Out of Africa: Logophoric pronouns and reported discourse in Finnish and High Latvian dialects

NICOLE NAU
Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza

In this paper I will discuss properties of logophoric constructions and their place within a typology of reported speech. The data from Finnish and Latvian dialects prove that the phenomenon is not restricted to Africa and support the view expressed by Culy (1994; 1997) and others that logophoric pronouns, in contrast to long-distance reflexives, are rooted in reported discourse and cannot be explained in syntactic terms. Bhat's (2004) claim that their primary function is to distinguish the participants of a reported speech act from the actual speaker and addressee leads to the opposition of logophoric constructions to direct speech, rather than indirect speech, and to a functional explanation of the distribution of types of reported discourse.

1. INTRODUCTION

A logophoric marker is a device used in reported speech, referring to the author whose words are reported, while in such a context the use of an anaphoric third person pronoun signals reference to another person. Consider the following minimal pair from colloquial Finnish, cited after Saukkonen (1967):

(1) Se_1 *sano,*   *ettei* $hän_1$ *voi*   *tulla.*
     PRO   say:PRS:3   COMP:NEG:3   LOG   can   come:INF
     'He/she$_1$ says that he/she$_1$ won't be able to come.'
     (reported utterance: 'I won't be able to come')

(2) Se₁   sano,   ettei   se₍ₙₒₜ ₁₎   voi   tulla.
    PRO   say:PRS:3   comp:NEG:3   PRO   can   come:INF
    'He/she₁ says that he/she₍ₙₒₜ ₁₎ won't be able to come.'
    (reported utterance: 'He/she won't be able to come')

The phenomenon of logophoricity has been widely discussed in linguistics within the last thirty years, since the term was introduced by Claude Hagège in his seminal paper (Hagège 1974). Overviews are provided by Roncador (1988; 2006) and Stirling (1994). The data I will discuss in this paper support the view that the use of logophoric pronouns cannot be explained by syntactic parameters, nor in purely semantic or pragmatic terms. Instead, they are tightly connected to reported discourse. Formal features which are frequently found in constructions with logophoric pronouns follow from the nature of reported speech, but they are not conditions for the use of the pronouns. Similarly, the marking of point of view is not at the basis of the logophoric pronouns in Finnish and High Latvian, but in some of their varieties developed as a secondary function.

While the Finnish and Latvian facts presented here have long been known by linguists of the respective countries, outside of their homelands they are still largely ignored, due to the fact that most of the literature is difficult to access by non-specialists of the languages. Finnish linguists have only recently started to describe the Finnish logophoric pronoun from a more general point of view and to publish their results in English (see especially Laitinen 2002; 2005). The Latvian data are still a well kept secret, but should remain so no longer. Because of the lack of accessible data, I will give two longer examples in the appendix. In section 2, I will briefly comment on the data used in this paper.

Most of the discussion of properties of logophoric constructions in the linguistic literature has been based on data from languages of West and Central Africa. It has even been claimed that the phenomenon is restricted to this continent (Culy 1994: 1059; Roncador 2006: 314)[1]. One aim of this paper is to challenge this view by showing that Finnish and Latvian dialects have logophoric pronouns which are very similar to those of African languages. In section 3, I will discuss their properties in detail.

[1] Güldemann (2003) is more cautious, and Kibrik (2001: 1133) explicitly mentions other parts of the world.

Speech reports with logophoric pronouns do not fit into the traditional division of direct and indirect speech (cf. Roncador 1988). Since one of the main features distinguishing these two types of reported discourse is the treatment of the reported speaker as either first or third person, it is obvious that with logophoric pronouns, we are dealing with a third type. Furthermore, they provide a unique way to disambiguate the reference to persons when a current speaker reports the words of another speaker. It is important to recognize that there are two different kinds of possible referential ambiguity in reported speech:

(i) reference to the reported speaker as opposed to another non-participant of the current speech situation;

(ii) reference to the reported speaker as opposed to the current speaker.

