Personal deixis and reported discourse: Towards a typology of person alignment

TATIANA NIKITINA

Abstract

This article explores crosslinguistic variation in the way speech-event participants are mapped to person values, focusing on the encoding of person in reported discourse. It surveys several types of PERSON ALIGNMENT*, or language-specific correspondences between participant discourse roles and person values, and shows that some of the types result in the deictic organization of reported discourse that seems inconsistent from the Eurocentric perspective: only selected person values are "shifted" in reported discourse. Such "inconsistent" patterns are argued to differ in important ways from partial deictic shifts attested in free indirect discourse and other types of optional "semi-direct" discourse.*

Keywords: *deixis, logophoricity, person, pronouns, speech reporting, syntax, West African languages*

1. Variation in the encoding of speech-event participants

All languages have a way of encoding person, distinguishing between the roles that participants play in the speech-event. It is often taken for granted that at the heart of person encoding is the universal distinction between the speaker, the addressee, and all others. In many languages, the encoding of speech-event roles *sensu stricto* is combined with the encoding of other, related categories, such as number, gender, clusivity, degree of politeness and formality, proximity, etc. (see, e.g., Siewierska 2004 for a general overview; Cysouw 2009, 2011 on person and number; Filimonova (ed.) 2005 on clusivity; Hale 1966 on generation level; Jacquesson 2001 on genre, *inter alia*). Such complications notwithstanding, speakers of European languages typically assume that in any language, the encoding of person is determined by the participant's involvement in the speech-event: 1st person encodes the current speaker, 2nd person

Linguistic Typology 16 (2012), 233–263
DOI 10.1515/lingty-2012-0008
1430–0532/2012/016-0233

the current addressee, and 3rd person all participants not involved in the speech situation.[1] In this article, I suggest that, in spite of the seeming universality of person deixis, the particulars of the mapping of speech-event roles to person values are subject to considerable crosslinguistic variation.

In modern European languages, the distinction between 1st, 2nd, and 3rd person is based on the participant's role in the current speech situation. This is illustrated in (1) with a sentence reporting a participant's speech: the 1st person pronouns refer to the current speaker, and the 3rd person refers to the reported speaker who is not involved in the speech situation at the time of narration.

(1) *The waiter*$_{\text{i}}$ *told me*$_{\text{j}}$ *that he*$_{\text{i}}$ *would bring me*$_{\text{j}}$ *more water*.

Besides the indirect speech reporting illustrated in (1), speech may also be reported directly, or quoted verbatim as in (2).[2] In this case, personal deixis in the reporting and the reported clauses is centered on different speech situations. Person values in the reporting clause (underlined in (2)) are assigned based on the participant's involvement in the current speech situation (hence, 1st person refers to the current speaker). Person values in the reported clause (in quotation marks) are assigned based on the participant's involvement in the speech situation being reported (hence, 1st and 2nd person refer to the reported speaker and addressee, respectively).[3]

(2) *The waiter*$_{\text{i}}$ *told me*$_{\text{j}}$*: "I*$_{\text{i}}$*'ll bring you*$_{\text{j}}$ *more water"*.

In both cases, only one set of interlocutors is taken into account per clause in the assignment of person values: the current ones in (1) and in the reporting clause in (2), and the original ones in the verbatim quotation in (2). This clear-cut distinction between the current interlocutors (1st and 2nd person) and all others (3rd person) can be described as a special type of person alignment, or a way of mapping speech-event roles to person values (3).

1. The situation is complicated, however, by the "extended" (or "displaced") uses of pronouns, such as the "polite" use of plural forms, the majestic *we*, the generic *you*, etc. (Forchheimer 1953: 37–39, Mühlhäusler & Harré 1990, *inter alia*). Such complications arise from the way certain pronouns are used in discourse "to achieve the effect of other pronouns", but do not in themselves undermine the basic principles of mapping speech-event roles to grammatical person (Zwicky 1977: 716). The situation is also less straightforward when number is taken into account; e.g., in the plural, reference of 1st and 2nd person can include participants other than the current speaker and the current addressee, in a way consistent with a referential hierarchy (Plank 1985). I do not discuss plural pronouns in this article.
2. The precise nature of direct reporting is in fact complex, as speakers can only render selected aspects of the original utterance (see, e.g., Clark & Gerrig 1990). The allegedly "verbatim" representation of another's discourse is therefore necessarily a matter of speakers' perception rather than an objective property of direct reporting.
3. Direct reporting is typically associated with a theatrical effect, the current speaker "assuming the role" of the reported one (Wierzbicka 1974, Clark & Gerrig 1990).

(3) current interlocutors vs. others
↓ ↓
1st and 2nd 3rd

Languages spoken in other cultural areas may differ from European languages in the way participant roles are mapped to person values. Consider the following ambiguous examples from Havyaka Kannada (Dravidian; India).[4]

(4) a. *en-na* *ello:ru-de* *hogaḷuttavu* *he:ḷi* *ra:ju* *enna-tre*
me-ACC all-EMPH praise that Raju me-with
he:ḷiddã
tell.PERF
'Raju$_i$ has told me$_j$, Everybody praises me$_i$.'
'Raju$_i$ has told me$_j$ that everybody praises me$_j$.' (Bhat 2007: 58)

b. *ni:nu* *be:ga* *bar-ekku* *he:ḷi* *avu* *hariya-tre* *he:ḷiddavu*
you early come-must that they Hari-with tell.PERF
'They have told Hari$_i$, You$_i$ must come early.'
'They have told Hari$_i$ (asked him$_i$ to tell you$_j$) that you$_j$ must go early.' (Bhat 2007: 58)

In (4a), the 1st person pronoun of the embedded clause may refer either to the current speaker or to the reported speaker (Raju), neutralizing the distinction that would be marked in European indirect discourse by the assignment of different person values to the two speakers (1st person to the current speaker, 3rd person to the reported speaker). Similarly, the distinction between the current and the reported addressee is not encoded in (4b), where two different speech situations could be chosen as the deictic reference point: the current speech interaction or the interaction being described.

Crucially, the ambiguity in (4a, b) cannot be explained by mere lack of the distinction between direct and indirect reporting, since in Havyaka Kannada, participants of the reported speech-event are not encoded by 3rd person; instead, they must be referred to by 1st and 2nd person pronouns (Bhat 2007: 59). This is in contrast with the use of 3rd person pronouns in languages with a European-style direct vs. indirect speech distinction, where all participants other than the current interlocutors can be mapped, in indirect reports, to 3rd person. In this sense, the Havyaka Kannada system does not present an alternative to realizing (4a) or (4b) as an "indirect" report, with 3rd person pronouns referring to Raju and Hari.

4. For similar uses of local pronouns in Punjabi, described in terms of "logophoric" properties, see Bhatia (2000: 645). Schlenker (1999, 2003) discusses similar facts for Amharic from a formal semantic perspective, cf. also Anand (2006) for a formal treatment of data from Slave and Zazaki, and Oshima (2011) for further discussion.

The use of 1st and 2nd pronouns in constructions with reported speech suggests that Havyaka Kannada maps speech-event roles to person values in a way different from European languages. Instead of contrasting current interlocutors with all others, Havyaka Kannada distinguishes all interlocutors involved in a speech situation (either current or reported) from the rest of participants (Bhat 2007: 58). Both current and reported speakers are encoded as 1st person (4a), and both current and reported addressees are encoded as 2nd person (4b). This way of mapping participant roles to person values can be described as a special type of person alignment (5) that differs from the alignment type of modern European languages.

(5) interlocutors (current or reported) vs. others
↓ ↓
1st and 2nd 3rd

A system similar to the one represented in (5) is attested in a number of New Guinean languages. The examples below are from Gahuku (Gokokan; Papua New Guinea), where both the current and the reported speaker must be referred to in the 1st person.

(6) a. *geza ne-leqmo gilil-it-ove l-oko*
you me-make heal-FUT-1SG say-SUCC
'If you say you will make me healed (lit., I will heal me).' (Deibler 1976: 115)

b. *ve makolite neniq ne-qmeget-at-une l-iki*
men some me me-follow-FUT-1PL say-SUCC
nigilikima
as.they.sense
'Supposing some men feel that they will follow me (lit., we will follow me).' (Deibler 1976: 115)

c. *leliq nemoqza mota li-m-it-ove l-oka-ke*
ours it.is.but now us-give-FUT-1SG say-3SG-SS
'It is ours, but after he said that he would give it to us now (lit., I will give it to us now).' (Deibler 1976: 115)

d. … *nenitoka nosaqnetaq makoq ahulonetatune liki*
to.me food some we'll.send.me saying
'… (those who) say they will send me some food (lit., we'll send me some food).' (Deibler 1971: 110)

The unusual construction with two non-coreferential 1st person participants is described by Evans (2005) as a special "double first person construction". The construction differs in one crucial aspect from the use of inconsistent personal reference for stylistic effect, such as the mixing of person values in free indirect discourse (Banfield 1973, Aikhenvald 2008, *inter alia*; also Plank 1986,

Günthner 2000, Güldemann & von Roncador 2002: viii on the direct-indirect continuum). In the languages discussed in this article, the particular combinations of person features are obligatory, and therefore have to be treated as a matter of grammar rather than style.

I would suggest that the use of non-coreferential 1st person in (6) is in fact a manifestation of a more general and widespread phenomenon, and a result of the same person alignment as the one represented in (5): two distinct participant roles, the current and the reported speaker, are mapped to the same person value.

