



PROJECT MUSE®

Logophoric Discourse and First Person Reporting in Wan (West Africa)

Tatiana Nikitina

Anthropological Linguistics, Volume 54, Number 3, Fall 2012, pp. 280-301
(Article)

Published by University of Nebraska Press
DOI: 10.1353/anl.2012.0013



➔ For additional information about this article
<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/anl/summary/v054/54.3.nikitina.html>

Logophoric Discourse and First Person Reporting in Wan (West Africa)

TATIANA NIKITINA

LLACAN, CNRS, France

Abstract. The distinction between direct and indirect reporting is commonly assumed to be a universal underlying principle of discourse representation. This article surveys a system of reporting that is based on an alternative principle. It argues that the choice of a reporting strategy in Wan (Mande, Côte d'Ivoire) depends not on the information properties of the report (form vs. content, *de re* vs. *de dicto*), but rather on discourse properties of the participants involved. The difference between discourse reporting in Wan and in European languages is related to a difference in the dominant means of transmitting knowledge (oral vs. written).

1. Introduction. Reported discourse is central to an individual's life as a social being. In construing our relationship to society, we rely on our interpretation of other people's speech, thoughts, intentions, and perceptions. Both in verbal art and in daily conversation, we represent personalities by quoting their speech and attributing to them thoughts and feelings no less than by describing their actions. The actual forms of reported discourse, however, vary widely across languages and communities, genres and time periods, suggesting that the choice of a strategy for representing another person's discourse is determined by a complex interaction of social, cultural, and historical factors (Voloshinov 1973: 123). This article seeks to contribute to the study of what Voloshinov characterizes as "speech within speech, utterance within utterance" (1973:115) by presenting a case study of reported discourse in Wan, a Southeastern Mande language spoken in Côte d'Ivoire (Ivory Coast).

The reporting strategy that is at the center of this study is the use of logophoric clauses, i.e., clauses with specialized logophoric pronouns that refer to the reported speaker and, more broadly, to the participant to whom the discourse is attributed. The use of logophoric clauses is rarely treated as a reporting strategy in its own right, and theoretical discussions of logophoricity tend to be limited to determining syntactic and lexical conditions on the use of specialized markers (typically, logophoric pronouns). Clauses including such pronouns are commonly classified as instances of indirect discourse (Culy 1997; Sells 1987:475; Andersen 1999:523; Kibrik 2011:315; a notable exception is von Roncador 1988:290–93). The data discussed in this article challenge this view and suggest that logophoric clauses in languages like Wan should be treated instead as a special discourse-reporting strategy—the logophoric style—that does not belong in the direct-indirect continuum, but functions as part of a discourse-reporting system that is based on a different underlying distinction.

For many decades, the distinction between direct and indirect speech, as well as examples of “intermediate” strategies, have been the focus of crosslinguistic research on reported discourse. In typical examples of direct and indirect reporting, all deictic values are defined with respect to the reported and the current speech situation, respectively; in English, e.g., *yesterday*, *here*, and *I* of direct speech correspond, in standard indirect speech reports, to *the day before*, *there*, and *he/she/they* (depending on the gender and number of the reported speaker). Languages do not always adhere strictly to that distinction, but may instead develop various reporting strategies that do not fit well into the dichotomy (Plank 1986; Günthner 2000).

First, some languages do not shift values of some deictic categories in indirect reports. This is especially characteristic of categories related to temporal interpretation: the use of verbal tense and temporal adverbials. Although in some languages—including standard literary English—direct and indirect reports are distinguished by tense, other languages, such as Russian, use the same tense in both types of reporting strategy (Comrie 1985:107–17, 1986). Similarly, direct and indirect reports are associated in standard English with different sets of temporal adverbials (cf. *I arrived yesterday* vs. *He said he had arrived the day before*), but some other languages are more flexible in using the same deictic adverbials as long as temporal reference is clear from context (Coulmas [1986:18] on Yoruba; Hewitt and Crisp [1986] on some languages of the Caucasus). This type of complication is most likely due to crosslinguistic variation in the set of categories encompassed by the direct vs. indirect distinction: some languages have fewer deictic categories that are subject to “shifting” in indirect reports than others (Coulmas 1986).¹

The second type of complication involves the acceptability, in some languages and in specific genres, of partially shifted deictic values (Plank 1986). In examples of this kind, only some of the values are defined with respect to the current speech situation, while others reflect the deixis of the reported interaction, as in the *style indirect libre* (Bally 1912; see Pascal [1977] for an overview). Partial shifting of deictic values is optional and genre-specific, and is generally regarded as a testimony to the artful exploitation of the underlying direct vs. indirect dichotomy on the part of creative language users. Partial deictic shifts are especially common in verbal art, where they are exploited by authors-performers for particular stylistic effects (Banfield 1973, 1982; Fludernik 1993; Aikhenvald 2008; among many others).

This article draws on data from Wan to discuss a third type of construction that does not fit well into the direct vs. indirect dichotomy: constructions in which specialized logophoric markers characterize discourse of participants other than the current speaker. The use of logophoric markers suggests that logophoric reports do not represent the reported discourse in its original form (in a direct report, first person would have been used instead). The logophoric encoding of the reported speaker, however, is often the only feature consistent with

the indirect-discourse interpretation, since all other deictic features, including other person values, are typically defined with respect to the reported speech situation (von Roncador 1988:290–93, 1992; Stirling 1993:256–57). The obligatory mixing of “direct” and “indirect” features in logophoric clauses sets logophoric reporting apart from the instances of direct-indirect “hybrids” discussed above: logophoric reporting is typically obligatory, often involves an inconsistent treatment of the same deictic feature (person), and is rarely associated with any special stylistic effect (Nikitina 2012).

Instead of trying to fit the logophoric reporting strategy into the European-style direct-indirect model, I explore it as a functional part of a system that is based on a different underlying distinction. I argue that in Wan the choice of reporting strategy (the logophoric strategy vs. first person reporting) depends not on the information properties of the report (form vs. content, *de re* vs. *de dicto*, etc.), but rather on discourse properties of the participants involved. In particular, a major factor in that choice is the role the person making the report plays in the situation being reported. I suggest that this system of reporting reflects a culture-specific construal of discourse that is related to a particular mode of traditional oral narration.

