Verbal logophoricity in African languages

TIMOTHY JOWAN CURNOW
RCLT, La Trobe University
T.Curnow@latrobe.edu.au, tjcurnow@ozemail.com.au

1. Introduction

The term 'logophoric' was introduced by Hagège (1974) to refer to special pronominal forms found in West African languages which show that an argument of a subordinate verb is coreferential with the speaker or 'source' argument of a superordinate verb of speech or thought. Thus, for example, the Benue-Congo language Igbo, spoken in Nigeria, contrasts the normal third person pronoun *ọ́* with the logophoric pronoun *yá* in such subordinate contexts:[1]

(1)   *ọ́*   *sị̀rị̀*   *nà*   *ọ́*   *byàrà*   (Igbo)
        he   said   that   he   came
        'He$_i$ said that he$_j$ came'

(2)   *ọ́*   *sị̀rị̀*   *nà*   *yá*   *byàrà*
        he   said   that   LOG   came
        'He$_i$ said that he$_i$ came' (Hyman & Comrie 1981:19)

More recent cross-linguistic work on the phenomenon of logophoricity (such as Culy 1994a, von Roncador 1992, Wiesemann 1986) has uncovered a number of typological features of logophoric pronouns. For example, it has been shown that if a language uses a logophoric pronoun to refer to plural referents, it also uses a logophoric pronoun to refer to singular referents, though not vice versa; third person referents take logophoric marking if such marking exists, while second person referents may or may not be marked in such a manner depending on the language and first person referents almost never are;[2] and in a logophoric system a subordinate subject will be marked with a logophoric pronoun while other grammatical relations may or may not be marked as logophoric. That is, various implicational scales have been developed for logophoric marking:

> singular > plural
> third person > second person (*?first person)
> subject of subordinate clause > other argument (object, possessive, etc.)

The definition of logophoricity has been expanded in some of the literature to cover verbal marking as well as strictly pronominal marking, with authors distinguishing between

---

[1] Abbreviations used in this paper are: AUX auxiliary, CPL complementizer, DF definite, LOG logophoric, OBJ object, PL plural, POSS possessive, PRG progressive, RP reporting particle, SG singular, SUBJ subject. Note also that, because of font problems, the under-dot used on vowels in many African orthographies is replaced here by an under-circle.

[2] One commonly discussed exception to the non-use of logophoric marking with first person is Gokana, discussed below; other exceptions mentioned by Wiesemann (1986) differ from 'standard' logophoricity in that the logophoric marker itself varies for person rather than having the same form regardless of person.

logophoric pronouns and verbal logophoricity (e.g. Culy 1994a, Huang 2000). In this paper it will be shown that rather than a single category of verbal logophoricity there are three distinct types of verbal logophoricity, each with different properties.

2. Verbal logophoricity

For the purposes of this paper, a marker will be considered as a verbal logophoric marker if it is a verbal form (affix or clitic) used in clauses embedded under verbs of speech or thought which indicates that one of the arguments of the subordinate clause is coreferential with one of the arguments (speaker or source) of the matrix clause. In addition, the use of this form must be obligatory in the contexts in which it is possible.

Under this relatively standard definition of logophoricity there are three types of verbal logophoricity, although these are not distinguished in the typological literature: logophoric cross-referencing, logophoric first person marking, and logophoric verbal affixes.

3. Logophoric cross-referencing

Logophoric cross-referencing is very similar to the use of special logophoric pronouns. Languages with this system of verbal logophoric marking have a system of verbal cross-referencing of person, but in subordinate clauses have an additional verbal form or forms specifically marking logophoricity.