It is, furthermore, clear from these examples that in the case of conflict between the two interlocutor roles, 1st person is preferred. In (6a), the current addressee is at the same time the reported speaker, while in (6c), the current speaker is, in all likelihood, the reported addressee. In both cases, the role conflict is resolved in favor of the 1st person. The problem of the assignment of a person value in the case of conflicting speech-event roles is only in part related to the problem of person alignment. I return to this issue in Section 4, where I show that languages vary in the way they deal with such conflicts, within the limits determined by their person alignment type. A great majority of the examples discussed in Sections 2 and 3 come from narratives, where the context makes it clear that there is no overlap between the current speakers/addressees and the reported ones.

The following two examples illustrate a similar type of person alignment for Golin (Chimbu; Papua New Guinea).

(7) a. *I* [*na* *si-Ø-w-a*] *di-n-g-e*
you 1SG.OBJ hit-1SG.SUBJ-REP-DIST say-2SUBJ-ASSERT-PROX
'You said you hit me (lit., you "I hit me" you-said).' (Loughnane 2005: 146, glosses from Evans 2005: 114)

b. *yal* *kane* [*ininna* *si-ra-bin-w-a*]
man many us hit-IRR-1PL.SUBJ-REP-DIST
di-n-g-w-e
say-3-ASSERT-3-PROX
'They say they will hit us (lit., they "we hit us" they-said).' (Loughnane 2005: 146, glosses from Evans 2005: 114)

In (7a, b), the reported clause includes two instances of 1st person, one referring to the current speaker, the other to the reported speaker. As in Gahuku, the conflict between the roles of current addressee and reported speaker is resolved in favor of the 1st person in (7a); cf. also an example from Dom, a closely related language, in Aikhenvald (2008: 405), citing Tida (2006: 219); also Reesink (1993: 220) for Usan.

Although similar to Havyaka Kannada in its treatment of reported speakers, Golin differs from it in the treatment of reported addressees: only the current

addressee is mapped to the 2nd person, while the reported one is treated as 3rd person (Loughnane 2005). This variation on the Havyaka Kannada type can be represented as follows:

(8)

current interlocutors	vs.	reported speaker	vs.	reported addressee & others
↓		↓		↓
1st and 2nd		1st		3rd

The data discussed in this section suggests that the mapping of speech-event roles to person values varies across languages, and the variation can be described in terms of language-specific person alignment types. For the rest of the article, I turn to a more systematic investigation of the types of person alignment attested in West African languages, to suggest that the West African types differ both from the European type and from the types illustrated above for Havyaka Kannada and Golin. Unlike the European type, the West African systems do not neutralize completely the distinction between reported interlocutors and 3rd person participants, but in contrast to Havyaka Kannada, they also do not treat the current and the reported interlocutors in exactly the same way.

In what follows, I first describe the strategy a number of African languages use to deal with the problem of encoding reported interlocutors and show that it differs from all three types described above (Section 2.1). I then discuss the phenomenon of LOGOPHORICITY in a number of West African languages, arguing that it represents a variation on essentially the same strategy, to which it is historically related (Section 2.2). I survey several types of logophoric systems, suggesting that they all share certain characteristics that distinguish them from the European person alignment type (Section 3). Finally, I address some of the more complex issues related to conflicting participant roles (Section 4) and conclude with a general discussion (Section 5).

2. Distinguishing between current and reported speakers

2.1. *Assimilating reported speaker to 3rd person*

Consider a seemingly anomalous combination of person values attested in the "semi-direct" discourse of Adioukrou (Kwa; Côte d'Ivoire).

(9) a. *li* *dad* *wɛl* *nɛnɛ* ɔny *ùsr*
3SG said.ACCM them this 2PL.REPORT build.IMPER
ir *el*
3SG.OBJ house
'She$_i$ said to them$_j$: You$_j$ build me$_i$ a house (lit., you build her a house).' (Hill 1995: 91)

b. *ow'n* *ɛsɛ* in ɛkn'ŋ
DISJ.REPORT said.ACCM 3SG.REPORT saw.ACCM.2SG.OBJ
yogŋ
there
'He$_i$ said, I$_i$ saw you there (lit., he saw you there).' (Hill 1995: 98)

In both examples, the reported clause cannot be classified as either direct or indirect speech. In (9a), the reported addressee is encoded as 2nd person plural, as in direct speech, but the reported speaker is introduced by a 3rd person pronoun, instead of 1st person. In (9b), the reported addressee is mapped to the 2nd person, but the reported speaker, again, is referred to by a 3rd person pronoun.[5] In both examples, the subject of the report is encoded by a special "reporting" pronoun. Such pronouns are normally used to encode subjects in both parts of constructions with speech reports, i.e., both in the reporting part and in the part introducing reported discourse.[6] The use of the special "reporting" forms clearly indicates that the reports are not intended to represent the original utterance verbatim, in the sense of European direct reporting.

Besides the 2nd person encoding of the reported addressee, the semi-direct discourse of Adioukrou is characterized by a number of features typical of European direct speech. It allows for the use of vocatives and exclamations, as well as of the unaltered question construction and the imperative form of the verb. Locational deictics are interpreted in semi-direct discourse relative to the narrated event, not relative to the current speech situation, suggesting that there is no shift in spatial deixis. Finally, semi-direct reports aim at reproducing the original intonation, just like direct speech reports. The only characteristic that distinguishes this type of report in Adioukrou from European direct discourse is a partial shift in pronominal reference: the reported speaker is encoded in the 3rd person.

The discourse reports of Adioukrou violate the implicational hierarchy proposed in Plank (1986) to account for the partial shifting of deictic categories in German and crosslinguistically. Most importantly, Plank's hierarchy predicts that shifts in speaker-indexicality and speech-event roles should imply a shift in spatial and temporal deixis. The combination of features attested in Adioukrou,

5. The context makes it clear that the 2nd person object marking refers in this example to a character other than the current addressee; hence, the example differs from indirect speech reporting, where the 2nd person would have to refer to the current (but not necessarily the reported) addressee.

6. Thus, both subjects are encoded by reported pronouns in (9b); in (9a), the subject of the reporting part is not encoded by a reporting pronoun, presumably due to the presence of the demonstrative 'this', which seems to imply a different syntactic relation between the two clauses (literally, 'She said to them this: you build her a house').

and other languages discussed here, violates the hierarchy in two ways: (i) only some of the person values are shifted, resulting in a non-consistent shift within a category (cf. Plank 1986: 298), and (ii) the person deixis is partially shifted, while other deictic categories (e.g., spatial deixis) are not. Such violations once again illustrate the difference between the optional "semi-direct" discourse of European languages and a special person alignment pattern: the latter is rigid in specifying which discourse roles can be mapped to which person values, and normally does not involve shifts in any deictic category other than person.

The Adioukrou-style encoding differs both from European indirect discourse and from the alternative model illustrated above with examples from Havyaka Kannada and New Guinean languages. In Adioukrou, reported addressees are encoded by 2nd person, just like the current addressee, but reported speakers receive 3rd person marking. This type of person alignment is represented in (10).[7]

(10)

current speaker	vs.	all addressees	vs.	reported speaker & others
↓		↓		↓
1st		2nd		3rd

The same type of person alignment is attested in Obolo (Cross River; Nigeria), where the reported speaker is encoded in "semi-indirect" discourse by 3rd person pronouns, but the reported addressee is treated as a 2nd person.

(11) a. *ògwú úgâ okêkǐtó ító íkíbé gwún̰* kàn̰, ɔ̀mɔ̂
this mother was.crying cry say child 3SG.POSS 3SG
ìkâtùmú ìnyí ɔ̀wù *yê íbé* ɔ̀wù *kàgɔ̌ɔk ìfít ífìt*
not.told give 2SG Q say 2SG not.follow play play
yì
this
'The mother was crying, saying: "My child, did I not tell you not to join in this dance group?" (lit., "her child, did she not tell you…").' (Aaron 1992: 232)

b. *ògwú énêrìèen̰ òbê* ɔ̀wù *ǹga* kàn̰, *m̀gbɔ̀ kèyí*
this man said 2SG mother 3SG.POSS time this
ìrè m̀bùbàn, tăp nyî ɔ̀mɔ̂…
be curse put give 3SG
'The man said: "Mother, this time (even if) you curse me …" (lit., "you, his mother, this time curse him").' (Aaron 1992: 232)

7. As in Golin, there is an asymmetry in the treatment of the two reported interlocutors, but their encoding is different: in Adioukrou, the reported speaker is distinguished from the current one and assimilated to 3rd person; in Golin, the same applies to the reported addressee.

Aaron (1992: 237–238) suggests that the unusual combination of person values is a result of reluctance on behalf of Obolo speakers to refer to a reported speaker, rather than the current narrator, with 1st person pronouns, and that the same reluctance accounts for the general avoidance of direct speech in Obolo discourse. As we will see below, a large number of other West African languages choose to encode the reported speaker in a way distinct from the current speaker, even though the particular strategies individual languages use for that vary.

To summarize, both in Adioukrou and in Obolo, person alignment is characterized by a split in the encoding of reported interlocutors. The reported addressee is treated in the same way as the current one (2nd person), but the reported speaker is encoded by 3rd person pronouns. I will now proceed to show that African languages with special logophoric markers are often characterized by the same type of person alignment, distinguishing between the reported speaker, on the one hand, and all other interlocutors, on the other.

