



HAL
open science

Logophoric pronouns outside speech and attitude reports in Wan

Tatiana Nikitina

► **To cite this version:**

Tatiana Nikitina. Logophoric pronouns outside speech and attitude reports in Wan. *Logophoricity, Pronouns, and Pronominals in African Languages*, 31, 2023. hal-04644355

HAL Id: hal-04644355

<https://hal.science/hal-04644355v1>

Submitted on 15 Jul 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Logophoric pronouns outside speech and attitude reports in Wan¹

Tatiana NIKITINA

CNRS-LACITO

This study aims to illustrate the complex nature of logophoricity by exploring the use of logophoric pronouns outside speech and attitude reports in a corpus of Wan, a Mande language spoken in Côte d'Ivoire. Logophoricity in Wan can be seen as a gradient phenomenon, in two different senses. First, only the singular logophoric pronoun is truly specialized while the plural pronoun retains vestigial uses that are not logophoric; these uses rarely come up in elicitation but are attested in narrative discourse. The non-logophoric uses of the plural pronoun introduce a number asymmetry that seems to be typical of logophoric languages and which I propose to explain in diachronic terms, by the fact that singular and plural pronouns undergo historical change at different rates. Second, logophoric pronouns appear in contexts that do not involve any speech or attitude reporting. In addition to contexts that are often associated with reported speech constructions in other languages (such as expressions of intention or purpose), logophoric pronouns appear in Wan in expressions that have not been previously related to reported speech. Despite the considerable overlap of contexts where logophoric pronouns appear and contexts where verbs of speaking or quotative markers can be used, the two are not identical, and the discrepancies suggest that logophoricity cannot be defined in terms of reported speech but should rather be treated in its own right, as a non-derivable category of pronominal deixis.

1. Introduction

Detailed descriptions as well as cross-linguistic studies of logophoricity tend to focus on examples of reported speech and thought (Hagège 1974; Clements 1975; Frajzyngier 1985; Nikitina & Bugaeva 2021, *inter alia*), with only occasional discussion of additional contexts where logophoric pronouns are attested. This study aims to illustrate the complex nature of logophoricity by exploring the use of logophoric pronouns outside speech and attitude reports in a corpus of Wan, a Mande language spoken in Côte d'Ivoire (Ravenhill 1982; Nikitina 2018). The way logophoric pronouns are used in Wan in speech and attitude reports has been previously described (Nikitina 2012a), but their uses outside such contexts have not been systematically studied, and their consequences for the understanding of logophoricity have not been explored. By focusing on such unexpected uses, I seek to address the gradient, emergent properties of logophoric systems that can be difficult to capture at the synchronic level but which begin to make sense when the construction's diachrony is taken into account.

Wan is an interesting language for this sort of exercise because it is a “pure” logophoric language in terms of Culy's (1994, 1997) typology: it uses specialized logophoric pronouns that are clearly distinct from, for example, reflexive or emphatic pronouns. The use of such pronouns in Wan is relatively well described, and their function (in speech reports, at least) is clearly that of signaling reference to a reported speaker who is not a narrator. At the same time, logophoricity in Wan can be seen as a gradient phenomenon, in two different senses.

First, only the singular logophoric pronoun is truly specialized while the plural pronoun retains vestigial uses that are not logophoric; these uses rarely come up in elicitation but are attested in narrative discourse. The non-logophoric uses of the plural pronoun introduce a number asymmetry that seems to be rather typical of logophoric languages and which I propose to explain in diachronic terms, by the fact that singular and plural pronouns undergo historical change at different rates.

Second, logophoric pronouns appear in contexts that do not involve any speech or attitude reporting. In addition to contexts that are often associated with reported speech constructions in other languages (such as expressions of intention or purpose), logophoric pronouns appear in Wan in expressions that have not been previously reported as commonly related to reported speech (Matić & Pakendorf 2003; Spronck & Casartelli 2021, *inter alia*). Despite the considerable overlap of contexts where logophoric pronouns appear and contexts where verbs of speaking or quotative markers can be used, the two are not identical, and the

discrepancies suggest that logophoricity cannot be defined in terms of reported speech but should rather be treated in its own right, as a non-derivable category of pronominal deixis.