For example, the Bantu language Akɔɔse, spoken in Nigeria, has verbal prefixes which for human referents mark person and number of the subject (Hedinger 1984). In subordinate clauses of speech, however, the usual third person form obligatorily shows that the subordinate subject is different from the matrix subject; coreference is shown using a special logophoric prefix:

(3)　　*à-hɔ́bé　ǎ　á-kàg*　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(Akɔɔse)
　　　　he-said　RP　he-should.go
　　　　'He$_i$ said that he$_j$ should go'

(4)　　*à-hɔ́bé　ǎ　mɔ́-kàg*
　　　　he-said　RP　LOG-should.go
　　　　'He$_i$ said that he$_i$ should go' (Hedinger 1984:95)

The same phenomenon is found in the Nilo-Saharan language Kaliko, spoken in Zaire (Andersen & Goyvaerts 1986); the verb prefixes indicate person and number of the subject, with third person singular being zero and a special logophoric cross-referencing prefix:

(5)　　*tà　　　　　　tá　(ɛ̀δī)　Ø-ātsā　　　tá*　　　　　　　　　(Kaliko)
　　　　3rd(SG)+speak　CPL　he　　3SG-come　　CPL
　　　　'He$_i$ said that he$_j$ came'

(6)　　*tà　　　　　　tá　yī-ātsā　tá　drùzùlɛ̄*
　　　　3rd(SG)+speak　CPL　LOG-come　CPL　morning
　　　　'He$_i$ said that he$_i$ came this morning' (Andersen & Goyvaerts 1986:313)

In terms of the implicational scales mentioned earlier, logophoric cross-referencing shows the same properties as logophoric pronoun systems. Logophoric cross-referencing may be used only with singular referents, as in the Nilo-Saharan language Logo (Andersen & Goyvaerts 1986), or with both singular and plural, as in the related language Moru (Andersen & Goyvaerts 1986); similarly its use may be restricted to third person referents, as in Kaliko (Andersen & Goyvaerts 1986), or it may be used with both third and second person referents, as in Akɔɔse (Hedinger 1984). The cross-referencing systems used in these languages only cross-reference subjects, although a similar system found in the Nilo-Saharan language Mabaan marks both subject and object, and marks logophoricity for both of these (Andersen 1999).[3]

In summary, then, the following hold true for logophoric cross-referencing:

> singular > plural
> third person > second person
> subject of subordinate clause > other argument (object, possessive, etc.)

These implicational scales are precisely those which have been found to be valid for logophoric pronouns.

The similarities between logophoric cross-referencing and logophoric pronouns are not surprising given the well-known path of grammaticalization leading from pronouns to verbal affixes. Indeed in some languages with logophoric 'pronouns', such as the relatively well-described Kwa language Ewe of Ghana (Clements 1975), the 'weak' pronouns including the logophoric pronouns cliticize to the verb, making it unclear if these should be treated as logophoric pronouns or logophoric cross-referencing:

(7) *Kofi   be   e-dzo*   (Ewe)
     Kofi   say   3SG-leave
     'Kofi$_i$ said that he/she$_j$ left'

(8) *Kofi   be   yè-dzo*
     Kofi   say   LOG-leave
     'Kofi$_i$ said that he$_i$ left' (Clements 1975:142)

Thus logophoric cross-referencing affixes and clitics and traditional free logophoric pronouns have the same behaviour, differing purely in terms of the formal integration of the pronominal marking and the verb stem into one word, or their separation into two words.

4. Logophoric first person marking

A quite different strategy of logophoric marking is used in some other languages, which indicate that the subject of a subordinate clause under a verb of speech or thought is coreferential with a matrix clause argument by using a verbal inflection on the subordinate verb which in independent clauses shows that the subject is first person. For example, in

---

[3] Mabaan is slightly different from other languages, in that subordinate verb forms mark person, as do matrix verb forms, but the actual forms used for subordinate and matrix verbs are different.

the Nilo-Saharan language Karimojong, spoken in Uganda, a subordinate verb is marked with first person to indicate logophoricity (Novelli 1985):

(9) *àbʊ́ papà tolim ɛbè àlózì   iŋèz morotó*   (Karimojong)
     AUX father say   that 1SG.go.NONPAST 3SG   Moroto
     'The father$_i$ said that he$_i$ was going to Moroto' (Novelli 1985:531, gloss added)

Note that this is not a case of direct speech. If it were direct speech ('The father said: "I am going to Morotó"'), then not only would the subordinate verb be cross-referenced with first person marking (as it is), but the pronoun in the subordinate clause referring back to the matrix subject would also be first person (which it is not). Thus this cannot be analyzed as direct speech.[4]

