

WEST AFRICAN LOGOPHORICS AND THE TYPOLOGY OF REFERENCE-TRACKING

Bernard Comrie

Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology
Inselstrasse 22, D-04103 Leipzig, Germany
comrie@eva.mpg.de

Logophorics are rightly recognised as an areal characteristic of West African languages. While they are found in languages of this region belonging to different language families, they are absent from languages of other parts of the world. Logophorics can, however, be decomposed into a number of properties which, as individual properties, are found in other languages of the world; the article documents this in detail. What is unusual about logophorics is thus a particular constellation of more primitive features, rather than those primitive features in isolation.

Les pronoms logophoriques sont reconnus à juste titre comme une particularité aréale des langues d'Afrique de l'ouest. Alors qu'on les trouve dans des langues de cette région appartenant à diverses familles linguistiques, ils sont absents des langues des autres parties du monde. Les pronoms logophoriques peuvent être réduits à une série de propriétés qui, en tant que propriétés individuelles, se rencontrent dans les autres langues du monde; l'article documente ceci en détail. Ce que les pronoms logophoriques ont d'inhabituel est donc une combinaison spécifique de traits plus primitifs, plutôt que ces traits primitifs considérés isolément.

0. INTRODUCTION

A distinction between ordinary and logophoric pronouns, as in Igbo examples (1) and (2), is a major areal typological feature of much of West Africa (taken in a somewhat broad sense): languages in this area are likely to have a distinction of this kind, some languages within this area have particularly rich systems of logophoric reference, while languages outside this area at best have systems that bear some partial resemblance to logophorics—despite the attempt in recent generative work to extend the use of the term *logophoric* way beyond the original sense in which it was introduced in Hagège (1974).¹

- (1) **ọ̀ sìrì nà ọ̀ byàrà.**
 he say that he come
 He_i said that he_j came.
- (2) **ọ̀ sìrì nà yá byàrà.**
 he say that LOG come
 He_i said that he_j came.

The examples (1)–(2), which are typical for West African logophoric systems, have the following properties. First, the distinction between ordinary and logophoric pronouns is made primarily in reported speech, although in particular languages the distinction may be extended to semantically or formally related constructions; since my main concern below is in the expression of coreference relations rather than in the reported-speech nature of the construction, this feature will play little role in what follows. Second, the crucial distinction indicated by the ordinary/logophoric pronoun

¹ In addition to references mentioned specifically in the text, I have benefitted from the insights and empirical material contained in the following works: Huang (1994), Koster and Reuland (1991), Kuno (1987), Lust et al. (2000), Reinhart and Reuland (1993), Sells (1987), von Roncador (1992), and Wieseemann (1986). For the meanings of abbreviations used in the interlinear glosses, please see the list on p. 51.

opposition is that of non-coreference versus coreference: the ordinary pronoun indicates non-coreference (in (1), the 'he' of the dependent clause is non-coreferential with the 'he' of the main clause), while the logophoric pronoun indicates coreference (the two instances of 'he' are coreferential). Third, this distinction of reference is indicated on the pronoun of the dependent clause. As will be seen in §3, there are other properties that are to be assigned to the logophoric construction, but the properties listed so far will suffice for the initial part of the exposition.

As described above, logophoric pronouns are a reference-tracking mechanism, i.e. a means of indicating overtly at least some of the relations of coreference holding within a text. Thus, in (1) we know that the two occurrences of 'he' are non-coreferential, in (2) that they are coreferential. Although logophoric reference of this kind is an areal characteristic of West Africa, it is nonetheless reasonable to compare logophoric reference with other reference-tracking devices, in order to tease out just what is unusual about West African logophoric reference and what simply reflects general properties of reference-tracking devices as found in other parts of the world.

1. PRONOUN-MARKING, VERB-MARKING, AND MARKEDNESS

As noted in §1, two characteristics of the logophoric construction are that the distinction is indicated in the pronoun (of the dependent clause), and that the marked value indicates coreference. Comparison with two reference-tracking devices found in other parts of the world will serve to highlight these features.