The article is organized as follows. In section 2, I show that logophoricity in Wan cannot be fully accounted for in syntactic terms (in terms of coreference), nor can the crucial properties of logophoric clauses be captured in purely semantic terms (such as by categories of “reported speaker,” “subject of consciousness,” etc.). Rather, the use of logophoric clauses in Wan should be analyzed as a discourse phenomenon, along the lines suggested by Hagège (1974) and Dimmendaal (2001). More specifically, logophoric clauses constitute a special type of a discourse reporting strategy that is characteristic of many West African languages. In section 3, I argue that the logophoric style differs in a systematic way from both direct and indirect reporting, and cannot be satisfactorily treated as a case of a stylistically meaningful partial shifting of deictic values. In section 4, I explore the use of the logophoric style and the alternative reporting strategy (first person reporting) in context, and suggest that discourse reporting in Wan is based on a distinction between “attributed” (logophoric) and “performed” (first person) discourse. Section 5 discusses implications of the Wan data for the study of logophoricity and discourse reporting strategies in general.

2. Logophoric reporting of discourse.

2.1. Logophoric markers and contexts. Logophoric markers are used with verbs of speaking, thinking, and volition, and with some other predicates encoding psychological and mental states, to indicate reference to the person whose speech, thoughts, or perceptions are being reported (Hagège 1974; Clements 1975). Although such markers are attested in various parts of the world, they are particularly widespread in a contact zone comprising West and Central

Africa (Güldemann 2003, 2008). Logophoricity can be encoded by specialized pronouns, by cross-reference markers on verbs, or by verbal affixes (Curnow 2002). In Wan, reported speakers are encoded by two logophoric pronouns, one singular and one plural. In (1a) and (1b), for example, the logophoric pronouns *ḡā* (singular) and *m̃* (plural) are used to represent the speech of participants introduced in the preceding clause.²

- (1a) *ḡé à ñ gé ḡā ḡé ḡōm̃*
 then 3SG wife said LOG.SG that.one understood
 'And his wife_i said she_i had understood that.'³

- (1b) *yrāmū é gé m̃ súglù é l̃*
 children DEF said LOG.PL manioc DEF ate
 'The children_i said they_i had eaten the manioc.' (elicited)

Substituting third person personal pronouns for the logophoric pronouns results in a different interpretation. In (2a) and (2b), the referents of the pronouns are understood as not coinciding with the subject of the verb of speaking, i.e., the pronouns are assumed to refer to participants other than the reported speaker.

- (2a) *ḡé à ñ gé è ḡā*
 then 3SG wife said 3SG went
 'And his_i wife_j said that he_i had left.' (elicited)⁴

- (2b) *yrāmū é gé à súglù é l̃*
 children DEF said 3PL manioc DEF ate
 'The children_i said that they_j had eaten the manioc.' (elicited)

The logophoric pronouns are used in exactly the same syntactic functions as personal pronouns, i.e., as subjects, objects, arguments of postpositions, as in (3a), and two types of possessor, as in (3b) and (3c).⁵ Their use is independent of the presence of the quotative marker *dóō*, which is optional in most instances of reported speech and has no discernible effect on the form of the report (cf. (3a) vs. (3b) and (3c)).⁶

- (3a) ARGUMENT OF A POSTPOSITION

yāā yrāl̃ lé dóō p̃ k̃ū ḡā òḡlé ò
 3SG+COP complain PROG QUOT thing any LOG.SG at NEG

'She_i complains that she_i has nothing [to wear].' (lit., 'She is complaining that there is nothing at her_{LOG}.') (elicited)

- (3b) INALIENABLE POSSESSOR

è gé ḡ l̃ḡ ḡā ḡbòk̃l̃ē k̃ā
 3SG said 1SG to LOG.SG maternal.uncle died

'She_i told me that her_i maternal uncle had died.'

(3c) ALIENABLE POSSESSOR

yrāmũ gé m̃ kú m̃
 children said LOG.PL house EQUAT
 'Children_i said it was their_i house.' (elicited)

Crosslinguistically, speech reports constitute the prototypical context in which logophoric markers occur; from there logophoricity can be extended to predicates encoding perceptions, feelings, and thoughts (Culy 1994). In Wan, logophoric pronouns appear with a variety of verbs describing mental activity and psychological states, such as those in (4a) and (4b). Most such verbs require the person to whom the mental activity or state is attributed to be referred to by a logophoric pronoun, not by a first person pronoun.

(4a) *kòtā zrāgbō gōtō dōō 6ā klá-ŋ lòn gē blèkó é*
 turtle oneself knew QUOT LOG.SG win-NEG hare POSS run DEF
gó ɔ
 in NEG

'The turtle_i knew himself that he_i could not compete with the hare in running.'

(4b) *è lā gbò á è káò dóó kãã sí lé 6ā lèn*
 3SG it imagine COP REFL belly QUOT 1PL.EXCL+COP help PROG LOG.SG to
 'He_i imagines ["in his belly"] that we are going to help him_i.' (elicited)

Speech reports, however, are by far the most frequent logophoric context, and as such they are the focus of this study. Speech verbs differ from verbs illustrated in (4a) and (4b) by allowing for an alternative mode of reporting: given an appropriate context, the reported speaker can be encoded by first person pronouns. Although this option appears to correspond to the use of direct speech in European languages, the distinction between logophoric discourse and first person reporting differs from the familiar direct vs. indirect distinction. I address this difference in section 3, after discussing the crucial aspects of the logophoric system.

2.2. How logophoricity is licensed. In Wan, logophoric pronouns neutralize the distinction between second and third person referents. In (5a) and (5b), the same forms are used to indicate coreference with the subject of the speech verb as in (1a) and (1b), in spite of the difference in person: the reported speaker is third person in (1a) and (1b), but second person in (5a) and (5b).

(5a) *lā gé 6ā súglù é lō*
 2SG said LOG.SG manioc DEF ate
 'You said you had eaten the manioc.' (elicited)

(5b) *ā gé m̃ kú m̃*
 2PL said LOG.PL house EQUAT
 'You (pl.) said it was your house.' (elicited)

First person, on the other hand, is excluded from the encoding of logophoricity. A logophoric pronoun cannot refer to the current speaker (the singular form) or to a group including the speaker (the plural form). In (6), the first person pronoun is the only available option for representing the reported speaker, since the reported speaker coincides with the current one.

- (6) *ŋ gé dóō nà ŋ gà*
 1SG said QUOT 1SG.PERF PERF go
 'I said that I am gone.'