The study is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the use of logophoric pronouns in contexts that are most well studied across languages: their use in speech reports. Section 3 discusses the less well-known yet still cross-linguistically common uses in expressions of attitude, as well as expressions of intention and related descriptions of attempt. Section 4 addresses the cross-linguistically rare contexts with aspectual readings. Section 5 describes non-logophoric uses attested with the plural pronoun. Section 6 concludes the paper with a discussion of this data's implications.

2. Logophoricity in the context of speech reports

The term *logophoricity* was introduced by Hagège (1974: 287) to describe markers that “refer to the author of speech or a participant whose thoughts are reported” (“qui réfèrent à l’auteur d’un discours ou à un participant dont sont rapportées les pensées”). The uses described in this section all fall into this category: the logophoric pronoun appears in a speech report, and refers to a reported speaker.

Reported speech constructions are typically introduced in Wan by a verb of speaking, and they may or may not include a quotative marker. The two verbs of speaking that appear most frequently in such constructions are *gé* ‘say’ and *pé* ‘tell’.

The verb *gé* ‘say’ is intransitive and has a reduced combinatorial potential: it does not co-occur with negation, aspectual markers or with a question marker, and it does not appear in subordinate contexts. It is also exceptional in not having a special past tense form (all other verbs have a distinct past tense form marked with a mid tone). The verb *gé* ‘say’ is the default option for reporting speech in syntactically independent affirmative clauses without negation or aspectual markers. Like regular verbs, it can combine with an addressee phrase and be modified by adverbs.

The verb *pé* ‘tell’ is transitive and behaves in every sense as a regular verb. It has a regular past tense form (characterized by mid tone), it can combine with negation, question markers and aspectual markers, and it can appear in syntactically subordinate clauses.

The word order in Wan is rigid S-(Aux)-OV-X, where the subject and the object precede the verb but all other arguments follow it (Nikitina 2009). In aspectual constructions, the subject can be separated from the verb phrase by an auxiliary. The language distinguishes between two types of possessive construction: arguments of relational nouns (the

“inalienable” possessors) combine with their nouns without additional marking, while possessive modifiers of regular nouns (the “inalienable” possessors) are normally marked by lengthening or introduced by the relational noun *gè* ‘property’ (for tonal differences between the two constructions and further details, see Nikitina 2019).

Examples (1)-(2) illustrate the use of the two verbs of speaking, with and without a quotative marker. Note that the transitive verb *pé* ‘tell’ commonly co-occurs with a third person pronoun in the object position, co-referential with the speech report (2a-b).²

- (1) a. *ḃé àṅ gé dḃḃ klé bú má*
 then 3PL say QUOT stone powder it.is
 ‘And they say it was stone powder.’
- b. *ḃé àṅ gé gà à wò yā*
 then 3PL say go 3SG do with
 ‘And they say: Go do it!’
- (2) a. *ḃāā pē dḃḃ lā glò-ṅ kḃlē gē ē*
 LOG+3SG tell:PAST QUOT 2SG marry-FUT man here Q
 ‘[The girl said:] I said, Can you marry a man like that?’
- b. *ḃé àṅ pē è gā wá gē*
 then 3PL+3SG tell:PAST 3SG go NEG PRT
 ‘And [when] they said she should not go [there]...’

There is in fact a lot of flexibility in the way speech and attitude reports are introduced in actual narrative data. Besides the most common types illustrated above, logophoric pronouns occur in speech and attitude reports introduced by other means or not introduced at all by any specific element. For example, they occur freely in so-called “defenestrated” reports which are not signaled as reports in any explicit way, but receive such an interpretation based on context or intonational cues alone (Spronck 2017; Spronck & Nikitina 2019).