The same phenomenon is also found, for example, in the Niger-Congo language Donno Sɔ, spoken in Mali and Burkina Faso (Culy 1994b). This language also has logophoric pronouns, however, and thus rather than "agreeing" with a simple third person pronoun, as in Karimojong, the 'first person' subordinate form "agrees" with the (third person) logophoric pronoun:

(10) *Oumar [inyemɛ jɛmbɔ paza bolum] miñ   tagi*   (Donno Sɔ)
      Oumar LOG:SUBJ sack:DF drop   left:1SG 1SG:OBJ informed
      'Oumar$_i$ told me that he$_i$ had left without the sack' (Culy 1994b:123)

In fact, Donno Sɔ is a 'pro-drop' language, and thus a first person verb form subordinated to a verb of speech may be the only indication that the subordinate subject is coreferential with the matrix argument:

(11) *Oumar [minnɛ inyemɛ mɔ̃ gɛndɛzɛm]   gi*   (Donno Sɔ)
      Oumar field LOG POSS regard:PRG:1SG said
      'Oumar$_i$ said that he$_i$ will look at his$_i$ field' (Culy 1994b:123)

(The logophoric pronoun in this example is acting as the possessor of the field.)

This use of first person marking to indicate logophoricity is not, to my knowledge, discussed in any of the typological literature, with the exception of an aside in von Roncador (1992), and it is certainly not common, being found so far in only half a dozen African languages. However it fits the definition given above — a particular verbal form is used obligatorily in subordinate clauses under verbs of speech and thought to indicate that an argument (the subject) is coreferential with the speaker argument of the matrix clause.[5]

In terms of the properties of logophoric pronouns, the use of a first person form to signal logophoricity has one distinct property. Logophoric pronouns, if they exist, always mark

---

[4] Whether this example and the following ones should be treated as examples of indirect speech is a more complex issue, and depends at least in part on one's definition of indirect speech. However for our purposes, it is only important that these are clearly reported speech but clearly not direct speech.

[5] Culy (1994a) divides logophoric marking into two types, 'pure' logophoricity and 'mixed' logophoricity. Pure logophoricity is where the marking in question is used for no other purpose, hence excluding the use of first person marking of this type as pure logophoricity.

singular referents, but may or may not mark plural referents. In contrast, no examples of first person logophoric marking in singular only have been found, but there is an example of this phenomenon used with plural referents but not singular referents. Ekpeye, a Kwa language of Nigeria, uses the first person verbal form with plural referents in logophoric contexts, but in the singular has a specifically logophoric pronoun form, a separate word rather than a verbal prefix (Clark 1972); all other persons are marked with verbal prefixes:

(12)   ṳ̀-kà-ɓɛ̀   ɓṵ́   à-zè   (Ekpeye)
        3-said-PL   that   1PL-went
        'They$_i$ said that they$_i$ went'

(13)   ṳ̀-kà   ɓṵ́   yá'   zè
        3-said   that   LOG.SG   went
        'He$_i$ said that he$_i$ went'

(14)   ṳ̀-kà   ɓṵ́   ù-zè
        3-said   that   3-went
        'He$_i$ said that he$_j$ went' (Clark 1972:103 -4, glosses added)

Thus the use of first person marking to signal logophoricity has been found with singular and plural referents, or with plural referents only, although in the latter case a distinct form of logophoric marking is found.[6]

With regard to the subordinate argument that is marked, the use of first person logophoric marking has only been found marking subordinate subjects; however as with logophoric cross-referencing, the majority of languages which show this marking only have verbal subject marking.

The third implicational scale, that of person, appears similar also to that found with logophoric pronouns. While it is never explicitly mentioned in descriptions, there are languages for which all examples involve third person referents, and others for which examples are given of both third and second person referents. Whether first person referents are marked using the logophoric strategy is not clear; there are certainly examples where the 'logophoric' marking is used with first person referents, as in the following from Ekpeye:

(15)   à-kà   méní   à-zè   (Ekpeye)
        1PL-said   that   1PL-went
        'We (exclusive) said that we went' (Clark 1972:103, gloss added)

However, of course, this marking would also be appropriate for non-logophoric first person subordinate subjects.

