A Broader Perspective on Point of View: Logophoricity in Ogonoid Languages

Oliver Bond
University of Manchester

1. Introduction

A number of different grammatical strategies are employed throughout the languages of the world to disambiguate interclausal co-reference. Such strategies include clause chaining structures, switch-reference systems, 'indirect' reflexive pronouns and logophoric reference. Languages exhibiting LOGOPHORIC PRONOUNS are almost exclusively found in African language families including subgroups of Niger-Congo and Nilo-Saharan as well as in neighbouring Afro-Asiatic languages. According to Culy (1997:847), the following much cited examples from Ewe (Kwa, Niger-Congo) represent the canonical use of logophoric reference, in which 'the logophoric pronoun occurs in the complement of a speech predicate'.

(1) Disambiguation of co-reference in Ewe (Clements 1975:142)

(a) kofi be yè-dzo
Kofi say LOG-leave
'Kofi$_i$ said that he$_i$ left.'

(b) kofi be è-dzo
Kofi say 3SG-leave
'Kofi$_i$ said that he/she$_k$ left.'

In (1a), the logophoric pronoun (LOG) indicates co-referentiality between the subject of the matrix clause and the subject of the embedded clause whereas the use of the regular personal pronoun in (1b) indicates that each clause has a different subject referent.[1]

It has been commonly held in the literature that the function of logophoric pronouns is not to disambiguate co-reference of clausal arguments, but to indicate the expression of a POINT OF VIEW distinct from that articulated using the personal pronoun. In such constructions, the logophoric pronoun refers to the speaker or SOURCE (in the matrix clause) whose speech, thoughts, knowledge or emotion is being reported. This argument can be illustrated by two further Ewe sentences.

(2) Expression of point of view in Ewe (Clements 1975: 160-161)

(a) ɖ̩evi-a xɔ tohehe be yè-a-ga-da alakpa ake o
child-D receive punishment so that LOG-T-P-tell lie again NEG
'The child$_i$ received punishment so that he$_i$ wouldn't tell lies again.'

(b) ɖ̩evi-a xɔ tohehe be wò-a-ga-da alakpa ake o
child-D receive punishment so that PRO-T-P-tell lie again NEG
'The child$_i$ received punishment so that he$_{i/k}$ wouldn't tell lies again.'

Both (2a) and (2b) may be understood to mean that the subjects of each clause are co-referential. In (2a) the child is understood to have voluntarily received the punishment, while in (2b), the most likely interpretation is that the child was punished against his will. Crucially, in (2a) *the child* believes the

[1] In line with conventions used elsewhere, the clause containing the verb of reporting will be referred to as the MATRIX clause, whereas the report itself will be referred to as the EMBEDDED clause.

punishment will inhibit him from telling lies, and in (2b) the same belief is (most likely) held by *someone else*. This use of logophoric pronouns is often presented as evidence that expression of point of view is the underlying semantic function of logophoric reference systems (and not co-reference). However, while it is clear that the two constructions above may express a difference in point of view, the only reading available to speakers for (2a) is that the logophoric pronoun indicates the clausal subjects are co-referential. While the personal pronoun may also indicate co-referentiality, this is potentially due to the pragmatic unlikelihood of the non-co-referential meaning (i.e. that the child received the punishment so that *someone else* would not tell lies again). Culy (1994: 1076) comments that indication of point of view is limited to marginal constructions (such as purposive clauses in Ewe) and is not found in predicate complements. In fact, according to Culy (1997), the primary function of morphologically distinct logophoric pronouns is to mark indirect discourse as REPORTED.

Following, Culy (1994, 1997) and others, the term (LOGOPHORIC) TRIGGER is employed here to refer to the referent in the matrix clause whose speech, thought, knowledge or emotion is being reported. He asserts that the stretch of discourse in which the speech, thoughts etc. is reported may be defined as a LOGOPHORIC DOMAIN. Culy (1994:1057) comments that a logophoric domain always starts in a clause subordinate to the one in which the trigger is identified. This is referred to as the SENTENTIAL LOGOPHORIC DOMAIN. It contrasts what is identified as the DISCOURSE LOGOPHORIC DOMAIN, which may extend across several utterances. Any element within the logophoric domain that is co-referent with the trigger in the matrix clause will be referred to as the TARGET of LOG marking. For example, in (1a), *Kofi* is the trigger and the target is the LOG marker *yè-*. Culy also makes a distinction between PURE and MIXED logophoric languages. Pure logophoric languages exhibit a morphological and/or syntactic form that is used only in logophoric domains whereas mixed logophoric languages exhibit an extended use of reflexives within a logophoric domain. This paper concerns only pure logophoric languages (see Culy (1994) for more on this distinction).