In many European languages, more specifically those that came to be called 'pro-drop' in generative grammar of the 1980s, the semantic distinction made in (1)–(2) can be made, but by a rather different means, as shown in Polish examples (3)–(4).

- (3) **Hania mówi, że przyjdzie.**
 Hania says that will.come.3sg
 Hania_i says that she_i will come.
- (4) **Hania mówi, że ona przyjdzie.**
 Hania says that she will.come.3sg
 Hania_i says that she_j will come.

In Polish, it is normal for personal pronoun subjects to be omitted unless there is some reason, usually pragmatic, for including them (such as contrastive focus). In (3), the dependent clause has no overt pronominal subject, and the interpretation, *ceteris paribus*, is that the understood subject is coreferential with the subject of the main clause. In (4), the dependent clause has an overt pronoun subject, and the default interpretation is that the subjects of the two clauses are non-coreferential.² As in the Igbo logophoric examples (1)–(2), the difference in reference-tracking is indicated in the pronoun of the dependent clause, but the markedness relation is different: in Polish, it is non-coreference that is specifically marked, while coreference is indicated by use of the normal construction (given that Polish is a pro-drop language).

² The system is not fully grammaticalised in Polish, and more generally in so-called pro-drop languages, at least of Europe and the Mediterranean area. Thus, under appropriate circumstances, (4), with contrastive stress on **ona**, would be compatible with an interpretation of coreferential subjects, for instance if the speaker intended to counter the addressee's mistaken belief that Hania says someone else will come.

A well-known reference-tracking device is switch-reference, whereby the verb of the dependent clause is marked according to whether or not the subject of that dependent clause is coreferential or non-coreferential with the subject of the main clause, as in the examples (5)–(6) from Siroi, a Madang language of Papua New Guinea (Longacre 1972).

- (5) **mbanduwaŋ ngur-mba, buk-ng-ina**
 bow break-DEP throw-TH-3sg.PST
 He broke and threw away the bow.
- (6) **agaŋ ndende kusna-niŋ-mba min-na le, teg puro-na**
 thing various ask-3pl-DEP be-3sg.PST DS fowl arrive-3sg.PST
 She was asking them various things and the fowl arrived.

Switch-reference is widespread among the non-Austronesian languages of New Guinea. In many cases, the same-subject morpheme (indicating coreference) and the different-subject morpheme (indicating non-coreference) are simply distinct morphemes, with no obvious relation of markedness between them. In some languages, however, including Siroi, there is a markedness difference, always with the different-subject morpheme being marked relative to the same-subject morpheme. In Siroi, the different-subject morpheme is **le**, while there is no overt same-subject morpheme. Switch-reference is unusual in that a relation of (non-)coreference between two noun phrases is indicated not on those noun phrases, but rather on the verb of the subordinate clause. The relation of markedness between coreference and non-coreference in a switch-reference system, where there is a markedness distinction, parallels what we observed above for Polish: the marked value indicates non-coreference, the unmarked value coreference.

Given the relations between where (non-)coreference is indicated and which value is marked versus unmarked, one might predict the existence of a fourth value, namely coreference being the marked value and being indicated on the verb. And this system is indeed in found in the logophoric system of Gokana, an Ogoni language within the Benue-Congo branch spoken in Nigeria (Hyman and Comrie 1981). Logophoric reference is indicated by means of a suffix **-è** (with morphophonemic variants) on the verb, and as in logophoric systems generally it is coreference that is marked, as in examples (7)–(8).

- (7) **à nyíma kɔ a-è dɔ**
 he know that he-PST fall
 He_i knows that he_j fell.
- (8) **à nyíma kɔ a-è dɔ-è**
 he know that he-PST fall-LOG
 He_i knows that he_i fell.

Note that in terms of its semantic range, this Gokana construction is a typical logophoric construction, having its core in the expression of reported speech. It should be noted, however, that the Gokana type, with marking on the verb, seems to be exceedingly rare among West African languages.