In all these cases, independent of the construction type, logophoric pronouns are used to refer to a reported speaker that is different from the current narrator. The examples in (3)-(4) illustrate the use of the singular logophoric pronoun in different syntactic positions and in different types of reported speech constructions. The construction types in (3)-(4) correspond exactly to those of (1)-(2): the examples in (3) contain the defective intransitive verb *gé* ‘say’, the examples in (4) contain the regular transitive verb *pé* ‘tell’; the examples in (3a) and (4a) contain a quotative marker, and the examples in (3b) and (4b) don’t. The logophoric pronoun

is the argument of a postposition in (3a), a focused subject in (3b), a possessor in (4a), and a regular subject in (4b). In all these cases, the pronoun refers to the speaker whose words are being reported (as indicated by co-reference indices in the translation). The same logophoric pronoun is used in embedded reports to refer to the speaker retelling the speech of others, as in (4b).

- (3) a. è gé lòṅ̀ nì lèṅ̀ dóō
 3SG.SUBJ say hare little to QUOT
 jṳ̀ṅ̀ é lā̀ gè jṳ̀ṅ̀ ḗ kḗ **ḃā** má
 hoe DEF 2SG POSS hoe DEF give LOG REC
 ‘He_i says to the hare: The hoe, give me_i your hoe!’
- b. gbógló gé **ḃāā** lā́á yrṳ́ má èèè
 hyena say LOG:EMPH FOC+3SG drink:PAST FOC INTJ
 ‘Hyena_i says: It is me_i who drank it, yeah!’
- (4) a. āṅ̀ nàlò é kḗ èè pé-ḡ
 2PL grandmother DEF if 3SG.SUBJ+3SG tell-HAB
 dóō āṅ̀ **ḃā** tṳ́ pé āā́ tó tṳ́ ē
 QUOT 2PL LOG name tell 2PL+3SG name know:PAST Q
 ‘When your grandmother_i says that you should say her_i name, do you know it?’
 (Literally, ‘Your grandmother, if she says that you should say her name, do you know her name?’)
- b. lāā́ pḗ **ḃā** pṳ́ mū́ ḗ kó tḗḗḗ yá
 2SG+3SG tell:PAST LOG thing PL DEF cut IDPH there
 gḗ ṳ́ cḗmāṅ̀ é è́ bṳ́ á
 PRT PRT okra DEF 3SG.SUBJ remain:PAST RSLT
 ḃéé yā́
 that.one with
 ‘[The young woman_i says to her mother-in-law:] Although you said I_i should cut all the vegetables, the okra still remains [uncut].’

It is important to note that Wan does not distinguish between direct and indirect speech, and there is usually only one way to encode other participants in the speech situation: both current and reported listeners are coded by second person pronouns, and the current speaker is always coded by first person (the pronominal system of Wan is presented in Table 1). The system of

pronominal reference in reported speech therefore does not correspond to the European direct or indirect type (Nikitina 2012a), and my use of direct and indirect speech in the translation of the examples into English is to a large extent arbitrary.

Table 1. The system of personal pronouns³

person	Sg	(glossed as)	Pl (Sg + Other)	(glossed as)
1 st person	ɨ̄	(1)	kā	(1+3)
1 st person dual	ko	(1+2)	kà	(1+2+3)
2 nd person	lā	(2)	ā, ā̄	(2+3)
3 rd person	è (subj) / à	(3SG)	à, à̄	(3PL)
logophoric	ḃā	(LOG)	mɔ, mɔ̄	(LOG.PL)

In Wan, logophoric pronouns can refer to reported speakers of third or second person (in examples like ‘She said...’ or ‘You said...’), but as in other logophoric languages, they cannot be used to refer to the current narrator (in examples like ‘I said’...). First person pronouns are the only option available when the narrator reports their own words. In examples like (5a), logophoric pronouns are not acceptable, and first person pronouns must be used instead.

- (5) a. mí̄ɨ̄ má yá ɨ̄ gé dóō ɨ̄ zò á Zòòwà
 1SG:EMPH FOC there 1SG say QUOT 1SG come RSLT Z.
 ‘[As for] me here, I am saying that I come from Zoowa.’
- b. * mí̄ɨ̄ má yá ɨ̄ gé dóō ḃā zò á Zòòwà
 1SG:EMPH FOC there 1SG say QUOT LOG come RSLT Z.