In the rest of this paper, the properties of LOG marking in the Ogonoid (Niger-Congo) languages are introduced before discussing new data from Eleme[2]. Evidence is presented that point of view does not play a role in the use of logophoric marking in Eleme. Rather, it is argued that the logophoric trigger is determined by the interaction of person, number and grammatical relation hierarchies allowing for the development of a unique and comparably pervasive system of co-reference.

2. Logophoric reference in the Ogonoid languages

The Ogonoid (also known as Ogoni or Kegboid) languages are spoken in Rivers State, South-eastern Nigeria and are classified as part of the Cross-River branch of Niger-Congo. Of the five languages belonging to the Ogonoid family, only Gokana and Kana have been previously analysed as exhibiting logophoric reference. This is the first description of logophors in Eleme and the two remaining Ogonoid languages, Tai and Baan, are undocumented in this respect. The system of logophoric marking in the Ogonoid languages differs significantly from most other logophoric reference systems in that each of the three languages discussed in this paper, namely Eleme, Gokana (Hyman and Comrie 1981) and Kana (Ikoro 1996), employs distinct verbal inflection in logophoric domains, *in addition* to the regular agreement marking. This contrasts other known logophoric reference systems that typically exhibit two sets of mutually exclusive pronouns, one logophoric and one non-logophoric. The following examples in (3) – (5) correspond to the Ewe examples given in (1) above. Note that while Eleme and Gokana bear a great deal of similarity to each other in this construction type, the Kana construction differs in that if the matrix verb is *kɔ̄* 'say', it may be omitted in logophoric contexts in the presence of the obligatorily connective (i.e. complementizer) *kɔ̄ɔ̀* (Ikoro 1996: 283). In examples (3a) and (4a) the trigger of LOG marking is the subject of the matrix verb *kɔ* 'say'. In (5a) it is the optional subject prefixed to the connective *kɔ̄ɔ̀*. The target in each sentence is the

[2] Fieldwork in Eleme was funded by a grant from the Arts and Humanities Research Council. All Eleme data is from the author's fieldnotes.

subject of the embedded clause. As noted above, unlike the Ewe example in (1), logophoricity is not marked on the target form, but rather as a suffix on the verb of the embedded clause.

(3) Eleme logophoric suffix

(a) è-kɔ è-dɔ̀-è
3-say 3-fall-LOG
'He$_i$ said that he$_i$ fell.'

(b) è-kɔ è-dɔ̀
3-say 3-fall
'He$_i$ said that he$_k$ fell.'

(4) Gokana logophoric suffix (Hyman and Comrie 1981:20)

(a) aè kɔ aè dɔ-è
he said he fell-LOG
'He$_i$ said that he$_i$ fell.'

(b) aè kɔ aè dɔ
he said he fell
'He$_i$ said that he$_k$ fell.'

(5) Kana logophoric suffix (Ikoro 1996:283)

(a) à-kɔ̄ɔ̀ é-kīī-è
he-CONN he.DF-go-LOG
'He$_i$ said that he$_i$ would leave.'

(b) à-kɔ̄ɔ̀ é-kīī
he-CONN he.DF-go
'He$_i$ said that he$_k$ would leave.'

2.1. Logophoric reference in Gokana

Hyman and Comrie's (1981) description of logophoric reference in Gokana is a thorough and extensive survey into the environments in which logophoric marking occurs in the language. It is the earliest description of a verbal suffix marking logophoric reference, and contrasts most other described systems (which usually employ mutually exclusive pronouns).