A further question that might arise is whether more canonical logophoric systems, centring on the expression of reported speech, might show the markedness relation that

was observed in Polish examples (3)–(4), with the non-coreferential member of the opposition being marked. Again, this seems to be exceedingly rare in West Africa, but is found in the Western Nilotic language Mabaan spoken in Sudan (Andersen 1999). In (9), the ordinary pronoun indicates coreference. In (10), the marked pronoun, which we may call ‘anti-logophoric’ following Andersen’s terminology, indicates non-coreference.

- (9) **ʔékè gókè ʔagē ʔékè kânjé**
 he says COMP he will.swim
 He_i says that he_i will swim.
- (10) **ʔékè gókè ʔagē ʔêktā kânḍō**
 he says COMP ALOG will.swim
 He_i says that he_j will swim.

In these Mabaan examples, the basic indication of (non-)coreference is in the pronoun of the dependent clause; the difference in the verb is secondary, since verbs agree with their subjects, and the distinction between ordinary and anti-logophoric pronouns is one parameter of this agreement system.

The data presented in this section serve to show that while the particular combination of features, in particular indication on the pronoun of the dependent clause with the marked value indicating coreference, that is found in the canonical logophoric construction is typologically unusual, its individual components can be found elsewhere, and there are intermediate types such as Gokana (coreference marked, but indicated on the verb) and Mabaan ((non-)coreference indicated on the pronoun, but with non-coreference as the marked value).

2. PARALLELS WITH OTHER REFERENCE-TRACKING SYSTEMS

In this section, some other properties of logophoric systems will be discussed, showing that these properties have at least equally widespread parallels in other reference-tracking devices, i.e. they are not specific properties of logophoric systems. Attention will be paid both to properties that are frequent in logophoric and other reference-tracking constructions, and to properties that are rare in the two types of constructions.

2.1. GRAMMATICAL PERSON AND NUMBER

In most West African languages that have logophoric reference, the opposition between logophoric and non-logophoric is restricted to the third person, i.e. only in the third person is there a formal opposition between logophoric and non-logophoric pronouns. Gokana is exceptional here, in part no doubt due to the fact that in this language (non-)coreference is indicated on the verb, and is thus in principle available for all grammatical persons. However, it turns out that even here, there is differentiation among the three grammatical persons: use of the logophoric suffix is obligatory in the third person, is optional but preferred in the second person, and is optional but dispreferred in the first person (Hyman and Comrie 1981).

Many instances of other reference-tracking devices across the languages of the world show similar patterning, often being restricted to the third person, or to the third and second persons, whereas reference-tracking devices that target the first and second

persons but not the third, or the first but not the second, are vanishingly rare. Reference-tracking by means of obviation in the Algonquian languages of North America is restricted to the third person. Many languages have distinct reflexive pronouns restricted to the third person, e.g. German **sich**. In English and many other languages the gender distinction in pronouns is restricted to the third person; in Classical Arabic it is found in the third and second persons, but not in the first. Of course, this does not exclude the possibility that some instances of reference-tracking devices apply irrespective of grammatical person, such as reflexive pronouns in English ('myself', 'yourself', 'himself/herself') or Russian (**sebjä** for all three persons); see further Faltz (1985). The crucial fact is that where there is differentiation according to person, it is according to a hierarchy third person > second person > first person.³

Though less frequently, a difference in grammatical number is also sometimes found in logophoric systems. In Igbo, for instance, the difference illustrated in (1)–(2) is restricted to the singular; in the plural, the opposition is neutralised to a single form **ha** (the tone depending on the construction). A similar restriction to the singular is found with reflexive pronouns in standard Danish. The reflexive possessive pronoun **sin** can only be used with a singular referent, where it contrasts with non-reflexive **hans** 'his', **hendes** 'her', while in the plural **deres** is used irrespective of (non-)coreference.