2.2. *Special marking for reported speaker*

In a large number of African languages, specialized LOGOPHORIC markers are used to refer to the person whose speech, thoughts, or perceptions are being reported. Logophoricity is particularly widespread in Niger-Congo, but it is also attested in Afro-Asiatic and Nilo-Saharan languages spoken in West and Central Africa (Dimmendaal 2001, Güldemann 2008a: 154–156). Languages vary in their way of encoding logophoricity. The majority of logophoric languages make use of special logophoric pronouns; this strategy is illustrated in (12) for Wan (Mande; Côte d'Ivoire). For a detailed study of logophoricity in Wan, see Nikitina (forthcoming).

(12) a. *ɓé à nɔ̰ gé* ɓā *ɓé gōmɔ̄*
then 3SG wife said LOG.SG that understood
'And his wife$_i$ said she$_i$ understood that.'

b. *ɓé à nɔ̰ gé* è *gā*
then 3SG wife said 3SG went
'And his wife said he left.'

In (12a), the singular logophoric pronoun refers to the person whose speech is being reported; in (12b), the regular 3rd person singular pronoun must refer to some other 3rd person participant, who can be involved neither in the current speech-event nor in the reported one.[8]

Somewhat less frequently, logophoricity is encoded by cross-reference markers on verbs or, rarely, by verbal affixes (Curnow 2002).[9] The contexts in which

8. In Wan, there are two logophoric pronouns, one singular and one plural. Their behavior in the relevant respects is identical.

logophoric markers appear also vary across languages, ranging from constructions reporting speech to constructions reporting thoughts, emotional states, intentions, etc. In this article, I focus on constructions with reported speech, for two reasons. Firstly, it is the primary environment in which logophoric markers are attested in all languages and from which logophoricity may be extended to other contexts in a language-specific way (Culy 1994b). Secondly, constructions with reported speech differ from other logophoric contexts in potentially involving a whole set of interlocutors, both current and reported. Reports of intention, thoughts, etc., on the other hand, are rarely addressed to anyone other than the reported speaker him/herself. In this sense, constructions with reported speech are unique in presenting evidence for the encoding of all four possible interlocutors: the current speaker and addressee, as well as the reported speaker and addressee.

Let us now turn to person alignment in speech reports with logophoric markers. It is commonly assumed that logophoricity is a feature of indirect discourse (Culy 1997, Sells 1987: 475, Andersen 1999: 523, Schlenker 2003, Oshima 2011, *inter alia*), and that logophoric markers are used in order to disambiguate reference in indirect speech reports, where a 3rd person pronoun can refer either to the reported speaker or to some other 3rd person participant, as in English *He$_i$ said he$_{i/j}$ was ready* (Hedinger 1984: 95; Coulmas 1986: 21–22; Dimmendaal 2001: 146; Güldemann 2003: 370, 2008b: 36, among many others). This assumption is motivated to some extent by the functional parallel between African logophoric markers and non-clause-bounded reflexives in languages like Latin, Japanese, or Icelandic (Sells 1987 and references therein). A closer look at the data, however, reveals that logophoric markers in a number of West African languages differ in important ways from the logophoric use of reflexive pronouns in European languages or in Japanese. In particular, African logophoric markers are rarely associated with unambiguously indirect discourse, even in languages where indirect speech reporting is an option. In this sense, African logophoric clauses usually do not fit into the direct vs. indirect dichotomy, displaying a number of features typical of direct speech, as well as a puzzling mixed combination of person values (von Roncador 1988, 1992). The examples below illustrate the unusual behavior of logophoric clauses that is problematic for treatments of logophoric markers as markers of co-referentiality restricted to indirect speech reports.

In Wan, logophoric pronouns appear in clauses that only differ from direct discourse in that they use a logophoric pronoun. Logophoric clauses retain the

9. A logophoric verbal affix is attested in Gokana (Cross River; Nigeria), cf. Hyman & Comrie (1981). Logophoricity of Gokana, however, differs in many ways from all other types of logophoric systems (Curnow 2002: 10–12); for example, Comrie (1983) analyzes the logophoric marking of Gokana as a "very young" (and highly atypical) switch-reference system.

original tense and aspect of the original utterance; they may include interjections and vocatives; and they may represent questions and commands in the same form as in direct speech (with an interrogative particle and the imperative form of the verb, respectively, cf. (14)); in addition, temporal adverbs with deictic reference ('today', 'yesterday', etc.) are normally interpreted with respect to the time of the reported speech-event, not the time of narration. Yet, the assignment of person values does not conform to the familiar distinction between direct and indirect discourse. On the one hand, reference to the reported speaker is made by a special pronoun distinct from the regular 1st person (the logophoric pronoun). Correspondingly, 1st person reference is reserved for the current speaker. In (13), for example, the 1st person pronoun does not include the reported speaker (an enraged wild animal), but refers to a group of people that includes the narrator, his siblings, and friends.[10]

(13) *ɓé* *gé* ɓāá kā̱ *tɔ́gɔ̄lē* *dō* *tɛ́-ŋ*
that.one said LOG+COP 1PL.EXCL elder.brother one kill-PROSP
'He wanted to kill one of our elder brothers (lit., he_i said he_i is going to kill an elder brother of ours).'

On the other hand, 2nd person pronouns are used to refer to the reported addressee, as in direct speech. In (14), the reported addressee is encoded as the 2nd person subject of the purpose clause, and the logophoric pronoun in the object function encodes the reported speaker.

(14) *è* *gé* *zò* *ɓé* lā ɓā *pólì*
3SG said come then 2SG LOG.SG wash
'She_i said: come and (you) wash her_i.'

This combination of person values is strikingly similar to the one discussed in the previous section for Adioukrou and Obolo: the reported speaker is treated in a way distinct both from the current speaker and the two kinds of addressee. In Adioukrou and in Obolo, the reported speaker is the only interlocutor encoded as 3rd person. In Wan, the reported speaker receives its own encoding in the form of a specialized logophoric pronoun.

(15)

current speaker	current & reported addressees	reported speaker	others
↓	↓	↓	↓
1st	2nd	LOG	3rd

10. Although this sentence is naturally interpreted as not involving speech in the literal sense, it involves a primary verb of speaking, and its meaning is not completely grammaticalized. It may be more correct, however, to refer to the relevant participant of (13) as the reported subject of consciousness, not the reported speaker *sensu stricto*.

The same type of person alignment is attested in many other West African languages, as well as in languages of Central Africa (Boyeldieu 2004). In the logophoric clauses of Mundang (Adamawa; Chad and Cameroon), both the current and the reported addressee are encoded as the 2nd person, while the current and the reported speaker are encoded by the 1st person and by the logophoric pronoun, respectively (Hagège 1974: 292). In other respects, logophoric clauses behave by and large like direct speech reports, retaining the structure of interrogative clauses (16a, c) and imperative forms of the verb (16d).

(16) a. *à fá* mò *ʔḬ̄* zì̱ *nē*
3SG say 2SG see LOG Q
'He asked (him): "Did you see me?" '

b. *à zī̱ zâ: ā:* rù *ʃɪ̰́ kì*
3SG answer mouth 3SG.POSS 1PL.EXCL detest RECIPR
zì̱ *Bá̰* mō *yá̰ wōr* Mìn
LOG take 2SG.NONSUBJ hut husband LOG.POSS
'She answered: "We (my husband and I) detest ourselves. I bring you to my husband's hut".'

c. *à fá fé* zì̱ *dzō̰ fàn mɛ̄y* mò *hɲ́ fḬ̄*
3SG say QUOT LOG do thing that 2SG give what
zì̱ *nē*
LOG Q
'He said: "If I do that, what will you give me?" '

d. *à fá* mò *tʃḭ̄ wāl* zì̱ *ʔḬ̄ Dɨ̀*
3SG say 2SG transform.oneself food LOG see INJUNCT
'He said: "Transform yourself into food, for me to see!" '

The same combination of person values is attested in the "combined" speech of Akɔɔse (Bantu, Cameroon). Unlike Wan and Mundang, which have logophoric pronouns, Akɔɔse uses a special logophoric prefix. In the "combined" speech, the reported speaker in the subject function is cross-referenced by a logophoric marker, while the reported addressee is encoded as 2nd person (Hedinger 1984: 92).

(17) *ă kèn nzé* è-*kàlé mètóm,* mə́-*'bɛ́l* wɛ̀ *čán*
RP Q if you-told lies LOG-will.do you will
'He asked, "If you told lies, what should I do with you?" '

The same mixture of person values is illustrated in (18), where the logophoric clause also contains a vocative form, just like a direct speech report (Hedinger 1984: 93); also note that the reported speaker is encoded by a 3rd person pro-

noun in a non-subject position (where no special logophoric marker is available).

(18) *mwàád à-lângɛ̀ ǹjóm ă à-ǹjóm, ngánè* nyú'mɔ́
wife she-tells husband RP VOC-husband as you.LOG
nyî-*dyɛ̌ nén… ă ǹbwɛ́'ɛ́* mɔ́-*'wɛ́ɛ́ ă* é-*kɛ̀*
2PL-have.stayed like.this RP day-when LOG'll-die RP you-go
è-*lɔ́géd* mɛ́ *á son tê*
you-leave her LOC grave in
'The wife said to her husband: "Husband, since we have stayed like this … the day when I die, go and put me in a grave." '

A combination of logophoric pronouns with 2nd person addressees is attested in the "semi-direct" discourse of Engenni (Kwa; Nigeria), as well as in a number of Narrow Grassfields Bantoid languages spoken in Cameroon: Aghem, Ngwo, Babungo.