In Gokana, the LOG suffix *-EE*, which may be represented by one of nine allomorphs depending on the phonological context, can be used in a reported context to indicate that a trigger NP in a matrix clause (of any person except second person plural) is included within a target NP in an embedded clause. Logophoric marking is obligatory with third person triggers, and optional with second person (singular)[3] and first person triggers (although LOG marking is preferred with the former and dispreferred with the latter):

> 'The trigger is normally subject of the matrix clause, but where semantically the source of the information contained in the embedded clause, it may also be the object of the matrix clause. The target, on the other hand, may be any NP in the embedded clause (e.g. subject, object, possessor).' (Hyman and Comrie 1981:33)

Crucially therefore, logophoric marking in Gokana depends on both syntactic and semantic parameters. For example, utterances such as in (6a), where the object of the matrix clause is the source, are morphologically marked for co-reference with the LOG suffix to contrast with (6b). Where a matrix object is not the semantic source, such a contrast is impermissible (7):

[3] In Gokana, the logophoric suffix *–EE* and the second person plural subject suffix *–II* are mutually exclusive and therefore logophoric marking does not occur with second person plural referents (Hyman and Comrie 1981:23).

(6) Source object as logophoric trigger in Gokana (Hyman and Comrie 1981:21-22)

(a) mm̀ dā́ lébàrè gā́ kɔ aè dɔ-ɛ̀
I heard Lebare mouth that he fell-LOG
'I heard from Lebare$_i$ that he$_i$ fell.'

(b) mm̀ dā́ lébàrè gā́ kɔ aè dɔ̀
I heard Lebare mouth that he fell
'I heard from Lebare$_i$ that he$_k$ fell.'

(7) Non-source object in Gokana (Hyman and Comrie 1981:22)

(a) *mm̀ kɔ́ nɛ̀ lébàrè kɔ aè dɔ-ɛ̀

(b) mm̀ kɔ́ nɛ̀ lébàrè kɔ aè dɔ̀
I said give Lebare that he fell
'I said to Lebare$_i$ that he$_{i/k}$ fell.'

According to Hyman and Comrie (1981:33), three hierarchies can be used to summarize the *likelihood* for LOG marking. Each hierarchy interacts with the others to account for the patterning of logophoric reference in Gokana. For example, the most likely context for logophoric marking is to mark co-reference between the third person singular subjects of the matrix and embedded clauses. It is important to stress that these hierarchies work in tandem with the semantic notion of source and cannot account for LOG marking in Gokana in isolation.

(8) Three hierarchies licensing logophoric reference (Hyman and Comrie 1981:33)

(a) a *grammatical* hierarchy: subject > non-subject
(b) a *person* hierarchy: 3rd > 2nd > 1st
(c) a *number* hierarchy: sg > pl

They also assert that a hierarchy of reportive contexts should be established to represent the observation that reported speech may more commonly induce logophoric environments than other reported contexts such as reported feelings or knowledge. Such a hierarchy has since been formally proposed by Culy (1994:1062), using data from 32 pure logophoric languages. In the implicational scale that follows, if a language exhibits logophoric marking with (some) verbs in one class then it will also exhibit the same phenomenon with (some) verbs of every class higher on the hierarchy.

(9) A hierarchy of logophoric licensers (Culy 1994:1062)

speech > thought > knowledge > direct perception

Gokana is placed on this hierarchy (by Culy) as exhibiting logophoric marking with verbs denoting speech, thought and knowledge. Although Hyman and Comrie (1981:20) state that other verbs of perception may precede the logophoric domain such as 'see', 'show' and 'want', they give no examples of this type and all other LOG domains following non-reportative verbs occur in *non-argument* purposive clauses. Culy's hierarchy would predict that direct perception verbs would only trigger LOG marking in non-argument clauses (in a similar way to *dù* 'come' in (10) below).

(10) Non-reportative verbs with LOG in Gokana (Hyman and Comrie 1981:30)

lébàreè dù kɔ baá mɔn-ɛ̀ɛ̀ ɛ
Lebare came that they see-LOG him
'Lebare$_i$ came for them to see him$_i$.'

2.2. Logophoric reference in Kana

Ikoro (1996:286) states that 'there is no formal difference in logophoric marking between Kana and Gokana'. However, with comparison of the data, this does not seem to be strictly true. According to Ikoro (1996), Kana has a LOG clitic *–E* (discussed further in §4), with three possible phonetic realisations (*-è, -è,* or *-ɛ̀*, cf. nine realisations for Gokana). It is compatible with all persons, although (like in Gokana), it is only obligatory with third person co-referents. The complementizer *kɔ̄ɔ̀* is more grammaticalized in Kana than in the other Ogonoid languages. Not only does it have a form phonological distinct from that of the verb *kɔ̄* 'say', it also has a different syntactic distribution[4]. The complementizer *kɔ̄ɔ̀* is an obligatory introducer of logophoric domains. Note that if the verb of the matrix clause is *kɔ̄* 'say' it may optionally be omitted, while the complementizer must be present (11b).