In languages like English, the first type of ambiguity appears in indirect speech reports (as in the translations of (1) and (2)), while the second type arises when it is not clear whether the report is direct or indirect, as in the sentence *She says I know*. The fact that logophoric pronouns provide an effective way to deal with this second type of ambiguity has not been given enough consideration. In section 4, I will discuss this question in more detail and develop a typology of reported speech based on the opposition of logophoric constructions to both direct and indirect speech.

Logophoric pronouns as understood in this paper should be distinguished from reflexive or other pronouns which may have a logophoric use as a secondary function. Examples of the latter, most often discussed under the name 'non-clause-bounded reflexive' (NCBR) or 'long-distance reflexive' (LDR), are found in languages of East Asia, like Japanese, Chinese and Korean, as well as in Europe, the most famous here being Icelandic (see Sells 1987; Stirling 1994; Huang 2002). An important difference between the two types of pronouns is that in languages with a logophoric use of reflexives, the use of an anaphoric pronoun in a logophoric context does not exclude coreference, nor is the LDR unambiguous, as it may still have a reflexive meaning. Languages with such pronouns are sometimes called 'mixed logophoric languages' (Culy 1994; 1997; Huang 2006: 236). In contrast, where the logophoric function is the primary function of a pronoun, the marking of coreference in speech reports is (ideally) unambiguous and obligatory; it is grammaticalized. However, grammaticalization often is a matter of degree. Logophoricity may start as a secondary function used occasionally, and

in the course of time become primary and obligatory. On the other hand, an erstwhile 'pure' logophoric pronoun may acquire other secondary functions, which in turn may become central. We should therefore not suppose the distinction between 'pure' and 'mixed' logophoric languages as clear-cut as Culy (1994) proposed (see also Güldemann 2003 and Bhat 2004: 69-70 on this point). Varieties of Finnish and Latvian provide examples for a whole range of variation from clearly grammaticalized logophoric pronouns (which will be be dealt with in the current paper) to occasional logophoric uses of a primarily anaphoric pronoun.

2. DATA

2.1. Pronoun *hän* in Finnish

The Finnish pronoun *hän*, plural *he*, is originally an anaphoric third person pronoun (see Itkonen 1992 for etymology and cognates in other Finno-Ugric languages). It is used as a logophoric marker in all dialects of Finnish as well as in non-dialectal spoken varieties (Hakulinen et al. 2004: 708, 1368, 1408; Laitinen 2005). The anaphoric third person pronoun in these varieties is *se*, plural *ne*. The degree of grammaticalization of the logophoric function of *hän* and the range of other functions of this pronoun vary. In the Eastern dialects it seems to be most grammaticalized (unambiguous and obligatory in a logophoric construction), while in Western and especially Southwestern dialects and in non-dialectal colloquial styles its use in a logophoric context is not obligatory and a third person pronoun does not exclude coreference with a reported author. In these varieties, *hän* also has a wider range of functions. In Standard Finnish *hän* is a third person pronoun for anaphoric reference to humans, while *se* is a demonstrative and used for anaphoric reference to non-human referents. In this paper, I will consider only dialect data and focus on those dialects in which the logophoric function is most grammaticalized.

The dictionary of Finnish subdialects (SMS) provides a good overview of the uses of this pronoun, presenting its functions and quoting examples in two separate entries for the singular *hän* (Vol. 4, pp. 418–423) and the plural *he* (Vol. 4, pp. 1–5). Vilppula (1989) provides an overview of the uses

of *hän*, *he* outside of reported speech. A number of Finnish scholars have carried out research on individual subdialects[2]. Ylikahri (1996) describes the subdialect of Siikainen in Western Finland, where *hän* is basically a logophoric pronoun but its use may be extended. Kuiri (1984) presents a monographic treatment of reported speech in two neighboring dialects of East Finland, Kainuu and Northern Karelian, with a section devoted to the use of *hän*. Without using the term 'logophoric', she is probably the first to draw attention to the similarities between Finnish *hän*, the Japanese long-distance reflexive *zibun* and the logophoric pronoun *neh* in Mabila. Ikola (1960) explores grammatical features of reported speech in Finnish from both a synchronic and a diachronic point of view. Curiously, he does not discuss *hän* explicitly, but his book is a good source for examples, as he presents data from many dialects.