The restriction in (5) only applies to the current narrator, and it does not affect the encoding of self-reports more generally, for example, by characters in a story. In (6), the hare reports his own words, but since he is a character in the story and not the current narrator, the restriction on using logophoric pronouns is irrelevant.

- (6) ḃé à gó zḃḃnè àgē ḃé ḃā gé dóō ḃā zō
 then 3SG in today PRT then LOG say QUOT LOG come
 á gbò mù nèblà nè zḃḃnè
 FUT maternal.relative PL search PURP today
 ‘[The hare_i says:] That's why I_i said, today, that I_i would come and search for my maternal relatives today.’

More generally, logophoric pronouns need not be licensed by any specific verb or construction; they can occur, for example, in “defenestrated” speech reports that are not introduced by anything, such as (7a). In vivid narration, they can alternate with first person pronouns; for example, the same reported speaker can be referred to by a logophoric pronoun and by a first pronoun within the same speech report, as in (7b). (Characteristically of logophoric languages lacking the direct/indirect distinction, the use of logophoric vs. first pronouns is not correlated with the choice of other pronouns within the same speech report; e.g., the same second person pronoun is used in both parts of the speech report in 7b, co-occurring with a logophoric pronoun in one case and a first person pronoun in the other.) Finally, in embedded reports multiple logophoric pronouns can be used to refer to different characters, or to speakers at different levels of embedding. In (7c), there are two reported speakers: Hare is reporting speech by Hyena. Both Hare and Hyena are therefore referred to by logophoric pronouns in the embedded report, hence the use of two non-coreferential logophoric pronouns (which of the pronouns refers to which reported speaker can only be established here based on context).

- (7) a. è ñ síá é gbàlòñ yā gōñglōñ
 3SG.SUBJ PERF fall REFL reverse with IDPH
 yíbo yíbo yíbo yíbo è ñ **bā** té
 damn damn damn damn 3SG.SUBJ PERF LOG kill
 ‘He_i fell face up: Damn, damn, damn, damn! He killed me_i!’
- b. è gé **bā** lā ē wá ñ lā
 3SG.SUBJ say LOG 2SG see:PAST NEG 1SG 2SG
 ē títiti wá
 see:PAST never NEG
 ‘He_i says: I_i did not see you, I_i never saw you!’
- c. è gé kóli má klá gé dóo **bāā** né
 3SG.SUBJ say lie it.is hyena say QUOT LOG:POSS child
 kpáì gā òñ kpū wía **bā** lāgá
 exact go:PAST wood piece enter LOG mouth
 ‘He_i (= Hare) said: It is a lie! Hyena_k said my_i own child went to enter a piece a wood in his_k mouth.’

3. Attitude reports – intention – attempt

3.1. Extended uses of reported speech constructions

The same expression types that are used in Wan to report speech can also be used to report “inner speech” and thought (as discussed in Author forthc., the phenomenon of recruiting reported speech constructions for the expression of thought is cross-linguistically wide spread and may be universal). In (8), the same construction with a verb of speaking is used as, for example, in (3a), but the context makes it clear that the reported utterance was not actually spoken.

- (8) è gé yīí **ǂā** ǂā má òò m̀m̀
3SG.SUBJ say INTJ LOG escape FOC PRT INTJ
[‘Hyena says: You will not escape!’] ‘The hare_i says [to himself]: I_i will [indeed] escape, yeah.’

Logophoric pronouns also appear when reported speech constructions are used with a non-speech interpretation, for example, to encode intention or describe attempted actions. Both are cross-linguistically common extensions of the meaning of reported speech expressions, and in Wan, they are expressed by constructions involving verbs of speaking and/or the quotative marker. In (9a), a construction with the verb *gé* ‘say’ describes the intentions of a buffalo (the example is used in the context of a real-life hunt story, where, in contrast to tales, animals are not expected to speak). In (9b), a construction with the verb *pé* ‘tell’ describes attempted action. In both examples, the character’s intentions are understood as having been manifested in their behavior: the buffalo *behaved* as if he wanted to kill the man, and the hostile reaction described in (9b) was caused by the character’s explicit attempts to approach other villagers.