(11) Omission of verb *kɔ̄* 'say' with complementizer *kɔ̄ɔ̀* in Kana (Ikoro 1996:283)

(a) à-kɔ́ kɔ̄ɔ̀ é-kīī-è
he-say:FACT CONN he.DF-go-LOG
'He$_i$ said that he$_i$ would leave.'

(b) à-kɔ̄ɔ̀ é-kīī-è
he-CONN he.DF-go-LOG
'He$_i$ said that he$_i$ would leave.'

The trigger of LOG marking may either be the subject of the matrix clause, or where the source of the information, the object of the matrix clause. Although Ikoro (1996) does not explicitly list which verbs in Kana may take a clausal argument with LOG marking, given examples include 'say' 'laugh' and 'cry'. Following non-reportative verbs, non-argument clauses may exhibit LOG marking with a purposive meaning as in Gokana.

(12) Non-reportative verbs with LOG in Kana (Ikoro 1996:286)

bà-lú kɔ̄ɔ̀ bà-é-tō-è
they-come:FACT CONN they-DF-cry-LOG
'They came to cry.'

3. Logophoric reference in Eleme

In a similar way to Gokana and Kana, Eleme utilizes the logophoric verbal suffix *-E* to express co-reference between clauses in certain reported environments (with the same phonetic realisations as in Kana). However, logophoric marking in Eleme is restricted to third person arguments, and the *–E* suffix is used only for third person singular arguments. In contexts where co-reference is between third person plural arguments, the verbal suffix *-ba* is employed.

3.1 Matrix Subject Triggers

The canonical context for use of logophoric marking in Eleme (where the logophoric pronoun occurs in the complement of a speech predicate) is given in (3) above. Logophoric reference also extends to a number of other environments. These include other speech(like) contexts (tell, ask, write), and predicates expressing reported knowledge (know), thoughts (think, understand, forget, remember), and emotions (such as fear, anger and happiness). Note that each matrix verb is followed by a ('speech verb') complementizer that has developed historically from the verb *kɔ* 'say' (see (28) for an exception). In discussion of the complementizer *kɔ* in Gokana, Hyman and Comrie (1981:31) assert

[4] Ikoro (1996:280-281) suggests that historically, the complementizer is derived from a fusion of the verb *kɔ̄* and the following connective (i.e. complementizer) *mɛ̀*. The reasoning behind this analysis is unclear.

that 'in becoming a grammatical morpheme, its complement clause is grammaticalized as an appropriate environment for logophoric marking'. The same can be said of both Eleme and Kana.

(13) Reported knowledge with LOG in Eleme

(a) a-ɲá kɔ̀ a-dɔ̀-è
3.AP-know COMP 3.AP-fall-LOG
'He$_i$ knew that he$_i$ fell.'

(b) a-ɲá kɔ̀ a-dɔ̀
3.AP-know COMP 3.AP-fall
'He$_i$ knew that he$_k$ fell.'

(14) Reported thought with LOG in Eleme

(a) a-gbi kɔ̀ a-dɔ̀-è
3.AP-think COMP 3.AP-fall-LOG
'He$_i$ thought that he$_i$ fell.'

(b) a-gbi kɔ̀ a-dɔ̀
3.AP-think COMP 3.AP-fall
'He$_i$ thought that he$_k$ fell.'

(15) Reported emotion (anger) with LOG in Eleme

(a) è-wãã kɔ̀ è-dɔ̀-è
3-be.angry COMP 3-fall-LOG
'He$_i$ was angry that he$_i$ fell.'

(b) è-wãã kɔ̀ è-dɔ̀
3-be.angry COMP 3-fall
'He$_i$ was angry that he$_k$ fell.'

The examples in (13) – (15), fit comfortably within the hierarchy of logophoric licensers given in (9) above. Note that while Culy (1994) asserts that none of the logophoric languages in his sample licensed logophoric marking with verbs of direct perception, Eleme does allow such constructions with, for example, the matrix verb *mɔ̀* 'see' in the presence of the complementizer *kɔ* (16). Eleme therefore allows LOG marking in both reported and (directly) perceived contexts.