2.2. OVERLAPPING REFERENCE

So far, we have treated coreference versus non-coreference as being a dichotomy, with no possible third value. However, there is another possibility, namely that the referent set of one noun phrase is included in the referent set of another, as for instance in the relation between 'I' and 'we', or between 'you' and 'we' where 'we' is interpreted inclusively. Different languages have different solutions to the treatment of such properly included reference, although I am not aware of any language that has a specific, distinct form for the treatment of proper inclusion; rather either the same form is used as for coreference or the same as for non-coreference. Sometimes the two are in free variation, at least in the sense that both are possible, although one suspects that there is nonetheless a subjective difference according to whether there is greater emphasis on the shared referent set or on the non-shared referent set. Moreover, and this will be the centre of the present sub-section, some languages have quite specific grammatical rules controlling the occurrence of coreference and non-coreference markers in cases of proper inclusion.

Koyra Chiini, a Songhai language spoken in Mali, has the asymmetry shown in (11)–(12) in the use of its logophoric pronoun (Heath 1999), and the same asymmetry is found in a number of other languages with logophoric pronouns, e.g. Gokana (Hyman and Comrie 1981).

- (11) **a har ngu-yo o koy koyra**
 he say LOG-pl IPV go town
 He_i said that they_{ij} would go to town.

³ One fact for which I do not have a satisfactory explanation is why there should be a difference among the various reference-tracking devices as to the likelihood of their having this person restriction. For instance, switch-reference systems from all parts of the world seem generally to lack such a restriction.

- (12) **i har a-a koy koyra**
 they say he-IPV go town
 They_{ij} said that he_i would go to town.

With the configuration having the properly included referent set in the main/first clause and the more inclusive referent set in the dependent/second clause, the logophoric pronoun is used. With the inverse configuration, the ordinary pronoun is used.

The question now arises whether parallels can be found in other reference tracking systems. And indeed they can. In switch-reference systems, one often finds an asymmetry, as in examples (13)–(14) from Haruai, a Piawi language of Papua New Guinea.⁴

- (13) **ydöm an pödök^wö=bö dw-ön nagö n pal-m-a**
 yesterday we Fitako=below go-SS you I hit-PST.2sg-DEC
 Yesterday we (incl. you) went to Fitako, and you hit me.
- (14) **ydöm nagö n pal-mön an pödök^wö=bö dw-öl-a**
 yesterday you I hit-DS we Fitako=below go-PRS.1pl-DEC
 Yesterday you hit me, and we (incl. you) went to Fitako.

This same asymmetry is found in a number of other switch-reference systems. In Papuan languages with switch-reference systems, it is almost invariably the case that the dependent clause precedes the main clause, the inverse clause order from what one finds in Koyra Chiini (and more generally in West African languages with logophorics). Comparison of the Koyra Chiini and Haruai data suggests that, if a single generalisation underlies the asymmetry in both types, it cannot be one of linear order, since the linear order of the properly included referent set relative to the more inclusive referent set is precisely the opposite in (13) as compared to (11), in (14) as compared to (12). If, however, one takes the decisive configurational property to be the relation between main and dependent clauses, then the same generalisation can be formulated for both clause orders, namely (Comrie 1983): if there is a directional difference depending on whether the referent of the relevant noun phrase in the main clause is properly contained within that of the dependent clause or vice versa, encoding as if the two noun phrases were coreferential is more likely in the former case. Further confirmation that this is the appropriate formulation of the generalisation comes from Australian languages with switch-reference (Austin 1981), and in which the dependent clause may either precede or follow the main clause; instances of proper inclusion are sensitive to the main / dependent clause distinction in the same way as in Koyra Chiini and Haruai, but not to the linear order of clauses.

2.3. TRIGGER AND TARGET

In the examples of logophoric reference presented so far, the trigger of logophoric reference, i.e. the antecedent, has always been both the subject of the main clause and the source of the speech (or thought, etc.) that is reported by means of the dependent clause. An obvious question to arise is what happens when these syntactic and semantic roles do not coincide, as in the translation of ‘X heard from Y that’, where X is the

⁴ For a fuller account of switch-reference in Haruai, see Comrie (1998b).

subject but not the source, and Y is the source but not the subject. Different logophoric languages part company here. Some are relatively lax, allowing either the subject or the source to be the trigger, thus giving rise to ambiguities as in Ewe sentence (15) (Clements 1975).