- (9) a. ǂé gé **ǂā** á kǎ tógǎlē dō té-ŋ̀
that.one say LOG COP 1+3 elder.brother one kill-PROSP
‘He [= a buffalo] wanted to kill one of our elder brothers.’
(Literally, ‘He_i says: Let me_i kill one of our elder brothers.’)
- b. ké è pé **ǂā** sí mī kē é lèŋ̀
if 3SG.SUBJ tell LOG approach person that DEF to
klózi lé ǂé ǂē gé pálo wānè
road on then that.one say return there
‘Everyone he tries to approach tells him to go back.’

(Literally, ‘If he_i says: Let me_i approach that person on the road – that one says: Go back.’)

3.2. Constructions not used for reporting speech

The fact that logophoric pronouns appear with extended meanings of the verbs of speaking is perhaps not surprising given that such expressions are structurally identical to reported speech constructions. Somewhat less trivial is the use of logophoric pronouns in expressions that feature neither a verb of speaking nor a quotative marker. In (10a,b), for example, logophoric pronouns appear in expressions of reported thought and desire that are unrelated to reported speech constructions and in which verbs of speaking cannot be used. In such contexts, the logophoric pronouns must be licensed directly by the expression’s meaning, independent of a particular verb. More precisely, they must be licensed by the presence of an experiencer – a subject of thinking and wishing, suggested by the non-literal interpretation of the noun *kào* ‘stomach, mind’ and the postposition *klā* ‘behind; on one’s mind’.

- (10) a. *lā* *kào* *mì* ***ḃā*** *gè* *má*
 2SG stomach by LOG property it.is
 ‘You_i thought it was yours_i.’
 (Literally, ‘[It was] on your_i stomach: It is yours_i.’)
- b. *yàá* *klā* *ḣ* ***ḃāā*** *gòlí*
 3SG.SUBJ+COP behind 1SG LOG:POSS money
 tā *bòḣgò*
 surface exchange
 ‘He_i wants me to give him_i change.’
 (Literally, ‘It is behind him_i [that] I exchange his_i money.’)

This analysis is further confirmed by examples such as (11), where no lexical expression suggests the presence of an experiencer or a subject of consciousness. The logophoric pronoun is licensed here directly by the purpose interpretation: the pronoun’s referent is understood to be a subject of thinking and wishing.

- (11) *ḃé* *è* *kúnā* *tā* ***ḃā*** *ó* *é* *glà*
 then 3SG.SUBJ ascend:past on LOG salt DEF take
 ‘And he climbed up in order to take the salt.’
 (Literally, ‘And he_i climbed up: Let me_i take the salt.’)

The fact that in such examples the logophoric pronoun is licensed by the intention interpretation alone is consistent with the view that logophoricity can be semantically motivated and need not depend on lexical or syntactic triggers. As predicted by such an analysis, logophoric pronouns cannot alternate here with first person pronouns, in contrast to reported speech constructions where such alternation is widely attested (as in 7b).

At the same time, only first person pronouns can be used when the subject of consciousness is the current speaker, suggesting that the use of logophoric pronouns is constrained here by the same factors as in constructions with reported speech (cf. 5a,b). Both facts point to the lexical, rather than syntactic, nature of logophoricity: the presence of logophoric pronouns depends on the presence of specific semantic roles rather than on particular predicates or syntactic configurations, and restrictions on their use depend on pragmatic factors – more specifically, on whether or not the relevant semantic role is associated with the current narrator.

4. Logophoricity motivated by aspect

Our final set of contexts present a challenge to the semantic analysis of logophoricity suggested by the previous examples. They are unusual in the sense that the logophoric pronoun cannot be interpreted as referring to a subject of consciousness. These uses are not among those commonly attested across languages, and in Wan, they come in two varieties.

First, constructions with the verb *gé* ‘say’ are attested in corpus data in the meaning of prospective aspect – in descriptions of preparatory stages of events or states immediately preceding an event (Nikitina 2018).