This particular pattern of person neutralization (second and third person vs. first person) is widespread in logophoric languages (Hyman and Comrie 1981; von Roncador 1992). Languages fall into two types depending on whether the second person is included in the logophoric domain along with the third person (second and third person logophoricity) or excluded from it, just like the first person (third person only logophoricity). The fact that a logophoric pronoun can have second or third person reference, but not first person reference, suggests that the phenomenon of logophoricity in languages like Wan cannot be analyzed satisfactorily in syntactic terms. In particular, it is problematic for the analysis of logophoric pronouns as markers indicating coreference of an argument of the reported clause with a participant of the main clause (e.g., the subject of a speech verb). Such an analysis does not account for the fact that logophoric markers cannot be used to indicate coreference with a participant functioning as the current speaker.⁷

Another problem for the syntactic approach is the lack of a specific syntactic configuration in which logophoricity is licensed. In Wan, logophoric pronouns need not be introduced by an overt complementizer or quotative marker, nor need they be licensed by one of a set of special verbs. For example, volition is expressed periphrastically in a construction with a postpositional phrase, literally 'be after it', where the pronoun 'it' refers cataphorically to a logophoric clause describing a situation that is perceived as desirable. In spite of the lack of a special logophoricity-licensing verb, the construction requires the use of logophoric pronouns. In (7), the proposition must be encoded by a nonfinite logophoric clause⁸ (the logophoric pronoun refers back to the subject of the preceding clause, and the entire proposition is cross-referenced by a third person pronoun in the main clause).

- (7) *è bī à klā ǂā zē dō dì ...*
 3SG PAST 3SG after LOG.SG word one say
 'He wanted to say something . . .' (lit., 'He was after it, he_{LOG} [to] say one word.')

Admittedly, an idiomatic expression such as 'be after it' for 'want' could be thought of as a lexical item, and such a lexical item might be able to license logophoric pronouns in the same way as a simple verb. But there are stronger arguments. One is that logophoric clauses can encode purpose, in which case

neither a specific lexical verb nor an overt marker is required to license the use of logophoric pronouns. In (8), the logophoric pronoun appears within a complex temporal adverbial; the adverbial contains a purpose clause that encodes intention by means of a logophoric pronoun.⁹

- (8) *à dìnà é 6ā 5 kú pō é mī, 6é kòtā gé ...*
 3SG stop TEMP LOG.SG hand reach thing DEF at then turtle said
 'When he (the hare) stopped in order to touch the thing, the turtle said ...' (lit., 'Him having stopped in order for his_{LOG} hand to reach the thing, then the turtle said ...')

Even more problematic for the syntactic coreference analysis is the fact that clauses with logophoric pronouns can be used by themselves in long stretches of reported discourse, at a considerable distance from any verb of speaking. In (9), for example, the logophoric pronoun appears at the end of a character's speech, and the speech itself is not introduced by any overt verb of speaking; instead, the narrator signals the beginning of a character's speech by intonation and gesturing. (To make the example easier to follow, several sentences of the character's speech are omitted from the original. This is indicated by the ellipsis in angle brackets <...> in the Wan version; the free translation of the omitted portion is also enclosed in angle brackets.)

- (9) *6é è àà tālí kōlé é dī é ló ságā.*
 then 3SG 3SG.ALN stranger man DEF cow DEF eat start
á gē! pō á lāā dī é tē á gē!
 that here.is thing that 2SG.ALN cow DEF killed that here.is
 <...>
lā zē bō 6ā tā á.
 2SG affair leave LOG.SG on NEG
 'Then he (the hyena) started eating the cows of his (the hare's) stranger. [And the hare said:] Here it is! Here's what killed your cow! <Here's what killed your cow! Look into the stomach! Let us set on fire some leaves of the *māan* tree. We will see who killed your cow.> You should not leave the blame on me.' (lit., 'You should not leave the affair on me_{LOG}.')

The use of the logophoric pronoun in the last sentence of the sequence cannot be related to a preceding verb of speaking, given that no overt verb of speaking introduces the speech of the character (the hare) in this portion of the narrative. The logophoric clause is separated from the beginning of the speech by six clauses, and there is no evidence that the clauses are in any way subordinate to a clause introducing the speech report.

The independent status of logophoric clauses is further supported by the behavior of the negation marker. In Wan, negation markers, together with question and exclamation markers, function as sentence-final complementizers and cannot be followed by any element of the same sentence (Nikitina 2008:54–64,

2009). This pattern is illustrated in (10) with a sentence involving a subordinate clause; the sentence-final negation marker follows the subordinate clause ('that it was he who was approaching'), even though it is associated with the main clause semantically ('his mother-in-law did not realize').

- (10) à *lròŋ-lē* à *gōt5* *dóō* èè *má* *zò* *lé* *yā* 3
 3SG in.law-woman 3SG knew QUOT 3SG.EMPH FOCUS come PROG there NEG
 'His mother-in-law didn't realize that it was he who was approaching.' (lit., "didn't know it that it is he . . .").

Crucially, the negation marker does not have to follow logophoric clauses that introduce a character's speech. The clause that contains the verb of speaking is normally negated by a marker that immediately follows that clause, and precedes the logophoric clause, as in (11).

- (11) èè *pé* *ŋ* *lèŋ* 3 *dóō* **6āá** *zò* *lé*
 3SG+3SG told 1SG to NEG QUOT LOG.SG+COP come PROG
 'He_i didn't tell me that he_i was coming.' (lit., "he didn't tell it to me that he_{LOG} is coming")

In (11), the logophoric clause follows the negation marker, not precedes it, as in subordinate clauses like (10). The position of the negation marker provides additional evidence for the independent status of the logophoric clause: the logophoric clause cannot be analyzed as subordinated to the clause containing a verb of speaking—hence, the use of the logophoric pronoun cannot be explained in terms of licensing by a verb of speaking in the main clause.

Given the flexibility in the use of logophoric pronouns, it does not seem possible to define the logophoric domain in syntactic terms, be it in terms of a set of licensing predicates (which are absent in (7)–(9)) or in terms of a particular construction with subordination (the logophoric clause is clearly independent in (11)). To maintain a syntactic account, one would have to stipulate for all such examples the presence of a covert, phonologically null matrix clause that licenses logophoricity—a solution that seems unsatisfactory. As an alternative, logophoricity in languages like Wan can be assumed to be a discourse phenomenon distinct from the syntactic logophoricity that has been described for languages such as Japanese, Italian, and Latin (for an overview of discourse logophoricity, see Sells [1987]; for further examples attesting to the discourse basis of African logophoricity, see Dimmendaal [2001]). In Wan, the use of logophoric pronouns is licensed in all sorts of attributed discourse, independent of how that discourse is introduced and what form it takes.