- (15) **ama se tso kofi gbɔ be yè-x nunana**
 Ama hear from Kofi side COMP LOG-receive gift
 Ama_i heard from Kofi_j that she_i/he_j had received a gift.

Many languages with logophoric reference would disallow coreference with ‘Ama’, i.e. with a syntactic subject that is not the semantic speaker. There is thus a certain amount of give-and-take possible in principle between syntactic and semantic roles in the characterisation of the trigger, with different languages differing according to how much give-and-take they allow. Interestingly, similar give-and-take is found in other reference-tracking systems, such as switch-reference. While Haruai has a strict rule that only grammatical subjects can trigger the same-subject suffix (Comrie 1998b), Telefol, an Ok language of Papua New Guinea, allows a noun phrase that is not a syntactic subject but that is interpreted as highest on the hierarchy of semantic roles, for instance the experiencer in the main clause of (16), to serve as the trigger for a same-subject suffix (Healey 1966).

- (16) **daám boóyó fákán-bi-nal-a-ta**
 fence that make-DELSEQ-SS-3sg.M.A-then
daál tebe-b’-ee-bu
 tiredness happen-PFV-3sg.U-PST-3sg.F.A

He was making that fence and then tiredness overcame him.

The verb of the main clause clearly has the feminine noun ‘tiredness’ as actor/subject and the understood masculine referent ‘he’ as undergoer/object, but nonetheless it is this undergoer/object, with the semantic role of experiencer, that serves as the trigger for same-subject morphology on the verb, this noun phrase being coreferential with the actor/subject/agent of the dependent verb.

A few languages have an even richer system of logophoric marking such that there are different logophoric pronouns depending on whether the trigger is the subject/source of speech in the main clause or the object/addressee, as for instance in the Chadic language Mupun (Frajzyngier 1985), illustrated in (17)–(19).

- (17) **wu sat nə dī nas an**
 he say COMP he-LOG beat me
 He_i said that he_i beat me.
- (18) **n-sat n-wur taji gwar dim n kaano**
 I-say to-he PRHB LOGADD go to Kano
 I told him_i that he_i may not go to Kano.
- (19) **n-sat n-wur taji wur dim n kaano**
 I-say to-he PRHB he go to Kano
 I told him_i that he_j may not go to Kano.

In (17), the subject of the dependent clause is coreferential with the subject of the main clause, so we find the (speaker) logophoric pronoun. In (18), the subject pronoun in the dependent clause is coreferential with the object/addressee of the main clause, and a special addressee logophoric, distinct both from the ordinary pronoun (as in (19)) and from the (speaker) logophoric (as in (17)), is used. Do we find parallels to this in other reference-tracking systems, i.e. distinct dependent forms corresponding to different antecedent roles? Again, the answer is affirmative. Warlpiri, a Pama-Nyungan language of Australia, has a switch-reference system. Dependent verbs within the switch-reference system show a three-way opposition. One form, as in (20), is used when the target is coreferential with the subject of the main clause.⁵ Another form is used when the target is coreferential with the object of the main clause, as in (21). A third form, as in (22), is used where there is no coreference. The crucial difference is thus between (20) and (21), paralleling that between (17) and (18) in Mupun.

- (20) **ngarrka ka wangka-mi karli jarnti-rninja-karra**
 man.ABS AUX speak-NPST boomerang.ABS trim-INF-S/A=S/A
 The man is speaking while trimming a boomerang.
- (21) **ngajulu-rlu rna yankirri pantu-rnu ngapa nga-rninja-kurra**
 I-ERG AUX emu.ABS spear-PST water.ABS drink-INF-S/A=P
 I speared the emu while it was drinking water.
- (22) **kurdu ka jarda-nguna-mi kirda-nyanu-ku karli**
 child.ABS AUX sleep-lie-NPST father-own-DAT boomerang.ABS
jarnti-rninja-rlarni
 trim-INF-DS
 The child is sleeping while the father trims a boomerang.