- (12) *nēē* *gé* ***ḃā*** *á* *zò-ḡ* *ḡḡ* *yē* *gó* *gē*
 child+DEF say LOG COP come-PROSP that time in PRT
 ‘At the moment when the baby is starting to be born...’
 (Literally, ‘At the time the baby_i says: I_i am going to be born.’)

The examples in (13), from Nikitina (2020), illustrate the crucial property of the prospective use: the logophoric pronoun is not restricted in reference to sentient beings but can refer to inanimate objects incapable of thinking or reasoning.

- (13) a. *yī* *ē* *gé* ***ḃā*** *kó*
 water DEF say LOG boil

‘The water was starting to boil.’

(Literally, ‘The water_i says: Let me_i boil...’)

- b. ké wàtí gé **ḃā** ʃó m̄
if time say LOG arrive PRT

‘When the time comes...’

(Literally, ‘[When] the time_i says: Let me_i arrive...’)

The prospective uses are analyzed in Nikitina (2020) as instances of a subject control structure different from reported speech constructions. There is no quotative marker, and the logophoric pronoun is obligatory (14a,b). Even more conspicuously, the logophoric pronoun is only attested in this type of use in the subject position. In other words, the logophoric pronoun must be co-referential, in the control structure, with the subject of the verb *gé* ‘say’. Configurations such as (14c) are unacceptable on the prospective reading, even though they make sense in the literal, reported speech interpretation.

- (14) a. # yī ē gé **dóō** ʃā kó
water DEF say QUOT LOG boil

‘The water was starting to boil.’

- b. # yī ē gé **ḡ** kó
water DEF say 1SG boil

‘The water was starting to boil.’

- c. # ké yrē gé **ḃā** wàtí ʃó m̄
if work say LOG time arrive PRT

‘When the time of work comes...’

(Literally, ‘When the work_i says: Let my_i time arrive...’)

The differences between the prospective reading and the reported speech reading suggest that the prospective construction should be analyzed separately from instances of reported speech, probably as a bi-clausal structure with a controlled logophoric subject. Diachronically, the prospective interpretation is clearly derived from reported speech constructions: a speaker saying that they would carry out an action can be easily reinterpreted as an agent intending to carry out an action, and subsequently as the subject in an event that is imminent or expected to take place.

Second, logophoric pronouns are attested in narrative discourse with another type of aspectual interpretation, this time without a verb of speaking. In (15a,b), the interpretation is

different from that of prospective aspect: the action is described as having just occurred or having just started, and the construction's meaning could be characterized as immediate precedence or interruption.

- (15) a. **ḃā** gnù tē é tā áá ìgī ēàō
 LOG jump fire DEF on INTJ IDPH IDPH
 yàá tē ē lé
 3SG.SUBJ+COP fire DEF on
 ‘[The moment] he leaps over the fire – Ah! He [falls] – he is in the fire!’
- b. gbógló gā è gbō é dī é pēñ
 hyena go:PAST 3SG.SUBJ pot DEF load REFL head
ḃā ḅè yī é mì b́é gé
 LOG touch water DEF by that.one say
 ‘Hyena went, he loads the pot on his head... [As soon as] he touches the water, the other one [= the water monster] says...’

The exact meaning of this construction is hard to explore because of its colloquial flavor, which makes it unsuitable for study by means of traditional elicitation methods. Crucially, all attested examples feature a sentient subject, but no verb of speaking. These characteristics make the construction similar to the purpose use illustrated in (11), and it is likely that the two uses are diachronically related. A possible diachronic path might involve a reinterpretation of an intended action as an action interrupted before completion or barely completed.