(16) Direct perception verb (see) with LOG in Eleme

(a) àɲ-a-mɔ̀ kɔ̀ a-dɔ̀-è
3SG-3.AP-see COMP 3.AP-fall-LOG
'He$_i$ saw that he$_i$ fell.'

(b) àɲ-a-mɔ̀ kɔ̀ a-dɔ̀
3SG-3.AP-see COMP 3.AP-fall
'He$_i$ saw that he$_k$ fell.'

In addition to the third person singular marker, Eleme employs a plural logophoric marker *-ba* in contexts where the subject of the matrix clause is co-referential with a third person plural target. This contrasts Gokana and Kana, which employ the same suffix (with various surface forms) in all LOG domains. This is illustrated in (17) below.

(17) Eleme 3PL logophoric suffix

(a) è-kɔ-ri m-è-dɔ̀-ba
3-say-3PL COMP-3-fall-LOG
'They$_i$ said that they$_i$ fell.'

(b) è-kɔ-ri m-è-dɔ̀-ri
3-say-3PL COMP-3-fall-3PL
'They$_i$ said that they$_k$ fell.'

Note that the logophoric suffix *-ba* is mutually exclusive with a third person plural subject suffix *-ri*. This distinction makes logophoricity in Eleme appear more like a proto-typical logophoric system, whereby one pronominal form is used in co-referential contexts, and another distinct pronominal form is employed where the arguments are disjoint.

The plural suffix may also be used to express the proper inclusion of a third person *singular* trigger in a third person *plural* target (18a). The reverse, however, does not hold; example (19a) illustrates that when a 3SG target is properly included in a 3PL trigger, the construction is ungrammatical.

(18) Proper inclusion of a trigger in the target with LOG in Eleme

(a) àŋɛ̀ lamá-mi kɔ̀ ɛ̀-ba-dɔ̀-ba
3SG tell-1SG COMP 3-3PL.AP-fall-LOG
'He$_i$ told me that they$_{i+k}$ fell.'

(b) àŋɛ̀ lamá-mi kɔ̀ ɛ̀-ba-dɔ̀
3SG tell-1SG COMP 3-3PL.AP-fall
'He$_i$ told me that they$_k$ fell.'

(19) Ungrammaticality of LOG with 3PL trigger and 3SG target in Eleme

(a) *àbà lamá-mi kɔ̀ àŋɛ̀ a-dɔ̀-ɛ̀

(b) àbà lamá-mi kɔ̀ àŋɛ̀ a-dɔ̀
3PL tell-1SG COMP 3SG 3.AP-fall
'They$_{i+k}$ told me that he$_l$ fell.'

In all of the Ogonoid languages, the most common trigger of a logophoric domain is the subject of the matrix verb representing the source of the embedded report. However, the following examples from Eleme illustrate that a trigger is not required to be the source of information if it is the subject of the matrix clause. This indicates the importance of the grammatical role hierarchy (8), proposed by Hyman and Comrie (1981:33), in Eleme.

(20) Non-source subject in Eleme (Subject = Agent)

(a) òsáro biná s-ábɛ kɔ̀ m-ɛ̀-dɔ̀-ɛ̀
Osaro ask if-PRTCL COMP COMP-3-fall-LOG
'Osaro$_i$ asked if he$_i$ fell.'

(b) òsáro biná s-ábɛ kɔ̀ m-ɛ̀-dɔ̀
Osaro ask if-PRTCL COMP COMP-3-fall
'Osaro$_i$ asked if he$_k$ fell.'

(21) Non-source subject in Eleme (Subject ≠ Agent)

(a) òsáro dā̋ lɔ̀-m-ɔ̀b-àmi kɔ̀ a-dɔ̀-ɛ̀
Osaro hear remove-INSTR-hand-1SG COMP 3.AP-fall-LOG
'Osaro$_i$ heard from me that he$_i$ fell.'

(b) òsáro dā̋ lɔ̀-m-ɔ̀b-àmi kɔ̀ a-dɔ̀
Osaro hear remove-INSTR-hand-1SG COMP 3.AP-fall
'Osaro$_i$ heard from me that he$_k$ fell.'

3.2. Matrix Object Triggers

Further evidence to suggest that the LOG trigger is grammatically determined in Eleme comes from the fact co-reference is possible between the object of the matrix clause and the subject of the embedded clause *regardless* of whether it is the semantic source in the embedded clause or not.