In Engenni (Thomas 1978: 23), logophoric pronouns do not appear in the object position, and 3rd person pronouns are used instead. The sentence in (19a) presents a combination of person values typical of a logophoric clause: the reported addressee is treated as a 2nd person (as in direct speech), and the reported speaker is encoded by a 3rd person pronoun in the object position (as in indirect speech), as well as by a special logophoric pronoun in the subject position. In (19b), the logophoric pronoun also co-occurs with a 2nd person referring to the reported, not the current, addressee.

(19) a. *ò wei ga…* bhú *tọu* ẹì *ka* ọ̀kì *nàà*
3SG say QUOT 2SG should.take 3SG.OBJ SEQ LOG and
ì̩wó *wu zà*
2SG should.die stay
'He said: "Look after me, and I will die with you." '

b. *… ga* ọ̀kí *wo ku* wo *ga* bhù *nà gba à*
QUOT LOG not.say give 2SG.OBJ that 2SG NEG tell Q
'(He said:) Did I not tell you that you weren't to tell anyone?'

In Aghem, the logophoric pronoun refers to the reported speaker, while the current speaker is encoded as 1st person (20a), as in indirect speech. In (20b), however, the reported addressee is encoded by a 2nd person pronoun, as in direct speech (Hyman 1979: 51).

(20) a. *wìzɨ́n mɔ̀ dzɛ̀ ɲɨ́'á* m̀ *mɔ̂ kɔ̀?* ghé
woman PST said that I PST see LOG
'The woman$_i$ said that I saw her$_i$.'

b. *wìzɨ́n* *'vʉ́* *ndzè* *à* *wɨ́n* *ɳ̃ɨ́'á* é *ŋgé* *'lɨ́ghá*
woman that said to him that LOG.SUBJ much like
wò
you
'The woman said to him that she likes him a lot.'

The same pattern of 2nd person encoding of the reported addressee is attested in logophoric clauses in Ngwo (Voorhoeve 1980: 181):

(21) *ékūrú* *wɛ̄* *kpē* *bə̄* *ɳ̃ém* *yé* ngwò *nɛ́* *zùŋʉ́* *kpē* mbè
panther it says to animal it you really think that LOG
sā: āwɛ́⁻*?*
leave you
'The panther says to the animal: "Do you really think that I'll leave you?"'

Finally, example (22) from Babungo not only features a similar combination of person values, but also demonstrates that the logophoric pronoun is not interpreted as a kind of 1st person pronoun (Schaub 1985: 2). To refer to a plurality of participants, Babungo uses a combination of a plural and a singular pronoun: literally, 'you.PL [with] LOG' for 'you and me'. The choice of the plural pronoun ('you' vs. 'we' or 'they') is determined by a referential hierarchy (cf. Plank 1985): 1st person plural is picked for referents that include the speaker, 2nd person plural is used with referents that include the addressee (but not the speaker), and 3rd person plural is used otherwise. If the logophoric pronoun were treated as a subtype of a 1st person pronoun (as in direct speech), the sentence in (22) would have to feature a 1st person plural pronoun (literally, 'we [with] LOG' for 'LOG and me'). Instead, the logophoric referent is included in the 2nd person plural pronoun ('you.PL'), just like regular 3rd person referents.

(22) *fəkáy* *gí* *(tɨ́* *bɔ́ɔ)* *lāa* *síi* *kà'* vìŋ yì
tortoise say-IMPF to leopard that doubt can you.PL LOG
yɨ̀ *kɔ́*
do.IMPF what
'Tortoise said (to Leopard): "What can we (1SG+2SG) do?"'

The proposed type of person alignment helps explain what from the European perspective is a widely attested "anomaly" in the functioning of such logophoric systems, namely, the fact that the encoding of person in logophoric contexts is consistent with neither the direct nor the indirect model of reported discourse. Crucially, the inconsistent combinations of person values are in general obligatory, and cannot be explained away as instances of partial deictic shifts for stylistic purposes. I return to this question at the end of the article.

The analysis in terms of a special type of person alignment captures the striking similarities in the encoding of person between the logophoric languages listed above and some other West African languages that have no dedicated logophoric markers. In the examples above, the logophoric pronouns behave exactly like 3rd person pronouns referring to the reported speaker in Adioukrou and Obolo, and as in Adioukrou and Obolo, their use is at odds with the "direct" encoding of the addressee. The similarity is of course not coincidental, as logophoric pronouns commonly derive from 3rd person pronouns, as well as emphatics, demonstratives, and other kinds of 3rd person elements (Dimmendaal 2001). The system of person alignment attested in Adioukrou, which encodes the distinction between a reported speaker (3rd person) and all other interlocutors (1st or 2nd person), presents ideal conditions for the development of a specialized logophoric pronoun once the 3rd person pronoun is replaced with a new form. This is exactly what happened in Aghem, where the singular logophoric pronoun goes back to an old 3rd person form, which became replaced by a demonstrative in all other functions (Hyman 1979: 51).

To summarize, I have shown that a number of West African languages display a characteristic pattern of person alignment that encodes the distinction between the reported speaker, on the one hand, and all other interlocutors, on the other. This phenomenon is attested both in logophoric and in non-logophoric languages. In logophoric languages, the reported speaker receives specialized marking; in non-logophoric languages, it is encoded as 3rd person, which still effectively distinguishes it from the current speaker. In the following section I turn to a variation on this type of person alignment – languages that encode not only the distinction between the current and the reported speaker, but also the distinction between the current and the reported addressee.

3. Distinguishing between current and reported addressees

3.1. *Assimilating the reported addressee to 3rd person*

The strategy of mapping the reported addressee to 3rd person is attested in a number of logophoric languages. The data from such languages does not look as striking, from the European perspective, as the examples discussed in the preceding section, but only for one particular reason: when a language uses a logophoric pronoun to encode the reported speaker, and the reported addressee is encoded as 3rd person, the resulting pattern is superficially similar to person assignment in European indirect discourse. The similarity is obvious, for example, in the case of Ewe, where reported addressees are treated as 3rd, not 2nd, person (Clements 1975: 152, contra Westermann 1907, 1930: 60–61).

(23) *Kofi gblɔ na wo be yè-a-dyi ga-a na* WO
Kofi speak to 3PL that LOG-T-seek money-D for 3PL
'Kofi$_i$ said to them$_j$ that he$_i$ would seek the money for them$_j$.'

In logophoric clauses of this type, there is no obvious conflict in the alignment of person values, if the logophoric pronoun is analyzed as a subtype of a 3rd person pronoun.

(24) current interlocutors → 1st & 2nd; reported speaker → LOG; reported addressee & others → 3rd

Logophoric languages of this type rarely pose obvious problems to the direct vs. indirect distinction, and their logophoric clauses are typically treated as indirect discourse (for formal treatments, see, e.g., Schlenker 2003, Anand 2006, Oshima 2011). It is important to note, however, that in some such languages person values are the only feature that logophoric clauses share with indirect speech in European languages. Other deictic values (the interpretation of temporal adverbs, spatial deictics, etc.) are often determined with respect to the reported speech-event, not the current one; logophoric clauses may include vocatives and interjections, as well as represent questions and commands as in direct discourse, i.e., with regular interrogatives and imperatives (for an example, see Perrin 1974: 31–33 on Mambila).

In some languages, the affinity between logophoric clauses and direct discourse may extend even further. In Donno Sɔ (Dogon; Mali and Burkina Faso), as in Ewe, the reported addressee in clauses with logophoric pronouns is treated as a 3rd person. The logophoric clauses, however, display a number of characteristics atypical of indirect speech reports. In the following example, the logophoric clause embeds an interjection, as well as the deictic adverb 'now'.

(25) *gamma … sǫ̀n-ana wa lɛ:* nɛ indyemɛn̰ *barazuu*
cat horse-male ADDR also now LOG.OBJ help
kɔ kwei ai wa yoru indyem' *mɔ̰ yabaa*
AUX certainly mouse SUBJ loan LOG POSS taken
obɛlɛ haya! indyemɛn̰ *baranni yo giru*
gives.NEG INTJ LOG.OBJ helped.NEG.3PL if surpass
gondi gi
remove said
'The cat$_i$ said to the stallion too that it was certainly necessary to help him$_i$; that the mouse had taken his$_i$ loan and wouldn't return it. Aaaah! That if someone didn't help him$_i$ he$_i$ would certainly not succeed.' (Culy 1994a: 117 citing Kervran & Prost 1986: 162)

Even more strikingly, the reported speaker is cross-referenced by 1st person markers on the verb; the current speaker, on the other hand, is encoded by regular 1st person pronouns but cross-referenced by 3rd person/unmarked suffixes:

(26) a. *Oumar* [inyemɛ *jɛmbɔ paza* bolum] *miŋ̃ tagi*
Oumar LOG sack.DEF drop left.1SG 1SG.OBJ informed
'Oumar$_i$ told me$_j$ that he$_i$ had left without the sack.' (Culy 1994a: 123)

b. *Oumar* [ma *jɛmbɔ paza* boli] *miŋ̃ tagi*
Oumar 1SG.SUBJ sack.DEF drop left 1SG.OBJ informed
'Oumar$_i$ told me$_j$ that I$_j$ had left without the sack.' (Culy 1994a: 123)

In some languages, reported speakers are cross-referenced by 1st person markers on the verb even though the language has no specialized logophoric pronoun. This phenomenon, illustrated below with examples from two Nilo-Saharan languages, is discussed by Curnow (2002) in terms of "first person logophoricity".