5. Non-logophoric uses of plural pronouns

The last phenomenon illustrating uses of logophoric pronouns outside speech and attitude reports has to do with the way logophoric pronouns develop from demonstratives and other third person elements. As new demonstratives and third person pronouns enter the system, the old ones may become restricted to logophoric contexts, resulting in the emergence of specialized logophoric pronouns (Hyman 1979; Dimmendaal 2001; Nikitina 2012b, *inter alia*). Crucially, this process does not always affect the entire pronominal system to the same degree; for example, at a given synchronic stage it may have been completed for the singular but not for the plural pronouns. Wan presents a clear example of such an asymmetric system, where the plural counterpart of the fully specialized singular logophoric pronoun is a multifunctional pronoun that is only interpreted as logophoric in some of its uses.

Since the point of the previous sections was to explore the use of logophoric pronouns outside reported speech and attitude reports, the examples discussed so far featured the fully specialized singular pronoun. The picture becomes less transparent when the plural pronouns are taken into account. The plural pronoun used in logophoric contexts derives from the noun *mɔ* ‘people’ and still retains, at least for the elder speakers, an anaphoric function. It is attested in the corpus as a marker of long-distance (non-clause-bound) co-reference; its antecedent must be located outside the clause. In (16a), for example, the plural logophoric pronoun refers to a topic (which appears in a position preceding the clause). In (16b), the plural pronoun’s antecedent is introduced in a preceding clause.

- (16) a. gòṅ kē mū é **móḡ** kà kó-ḡ
 boats this PL DEF LOG.PL 1+2+3 cross-HAB
 bī wá ō
 PAST NEG PRT
 ‘The boats, they would not be taking us across.’
- b. jò mù ōō ɓā bō **móḡ** tā móḡ
 buffalo PL PRT LOG pass:PAST LOG.PL on LOG.PL
 kpālèṅ zē dī ɓā lèṅ wá
 difficulty affair plant:PAST LOG to NEG
 ‘Buffalo, I passed them, [and] they did not vex me...’

The anaphoric uses of the plural logophoric pronoun are functionally similar to the uses of the singular demonstrative *be* ‘that one’; it is possible that the singular logophoric pronoun *ɓā* was originally a demonstrative that has gradually become restricted to logophoric contexts.

In practice, the retention of the anaphoric function by the plural pronoun results in a number asymmetry and complicates the task of delineating logophoric contexts. On the one hand, the plural pronoun is clearly associated with a logophoric function (since it is obligatory in logophoric contexts). On the other, it has to be described together with those of its uses which cannot be directly related to logophoric contexts (they only testify to a common origin of specialized logophoric pronouns).

6. Conclusion

This study described the contexts of use of logophoric pronouns attested in narrative data in Wan. The data has several implications for the cross-linguistic study of logophoricity.

First, the popular typology introduced by Culy (1994) is not always easy to adhere to in practice, since elements of “pure” and “mixed” logophoricity may co-occur in the same language. Like most typologies, the pure-mixed dichotomy leaks, since specialization of any grammatical marker is a matter of degree, and logophoric pronouns are no exception.

Second, the number asymmetry within the logophoric system of Wan illustrates the way language change favors certain contexts over others, and does not always affect the entire pronominal system at the same rate. Logophoric contexts involving singular pronouns are considerably more frequent in corpus data than logophoric contexts involving plural pronouns. The difference in frequency may explain why logophoric pronouns become specialized in the singular before they become specialized in the plural. This explanation is consistent with the evidence of similar asymmetries in other languages, where a fully specialized logophoric pronoun appears in the singular but not in the plural (see Litvinova *forthc.*; Villa *forthc.* for the Adamawa languages Kugama and Sam).

Third, the contexts where logophoric pronouns appear do not coincide with the contexts where verbs of speaking or quotative markers can be used. For example, logophoric pronouns appear with expressions of attitude or in purpose constructions where they cannot be licensed by any specific lexical element. This discrepancy suggests that logophoricity is to some extent dissociated from speech and attitude reporting and is not triggered by any specific syntactic environment.

Fourth, only some of the uses of logophoric pronouns can be defined in semantic terms; these are the uses involving reference to sentient experiencers, or subjects of consciousness. Some of the contexts where logophoric pronouns are attested can no longer be subsumed under the same synchronic analysis as the contexts of reported speech or attitude reports. The idiosyncratic uses remind us once again that like typologies, grammatical categories leak, and the distribution of a category in spontaneous discourse often challenges the logic of the grammarian’s idealized description.