(22) Source object as logophoric trigger in Eleme

(a) a-wãã òsáro kɔ̀ a-dɔ̀-ɛ̀
3.AP-anger Osaro COMP 3.AP-fall-LOG
'It angered Osaro$_i$ that he$_i$ fell.'

(b) a-w-òsáro kɔ̀ a-dɔ̀
3.AP-anger-Osaro COMP 3.AP-fall
'It angered Osaro$_i$ that he$_k$ fell.'

(23) Non-source object as logophoric trigger in Eleme

(a) àmi lam-égóspel kɔ̀ m-è-dɔ̀-è
1SG tell-Gospel COMP COMP-3-fall-LOG
'I told Gospel$_i$ that he$_i$ fell.'

(b) àmi lam-égóspel kɔ̀ m-è-dɔ̀
1SG tell-Gospel COMP COMP-3-fall
'I told Gospel$_i$ that he$_k$ fell.'

The data in (23) clearly indicates that in Eleme, the trigger of a logophoric marker does not necessarily refer to the person whose speech or point of view is reported in indirect discourse. Therefore, the *point of view* orientated definition of 'trigger' discussed in §1 does not adequately account for the grammaticality and meaning of all logophoric constructions in Eleme. Instead, the trigger is a co-referent determined by the person, number and grammatical role of the arguments of the matrix verb. The grammatical hierarchies proposed by Hyman and Comrie (1981) also hold for Eleme, although more rigidly than in Gokana. For example, if the matrix clause has a non-third person subject and a third person object then the object may trigger logophoric marking, since only third person arguments permit logophoric reference in Eleme, Where both the subject and the object of the matrix clause are third person arguments, it is the subject that triggers the logophoric domain. The only exception to this rule is where the matrix verb has a dummy subject, as in (22). It is therefore not necessary to appeal to the domain of semantics for an explanation of argument co-reference in Eleme, although indirect discourse marking is clearly the historical source of this grammatical pattern.

3.3 Logophoric Targets

The logophoric target NP in Eleme is typically the subject of the embedded clause. Speakers express a strong preference for the independent subject form to be used in conjunction with, or instead of the subject prefix in logophoric contexts. The constructions in (24) bear a striking similarity to canonical logophoric reference marking.

(24) Subject of embedded clause as target in Eleme

(a) òsáro kɔ àŋɲè a-dʒi-è èsaa-yo
Osaro say 3SG 3.AP-steal-LOG yams-2SG.POSS
'Osaro$_i$ said he$_i$ stole your yams.'

(b) òsáro kɔ a-dʒi èsaa-yo
Osaro say 3.AP-steal yams-2SG.POSS
'Osaro$_i$ said he$_k$ stole your yams.'

However, not all co-referential clause subjects trigger LOG marking. For example, if the subject of the embedded clause is a possessed NP, where the possessor is co-referential with the subject of the matrix clause, a LOG domain is not permitted.

(25) Absence of LOG marking with embedded possessor NP subject target in Eleme

òsáro lamá-mi kɔ̀ ekó-ye a-mɔ̀-rũ
Osaro tell-1SG COMP friend-3SG.POSS 3.AP-see-2SG
'Osaro$_i$ told me that his$_{i/k}$ friend saw you.'

Object NPs of an embedded clause (including possessed NPs in an object role) are equally ungrammatical as the LOG target in Eleme. Therefore, in a construction such as (26), the object referent is ambiguous.

(26) Absence of LOG marking with embedded object target in Eleme

òsáro lamá-mi kɔ̀ àʔò wa-pɪ̀̃ ènu
Osaro tell-1SG COMP 2SG AP-hit something
'Osaro$_i$ told me that you hit him$_{i/k}$.'

The only other potential target for LOG marking is the subject of a relative clause. Note that in (27) the complementizer *kɔ*, usually necessary preceding LOG domains, is absent. This is likely to be related to the fact that the LOG domain is part of a speech predicate. Unlike in Gokana and Kana, Eleme purposive clauses do not seem to permit LOG marking.

(27) Subject of a relative clause as target in Eleme

(a) òsáro biná èsaa ne ke-dʒi-è
Osaro ask yam REL PRTCL.3-steal-LOG
'Osaro$_i$ asked for the yams that he$_i$ stole.'

(b) òsáro biná èsaa ne ke-dʒi
Osaro ask yam REL PRTCL.3-steal
'Osaro$_i$ asked for the yams that he$_k$ stole.'