3. Logophoric reporting and the direct vs. indirect dichotomy.

3.1. The preservation of deictic values. One of the most intriguing aspects of logophoricity is its ambiguous status with respect to the direct vs. indirect

speech dichotomy. On the one hand, the use of the logophoric pronoun itself modifies the original utterance, and thus distinguishes logophoric reporting from European direct discourse, which claims to convey the exact wording used by the reported speaker. On the other hand, logophoric reports preserve various features of the original utterance that are unambiguously associated, in modern European languages, with direct speech. For example, logophoric reports commonly include interjections, as well as affirmative and negative words (see the discussion in von Roncador 1992:164–65), as in (12a) and (12b).¹⁰

- (12a) *ḡé è gé ēé! ḡāā bō á dīdīā yā*
 then 3SG said yes LOG.SG passed COP just.now there
 ‘And he_i said yes, it was him_i who passed just now.’

- (12b) *ḡé ḡé gé ēé! ḡā lōsí sō-ŋ pō é lé ó!*
 then that.one said INTJ LOG.SG beak fit-NEG thing DEF at NEG
ḡāá yā-ŋ ḡé ḡāá ḡā ḡòflé
 LOG.SG+COP sit-PROG then LOG.SG+COP LOG.SG have.rest
 ‘And that one_i said oops! his_i beak doesn’t fit into this thing (the jar)! He_i’ll sit and have a rest [instead of eating].’

Logophoric reports retain the tense-aspect of the original utterance and do not allow tense to be shifted or interpreted relative to the current speech situation, as seen in (13).¹¹

- (13) *ḡé è gé ḡāá gā lé ḡé dūŋgè nē yré dō gó*
 then 3SG said LOG.SG+COP go PROG that hang PURP tree one in
 ‘Then he_i said he_i was going in order to hang it on a tree.’ (lit., ‘he_{Log} is going’).

Logophoric clauses include unaltered commands and questions, which are typically excluded from indirect discourse in languages with a well-defined direct vs. indirect distinction (in such languages, imperatives and interrogatives are usually replaced by special constructions encoding reported, “indirect” questions and commands; see Aikhenvald 2008). In (14a) and (14b), logophoric pronouns are used with imperatives (the verb in the imperative may be used on its own, as in (14b), or in combination with a specialized pronoun in the subject function—the ‘imperative’ subject, as in (14a)).¹² An example of an interrogative logophoric clause is presented in (15).

- (14a) *pō kē é mī, à lŋŋ-lē gé dōō é gā*
 thing this DEF because 3SG in.law-woman said QUOT IMPER go
ḡāā yrē lé
 LOG.ALN work at
 ‘Because of that, his mother-in-law_i told [him] to go [do] her_i work.’

- (14b) *ké lā zò-á ɓā biàgà nɛ zē zānā dī*
 if 2SG come-STAT.PERF LOG.SG wake PURP word true say
 [‘He said’] ‘If you’ve come to wake me_{LOG} up, tell the truth.’

The major difference between direct and indirect discourse consists in the interpretation of deictic values (see Jakobson 1971). In Wan, the interpretation of most deictic values is the same in logophoric clauses and in first person reports. In particular, temporal and spatial deixis is centered on the deictic center of the reported speech situation, not on the event of reporting. In (15), the logophoric report contains a deictic temporal adverbial *ẓ* ‘today’, which is interpreted relative to the time of the reported speech event, i.e., the day when the characters of the story were talking.¹³

- (15) *ɓé à lṛ-ḳḷé gé é ḷɛ̃n dóō ké ɓāá wò ḳéé*
 then 3SG in.law-man said REFL to QUOT if LOG.SG+COP do this.way
bī í ɓāá p̣ ḷ-ɲ ẓ éé?
 PAST NEG LOG.SG+COP thing eat-PROSP today Q
 ‘Then her in-law said to her: If I_{LOG} didn’t do that, would I_{LOG} not eat anything today?’

In (16), the spatial adverb *yē* ‘here’ is interpreted relative to the deictic center of the reported speech situation: the man is located in close proximity of the place where the participants of the reported event are located.¹⁴

- (16) *ɓé è gé ɓā gē tólì mī ḳḷé é gē yē yā*
 then 3SG said LOG.SG POSS liver side man DEF here.is here there
 ‘And she said: Here is the man I_{LOG} like.’ (lit., ‘Then she said: This is the man of her_{LOG} liver’s side here.’)

The retention of deictic values in logophoric reports is problematic for the common assumption that logophoricity is a feature of indirect discourse. It suggests instead that logophoricity should be recognized as a special reporting mode on its own, which does not fit into the direct vs. indirect dichotomy and constitutes an independent strategy for representing another’s discourse. The treatment of logophoricity as a phenomenon orthogonal to the distinction between direct and indirect speech is further supported by a highly idiosyncratic assignment of person values within logophoric clauses, discussed in the next section.

3.2. “Mixed” pronominal reference. Logophoric clauses are characterized by what from the European perspective is a mixed combination of values. In particular, the treatment of the current and the reported speaker differs from the treatment of all other participants in a way inconsistent with either direct or indirect reporting. The reported speaker is encoded by special logophoric markers, not by first person pronouns. First person pronouns, on the other hand, are used in logophoric clauses to refer to the current speaker, as in European

indirect speech. In (17), the first person plural pronoun refers to the narrator and his siblings (who act as protagonists in the story). The logophoric clause describes the intentions of an enraged wild animal attacking the narrator's brother.

- (17) *6é gé 6āá kâ tógǝlē dō té-ŋ*
 that.one said LOG.SG+COP 1PL.EXCL elder.brother one kill-PROSP
 'He wanted to kill one of our elder brothers.' (lit., 'He said he_{LOG} is going to kill an elder brother of ours.')

In spite of the seemingly "indirect" interpretation of first person pronouns, second person pronouns are used in logophoric clauses to encode the reported addressee. In (18), the reported addressee is treated as second person, just as in European direct speech (the reported addressee clearly differs from the current one, as the utterance is addressed to a fictional character: an old woman soliciting help from the story's protagonist).

- (18) *è gé zò 6é lā 6ā pólì*
 3SG said come then 2SG LOG.SG wash
 'She said: come and wash me_{LOG}.' (lit., 'She said: Come and then you wash her_{LOG}.')

Similar "direct" use of second person is illustrated in (19), from a transcript of a narrative performance. The logophoric clause represents the inner speech of the people taking the decision to flee from an advancing enemy. The logophoric report is not introduced by any verb of speaking or quotative marker, and is followed by an ideophone describing the way in which the reported speaker quickly abandons the village.

- (19) *dēgbè, mǝ-mū é, àá tí dé! ké lāá nē*
 friend people-PL DEF 3PL+COP many really if 2SG+COP at.place
6āá nē ǝ, srò!
 LOG.SG+COP at.place NEG IDPH
 'Man, those people, they are many! If you're here, I_{LOG} am not here.'