We may now turn to the question of the target of logophoric reference, i.e. what appears as the logophoric pronoun. In general this can be any argument noun phrase in the dependent clause, including arguments of adpositions, in some languages also possessors. Thus, in Gokana example (23) the logophoric suffix on the verb indicates that at least one of the noun phrases in the dependent clause is coreferential with the subject of the main clause, but leaves open (since logophoric reference is indicated on the verb, not on a pronoun) that it might be the subject (as in the (a) translation), the possessor (as in the (b) translation), or indeed both (as in the (c) translation).

- (23) **lébàrèè kò àè de-è a gíá**
 Lebare said he ate-LOG his yams
 (a) Lebare_i said that he_i ate his_j yams.
 (b) Lebare_i said that he_j ate his_i yams.
 (c) Lebare_i said that he_i ate his_i yams.

⁵ Perhaps more explicitly, when the S or A of the dependent clause is coreferential with the S or A of the main clause. Given that Warlpiri has ergative morphology, the question might arise as to which noun phrase in a transitive clause is subject. At least as far as switch-reference is concerned, it is the A of a transitive clause that behaves like the S of an intransitive clause.

This parallels the behaviour of reflexive pronouns in Russian, which must be coreferential with the subject as trigger, but may as target occupy a wide range of syntactic-semantic roles, such as direct object and possessor in (24).

- (24) **kolja ranil sebja svoim nožom**
 Kolya wounded REFL.ACC POSS.REFL.INS knife.INS
 Kolya_i wounded himself_i with his_i knife.

There is, however, one further quirk that is attested in at least one logophoric system, namely Yag Dii (Duru), an Adamawa language of Cameroon, which has distinct sets of logophoric pronouns according to whether the target is in the clause immediately dependent on the clause containing the verb of speech, or in a lower clause; in other words, there are distinct sets of logophoric pronouns according to the degree of embedding (Bohnhoff 1986:119-123). This is an elaboration for which I must admit I have not (yet?) found parallels in other reference-tracking systems.

3. LOGOPHORICS AND LONG-DISTANCE REFLEXIVES

By a long-distance reflexive is meant a form that can be used as a reflexive to indicate coreference within the clause, but can also be used to indicate coreference across a clause boundary, as in Japanese examples (25)–(28). Version (25), with the simple reflexive pronoun **zibun**, is not acceptable to all speakers of Japanese, while for this example of subject–object coreference all speakers accept the compound reflexive **zibun zisin** as in (26). However, for somewhat less local coreference relations within the clause, as between subject and possessor, the ordinary reflexive is possible (as in (27)).⁶

- (25) **taroo wa zibun o but-ta**
 Taro TOP REFL ACC hit-PST
 Taro_i hit himself_i.
- (26) **taroo wa zibun zisin o butta**
- (27) **mitiko wa zibun no heya de benkyoo si-te i-ru**
 Michiko TOP REFL GEN room in study do-CVB be-PRS
 Michiko_i is studying in her_i room.

The same simple reflexive **zibun** can also be used to indicate coreference across a clause-boundary, as in (28), and it is this possibility of being used across a clause boundary that identifies a reflexive as a long-distance reflexive.

- (28) **hirosi wa [mitiko ga zibun no heya de benkyoo site iru tte] it-ta**
 Hiroshi TOP Michiko NOM that say-PST
 Hiroshi_i said [that Michiko_j was studying in his_i/her_j room].

Note that a long-distance reflexive differs from a clause-bounded reflexive like the English reflexive in that it can also be used across clause boundaries, but also differs from a logophoric pronoun in that the latter can only be used across a clause boundary.

⁶ For further development of the notion *locality of domain* in reference tracking, including its relevance to the difference between simple and compound reflexives in languages like Japanese, see Comrie (1998a).

