approaches*. John Benjamins. 35-57.
- Creissels, Denis. 2019a. Grammatical relations in Mandinka. In Alena Witzlack-Makarevich & Balthasar Bickel (eds), *Argument Selectors. A new perspective on grammatical relations*. John Benjamins. 301-348.
- Creissels, Denis. 2019b. Tonologie du mandinka du Pakaawu. *Mandenkan* 61. 3-46.
- Creissels, Denis, and Pierre Sambou. 2013. *Le mandinka: phonologie, grammaire, textes*. Paris: Karthala.
- Dimmendaal, G. 2011. *Historical linguistics and the comparative study of African languages*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Vydrin, Valentin. 2006. К реконструкции фонологического типа и именной морфологии пра-манде. Труды Института лингвистических исследований. Т. 2, Ч. 2. СПб: Наука. С. 3-246 [Toward the reconstruction of the phonological type and the noun morphology of the Proto-Mande. *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana*. Vol. 2, Part 2. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 3–246].
- Vydrin, Valentin. 2009. On the problem of the Proto-Mande homeland. *Вопросы языкового родства – Journal of Language Relationship* 1: 107–142.