(27) a. Karimojong (Eastern Nilotic; Uganda)
àbɨ papà tolim ɛbè àlózì iŋèz *morotó*
AUX father say that 1SG.go.NPST 3SG Moroto
'The father said that he was going to Moroto.' (Novelli 1985: 531, quoted from Curnow 2002: 9)

b. Lotuko (Eastern Nilotic; Sudan)
a̰ati 'daŋ xul ojori 'tɔ jojo ɛra isi *a*
people all REL say PART COMP 1PL.be they PART
xobwok
kings
'those who say that they are kings' (Muratori 1938, quoted from von Roncador 1992: 172)

In both examples, the current and the reported speakers are distinguished at the level of pronominal reference: the reported speaker is encoded by 3rd person pronouns, just as in Adioukrou and Obolo (see Section 2.1). The cross-reference markers on the verb, however, are in conflict with the 3rd person encoding of the reported speaker, as if the verb form were reproduced verbatim. As discussed above, given that logophoric pronouns typically derive from 3rd person pronouns, the structures in (27) provide an ideal context for the development of a specialized logophoric pronoun cross-referenced by 1st person markers on the verb, as in Donno Sɔ.[11]

11. The pattern of cross-reference in Donno Sɔ has some additional complications: e.g., the re-

In sum, the type of person encoding discussed in this section is superficially similar to that of European indirect discourse, if the logophoric pronouns are analyzed as a subtype of 3rd person pronouns (which, in most cases, is motivated by their diachrony). Personal deixis, however, is often the only feature distinguishing logophoric clauses from direct reporting, and person alignment may show a number of further anomalies, such as conflicting values of pronouns and cross-reference markers encoding the reported speaker. While the standard direct vs. indirect dichotomy cannot accommodate such systematic discrepancies, treating them in light of crosslinguistic differences in person alignment has the advantage of accounting for some recurring patterns, rather than dismissing them as exceptional. In particular, I have suggested that this kind of logophoricity is another variation on the type of person alignment discussed in the previous section: not only is the reported speaker encoded by a special marker, but the reported addressee is also distinguished from the current interlocutors and encoded as 3rd person. This strategy is parallel to the one used in Adioukrou and Obolo for reported speakers: shifting reported addressees to 3rd person warrants distinct encoding of current vs. reported interlocutors (a curious reader is invited to consult the summarizing Table 2 in Section 5 for a preview of a comparison between the types).

3.2. *Special marking for the reported addressee*

Encoding the reported addressee by 3rd person pronouns is but one strategy of distinguishing it from the current addressee. One would expect to find languages where the same distinction would be encoded by means of a special "reported addressee" marker.[12] Such markers are indeed attested in Chadic languages. In Goemai (West Chadic; Nigeria), there are two special sets of pronouns used for the encoding of the reported speaker and the reported addressee, respectively.[13] The use of the two types of logophoric pronoun is illustrated below.

---

ported addressee is both encoded by 3rd person pronouns and cross-referenced by 3rd person/unmarked suffixes. More data on the encoding of all combinations of discourse roles is necessary for a fuller account.

12. The discovery of exactly this type of pronominal system was anticipated, on theoretical grounds, by Hagège (1974: 295): "it would be interesting to research languages where *you* of the audience of principal discourse would have a different form from *you* of the audience of reported discourse".

13. The logophoric pronouns are disappearing in the speech of the younger generation due to interference from Hausa.

(28) *k'wal yin* gwa *goe tu* ji
talk say SG.M.LOG.ADR OBLIG kill SG.M.LOG.SP
'(He$_i$) said that he$_j$ should kill him$_i$.' or 'He said: "You should kill me".' (Hellwig 2006: 219)

Crucially, apart from person alignment, the logophoric construction behaves exactly like direct speech reports in European languages (Hellwig 2006: 219–220). Temporal adverbs in logophoric clauses are interpreted with respect to the reported speech-event (29a), the logophoric clause may contain interjections (29b), and it may even reproduce verbatim idiosyncrasies of the reported speaker's speech, cf. the non-standard form in (29c).

(29) a. *dyen k'wal yin d'in ji wul*
YESTPST talk say CLOSEPST SG.M.LOG.SP arrive
m-b'itlung
LOC-morning
'(He$_i$) said yesterday that he$_i$ arrived earlier today.' (i.e., he arrived yesterday from the perspective of the current speaker)

b. *yin* to / hai *pa goe dap*
say okay hey SG.F.LOG.ADR OBLIG slap
'(He said) that, okay, hey, she should slap (him).'

c. *ji t'al* oelem
SG.M.LOG.SP pluck beans
'(He$_i$ said that) he$_i$ plucked the beans.' (here, the childish form *oelem* is used in place of the standard adult form *oerem* 'beans')

The pattern of person alignment in Goemai is summarized in (30).

(30)

current interlocutors	reported addresseee	reported speaker	others
↓	↓	↓	↓
1st & 2nd	LOG.ADR	LOG.SP	3rd

A similar system with two sets of logophoric pronouns is attested in Mupun (West Chadic; Nigeria) (Frajzyngier 1985, 1993: 108–118).[14] On the other hand, Pero, another West Chadic language, makes use of addressee-oriented logophoric pronouns in order to distinguish between current and reported addressees, but has no special pronouns to encode the difference between the current and the reported speaker (Frajzyngier 1996: 179). Instead, Pero encodes the reported speaker as 3rd person, still avoiding the ambiguity between the current vs. the reported speaker interpretation (Frajzyngier 1989: 123).

14. In Mupun, addressee-oriented logophoric pronouns are also used to indicate disjoint reference, which may point to the way the addressee-oriented logophoric markers developed.

Table 1. *European solution to overlaps in the sets of interlocutors*

	Reported speaker	Reported addressee
Current speaker coincides with:	1st person *I said* I *would not agree*	1st person *He told me he would not let* me *in*
Current addressee coincides with:	2nd person *You said* you *would leave*	2nd person *Did they tell you* you *should come back again*?

4. Overlapping sets of current and reported interlocutors

Before turning to general discussion, I would like to address one type of complication related to the encoding of current and reported interlocutors in speech reports. Quite often – possibly in the majority of naturally occurring speech reports – the sets of current and reported interlocutors overlap. The reported speaker may coincide with the current addressee, as in *You said you would leave*, or with the current speaker, as in *I said I would not agree*. The same type of relation often exists between the reported addressee and the current speaker, as in *He*$_{\text{i}}$ *told me he*$_{\text{i}}$ *would not let me in*, or between the reported and the current addressees, as in *Did they tell you you should come back again?* In European indirect discourse, the referential conflict is resolved in favor of the current interlocutor, and person is always encoded based on the participant's role in the current speech-event. The choice of person is illustrated in Table 1 for the four possible variants of overlapping sets of current and reported interlocutors.[15] The choice of person value in Table 1 is entirely predictable based on the European type of person alignment, as European languages only encode the distinction between the current interlocutors and all other participants (see Section 1). As a result, all participants involved in the current speech situation can – and indeed must – be encoded by 1st and 2nd person, based on their role in that situation (speaker vs. addressee).

In languages with other types of person alignment, the situation is more complex. In case of some overlaps, languages vary with respect to the strategy they choose. I review the four types of referential conflict below, just to demonstrate that in African languages the encoding of conflicting speech-event roles varies, albeit only within the limits defined by the language-specific type of person alignment.

15. For the sake of simplicity, I leave aside another type of overlap, where a singular current interlocutor is included in a set of multiple reported interlocutors, or vice versa (e.g., *He told me*$_{\text{i}}$ *he would call us*$_{\text{i+j}}$ *back*).

(i) Current speaker = reported speaker
This is the type of overlap where the majority of African languages opt for the 1st person encoding. Even in languages with specialized logophoric pronouns, logophoricity is normally not extended to 1st person reported speakers, i.e., to cases where the speaker reports his/her own words (see Hyman & Comrie 1981, Wiesemann 1986, Curnow 2002: 11, von Roncador 1992: 166 for discussions of the few exceptions). This restriction is consistent with the hypothesis that the major function of logophoricity is distinguishing the reported speaker from the current speaker. There is no need to use the logophoric marker when the two coincide. The fact that logophoricity is hardly ever attested in reports of one's own discourse (in examples like 'I said that I would leave') presents a challenge to any syntactic account that treats logophoric pronouns as markers of co-reference. Such accounts would have to prevent logophors from referring to 1st person reporters, presumably by stipulating an additional – and rather arbitrary-looking – person restriction on the use of logophoric markers.

(ii) Current speaker = reported addressee
If African person alignment is indeed based on the distinction between the current and the reported interlocutors, rather than on the participant's role in the current interaction (as in Europe), one would expect to find some variation in this type of overlap. This is indeed the case. Some languages encode such participants as 1st person, cf. (26b) from Donno Sɔ. Others opt for the 2nd person marking, cf. Hagège (1974: 296–297) on Mundang: "if discourse is addressed to a principal speaker, then 'He says that I don't know Mundang' will be "He tells me: You don't know Mundang."".