The unusual "mixture" of person values (first person encodes the current speaker; second person, the reported addressee) is obligatory in logophoric reports. It is not used in order to achieve a stylistic effect as in European free indirect discourse or in typical cases of semidirect speech in other languages (Aikhenvald 2008). The principles of person alignment in Wan can be summarized as in table 1: first person is assigned to the current speaker; second person is assigned both to the current and to the reported addressee; and specialized logophoric markers are used to encode the reported speaker.

The same alignment of person with the discourse roles of current and reported interlocutors is attested in a number of unrelated languages spoken in West Africa, suggesting that it is not an idiosyncratic feature of Wan but

rather a systematic strategy commonly employed in the area for distinguishing reported speakers from the current one (Nikitina 2012). The use of this strategy may be deeply grounded in the West African cultural practice of oral narration, which relies on a highly interactive performance style. In the traditional oral performance, the single narrator assumes at least two discourse functions. On the one hand, he acts out all major characters of the story, often imitating their voice, posture, and gestures; on the other, he regularly addresses the audience, soliciting emotional response or encouraging remarks (most of which are formulaic, e.g., “Am I not telling it right?”—“Yes, you’re right!”).

Table 1. Assignment of Person in Wan

CURRENT SPEAKER AND ADDRESSEE	REPORTED ADDRESSEE	REPORTED SPEAKER	OTHERS
first and second person	second person	logophoric	third person

This multiplicity of the performer’s roles may contribute to the explicit differentiation of the roles of reported speakers (characters in the story) and the current speaker (in the capacity of the narrator). The practice of constantly monitoring that distinction in the context of a popular traditional genre may support the tendency to develop and maintain specialized linguistic means for an explicit encoding of reported speakers. In this sense, logophoric markers correspond to what Urban (1989:49) describes as the anaphoric function of “I” in direct quotation: rather than referring to the current speaker, such markers function as “anaphoric substitutes for characters in a narrative text.” Instead of using first person pronouns in the anaphoric function, speakers of Wan refer to the reported speaker by means of specialized markers.

4. Logophoric style vs. first person reporting. Languages vary in the means they develop for the encoding of another’s discourse. The options available to a speaker of Wan do not coincide with those offered by European languages. “Direct” first person reporting is contrasted in Wan with a special “logophoric” style that does not correspond to European indirect discourse, for it does not allow for shifts in deictic values. Instead of referring to the current speech situation as the deictic center, logophoric clauses maintain the deixis of the original interaction, with one crucial exception: the “I” of the reported speaker is replaced by specialized logophoric markers, while first person reference is reserved for the current speaker. In this sense, instead of distinguishing between direct and indirect discourse, speakers of Wan make a choice between first person reporting and logophoric style.

The two reporting strategies are used together in discourse. Switches from one to the other mark critical turns in the plot and help organize the narrative around such culminating points. First person reporting tends to be reserved for

the most exciting parts of the story; it corresponds to peaks of attention on the part of the audience and most intense theatrical moments on the part of the narrator. In terms of Urban's (1989) classification, one can assume that, apart from its indexical-referential use in daily interaction, first person is associated in Wan primarily with a theatrical function (imitating the reported speaker by acting him out, which includes imitation of tone, gesturing, posture, etc., often with a certain amount of grotesque exaggeration).¹⁵ Logophoric reporting tends to be used elsewhere. In particular, the logophoric style is the only available option for the opening, stage-setting portions of a story (e.g., 'Once upon a time the duiker announced that he_{LOG} would give a prize to the one who . . .').

There are further restrictions on the use of first person reporting. First, logophoric style tends to be preferred in reports embedded under reports, as in (20). No instances of embedded first person reporting are attested in my corpus; discourse reports by characters are presented exclusively in the logophoric style.¹⁶

- (20) *Dèlòtɔ́ gé é lèn lē dō bō gó, è gé ǂā*
 Deloto said REFL to woman one passed in 3SG said LOG.SG
yòlè bèbè ē nē
 cane.rat many saw at.place
 'Deloto told him that a woman passed in [the field] and said that she_{LOG} saw many cane rats there.'

This preference may be explained by the need to further organize the complex multilayered structure of the report. If first person reporting were used at both levels, the narrator would have to assume not only the role of the reporting character (Deloto), but also the role of the speaker in the embedded report (the woman). Given the general tendency to resolve the ambiguous reference of first person pronouns in verbal performance by means of logophoric markers, it is not surprising that in cases of multiple report embedding narrators adhere to logophoric reporting.

Instances of embedded—or "nested"—reports provide further evidence for the discourse function of logophoricity. Instead of disambiguating reference to characters of the story reporting on one another's speech, logophoric pronouns are used to distinguish the narrator's "I" from that of the characters, even in cases where their use leads to an ambiguity as to which of the characters is speaking. In (21), the character (a hare) reports another character's (hyena's) speech. In the embedded report, both characters are referred to by logophoric pronouns. As a result, the two characters are distinguished from the current speaker, but not from each other; the logophoric pronouns are noncoreferential, and it is left to the listener to figure out which character is referred to by which pronoun. This systematic ambiguity of reference in logophoric clauses suggests once again that logophoric pronouns do not serve to mark coreference but rather encode reported speakers distinct from the current narrator.¹⁷

- (21) è gé kólì mǎ, klǎ gé dóō **ǎǎ** né kpáì gǎ
 3SG said lie be hyena said QUOT LOG.SG.ALN child exact went
 ǎǎ kpū wiá **ǎǎ** lǎgǎ
 wood piece enter LOG.SG mouth
 ‘He_i said: It’s not true. Hyena_j said my_{i,LOG} own child went to enter a piece of wood in his_{j,LOG} mouth.’ (alternative interpretation: ‘his_{j,LOG} own child went to enter a piece of wood in my_{i,LOG} mouth’)

Second, logophoric reporting is strongly preferred whenever the current speaker plays an active part in the reported speech situation. In (22), the current speaker features as the reported addressee, and the report is in the logophoric style.

- (22) è gé ñ lèn dóō **ǎǎ** gbòkǎlē kǎ
 3SG said 1SG to QUOT LOG.SG maternal.uncle died
 ‘She told me her_{LOG} maternal uncle had died.’

First person reporting, on the other hand, is freely used in contexts where the current speaker plays no role in the reported situation, independent of the presence or absence of an overtly encoded reported addressee, as in (23).

- (23) è gé é lèn dóō ñ bǎlè bèbè ē lǎǎ gǎn bǎ é gó
 3SG said DEF to QUOT 1SG bird many saw 2SG.ALN yams field DEF in
 ‘She told him: I saw many birds in your yams field.’