2.2. High Latvian *šys*

Latvian dialects are divided into three groups: Tamian or Livonian, Central, and High Latvian. In opposition to High Latvian, Tamian and Central dialects, which cover the western and central part of Latvia, can be classed together as Low Latvian[3]. High Latvian is spoken in the Eastern part of the country, that is, in Latgalia and some neighboring territories. It is also referred to as Latgalian. The question whether Latgalian/High Latvian is a dialect of Latvian or a separate language has been discussed controversially, but is of no importance for the current purpose.

A grammaticalized logophoric pronoun is found in many subdialects of High Latvian. It is the pronoun *šys*, stemming from a demonstrative of speaker deixis ('this'; for etymology and cognates, see Euler 1993). The demonstrative function of this pronoun has been lost in most subdialects or is retained only where the pronoun is used as a determiner. The usual anaphoric third person pronoun is *jis*. The demonstrative *tys* 'that' is also used

---

[2] Unfortunately, unpublished theses I found quoted in the literature have not been available to me.

[3] Information on Latvian dialects can be found in Balode & Holvoet (2001) and Gāters (1977).

anaphorically. The following example illustrates the use of *jis* (third person), *tys* (demonstrative) and *šys* (logophoric):

High Latvian, speaker Anna (AA 70)

(3) **tys** *Broks₁,* *jā,* **tys₁** *cīš* *pordzeivuojs* *beja.*
DET Broks yes PRO very suffer:PAP:M.SG AUX:PST
Jis₁ *teice,* *ka* ***šys₁*** *grybiejs* *nūšautīs*
PRO say:PST:3 COMP LOG want:PAP:M.SG shoot:INF:REFL
'**this** Broks₁, well, **he₁** had really suffered. **He₁** said that **he₁**
wanted to shoot himself'

Some High Latvian subdialects, all Low Latvian dialects, and Standard Latvian have lost the anaphoric pronoun *jis* and replaced it with *viņš*. In Standard Latvian, *viņš* is used only for animated referents, a curious parallel to Standard Finnish, where, as noted above, the use of *hän* vs. *se* is also based on animacy. Standard Latvian and some Low Latvian subdialects still make use of *šis* (the Low Latvian and Standard form of the pronoun) as a demonstrative, but more often, *šis* is used as a second, functionally marked anaphoric pronoun (cf. MLLVG–I, 517). It may also be used as a logophoric marker, but this function is not grammaticalized in Low Latvian dialects as it is in High Latvian, and the use of the anaphoric *viņš* in reported speech does not exclude coreference.

The High Latvian data presented here are taken from two different sources. Most valuable for this research was the recording of an interview from the Latvian Oral History collection of life stories. The narrator, Anna, born in 1918, comes from the village Viļāni in Central Latgalia. She is interviewed about her life by her granddaughter in 1993. For the transcription of fragments of this text, I tried to use the new Latgalian standard orthography without (too much) standardizing of the words. This task would have been impossible for me without the help of Lidija Leikuma, a dialectologist from the University of Latvia and native speaker of High Latvian, whom I acknowledge most gratefully. The other kind of source used are dialect texts published by Latvian dialectologists. To make the examples more readable and to facilitate the editing of this paper, I have (again with the kind help of Lidija Leikuma) simplified the often very sophisticated phonetic transcriptions of the sources, that is, I have deleted the markers of pitch accent, reduced the variety of vowel allophones, marked palatalization only where

it does not follow from the position of a consonant, and noted semivowels as <j> and <v>. I have also consulted grammatical descriptions of subdialects, but unfortunately they usually present only very short examples out of context, which makes it difficult to interpret the construction, or no examples at all. Still, these sources, as well as personal communication with Anna Stafecka and Lidija Leikuma, convinced me that the logophoric use of *šys* is quite widespread in High Latvian. In the narrative of Anna, the logophoric *šys* is clearly grammaticalized and the use of the anaphoric *jis* in a speech report points to another person than the reported speaker:

High Latvian, speaker Anna

(4) *Tagad* *jis*$_1$ *suoka* *runuot,* *tys* *bruolāns*$_1$*,* *lai* *es*
   now PRO start:PST:3 talk:INF DET cousin COMP 1sg
   precejūs *ar* *jū*$_3$*.*
   marry: PA:F.SG with PRO:ACC
   'Now he$_1$ started to say, this cousin$_1$, that I should marry him$_{(not\ 1)}$
   [= the uncle]' (AA 55)

A larger fragment of Anna's narrative, showing the regular use of the logophoric pronoun, is given in the appendix.