Precisely how rigid the distinction is between logophoric pronouns and long-distance reflexives is, of course, an empirical issue, one that has been addressed in considerable detail by Culy (1994, 1997). Culy concludes that the distinction, as per the definitions just given, correlates with another distinction, namely that the opposition between a logophoric and an ordinary pronoun is usually obligatory—in a pair like (1)–(2) in Igbo it is not possible to use the logophoric if the interpretation is to be of non-coreference, nor the ordinary pronoun if the interpretation is to be of coreference—while the opposition between a long-distance reflexive and an ordinary pronoun is usually ‘optional’ in the sense that both may be used, as in Icelandic example (29), where either ordinary pronoun **hann** or long-distance reflexive **sig** may be used if there is coreference with the subject pronoun.⁷

- (29) **Jón krafðist þess að við hugsuðum (SBJ) stöðugt um hann/sig.**

John demanded that we thought constantly about him.

The two versions of (29) are not absolutely synonymous, since use of the long-distance reflexive implies that the content of the dependent clause is being presented from the viewpoint of the referent of the subject of the main clause. If the subject of the main clause is an inanimate noun phrase and thus incapable of having a viewpoint, the use of the reflexive is impossible, as in (30) (Sigurðsson 1990).

- (30) **Þetta vandamál krafðist þess að við hugsuðum (SBJ) stöðugt um það/*sig.**

This problem required that we thought constantly about it.

And in general it does seem that this distinction between obligatory logophoric pronouns and optional long-distance reflexives is robust. Nonetheless, there are some cases that suggest that the boundary is not quite watertight. In Koyra Chiini, for instance, the forms that are used as logophoric pronouns are identical to those used as short-distance reflexives, as can be seen in (31)–(33) (Heath 1999).

- (31) **a har ngu o koy koyra**

he say LOG IPV go town

He_i said that he_i would go to town.

- (32) **a har a-a koy koyra**

he say he-IPV go town

He_i said that he_j would go to town.

- (33) **a bere ngu nda čirow**

he turned REFL into bird

He_i turned himself_i into a bird.

This would suggest that the pronoun glossed as logophoric in (31) is in fact a long-distance reflexive. However, the use of the logophoric pronoun in (31) is obligatory if coreference is intended, in contrast to Icelandic examples like (29)–(30). For an

⁷ As short-distance reflexives, i.e. within the clause, however, the opposition between **hann** indicating non-coreference and **sig** indicating coreference would be obligatory. The ‘optionality’ only arises in the long-distance environment. Note that especially in the generative literature, long-distance reflexives are often referred to as logophorics, thus blurring the important distinction that Culy seeks to draw. Note finally that in Icelandic long-distance reflexives occur only in infinitive and subjunctive clauses, although this is not directly relevant to the questions at issue in this article.

exception in the opposite direction, consider sentences (34)–(35) from Tuburi, an Adamawa language of Chad (Hagège 1974).

- (34) **á dīk lí máy mà:gā sē kó nsú m̀nò**
 he think of girl REL LOG see yesterday REL
 He_i is thinking of the girl he_i saw yesterday.

- (35) **á dīk lí máy mà:gā à kó nsú m̀nò**
 he think of girl REL he see yesterday REL
 He_i is thinking of the girl he_{i/j} saw yesterday.

In (34), the logophoric pronoun explicitly indicates coreference. In (35), however, the ordinary pronoun is simply vague between an interpretation of non-coreference and one of coreference, i.e. when coreference is intended use of the logophoric is optional. Thus, the correlation between, on the one hand, identity versus non-identity of short-distance and long-distance forms and, on the other hand, optionality versus obligatoriness of indicating coreference in the long-distance domain, is not quite absolute when viewed cross-linguistically. Again, there are phenomena that seem to fall between canonical logophoric reference and other phenomena.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Logophoric reference is rightly recognised as a distinctive feature in the areal typology of West African languages. As I have tried to show, the particular combination of features that characterises logophoric reference is highly distinctive. However, some of the properties of logophoric reference, such as person/number restrictions, treatment of overlapping reference, and the syntax/semantics of trigger and target, are properties found more generally in reference-tracking devices. Moreover, even where logophoric reference shows a distinctive combination of features, the individual features that make up this combination can be found elsewhere, such as indication of coreference on the pronoun of the dependent clause (also in pro-drop languages) and use of a marked form for coreference (cf. reflexive pronouns). What is unique about logophoric reference as a reference-tracking device is the particular combination of features that typically characterises it.