The restriction on first person reporting is extended to contexts where the current speaker is not encoded explicitly within the reporting clause, as it is in (22), but is implied as an immediate witness of the reported speech situation.

The choice of reporting style (logophoric vs. first person) is correlated with the choice of a temporal-aspectual form of the verb in the reported clause. Although the perfect aspect occasionally appears in first person reporting in the performance of stories, it tends to be dispreferred in ordinary reports on everyday interactions. In (24), the perfect form is used in the culmination of a story, where the protagonist claims victory in a race.

- (24) é kǎtǎ gé wééyǎ dóō **nǎ** ñ klǎ ōó
 then turtle said INTJ QUOT 1SG.PERF PERF arrive CONJ
nǎ ñ klǎ
 1SG.PERF PERF arrive

‘Then the turtle said: Ooh, I’ve arrived, I’ve arrived!’ (speech report from a story)

In (25), recorded in a casual conversation, the use of the perfect form (rather than the past tense or the stative perfect, which do not imply immediate relevance) in the reported clause implies that the event is directly relevant to the

reported speech situation, which in turn suggests to the audience the involvement of the current speaker. As a result, the perfect form tends to be associated with logophoricity and dispreferred in first person reporting.

- (25) *è gé dóó ǂā η gā*
 3SG said QUOT LOG.SG PERF go

‘He says he_{LOG} is gone.’ (speech report from a casual conversation)

Since first person reporting typically excludes the current speaker from the reported speech situation, the amount of detailed aspectual information provided by the perfect form is perceived as irrelevant, and the perfect form as inappropriate. This correlation between tense-aspect and reporting style provides further insight into the general properties of reported discourse in Wan. It is unexpected on the assumption that first person reporting aims at a verbatim reproduction of the original utterance. If verbatim reproduction were intended, the use of the perfect form in speech reports would be subject to the same constraints as its use in spontaneous discourse. The fact that the perfect construction hardly ever appears in first person reporting outside the genre of oral narration¹⁸ suggests instead that first person reporting is not construed as exact reproduction of the form of the utterance. Rather, it is associated with a particular distribution of discourse roles in oral performance, where the current speaker is detached from the events narrated. In other words, in typical instances of first person reporting, the narrator does not take part in the narrated events—hence, his or her assuming the discursive role of a particular character does not come into conflict with his or her actual role in the reported situation, and there is no need to distinguish those roles by means of specialized logophoric markers.

Finally, logophoric reporting is sometimes combined with first person reporting within the same stretch of a character’s discourse. In this case, the distribution of the two reporting styles tends to conform to a particular ordering: the discourse starts as a logophoric report and subsequently switches to first person reporting. The fixed ordering is consistent with the major function of logophoric markers—distinguishing the reported speaker from the current one, or signaling that the stretch of discourse is attributed to a character. Once the speaking persona is established, the storyteller may switch to first person narration, assuming the character’s role and reproducing his or her words with a theatrical effect. Examples (26a) and (26b), which are extracted from the same story, illustrate this kind of switching; in both cases, the logophoric style is dropped after it has been used to attribute the utterance to a character.

- (26a) *ǂé è gé ēé! ǂāā kē é, lā n̄n̄n̄-ǂ η m̄.*
 then 3SG said yes LOG.EMPH that DEF 2SG lose-STAT.PERF 1SG at

ēé! tóli yā gē, n̄ā gā lé kōŋ tā ...
 yes tomorrow there here.is 1SG+COP go PROG walk at

‘And he said: Yes, as for myself_{LOG}, you won’t be able to recognize me. Well, tomorrow I’ll go for a walk ...’

- (26b) *ḡé ḡé gé à lēṇ dóō ḡílá b̀-á dīdīā ēé?*
 then that.one said 3SG to QUOT 2SG.EMPH pass-STAT.PERF right.now Q
ḡé è gé ēé! ḡāā b̀-á dīdīā yā.
 then 3SG said yes LOG.SG.EMPH pass-STAT.PERF right.now there
ḡílá kpāi mā ēé? ḡé è gé lēē mīṇ mā é!
 2SG.EMPH exact EQUAT Q then 3SG said QUOT 1SG.EMPH EQUAT EXCL
 ‘Then she told him: Was it you who passed just now? And he said: Yes, it was me_{LOG}
 who passed there just now.—It was you yourself?—And he said, like, it was me
 indeed!’

5. Conclusion. Apart from its areal distribution and formal grammatical properties, logophoricity of African languages remains a poorly studied phenomenon. In Wan, the use of logophoric clauses represents a distinct strategy of reporting discourse and is contrasted with first person reporting. The choice between the two strategies depends primarily on the perceived distance between the current speaker and the reported speech situation; logophoric reports introduce attributed discourse, i.e., they mark the role of the reported speaker as distinct from that of the narrator. The logophoric reporting style is associated precisely with those portions of narration where the narrator’s persona comes dangerously close to that of the story’s characters. These are, first of all, the cases where the narrator participates in the reported situation (as in reports on everyday conversations), and his or her own “voice” may be confused with that of other characters. Second, logophoric clauses introduce nested discourse reports, where the presence of multiple discourse-producing characters adds to the potential confusion (i.e., discourse in which the narrator reports on character A’s report of character B’s discourse). Nested reports often involve multiple nonco-referential logophoric pronouns and are often potentially ambiguous (cf. (21)); they are nevertheless unambiguously attributed to the story’s characters, and exclude the possibility of the narrator’s own persona taking responsibility for the way the discourse is reported.

In contrast, the logophoric reporting style is never attested in cases where the different voices need not be distinguished, i.e., where the current speaker reports on his or her own speech or thoughts. Similarly, logophoric reporting tends to be replaced with first person narration in cases where the narrator cannot possibly claim participation in the story (e.g., in traditional narratives involving fictional characters), especially if the distance between the characters and the narrator has already been established by means of logophoric marking (these are the cases of switching from logophoric to first person reporting style). In such cases, the narrator may choose to perform a character’s discourse, by acting out the story, rather than telling it.

The relevance of discourse factors in the choice of a reporting mode suggests that in Wan, the major underlying distinction is that between attribution of discourse and its performance. A speaker of Wan has no means of representing an utterance from his or her own perspective, through a shift in the deictic values

(as in indirect speech). Instead, a specialized means can be used to explicitly mark a portion of discourse as attributed by him or her to another person. This specialized means gives the narrator additional flexibility in exploring multiple discourse roles (e.g., the narrator performing the story and reporting or construing the character’s discourse, characters whose discourse is being reported or construed, characters whose speech is reported by other characters, etc.). In a traditional West African narrative, where the same speaker switches systematically between his or her narrator’s “I” and the performed “I” of the characters, logophoricity helps the narrator effectively mediate between the different functions of the first person: logophoric pronouns are used to refer to the “I” of the characters in a neutral way, without assuming the characters’ roles in a dramatic sense. This is summarized in table 2.