3. FORMAL PROPERTIES OF THE LOGOPHORIC MARKER AND THE LOGOPHORIC CONSTRUCTION

In this section, I will discuss the formal features of the logophoric construction in Finnish and High Latvian dialects. The same features have been discussed for other logophoric languages, and I will mainly follow the typology of Stirling (1994).

3.1. Formal properties of the logophoric marker

The logophoric pronoun in Finnish and in High Latvian has the same inflectional categories as demonstrative and third person pronouns in the respective language: in Finnish, it is inflected for number and case, in High Latvian for number, case and gender. When used as a subject, it triggers third person agreement.

There seem to be no restrictions as to possible case forms and syntactic functions. Most often the logophoric pronoun is used as a subject or an object, it also appears as genitive attribute or complement of an adposition. Laitinen (2005: 77–78) draws attention to the fact that Finnish *hän* shares two morphosyntactic properties with (singular) first and second person pronouns. First, only personal pronouns (but not *se*) and the interrogative *kuka* 'who' have a special accusative ending. Interestingly, this feature has entered the standard language from the Eastern dialects, where, as noted above, the logophoric use of *hän* is more grammaticalized than in the West. The second feature regards the use of the possessive suffix, which I will not discuss further, as there is a lot of dialectal variation in this area.

A more striking parallel to first and second person pronouns is found in both languages regarding the assignment of number, which is not a matter of agreement with the antecedent. This becomes evident in cases where a plural logophoric pronoun is used in the report of a single speaker, as in the following examples:

Finnish, Siikainen [Western Satakunta; Häme group]
(Ylikahri 1996: 186)

(5) *Kalle*₁ *sano* *että* ***he***(incl. 1) *otti* *sen* *aina* *veneeseen*
    Kalle say:PRS:3 COMP LOG:PL take:PST:3 PRO:ACC always boat:ILL
    ko ***he***(incl. 1) *lähti,* *kalastelemaan ni kissa sai* *ruakaa.*
    when LOG:PL leave:PST:3 fishing:INF:ILL so cat get:PST:3 meal:PAR
    'Kalle₁ said they(incl. 1) always took the cat into the boat, when they(incl. 1) left fishing, so it got a meal.' (reported utterance: "we always take the cat…")

High Latvian, speaker Anna (AA 99)

(6) *jis*₁ *teice,* *ka,* *vot,* ***šī̄***₁ *jau ka* *karuojuši* [...]
    PRO say:PST:3 COMP PTC LOG:PL PTC when fight_in_war:PAP:M.PL
    'He₁ said that, so, when they(incl. 1) were in the war [...]'
    (reported utterance: "when we were in the war")

This phenomenon is well known from the logophoric languages of Africa and is usually described in a way stating that a singular antecedent may 'trigger' a plural logophoric pronoun if its referent is included in the set denoted by the pronoun, while a plural antecedent never triggers a sin-

gular logophor (cf. Sells 1987: 449; Roncador 2006: 313). However, the use of the word 'trigger' seems somewhat misleading to me. In my eyes, number assignment simply follows from the functioning of logophoric pronouns within reported discourse and reflects their closeness to first person pronouns: a plural logophor refers to the reported speaker and other persons, just as a first person plural pronoun refers to the current speaker and others. In other words, a plural anaphoric pronoun replaces a 'we' of the reported utterance. And while it is natural for a single speaker to speak of himself and others as 'we', it would be odd for a group of speakers to refer to one of them as 'I'.

