

## LOGOPHORS AND REFINED STRUCTURE OF THE LEFT PERIPHERY: THE CASE OF TOMO KAN DOGON

*Vadim Dyachkov*  
*Institute of Linguistics, RAS*

My talk contributes to the discussion of possible structures for the left periphery in languages of the world bringing to light the data from Tomo Kan which is an understudied Dogon language (< Niger-Congo)<sup>1</sup>. In Tomo Kan, like in many Dogon languages, there is a special marker (*ká*) introducing quoted clauses. An embedded quoted clause may contain a logophoric pronoun (*là*), and the quoted clause subject is marked by the element *wa*. A full structure of quoted clause is exemplified in (1). Another important property of quoted clauses is that subjects of quoted imperatives can bind reflexive pronouns, whereas imperatives are not able to do so in general, see (Heath, Dyachkov 2015). This is shown in (2) and (3), respectively.

- (1) èbé [lá ká [w-á: à:rè<sup>L</sup> fúrí <sup>L</sup>yà]]  
E. LOGO QUOT 3SG-QS A. at go.IMP  
'Ebe said: I told him to go to Are'.
- (2) àmàdú ká sè:dù<sup>L</sup> wá há<sub>i</sub> nàʔ<sup>n</sup>à jù:-má  
A. QUOT S. QS REFL cow eat-CAUS.IMP  
'Amadou told Seydou<sub>i</sub> to feed his<sub>i/\*j</sub> cow'.
- (3) à / \*há nùmè<sup>n</sup>-í:<sup>n</sup> cóló  
2SG.POSS REFL hand-child cut.IMP  
'Cut your finger!'

In my talk, I will give an overview of the sentential structure and propose a hierarchical structure of the left periphery in Tomo Kan. In particular, I propose that in order to account for the whole range of the data, one should decompose the left periphery into a projection representing the Speech Act and a projection introducing the clausal topic. I assume that certain elements of the left periphery can introduce their own arguments and assign them thematic roles. In particular, the Speech Act projection is able to introduce the role of the Speaker (filled by an overt or covert logophoric pronoun), whereas the lower projection introduces the Content of speech. Following the line of reasoning proposed in (Hantgan 2020), I assume that *wa* marking embedded subjects is introduced as a Topic of the Content of speech. As a result, the quoted subject marked by *wa* is not assigned any thematic role and its interpretation varies with respect to the TAM value of the quoted clause – it is a regular subject in clauses of most types but is interpreted either as an addressee or as an actor in quoted imperatives. I will also argue extensively that imperatives lack subjects and the appearance of the latter is conditioned entirely by the presence of the Content of speech projection. In addition, I will show that, given certain flexibility of word order in quoted clauses, one may raise the question of whether the left periphery is best represented as a structure with linear ordering or rather as a functional structure involving free-ordered blocks of meaning.

### References

Heath, J., Dyachkov, V. 2015. Subject versus addressee in Dogon imperatives and hortatives. *Studies in Language*, 39 (3), 555-593.

---

<sup>1</sup> The data used in the talk come from my own fieldwork in 2011 – 2022 and is based primarily on elicitation sessions and my text collection of Tomo Kan spoken in the village of Ségué (appr. 1,5h of spontaneous speech).

Hantgan, A. Dogon reported discourse markers: The Ben Tey quotative topicalizer. *Folia Linguistica* 54 (3), 2020, 581-613.