(iii) Current addressee = reported speaker
The encoding of person in this type of overlap is, again, underdetermined for African languages. Since the central distinction underlying their person alignment system is that between the current and the reported interlocutors (not between the current interlocutors and all others), there are no *a priori* constraints on the choice of person value in this particular case. And indeed, logophoric languages fall into two types depending on whether logophoricity is restricted to 3rd person speakers or extended to the 2nd person, i.e., to the current addressee (Hyman & Comrie 1981, von Roncador 1992). Languages that use logophoric marking for both non-interlocutors and for current addressees ("2+3 logophoricity") include Wan, Akɔɔse, and Ewe; in such languages, a sentence like 'You said you would leave' would be rendered using a logophoric pronoun ('You said LOG would leave'). Languages that restrict logophoric marking to non-interlocutors ("3-only logophoricity") include Mundang, Donno Sɔ, and Mupun; in this type of language, the same sentence would not feature

a logophoric pronoun, but the report would include a 2nd person pronoun instead.

(iv) Current addressee = reported addressee
Unfortunately, this type of example ('I told you you should leave') is very infrequent in texts, and no conclusion can be drawn regarding the choice of pronoun in logophoric languages in this case. One would expect, however, that addressee-oriented logophoric markers would not be extended to such cases, just as speaker-oriented logophoric markers are rarely extended to current speakers.

The variation in the treatment of some types of overlap is predicted by the hypothesis that African languages differ from European languages in their person alignment. Instead of relying exclusively on the participant's role in the current speech event, the languages discussed above develop sophisticated subtypes of person alignment that take into account the distinction between the current and the reported interlocutors.

5. Conclusion

5.1. *Person alignment vs. partial deictic shifts*

At the heart of person distinctions in European languages is the dichotomy between current speech-event participants and all others. This dichotomy, however, is but one distinction that a language may choose to encode in its system of person alignment. In other languages, person is construed not only in terms of the participant's role in the current speech situation, but also in terms of its role in the reported speech-event. In West Africa, in particular, the encoding of person is often complicated either by the use of special markers to encode reported speech-event participants or by unexpected combinations of person values, which are compatible with neither the direct nor the indirect speech model. Even though such combinations of person values are typically described for individual languages in terms of "semi-direct" or "combined" discourse, they differ in three ways from the well-known cases of mixed reporting attested in European languages (e.g., in the free indirect discourse):

(i) They are often obligatory, and either represent the only possible discourse reporting strategy or co-exist with an alternative strategy, from which they are distinguished in a systematic way. It seems preferable to account for an obligatory combination of person values in terms of language-specific role-to-person mapping, rather than treat it as a stylistic device.

(ii) They are rigid in specifying the encoding of specific discourse roles, suggesting that the choice of a person value is a matter of language-specific person alignment, not a matter of the narrator's creative use of deixis (cf. the cases discussed in Aikhenvald 2008).

(iii) They normally do not extend to deictic categories other than person, suggesting that the systematic "inconsistencies" in personal deixis are different from the mechanism of partial deictic shifting, which may involve, e.g., shifts in temporal and spatial deixis (cf. Plank 1986).

The characteristic differences between the systems treated in this article and cases of partial deictic shifts suggest that the two phenomena should be distinguished. The proposed account in terms of person alignment is one way of making that distinction.

5.2. *The attested types*

I have argued that the basic principle underlying the assignment of person values in such languages is the encoding of the distinction between participants of the current vs. the reported speech-event. The subtypes of person alignment vary according to whether both or only one of the reported interlocutors (the speaker) are differentiated from the current ones and whether special pronominal elements (logophoric markers) are involved in the encoding of that distinction. The simplest type of person alignment is attested in languages without special logophoric markers, where one of the reported interlocutors (reported speaker) is distinguished from the current one by its 3rd person encoding (Adioukrou, Obolo). In this system, a specialized logophoric marker may later develop for the reported speaker (Wan, Mundang, and other languages discussed in Section 2.2). Some languages also distinguish between the reported and the current addressee by treating the reported addressee as 3rd person (Ewe, Donno Sɔ). This system may also develop a second set of logophoric markers encoding the reported addressee (Goemai, Mupun). Finally, one language is reported to only use specialized marking for the reported addressee, distinguishing the reported speaker from the current one by using 3rd person marking (Pero).

The attested systems distinguishing one or both of the reported interlocutors from the current ones are presented in Table 2. For convenience, I refer to the person values canonically used to represent current interlocutors as "local"; this subsumes 1st and 2nd person, which refer to the speaker and the addressee, respectively.[16] The systems drawing a distinction between at least one pair of current and reported interlocutors are contrasted with the European system on the one hand, and with the systems attested in Havyaka Kannada and some Papua New Guinean languages on the other (Section 1). The latter are characterized

16. Note that this division refers to a way of grouping person values, not speech-event roles. In typological literature, the two are sometimes not explicitly distinguished, and the question of which grammatical phenomena refer to person values (e.g., "local" vs. "non-local"), as opposed to speech-event roles (e.g., "Addressee" vs. all others), is not well researched (cf. the discussion of the distinction in Zwicky 1977).

Table 2. *Summary of the attested types of person alignment*

	Current interlocutors	Reported speaker	Reported addressee	Others
English	local (1/2)	3rd		
Golin	local (1/2)		3rd	
H. Kannada	local (1/2)			3rd
Adioukrou	local (1/2)	3rd	local (1/2)	3rd
Wan	local (1/2)	**LOG**	local (1/2)	3rd
Ewe	local (1/2)	**LOG**	3rd	
Goemai	local (1/2)	**LOG**	**LOG.ADR**	3rd
Pero	local (1/2)	3rd	**LOG.ADR**	3rd

by extending local (1st and 2nd) person marking to the reported speaker, and sometimes also to the reported addressee. The African systems, on the other hand, are based on distinguishing the reported speaker from the current one, sometimes also by using non-local marking for the reported addressee. In this sense, the two types of system, which are both different from the European one, are based on different underlying principles: in one, reported interlocutors (primarily, the reported speaker) are assimilated to the current ones; in the other, they are distinguished from them by means of specialized marking.

Interestingly, while a number of languages only encode the distinction between the current and the reported speaker, treating the reported addressee as the 2nd person, the reverse pattern is not attested. No language is reported to only distinguish between current and reported addressees while encoding the reported speaker as 1st person. In addition, special addressee-oriented logophoric markers are rare compared to speaker-oriented ones; as far as I know, they are only attested in Chadic.

This asymmetry is most likely due to two factors. As people are in general more likely to talk about themselves than about their addressees, sentences with overtly encoded reported addressees are less frequent than sentences with overt reported speakers. Because of the difference in frequency, the ambiguity between the current and the reported speaker has by far greater significance for the speakers than the ambiguity between the current and the reported addressee. Special strategies for resolving the former ambiguity are more likely to be perceived as indispensable, hence more likely to be propagated, (re)invented, and acquired by new generations of speakers.

The second factor is related to the first: because of the low frequency of relevant examples, the encoding of reported addressees is often not mentioned in discussions of logophoricity or in descriptive grammars of individual languages. The encoding of reported addressees is often difficult to determine

based on texts alone, and researchers rarely make special efforts to document this aspect of grammar.

5.3. *Further implications*

It is possible that the typology in Table 2 is incomplete and more subtypes of person alignment will be found.[17] Moreover, the descriptive data available for most of the languages is scarce, and does not allow me to explore the individual systems in more detail (see, however, Nikitina (forthcoming) for an in-depth case study). In particular, the survey presented here ignores some aspects of person marking that may turn out to be relevant, including the interaction of person with various grammatical phenomena or the syntactic properties of language-particular discourse reporting strategies. My major goal, however, was to demonstrate – admittedly, based on a necessarily superficial survey of existing data from a small number of languages – that a number of African systems of personal deixis share the same underlying principle: not only do they single out participants of the current speech-event, but they also distinguish one or both of the reported interlocutors from the current ones. This observation, if further confirmed, suggests that Jespersen's view of person as a *bona fide* shifter (Jespersen 1921: 123–124, 1924 [1965: 219]; Jakobson 1957) is to a large extent Eurocentric: on a par with the purely deictic distinction between the current interlocutors and all others, languages from other areas may choose to encode the distinction between ENDOPHORIC and EXOPHORIC speech-event participants – that is, text-internal participants and participants determined in the situational context (Hagège 1986: 101, Bhat 2007: 59–61; cf. also Schlenker 2003).

My second goal was to suggest a new approach to African logophoricity and show that a typical West African logophoric language differs in a principled way from Latin or Japanese. In the literature, two characteristics are often assumed to be shared by all logophoric markers: (i) logophoric markers are a feature of indirect discourse; and (ii) logophoric markers are used to resolve the ambiguity of 3rd person reference, i.e., to distinguish the reported speaker from another 3rd person participant. Evidence from person alignment in African logophoric languages discussed above undermines both these assumptions.