---

[6] It would be possible to interpret the implicational scale 'singular > plural' as simply indicating that if there is some sort of logophoric marking in the plural then there must be some sort of logophoric marking in the singular, and hence Ekpeye would not be an exception. However this would considerably weaken the typological force of the implicational scale, since it would suggest that a language could have logophoric pronouns in the plural, but some other sort of logophoric marking (e.g. first person logophoric marking) in the singular. But this sort of patterning is never found; if a language has a logophoric pronoun in the plural, it always has a logophoric pronoun in the singular, rather than just any form of logophoric marking.

The equivalent of the logophoric implicational scales which appear to hold for first person logophoric marking, then, are:

> no implication between singular and plural, or else plural > singular
> third person > second person (from examples)
> referent always subordinate subject (from examples)

The first of these is in conflict with the corresponding logophoric pronoun implicational scale; the second is the same; and the third can be subsumed within the equivalent scale for logophoric pronouns.

5. Logophoric verbal affixes

The third type of verbal logophoric marking, referred to here as a logophoric verbal affix, is the least common verbal marking of logophoricity, being reported only for two closely related Niger-Congo languages of Nigeria, Gokana (Hyman & Comrie 1981, 1982) and Kana (Ikoro 1996). Despite its rarity, it is probably the most discussed verbal logophoric marking.

The logophoric verbal affix is a special verb suffix used to show coreference of some subordinate argument with an argument of a matrix clause of speech or thought; the presence of this suffix contrasts with its absence:

(16) *aè   kɔ   aè   dɔ̀-ɛ̀*   (Gokana)
      he   said   he   fell-LOG
      'He$_i$ said that he$_i$ fell'

(17) *aè   kɔ   aè   dɔ̀*
      he   said   he   fell
      'He$_i$ said that he$_j$ fell' (Hyman & Comrie 1981:20)

Based on these examples alone, the logophoric verbal affix appears to be a same-subject marker, but in fact the coreferential subordinate argument need not be a subject:

(18) *lébàreè kɔ aè div-èè e*   (Gokana)
      Lebare   said he   hit-LOG him
      'Lebare$_i$ said that he$_i$ hit him$_j$ / that he$_j$ hit him$_i$' (Hyman & Comrie 1981:24)

Equally, in appropriate cases where the source of the utterance in the matrix clause is not a subject (e.g. 'she heard from me that …'), the triggering argument in the matrix clause need not be a subject (Hyman & Comrie 1981).

The logophoric verbal affix has quite distinct properties from other logophoric marking, both logophoric pronouns and other verbal logophoric strategies. The most basic difference is that unlike all other logophoric marking, 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.

Another distinction relates to person also. It was seen earlier that logophoric pronouns are used either with third person only or with third and second person, but where they may occur, they are obligatory. The logophoric verbal affix in Gokana is obligatory with third person, optional but preferred with second person singular, cannot be used with second person plural (another verb suffix is present then, marking second person plural), and is even optional though dispreferred with first person referents. This is quite a different set of properties from those of logophoric pronouns.

A further difference is that the referent the logophoric verbal affix refers to may be any argument in the subordinate clause (e.g. subject, object, possessor), as seen in example (18) — while this sort of ambiguity also occasionally arises in specific examples from some languages with logophoric pronominal systems, in these systems it is at least in theory possible to distinguish which subordinate argument is coreferential,[7] while the logophoric verbal affix of Kana and Gokana indicates simply that some subordinate element is coreferential.