GRAMMATICAL ABBREVIATIONS

A..... actor/agent	ERG.....ergative
ABS..... absolutive	Ffeminine
ACC accusative	FUTfuture
ACT active	GEN.....genitive
ALOG antilogophoric	INFinfinitive
AUX..... auxiliary	INSinstrumental
COMP..... complementiser	IPVimperfective
CVBconverb	LOG.....logophoric
DATdative	LOGADD.....addressee logophoric
DECdeclarative	Mmasculine
DELSEQ..... delayed sequence	NOM.....nominative
DEP..... dependent	NPSTnon-past
DS..... different subject	Ppatient

PFV.....	perfective	s.....	single argument of
pl.....	plural		intransitive predicate
POSS.....	possessive	SBJ.....	subjunctive
PRHB.....	prohibitive	sg.....	singular
PRS.....	present	SS.....	same subject
PST.....	past	TH.....	theme
REFL.....	reflexive	TOP.....	topic
REL.....	relative	U.....	undergoer

REFERENCES

- Andersen, Torben. 1999. Anti-logophoricity and indirect mode in Mabaan. *Studies in Language* 23:499–530.
- Austin, Peter. 1981. Switch-reference in Australia. *Language* 57:309–334.
- Bohnhoff, Lee E. 1986. Yag Dii (Duru) pronouns. In Wieseemann, 103–129.
- Clements, George N. 1975. The logophoric pronoun in Ewe: Its role in discourse. *Journal of West African Languages* 2:141–177.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1983. Switch-reference in Huichol: A typological study. In John Haiman and Pamela Munro (eds.), *Switch reference and universal grammar*, 17–37. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- . 1998a. Reference-tracking: Description and explanation. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung (STUF)* 51:335–346.
- . 1998b. Switch reference in Haruai: Grammar and discourse. In Marc Janse (ed.), *Productivity and creativity: Studies in general and descriptive linguistics in honor of E. M. Uhlenbeck*, 421–432. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Culy, Christopher. 1994. Aspects of logophoric marking. *Linguistics* 32:1055–1094.
- . 1997. Logophoric pronouns and point of view. *Linguistics* 35:845–859.
- Faltz, Leonard. 1985. Reflexivization: A study in universal grammar. New York: Garland.
- Frajzyngier, Zygmunt. 1985. Logophoric systems in Chadic. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 7:23–37.
- Hagège, Claude. 1974. Les pronoms logophoriques. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 69:287–310.
- Healey, P. M. 1966. Levels and chaining in Telefol sentences. Canberra: Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.
- Heath, Jeffrey. 1999. A grammar of Koyra Chiini: The Songhai of Timbuktu. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Huang, Yan. 1994. The syntax and pragmatics of anaphora: A study with special reference to Chinese. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyman, Larry and Bernard Comrie. 1981. Logophoric reference in Gokana. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 3:19–37.
- Koster, Jan and Eric Reuland, eds. 1991. Long-distance anaphora. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1987. Functional syntax: Anaphora, discourse and empathy. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Longacre, Robert E. 1972. Hierarchy and universality of discourse constituents in New Guinea languages, 2 vols. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Lust, Barbara, Kashi Wali, James W. Gair and K. V. Subbarao, eds. 2000. *Lexical anaphors and pronouns in selected South Asian languages*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Reinhart, Tanya and Eric Reuland. 1993. Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24:657–720.
- Sells, Peter. 1987. Aspects of logophoricity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18:445–479.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór. 1990. Long-distance reflexives and moods in Icelandic. In Joan Maling and Annie Zaenen (eds.), *Modern Icelandic Syntax*, 309–346. New York: Academic Press.
- von Roncador, Manfred. 1992. Types of logophoric marking in African languages. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 13:163–182.
- Wieseemann, Ursula (ed.). 1986. *Pronouns*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.