Table 2. Types of Discourse and Reporting Strategies: Modern European Languages vs. Wan

DISCOURSE TYPE	WAN	MODERN EUROPEAN LANGUAGES
CURRENT SPEAKER’S OWN DISCOURSE	first person reporting	direct or indirect reporting
ANOTHER’S DISCOURSE	logophoric style (neutral) or “theatrical” first person reporting (“performed” first person: only in cases where the current speaker is clearly distinguished)	direct or indirect reporting

The difference in the functioning of the two reporting modes accounts for two otherwise mysterious properties of logophoricity: the exclusion of the current speaker from possible referents of logophoric pronouns, and the obligatory use of the logophoric style in reports of mental and psychological states (with the exception of the states experienced by the current speaker). Since logophoric style is used for the purpose of distancing the current speaker from the reported one, it cannot be used to report the current speaker’s own discourse. Similarly, mental and psychological states—unless experienced by the current speaker (in which case first person reporting is used)—are normally not verbalized, and, as such, they can only be attributed to the experiencer by an outside interpreter, not performed by means of first person reporting.

The strategies for representing discourse in Wan enrich our understanding of the European distinction between direct and indirect discourse (at least as it is used in the written register). The latter is grounded in the form vs. content dichotomy, in which reproducing the exact form of the utterance is contrasted with reproducing its content in a modified, interpreted form (independent, for example, of whether or not the utterance belongs to the current speaker).¹⁹ This distinction is irrelevant for discourse reporting in Wan; instead, speakers use

explicit means to distance themselves from the discourse they are reproducing, and to signal the intrusion of another's voice into their own speech.

The differences between Wan and modern European languages in the way discourse is reported may be related to the role of literacy in preserving and transmitting knowledge in the two cultures. The perception that discourse can be recorded in a fixed, decontextualized form contributes to the idea of discourse existing independently of its original performance context (Goody 1977:118–19; Coulmas 1986:10–11). As a result, the exact reproduction—or “copying”—of the form of an utterance (direct reporting) is perceived as a faithful representation of the “original” that is opposed to a (potentially unfaithful) interpretation of content (indirect reporting).²⁰ This dichotomy need not be perceived as relevant in a culture where transmission of knowledge is not mediated by writing. In the context of oral culture, strategies for distinguishing between alleged verbatim and content-oriented reports that are so prominent in European culture may be of little use, and elaborate means for distinguishing between various sources of discourse may develop instead.²¹

Notes

Acknowledgments. This article is based on data collected in the village of Kounahiri, Côte d'Ivoire, and in Abidjan during several field trips, over the period from 2001 to 2006. I thank all Wan speakers who have participated in the project of documenting and describing their language; special thanks are due to Bomisso Mablo Augustin, Bomisso Ouléhi, and Bomisso Tchemon Christophe Kingston. I am also grateful to the editor and the anonymous reviewers for insightful feedback and helpful suggestions.

Abbreviations. The following abbreviations are used in interlinear glosses: ALN = alienable possessor; CONJ = conjunction; COP = copula; DEF = definite marker; EMPH = emphatic form of the pronoun; EQUAT = equational predicate; EXCL = exclusive first person; IDPH = ideophone; IMPER = imperative subject pronoun; INTJ = interjection; LOG = logophoric marker; NEG = negation; PERF = perfect; PL = plural; POSS = possessive noun; PROG = progressive marker; PROSP = prospective; PURP = purpose marker; Q = question; QUOT = quotative marker; REFL = reflexive; SG = singular; STAT.PERF = stative perfect; TEMP = temporal adverbial marker.

Transcription. Transcription of the Wan examples follows IPA conventions. Tones are represented by diacritics: *á* = high tone; *ā* = mid tone; *à* = low tone. Nasalization is represented by a tilde beneath the vowel: *ã*.

1. It is an interesting question whether this difference has to do with a difference in the construal of the direct vs. indirect distinction, or rather with a difference in the deictic properties of some categories (e.g., adverbs corresponding to English *yesterday* need not be inherently deictic in other languages, but may only be interpreted as such in the absence of any relevant reference time other than the moment of speaking).

2. Most examples in this article come from transcriptions of traditional oral narratives. A few were attested in spontaneous interactions (dialogues); the rest were directly elicited during my work on the grammar of Wan and crosschecked with at least one—usually two—other consultants (such examples are marked as “elicited”).

3. In free translations, subscripts indicate whether the pronouns are understood as coreferential with an earlier noun phrase, and if so, which one (identical subscripts point to identical referents).

4. The preferred interpretation treats the two personal pronouns as coreferential, since third person participants other than the story's protagonist are typically referred to by demonstrative, not personal, pronouns.

5. Like other Mande languages, Wan distinguishes between alienable and inalienable possession; the choice of a possessive construction depends primarily on the semantic properties of the head noun (e.g., body parts and kinship terms function as inherently relational nouns and normally require the presence of an inalienable possessor). The two constructions differ in the form of the possessive pronoun: inalienable possession is signaled by basic pronouns, which are also used as objects and arguments of postpositions; alienable possessors are encoded by specialized pronouns that do not appear in any other syntactic function.

6. The quotative marker tends to be present in reports of thoughts and psychological states, as in (4a) and (4b). Further research is needed to determine the full range of factors behind its distribution.

7. The restriction on person could be of course stipulated by specifying the person feature of the logophoric pronoun as [-1st]; this solution, however, is arbitrary and can hardly be considered satisfactory.

8. In Wan, nonfinite forms of most verbs are distinguished from the finite past tense form and the imperative form by tone. In (7), the low-tone form of the verb suggests that the form is nonfinite; the finite form would be marked by mid tone.

9. Within temporal adverbial clauses, verbs attach a marker that is homophonous with the nominalizer (from which it appears to derive historically [Nikitina 2008:75–78]). As the verb is nonfinite, its pronominal subject takes a nonnominative form (*à*).

10. The same form *ěě*! is used in Wan as a common interjection and as an affirmative word in answers to questions.

11. Most verbs change their tone to mid in the past tense (the verb *gé* 'say' is the exception). The progressive construction describes events that are in progress at the time of speaking and normally cannot be used to describe events in the past (Nikitina 2007).

12. Example (14b) is extracted from a long stretch of reported discourse—hence, it is not directly preceded by a clause with a verb of speaking.