First of all, the use of the logophoric marker is often the only feature shared by logophoric clauses with European indirect discourse (von Roncador 1988: 290–293, 1992; Stirling 1993: 256–257). In light of this, I believe that at least

17. For example, Bohnhoff (1986) reports that Yạg Dii (Adamawa; Cameroon) uses special pronouns to distinguish between two levels of embedding of a speech report: reported speaker pronouns used in speech reports (first-degree logophoricity) are different from logophoric pronouns used in reports of speech reports (second-degree logophoricity). Further research is needed to determine the nature and extent of this phenomenon.

some cases of African logophoricity should be treated as representative of a type of person alignment distinct from the familiar European one. In addition to accounting for the "anomalous" combinations of person values in West African speech reports, this treatment would draw a sharper distinction between such obligatory combinations and optional partial person shifts used in some languages for stylistic purposes.

The distinction between direct and indirect discourse is not particularly useful in the case of logophoric languages. The regular combination of "direct" and "indirect" person values in African discourse corroborates the idea that the (allegedly) verbatim reproduction of another's speech as a neutral way of faithful reporting may be characteristic of modern European societies and ultimately dependent on the spread of literacy (Goody 1977: 118–119, Coulmas 1986: 10–11, Nikitina forthcoming).

Secondly, African logophoric markers can hardly be treated as syntactic co-reference markers or simply elements distinguishing the reported speaker from all other participants. Such a treatment misses an essential feature of logophoricity: the common anomalies in the assignment of other person values (which are assigned according to the participant's role in the reported speech situation, as in European direct speech). In addition, many African languages allow for more than one level of embedding of speech reports, in which case several non-coreferential logophoric markers may be used to refer to more than one reported speaker. In (31) from Donno Sɔ, a speech report is embedded in another speech report. Hence, in addition to the current speaker (the narrator of the story), there are two different reported speakers, both of which are encoded by logophoric pronouns within the same sentence (literally, 'if he catches her [LOG], she's his [LOG] wife').

(31) *kɔndyi* *i-yai* *yɛlaa* indyemɛn̰ *tɛmbɛ* indyemɛn̰ *dyɔbaa*
thus child-female come LOG.OBJ found LOG.OBJ run
dɔɛ *yo* *yaana* indyem' *mɔ̰n̰* *gi*
arrive.3SG if wife LOG POSS.OBJ said
'[He$_j$ said that] a girl$_i$ came and found him$_j$ [LOG] and that she$_i$ said that if he$_j$ ran up and caught up with her$_i$ [LOG] then she$_i$ would be his$_j$ [LOG] wife.' (Culy 1994a: 118, Kervran & Prost 1986: 171)

The same combination of two logophoric pronouns referring to two different reported speakers is found in (32) from Yoruba (Defoid; Nigeria), this time within one clause (literally, 'let him [LOG] come with him [LOG]'):

(32) *ó* *ní* *ó* *sọ* *pé* *kí* òun *wá* *bá* òun *lọ*
3SG say 3SG say COMP let LOG come accompany LOG go
'He$_i$ said that he$_j$ asked that he$_i$ [LOG] should come along with him$_j$ [LOG].' (Bamgboṣe 1986: 83)

Even though accounts in terms of syntactic co-reference can probably capture the use of non-coreferential logophors within the same clause, they do not predict such uses. On the contrary, the possibility of having non-coreferential logophors follows naturally from the treatment of logophoricity in terms of person alignment. On such an account, logophoric markers are analyzed as a special person category resolving the ambiguity between the current and the reported speaker (Stirling 1993: 257, Bhat 2007: 60–61, von Roncador 1988), the ambiguity that is so characteristic of European languages (Hagège 1974: 294, Benveniste 1956 [1966: 252]). In this sense, African-style logophoric markers differ from the well-studied instances of syntactic "logophors" of European and Asian languages (in particular, from specialized uses of long-distance reflexives) in their basic function: instead of helping resolve ambiguities in 3rd person reference ('He_i said $he_{i/j}$ agreed'), African-style logophors help keep the current speaker distinct from the reported one ('He_i said $I_{i/j}$ agree').

One final remark is due on the areal distribution of the systems of person alignment based on the special encoding of reported interlocutors. This study focused on African logophoric systems and their close relatives, which seem to be concentrated in a relatively well-defined contact area (Güldemann 2003, 2008a). Similar phenomena are, of course, attested in other parts of the world, and some of the non-African logophoric languages are strikingly similar to the ones discussed above with respect to person alignment (see especially Nau 2006 for Finnish and Latvian, and Bugaeva 2008 for Ainu). West Africa, however, is unusual in its high concentration of logophoric languages, and it is natural to suppose that the spread of this particular person alignment type is motivated by certain shared cultural practices. I would like to suggest that its popularity could be related to the highly interactive practice of narrative performance widespread throughout West and Central Africa. In this type of performance, it is not infrequent for the distinction between the current audience and the narrator, on the one hand, and the characters of the narrative, on the other, to become blurred. Furthermore, a single narrator performing the narrative typically "inhabits" the roles of characters that in the Western theater are assigned to different actors, i.e., associated with different 1st person referents (Urban 1989: 37–38). The multiplicity of roles assumed by a sole speaker in the traditional genre of storytelling may contribute, in combination with an interactive style of performance, to the development of specialized means for distinguishing reported speakers from the narrator in those parts of the narrative where the distinction needs to be drawn.

In oral narratives, logophoric clauses can be interleaved with 1st person narration: the performer may start out reporting a character's speech using logophoric pronouns but later switch to 1st person as the narration becomes more "theatrical". The following example from Wan (Southeastern Mande) illustrates the possibility of shifting from logophoric to 1st person reporting as

the narrative reaches its "culminating" point and the narrator switches from "reporting" to "performing" the discourse of the characters, simultaneously starting to imitate the intonation and sometimes the physical appearance and gesturing of the reported speaker.

(33) *ɓé è gé ēé! ɓāā kɛ̄ é, lā nɔ̰̀nì-á̰*
then 3SG said yes LOG.EMPH that DEF 2SG lose-STATPERF
ŋ̀ mì. ēé! tólì yā̰ gɛ̄, nà̰á̰ gà lé
1SG at yes tomorrow there here.is 1SG+COP go PROG
kɔ̄ŋ tā . . .
walk at
'He said: Yes, myself [LOG], you won't be able to recognize me. Well, tomorrow I'll go for a walk . . . ' (Nikitina forthcoming)

The additional option of 1st person reporting is typically restricted to the liveliest parts of the narrative, where 1st person pronouns are used in what Urban (1989) describes as the "theatrical" function of 1st person, which is opposed both to its "indexical-referential" function in daily speech and to its "anaphoric" function in stylistically neutral European direct speech reports. It is in the latter function – in reports of another's speech that presuppose a clear-cut distinction between the current and the reported speaker – that African logophoric markers are commonly used. In this way, the material of logophoric languages provides a particularly interesting case for the study of various discourse-pragmatic functions of person, which in European languages cannot be distinguished.

Received: 2 August 2011
Revised: 19 February 2012

Universitetet i Oslo

Correspondence address: Universitetet i Oslo, Det humanistiske fakultet, Institutt for filosofi, ide- og kunsthistorie og klassiske språk, Postboks 1020, Blindern, 0315 Oslo, Norway; e-mail: tavnik@gmail.com

Acknowledgements: I am grateful to Joan Bresnan, Beth Levin, Elena Maslova, and Martine Vanhove for their advice on various aspects of this project. I also thank Frans Plank and the anonymous reviewers for helping me improve the article. I am alone responsible for all errors and omissions that remain.

Abbreviations: 1/2/3 1st/2nd/3rd person; ACC accusative; ACCM accomplished form of the verb; ADDR marker of the addressee; ADR addressee; ASSERT assertative; AUX auxiliary; CLOSEPST close past; COMP complementizer; COP copula; D determiner; DEF definite marker; DISJ disjoint reference pronoun; DIST distal; EMPH emphatic; EXCL exclusive; F feminine; FUT future; IMPER imperative; IMPF imperfect; INJUNCT injunctive; INTJ interjection; IRR irrealis; LOC locative; LOG logophoric; M masculine; NEG negation; NONSUBJ nonsubject form; NPST non-past; OBJ object; OBLIG obligative; PART particle; PERF perfect; PL plural; POSS possessive; PROG progressive; PROSP prospective; PROX proximate; PST past; Q question marker; QUOT quotative; RECIPR reciprocal; REL relativizer;

REP reportative; REPORT reporting pronoun; RP reporting particle; SEQ sequential; SG singular; SP speaker; SS same subject marker; STATPERF stative perfect; SUBJ subject; SUCC successive action form; T tense; VOC vocative form; YESTPST yesterday's past.

References

Aaron, Uche E. 1992. Reported speech in Obolo narrative discourse. In Shin Ja J. Hwang & William R. Merrifield (eds.), *Language in context*: *Essays for Robert E. Longacre*, 227–240. Dallas: SIL & The University of Texas at Arlington.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2008. Semi-direct speech: Manambu and beyond. *Language Sciences* 30. 383–422.

Anand, Pranav. 2006. *De de se*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology doctoral dissertation.

Andersen, Torben. 1999. Anti-logophoricity and indirect mode in Mabaan. *Studies in Language* 23. 499–530.

Bamgboṣe, Ayọ. 1986. Reported speech in Yoruba. In Coulmas (ed.) 1986, 77–97.

Banfield, Ann. 1973. Narrative style and the grammar of direct and indirect speech. *Foundations of Language* 10. 1–39.