Finally, the fact that the range of contexts where logophoric pronouns appear cannot be defined exhaustively by syntactic or semantic criteria points to the language-specific, idiosyncratic nature of logophoricity. The characteristics of logophoric pronouns in Wan differ in many respects from the characteristics of logophoric pronouns in other languages, such as Ewe (Clements 1975), and the range of relevant contexts is likely to vary widely from one logophoric language to another. This variation illustrates the challenge of cross-linguistic comparison of grammatical categories, to which this paper provides no answer.

Notes

- ¹ Acknowledgements TBA.
- ² Diacritics indicate tonal realizations (á for high, ā for mid, à for low). The tilde indicates nasalization, as in /ã/.
- ³ Some words are not associated with a tone in Wan; they can be realized as low, mid or high depending on their environment (see Nikitina 2019 for details). This is why two of the pronouns in Table 1 (first person dual and logophoric plural) are presented as lexically toneless.

Bibliography

- Clements, George N. 1975. The logophoric pronoun in Ewe: Its role in discourse. *Journal of West African Languages* 10: 141–177.
- Culy, Christopher. 1994. Aspects of logophoric marking. *Linguistics* 32: 1055–1094.
- Culy, Christopher. 1997. Logophoric pronouns and point of view. *Linguistics* 35: 845–859.
- Dimmendaal, Gerrit J. 2001. Logophoric marking and represented speech in African languages as evidential hedging strategies. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 21: 131–157.
- 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 Linguistique de Paris* 69(1): 287–310.
- Hyman, Larry M. 1979. Phonology and noun structure. In Larry M. Hyman (ed.) *Aghem grammatical structure*. Los Angeles: Department of Linguistics, University of Southern California, 1–72.
- Litvinova, Lora. Forthc. A grammatical analysis and documentation of Kugama (Wam), an Adamawa language of Nigeria. PhD dissertation, INALCO.
- Matić, Dejan & Brigitte Pakendorf. 2013. Non-canonical ‘say’ in Siberia: Areal and genealogical patterns. *Studies in Language* 37(2): 356–412.
- Nikitina, Tatiana. 2009. The syntax of postpositional phrases in Wan, an “SOVX” language. *Studies in Language* 33(4): 910–933.
- Nikitina, Tatiana. 2012a. Logophoric discourse and first person reporting in Wan (West Africa). *Anthropological Linguistics* 54(3): 280–301.

- Nikitina, Tatiana. 2012b. Personal deixis and reported discourse: Towards a typology of person alignment. *Linguistic Typology* 16(2): 233–263.
- Nikitina, Tatiana. 2018. When linguists and speakers do not agree: The endangered grammar of verbal art in West Africa. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 28(2): 1–24.
- Nikitina, Tatiana. 2019. Verb phrase external arguments in Mande: New evidence for obligatory extraposition. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 37: 693–734.
- Nikitina, Tatiana. 2020. Logophoricity and shifts of perspective: New facts and a new account. *Functions of Language* 27(1): 78-88.
- Nikitina, Tatiana & Bugaeva, Anna. 2021. Logophoric speech is not indirect: Towards a syntactic approach to reported speech constructions. *Linguistics* 59(3): 609-633.
- Ravenhill, Philip L. 1982. The Wan language. *Mandenkan* 4: 57–69.
- Spronck, Stef. 2017. Defenestration: deconstructing the frame-in relation in Ungarinyin. *Journal of Pragmatics* 114: 104-133.
- Spronck, Stef & Tatiana Nikitina. 2019. Reported speech forms a dedicated syntactic domain. *Linguistic Typology* 23(1): 119–159.
- Spronck, Stef & Daniela Casartelli. 2021. In a manner of speaking: How reported speech may have shaped grammar. *Frontiers in Communication* 6: 1-22.
- Villa, Eveling. Forthc. Grammatical sketch and audio-visual documentation of Nyesam, Adamawa language of Nigeria. PhD dissertation, INALCO.