4. Beyond POV: Do Ogonoid languages have logophoric reference?

A number of attempts have been made to incorporate the properties of the Ogonoid languages into traditional concepts of co-reference. In response to the patterns schematised in the implicational scales in (8) and (9), together with Gokana's unusual method of marking logophoric reference, Comrie (1983) suggests that rather than exhibiting a logophoric reference system, Gokana presents a young switch reference system that has *developed* from co-reference marking in indirect speech contexts. It is proposed that such an analysis can account for both the original semantic controlling factors and the restricted use of LOG marking to certain subordinate clauses. One of the main reasons that he suggests this analysis is that co-reference is marked as an inflection on the verb of the dependent clause *in addition* to the regular bound pronouns. However switch-reference systems usually overtly mark both same-subject and different-subject, or, if only one, the different-subject form. Even if Gokana were described as exhibiting switch-reference it would still be a typologically unusual system. It is unclear why such an approach is more desirable or appropriate than describing the system as logophoric, especially since this co-reference system has clearly developed from indirect discourse marking.

Data from Kana shows that the language is even less aptly described as switch-reference than Gokana. In addition to indicating co-referentiality in verbal constructions, Ikoro (1996:285) asserts that a secondary use of LOG in Kana is to indicate co-reference in *nominal* predicates. In (28a), the LOG marker attaches to a copula form. For this reason he labels the LOG marker in Kana as a clitic rather than a suffix. More importantly, in (28b), where the matrix subject, the embedded subject and the embedded object are all equative, LOG marking is duplicated on the possessor NP.

(28) LOG in embedded nominal predicates in Kana (Ikoro 1996:284-5)

(a) à-ānà kɔ̄ɔ̀ ɛ̀ɛ̀-è nɛ̄ɛ̀-péé
he-deny:FACT CONN he:COP:PRE-LOG person:AM-goat
'He$_i$ denied that he$_i$ is an idiot.'

(b) kɔ̄ɔ̀ èè-è ná kà-è
CONN he:COP:PRE-LOG my mother-LOG
'She$_i$ claims that she$_i$ is my mother.'

Double-marking of LOG is also attested in other constructions with possessors. In (29) the possessor of the embedded object is co-referential with the matrix object and may be optionally marked with the enclitic LOG marker, yet is also grammatical with single LOG marking on the verb.

(29) Optional double LOG marking of possessor NP in Kana (Ikoro 1996:285)

à-tó kɔ̄ɔ̀ máà-fɛ́-à-è yē péé-è
he-CRY:FACT CONN I:PF.PRE-kill-PS-LOG his goat-LOG
'He$_i$ cried that I have killed his$_i$ goat.'

Gokana also exhibits some unusual properties involving possessor co-reference. As noted above in (6), the logophoric trigger in Gokana can only be the object of the matrix clause, 'if its referent represents the *source* of the information contained in the embedded clause' (Hyman and Comrie 1981:21) and where this is not the case, logophoric marking is ungrammatical, as in (7a). However, exceptionally, a non-source object of the matrix clause may be the logophoric trigger when the target is a possessor NP. While the construction in (30b) is dispreferred to the ambiguous construction in (30a), Hyman and Comrie (1981:25) comment that they have no explanation for the grammaticality of (30b).

(30) *Non-source object* as logophoric trigger in Gokana (Hyman and Comrie 1981:25)

(a) mm̀ kɔ́ nɛ̀ lébàrè kɔ oò dé a gĩ́ã́
I said give Lebare that you ate his yams
'I said to Lebare$_i$ that you ate his$_{i/k}$ yams.'

(b) mm̀ kɔ́ nɛ̀ lébàrè kɔ oò de-è a gĩ́ã́
I said give Lebare that you ate-LOG his yams
'I said to Lebare$_i$ that you ate his$_i$ yams.'

In light of the Gokana data above, and the nature of LOG marking in Kana, it may be the case that possessor NPs have a special, more flexible status in logophoric systems, or more generally in all types of co-reference system, that enables them to be employed in pervasive contexts.

Ikoro also extends this analysis of the Kana LOG clitic to Gokana. In example (31) from Ikoro (1996:287) the LOG marker is said to be enclitic on the verb group and follows the object suffix; compare the similar example (10) from Hyman and Comrie (1981:30), where the LOG marker is analysed as suffixed to the verb stem before the object pronoun.