In summary, there are differences between the behaviour of the logophoric verbal affix of Gokana and the implicational scales developed for logophoric pronouns. Even where the Gokana morpheme follows the implicational scales, it does so in terms which are not those of the implicational scale itself. While Gokana technically may fall under the implicational hierarchy 'singular > plural', this hierarchy was intended to be between languages, not within languages; but in Gokana the logophoric verbal affix is used (potentially) with all singular referents, but never with second person plural. The person hierarchy 'third person > second person' is likewise developed on a cross-linguistic basis, but has a language-internal interpretation in Gokana: the verbal logophoric affix is obligatory with third person and optional but preferred with second person (and optional but dispreferred with first person), except, of course, that it can never be used with second person plural. Likewise, as noted above, the Gokana system technically follows the implicational scale that logophoricity should be used with subordinate subjects, and may or may not be used with other subordinate arguments; however in Gokana any element of coreferentiality gives rise to precisely the same marking.

There is in fact some doubt about the precise verbal status of this logophoric morpheme. In their description of the Gokana system, Hyman and Comrie (1981) consider that it is a verbal suffix; but in a later work on the closely related Kana, Ikoro (1996) shows that an almost identical morpheme is a clitic rather than a verbal affix, and occurs on non-verbal elements as well. He suggests that this may also be the case for Gokana.

6. Conclusion

This paper has examined the various verbal markers of logophoricity found in African languages, and shown that there are three distinct types, each with different properties, even restricting the discussion to a handful of the more commonly discussed properties which logophoric systems in general are taken to have, relating to the use of logophoric

---

[7] Confusion can arise if, for example, the language has verb-final subordinate clauses, no case marking of the logophoric pronoun, and optional ellipsis of pronouns. In this case a subordinate clause with the structure 'logophoric-pronoun transitive-verb" can be interpreted with the logophoric pronoun being either subject or object of the verb. However the addition of the other argument can clarify the referents in cases such as this.

marking with singular versus plural referents, its use with third versus second person referents, and its use to mark subjects versus other arguments.

Logophoric cross-referencing has been shown to have the same properties as logophoric pronouns with regard to these properties. When first person affixes are used in subordinate clauses to indicate coreferentiality, the properties of the construction are similar to those of logophoric pronouns, but the use of the construction with singular and plural referents does not follow the implicational scale of logophoric pronouns. And finally, the verbal logophoric affixes of Gokana and Kana are seen to differ quite radically from logophoric pronouns in terms of their properties.

Given the variation in properties between the different types of verbal logophoric marking, it is vital that these systems be distinguished in work dealing with establishing the typological properties of logophoricity, rather than treating the three distinct types as all equally representative of verbal logophoric marking as is done at present.

References

Andersen T 1999 'Anti-logophoricity and indirect mode in Mabaan' *Studies in Language* 23: 499-530.

Andersen T & DL Goyvaerts 1986 'Reflexivity and logophoricity in Moru-Madi' *Folia Linguistica* 20: 297-318.

Clark DJ 1972 'A four-term person system and its ramifications' *Studies in African Linguistics* 3: 97-105.

Clements GN 1975 'The logophoric pronoun in Ewe: Its role in discourse' *Journal of West African Languages* 10(2): 141-177.

Culy C 1994a 'Aspects of logophoric marking' *Linguistics* 32: 1055-1094.

Culy C 1994b 'A note on logophoricity in Dogon' *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 15: 113-125.

Hagège C 1974 'Les pronoms logophoriques' *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 69: 287-310.

Hedinger R 1984 'Reported speech in Akɔɔse' *Journal of West African Languages* 14(1): 81-102.

Huang Y 2000 *Anaphora: A cross-linguistic study* Oxford University Press Oxford.

Hyman LM & B Comrie 1981 'Logophoric reference in Gokana' *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 3: 19-37.

Hyman LM & B Comrie 1982 'Coreference and logophoricity in Gokana' in WR Leben (ed.) *Précis from the twelfth Conference on African Linguistics, Stanford, April 10-12, 1981* Department of Linguistics, UCLA Los Angeles: 69-72.

Ikoro SM 1996 *The Kana language* Research School CNWS Leiden.

Novelli B 1985 *A grammar of the Karimojong language* Reimer Berlin.

von Roncador M 1992 'Types of logophoric marking in African languages' *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 13: 163-182.

Wiesemann U 1986 'Grammaticalized coreference' in U Wiesemann (ed.) *Pronominal systems* Gunter Narr Tübingen: 437-463.