Benveniste, Émile. 1956. La nature des pronoms. Reprinted in Émile Benveniste, *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, 251–257. Paris: Gallimard, 1966.

Bhat, D. N. S. 2007. *Pronouns*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bhatia, Tej K. 2000. Lexical anaphors and pronouns in Punjabi. In Barbara C. Lust, Kashi Wali, James W. Gair & K. V. Subbarao (eds.), *Lexical anaphors and pronouns in selected South Asian languages*, 637–714. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bohnhoff, Lee E. 1986. Yạg Dii (Duru) pronouns. In Wiesemann (ed.) 1986, 103–129.

Boyeldieu, Pascal. 2004. A qui s'adresse le logophorique yakoma. In Pascal Boyeldieu & Pierre Nougayrol (eds.), *Langues et cultures: Terrains d'Afrique. Hommage à France Cloarec-Heiss*, 185–191. Leuven: Peeters.

Bugaeva, Anna. 2008. Reported discourse and logophoricity in Southern Hokkaido dialects of Ainu. *Gengo Kenkyū* 133. 31–75.

Clark, Herbert & Richard J. Gerrig. 1990. Quotations as demonstrations. *Language* 66. 764–805.

Clements, George N. 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 John Haiman & Pamela Munro (eds.), *Switch-reference and universal grammar*, 17–37. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Coulmas, Florian. 1986. Reported speech: Some general issues. In Coulmas (ed.) 1986, 1–28.

Coulmas, Florian (ed.). 1986. *Direct and indirect speech*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Culy, Christopher. 1994a. A note on logophoricity in Dogon. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 15. 113–125.

Culy, Christopher. 1994b. Aspects of logophoric marking. *Linguistics* 32. 1055–1094.

Culy, Christopher. 1997. Logophoric pronouns and point of view. *Linguistics* 35. 845–859.

Curnow, Timothy Jowan. 2002. Three types of verbal logophoricity in African languages. *Studies in African Linguistics* 31. 1–25.

Cysouw, Michael. 2009. *The paradigmatic structure of person marking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cysouw, Michael. 2011. The expression of person and number: A typologist's perspective. *Morphology* 21. 419–443.

Deibler, Ellis. 1971. Uses of the verb 'to say' in Gahuku. *Kivung* 4(3). 101–110.

Deibler, Ellis, Jr. 1976. *Semantic relationships of Gahuku verbs* (SIL Publications 48). Norman, OK: SIL of the University of Oklahoma.

Dimmendaal, Gerrit J. 2001. Logophoric marking and represented speech in African languages as evidential hedging strategies. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 21. 131–157.

Evans, Nicholas. 2005. View with a view: Towards a typology of multiple perspective constructions. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 31(1). 93–120.

Filimonova, Elena (ed.). 2005. *Clusivity: Typology and case studies of the inclusive-exclusive distinction*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Forchheimer, Paul. 1953. *The category of person in language*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Frajzyngier, Zygmunt. 1985. Logophoric systems in Chadic. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 7. 23–37.

Frajzyngier, Zygmunt. 1989. *A grammar of Pero*. Berlin: Reimer.

Frajzyngier, Zygmunt. 1993. *A grammar of Mupun*. Berlin: Reimer.

Frajzyngier, Zygmunt. 1996. *Grammaticalization of the complex sentence: A case study in Chadic*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Goody, Jack. 1977. *The domestication of the savage mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Güldemann, Tom. 2003. Logophoricity in Africa: An attempt to explain and evaluate the significance of its modern distribution. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 56. 366–387.

Güldemann, Tom. 2008a. The Macro-Sudan belt: Towards identifying a linguistic area in northern sub-Saharan Africa. In Bernd Heine & Derek Nurse (eds.), *A linguistic geography of Africa*, 151–185. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Güldemann, Tom. 2008b. *Quotative indexes in African languages: A synchronic and diachronic survey*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Güldemann, Tom & Manfred von Roncador. 2002. Preface. In Tom Güldemann & Manfred von Roncador (eds.), *Reported discourse: A meeting ground for different linguistic domains*, vii–ix. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Günthner, Susanne. 2000. Zwischen direkter und indirekter Rede. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 28. 1–22.

Hagège, Claude. 1974. Les pronoms logophoriques. *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique de Paris* 69(1). 287–310.

Hagège, Claude. 1986. *La structure des langues*. 2nd edn. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Hale, Kenneth L. 1966. Kinship reflections in syntax: Some Australian languages. *Word* 22. 318–324.

Hedinger, Robert. 1984. Reported speech in Akɔɔse. *Journal of West African Languages* 14. 81–102.

Hellwig, Birgit. 2006. Complement clause type and complementation strategies in Goemai. In R. M. W. Dixon & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), *Complementation*, 204–223. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hill, Harriet. 1995. Pronouns and reported speech in Adioukrou. *Journal of West African Languages* 25. 87–106.

Hyman, Larry M. 1979. Phonology and noun structure. In Larry M. Hyman (ed.), *Aghem grammatical structure* (Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics 7), 1–72. Los Angeles: Department of Linguistics, University of Southern California.

Hyman, Larry M. & Bernard Comrie. 1981. Logophoric reference in Gokana. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 3. 19–37.

Jacquesson, François. 2001. Person marking in Tibeto-Burman languages, North-Eastern India. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 24. 113–144.

Jakobson, Roman. 1957. Shifters, verbal categories, and the Russian verb. Reprinted in *Selected writings*, Vol. 2, 130–147. Den Haag: Mouton.

Jespersen, Otto. 1921. *Language*: *Its nature, development and origin*. New York: Holt & Co.

Jespersen, Otto. 1924. *The philosophy of grammar*. London: Allen & Unwin. Reprinted: New York: Norton, 1965.

Kervran, Marcel & André Prost. 1986. *Un parler dogon*: *Le donno sɔ. Notes de grammaire*. Bandiagara, Mali: Paroisse catholique.
Loughnane, Robyn M. 2005. Reported speech constructions in Golin. In Nicholas Evans, Hywel Stoakes, Alan Lee & Jutta Besold (eds.), *Materials on Golin*: *Grammar, texts and dictionary*, 131–152. Melbourne: University of Melbourne, Department of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics.
Mühlhäusler, Peter & Rom Harré. 1990. *Pronouns and people: The linguistic construction of social and personal identity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Muratori, Carlo. 1938. *Grammatica lotuxo*. Verona: Missioni Africane.
Nau, Nicole. 2006. Out of Africa: Logophoric pronouns and reported discourse in Finnish and High Latvian dialects. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 55. 55–87.
Nikitina, Tatiana (forthcoming). Logophoric discourse and first person reporting in Wan (West Africa). Manuscript under review.
Novelli, Bruno. 1985. *A grammar of the Karimojong language*. Berlin: Reimer.
Oshima, David Yoshikazu. 2011. *Perspectives in reported discourse: The de re/de dicto distinction, indexicality, and presupposition*. Saarbrücken: VDM.
Perrin, Mona. 1974. Direct and indirect speech in Mambila. *Journal of Linguistics* 10. 27–37.
Plank, Frans. 1985. Die Ordnung der Personen. *Folia Linguistica* 19. 111–176.
Plank, Frans. 1986. Über den Personenwechsel und den anderer deiktischer Kategorien in der wiedergegebenen Rede. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 14. 284–308.
Reesink, Ger P. 1993. "Inner speech" in Papuan languages. *Language and Linguistics in Melanesia* 24(2). 217–225.
Schaub, Willi. 1985. *Babungo*. London: Croom Helm.
Schlenker, Philippe. 1999. Propositional attitudes and indexicality: A cross-categorial approach. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology doctoral dissertation.
Schlenker, Philippe. 2003. A plea for monsters. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26. 29–120.
Sells, Peter. 1987. Aspects of logophoricity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18. 445–479.
Siewierska, Anna. 2004. *Person*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Stirling, Lesley. 1993. *Switch-reference and discourse representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Thomas, Elaine. 1978. *A grammatical description of the Engenni language*. Dallas: SIL & The University of Texas at Arlington.
Tida, Shuntaroo. 2006. *A grammar of the Dom language, a Papuan language of Papua New Guinea*. Kyōto: Kyōto Daigaku doctoral dissertation.
Urban, Greg. 1989. The "I" of discourse. In Benjamin Lee & Greg Urban (eds.), *Semiotics, self, and society*, 27–51. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
von Roncador, Manfred. 1988. *Zwischen direkter und indirekter Rede*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
von Roncador, Manfred. 1992. Types of logophoric marking in African languages. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 13. 163–182.
Voorhoeve, Jan. 1980. Le pronom logophorique et son importance pour la reconstruction du proto-bantou (PB). *Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika* 2. 173–187.
Westermann, Diedrich. 1907. *Grammatik der Ewe-Sprache*. Berlin: Reimer.
Westermann, Diedrich. 1930. *A study of the Ewe language*. Translated by A. L. Bickford-Smith. London: Oxford University Press.
Wierzbicka, Anna. 1974. The semantics of direct and indirect discourse. *Papers in Linguistics* 7. 267–307.
Wiesemann, Ursula. 1986. Grammaticalized coreference. In Wiesemann (ed.) 1986, 437–463.
Wiesemann, Ursula (ed.). 1986. *Pronominal systems*. Tübingen: Narr.
Zwicky, Arnold M. 1977. Hierarchies of person. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 13. 714–733.