(31) Analysis of LOG marker as a clitic in Gokana (Ikoro 1996:287)

à-dú kɔ̄ɔ̀ à-bɔ̄m-ɛ̰̄ɛ̀-ɛ̰̄
he-came CONN he-beat-him-LOG
'He$_i$ came because he$_i$ beat him.'

Note, that other than a different gloss on the cited example, no syntactic or morphological evidence is provided by Ikoro (1996) to counter the analysis made by Hyman and Comrie (1981). In Eleme, the LOG marker is clearly an affix bound to the verb stem, and does not require a clitic analysis. Note also that the properties of logophoric marking in the language do not compare favourably with the grammatical properties found in canonical switch reference.

Another attempt at accommodating the Ogonoid languages in a taxonomy of co-reference systems has been made by Curnow (in press) who divides verbal logophoricity into three types: logophoric cross-referencing, logophoric first person marking and logophoric verbal affixes. Logophoric cross-

referencing is the term used to describe systems where the logophoric pronominals are bound items or clitics, rather than independent forms (which he distinguishes as 'logophoric pronouns'). Languages with logophoric verbal affixes (i.e. Gokana and Kana), reflect those logophoric properties discussed in §2. Curnow (in press) asserts that the most basic difference between logophoric verbal affixes and other sub-types of LOG marking is that 'the logophoric verbal affix does not form part of a paradigm with person marked forms: there is no contrast between a logophoric form and person forms'. This is not the case for Eleme however, which appears to exhibit such a contrast in marking 3PL co-referents in the LOG domain, as in (17). Another property Curnow gives of logophoric verbal affixes is that they may be used with third, second (singular) and first person arguments, but this is also untrue for Eleme, which only permits LOG marking with third person co-referents. Similarly, neither is Eleme of the cross-referencing type, since LOG marking occurs in addition to person marking not instead of it. Again, Eleme does not fit neatly into this taxonomy.

5. Conclusion

Data presented here from Eleme, Gokana and Kana indicates that the Ogonoid languages occupy a seemingly unique position in terms of their co-reference systems. They cannot be satisfactorily described in terms of canonical logophoricity or switch-reference. Future work in this area must attempt to create a more flexible global model of disambiguation strategies, which incorporates the properties that distinguish the various different systems employed across languages; current approaches seem to inadequately compartmentalise them.

Abbreviations

AP	anterior-perfective	P	-
COMP	complementizer	PL	plural
CONN	connective	POSS	possessor
COP	copula	PRE	present tense marker
D	-	PRO	pronoun
DF	definite future	PRTCL	particle
FACT	factitive	PS	perfective suffix
INSTR	instrumental	REL	relativizer
LOG	logophoric marker	SG	singular
NEG	negative	T	-

References

Clements, G. 1975. The Logophoric Pronoun in Ewe: Its Role in Discourse. *Journal of West African Languages* 10: 141-177.

Comrie, Bernard. 1983. Switch-reference in Huichol: A Typological Study. In *Switch-Reference and Universal Grammar*, eds. John Haiman and Pamela Munro. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Culy, Christopher. 1994. Aspects of Logophoric Marking. *Linguistics* 32:1055-1094.

Culy, Christopher. 1997. Logophoric Pronouns and Point of View. *Linguistics* 35:845-859.

Curnow, Timothy Jowan. In press. Verbal Logophoricity in African Languages. In *Proceedings of the 2002 Conference of the Australian Linguistic Society*, eds. Peter Collins and Mengistu Amberber.

Hyman, Larry, and Comrie, Bernard. 1981. Logophoric Reference in Gokana. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 3:19-37.

Ikoro, Suanu. 1996. *The Kana Language*. Leiden: CNWS Publications.

Selected Proceedings of the 35th Annual Conference on African Linguistics: African Languages and Linguistics in Broad Perspectives

edited by John Mugane,
John P. Hutchison, and Dee A. Worman

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2006

ISBN 1-57473-410-5 library binding

Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, e-mail: sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Bond, Oliver. 2006. A Broader Perspective on Point of View: Logophoricity in Ogonoid Languages. In *Selected Proceedings of the 35th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, ed. John Mugane et al., 234-244. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

or:

Bond, Oliver. 2006. A Broader Perspective on Point of View: Logophoricity in Ogonoid Languages. In *Selected Proceedings of the 35th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, ed. John Mugane et al., 234-244. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #1313.