13. Interpretation of temporal deixis is known to be the least straightforward feature of speech reports (see Coulmas 1986:17–19). Indeed, in Wan, the use of some deictic temporal adverbials in logophoric clauses seems to be subject to interspeaker variation. Further investigation is needed to establish the range of this variation.

14. The adverb *yā* 'there' is used to establish coherence with the previous discourse. After a long sequence of marriage proposals, the girl finally sees a man she likes: 'There, this is the man I like here.'

15. Urban (1989) treats various functions of "I" as a continuum that is defined in part by the presence of an overt reporting clause or a quotative marker. The flexibility in the use of logophoric style in Wan suggests that some of the uses should be classified as corresponding to the "de-quotative function" (1989:36) which is located by Urban between the anaphoric and the theatrical use.

16. By "embedded" reports, I refer not to syntactically embedded clauses but to clauses with "nested" interpretation, which report on reported discourse. In (20), the logophoric clause represents an embedded report ("speech within speech within speech"). The report itself (Deloto's words) is underdetermined as to logophoric vs. first person reporting style, since Deloto does not make reference to himself.

17. This evidence also seems to go against the accounts of logophoricity that rely on categories like "subject of consciousness," as the use of noncoreferential logophoric pronouns would suggest multiple (and conflicting) subjects of consciousness.

18. Apart from the cases where the reported speaker coincides with the current one, and logophoric reporting is not an option, as, e.g., in (6).

19. As pointed out by Clark and Gerrig (1990), instead of aiming at a verbatim reproduction, speakers, in fact, only represent selected aspects of the original utterance. The assumption of "faithful" rendition is therefore a matter of speakers' perception rather than an objective property of direct reporting.

20. Olson and Hildyard (1983:293–96) discuss metalinguistic effects of literacy on the properties of quotation, as does Olson (2001:251).

21. The modern European preoccupation with this distinction has even led to the development of a number of highly specific typographic conventions regulating the treatment of written sources, including special marking for changes in capitalization (square brackets indicating a change from lower to upper case or vice versa).

References

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y.
 2008 Semi-direct Speech: Manambu and Beyond. *Language Sciences* 30:383–422.
- Andersen, Torben
 1999 Anti-logophoricity and Indirect Mode in Mabaan. *Studies in Language* 23(3):499–530.
- Bally, Charles
 1912 Le style indirect libre en français moderne. *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift* 4:549–56, 597–606.
- Banfield, Ann
 1973 Narrative Style and the Grammar of Direct and Indirect Speech. *Foundations of Language* 10(1):1–39.
 1982 *Unspeakable Sentences: Narration and Representation in the Language of Fiction*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Clark, Herbert, and Richard J. Gerrig
 1990 Quotations as Demonstrations. *Language* 66(4):764–805.
- Clements, George N.
 1975 The Logophoric Pronoun in Ewe: Its Role in Discourse. *Journal of West African Languages* 10:141–77.
- Comrie, Bernard
 1985 *Tense*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coulmas, Florian
 1986 Reported Speech: Some General Issues. In *Direct and Indirect Speech*, edited by Florian Coulmas, 1–28. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Culy, Christopher
 1994 Aspects of Logophoric Marking. *Linguistics* 32(6):1055–94.
 1997 Logophoric Pronouns and Point of View. *Linguistics* 35(5):845–59.
- Curnow, Timothy Jowan
 2002 Three Types of Verbal Logophoricity in African Languages. *Studies in African Linguistics* 31(1/2):1–25.
- Dimmendaal, Gerrit J.
 2001 Logophoric Marking and Represented Speech in African Languages as Evidential Hedging Strategies. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 21(1): 131–57.
- Fludernik, Monika
 1993 *The Fictions of Language and the Languages of Fiction: The Linguistic Representation of Speech and Consciousness*. London: Routledge.

- 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(4):366–87.
2008 The Macro-Sudan Belt: Towards Identifying a Linguistic Area in Northern Sub-Saharan Africa. *In A Linguistic Geography of Africa*, edited by Bernd Heine and Derek Nurse, 151–85. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Günthner, Susanne
2000 Zwischen direkter und indirekter Rede. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 28(1):1–22.
- Hagège, Claude
1974 Les pronoms logophoriques. *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique de Paris* 69:287–310.
- Hewitt, B. G., and S. R. Crisp
1986 Speech Reporting in the Caucasus. *In Direct and Indirect Speech*, edited by Florian Coulmas, 121–43. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hyman, Larry M., and Bernard Comrie
1981 Logophoric Reference in Gokana. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 3:19–37.
- Jakobson, Roman
1971 Shifters, Verbal Categories, and the Russian Verb. *In Selected Writings*. Vol. 2: Word and Language, by Roman Jakobson, 130–47. The Hague: Mouton.
- Kibrik, Andrej A.
2011 *Reference in Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nikitina, Tatiana
2007 Time Reference of Aspectual Forms in Wan (Southeastern Mande). *In Selected Proceedings of the Thirty-Seventh Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, edited by Doris L. Payne and Jaime Peña, 126–33. Somerville, Mass.: Cascadia Proceedings Project.
2008 The Mixing of Syntactic Properties and Language Change. Ph.D. diss., Stanford University.
2009 The Syntax of Postpositional Phrases in Wan, an “SOVX” Language. *Studies in Language* 33(4):910–33.
2012 Personal Deixis and Reported Discourse: Towards a Typology of Person Alignment. *Linguistic Typology* 16(2):233–63.
- Olson, David R.
2001 What Writing Is. *Pragmatics and Cognition* 9(2):239–58.
- Olson, David R., and Angela Hildyard
1983 Literacy and the Comprehension and Expression of Literal Meaning. *In Writing in Focus*, edited by Florian Coulmas and Konrad Ehlich, 291–325. Berlin: Mouton.
- Pascal, Roy
1977 *The Dual Voice: Free Indirect Speech and Its Functioning in the Nineteenth-Century European Novel*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Plank, Frans
1986 Über den Personenwechsel und den anderer deiktischer Kategorien in der

- wiedergegebenen Rede. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 14:284–308.
- Sells, Peter
1987 Aspects of Logophoricity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18(3):445–79.
- Stirling, Lesley
1993 *Switch-Reference and Discourse Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Urban, Greg
1989 The “I” of Discourse. In *Semiotics, Self, and Society*, edited by Benjamin Lee and Greg Urban, 27–51. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- von Roncador, Manfred
1988 Zwischen direkter und indirekter Rede: nichtwörtliche direkte Rede, erlebte Rede, logophorische Konstruktionen und Verwandtes. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
1992 Types of Logophoric Marking in African Languages. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 13:163–82.
- Voloshinov, V. N.
1973 *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. New York: Seminar Press.