In both cases (first person plural and plural logophoric pronouns) we may semantically distinguish between inclusive and exclusive, but this distinction need not be formally reflected in the language. In fact, in Finnish and High Latvian, there is no such distinction in neither personal nor logophoric pronouns. The examples above both illustrated an exclusive 'we' (reported speaker and non-participants of the reported speech act), while the following is an example of an inclusive 'we' (reported speaker and addressee of the reported utterance):

High Latvian, Varakļāni (Jokubauska 1988: 139)

(7) *sokeite*$_{(1)}$, *nu niu piēc **šūs**$_{(incl. 1)}$ dzanās pakaļ.*
say:PAP:F.SG PTC now after LOG:ACC.M.PL chase:PST:3 after
'[she$_1$] said, now [they] were chasing after them$_{(incl. 1)}$' (= 'after us, you and me')

Similarly, the gender of the pronoun in High Latvian is assigned according to the sex of the referent. As a result, there usually is gender agreement between the antecedent and the logophoric pronoun. In cases where the antecedent is a single female speaker but the logophor refers to her and at least one male person, the logophoric pronoun is marked plural masculine (see ex. (7)). Again, we find the same kind of gender assignment as in personal pronouns, while it makes little sense to speak of a feminine antecedent "triggering" a masculine logophoric pronoun.

3.2. The logophoric construction

Various terms are used in the literature to describe the elements of a construction containing a logophoric pronoun. I will attempt to consolidate this terminology without increasing the confusion.

A logophoric construction is a stretch of discourse containing a speech report, which itself contains a logophoric pronoun. This loose characteristic allows for the consideration not only of sentences, but also of sequences of independent clauses as logophoric constructions. The element that introduces the speech report will be called the report opener (German *Redeeinleitung*); Stirling (1993; 1994) calls it 'logophoric trigger', but this term is used with a different meaning by other researchers. The noun phrase or other element with which the logophoric pronoun is coreferent will be called the antecedent (Wiesemann 1986, following Hyman & Comrie 1981: '(logophoric) trigger'; Stirling 1993; 1994: 'logocentric NP'). The part of discourse containing the antecedent and the report opener will be called the introduction. Following Stirling, I will use the term logophoric context for 'the syntactic and/or discourse domain in which it is possible to use a logophoric pronoun' (Stirling 1994: 2303; similar definition by Roncador (2006: 312); Culy (1994; 1997) uses the term 'logophoric domain'). Using these terms, the following is a general scheme for a logophoric construction:

LOGOPHORIC CONSTRUCTION:

[... ANTECEDENT ... REPORT OPENER]$_{\text{INTRODUCTION}}$ [... LOGOPHORIC PRONOUN ....]$_{\text{LOGOPHORIC CONTEXT}}$

Note that 'introduction' and 'logophoric context' are not syntactic constructions, but stretches of discourse, and the scheme doesn't imply anything about their structure or the formal relationship between them. In a canonical logophoric construction, all elements of the scheme are within one sentence, with the introduction being a matrix clause and the logophoric context a subordinate clause. A canonical report opener consists of a speech act verb and a complementizer (as in English *says that*). A canonical antecedent is the subject of the speech act verb.

CANONICAL LOGOPHORIC CONSTRUCTION:

[... ANTECEDENT ... SPEECH ACT]$_{\text{MATRIX CLAUSE}}$ [(COMPL) ... LOGOPHORIC PRONOUN ....]$_{\text{SUB. CLAUSE}}$

Many of the examples from Finnish and High Latvian dialects correspond to the canonical construction. However, considerable variation is found, and although a complete introduction with antecedent, speech act verb and complementizer is frequent, none of these is obligatory. I will now take a closer look at these elements in turn.

3.2.1. Report opener

Very often, a speech report is introduced by a speech act verb. Various verbs are possible here, but in both languages, one verb, the most general verb meaning 'to say', is used much more frequently than others. Furthermore, in both Finnish and High Latvian dialects, there is a tendency to generalize the present tense of this verb and use it as an invariant form: Finnish *sano*, High Latvian *soka*, literally 'says', are also used in past tense contexts (ex. (8), (9), (11)) and for the introduction of reported questions, where a verb meaning 'ask' would be semantically more appropriate (ex. (8)):

Finnish, Puolanka [Kainu; Savo group] (Kuiri 1984: 118)

(8) *se*$_1$ (pappi) *tuli iltasella ja **sano että***
   PRO (the priest) come:PST:3 evening:ADE and say:PRS:3 COMP
   etkö sinä hänen$_1$ *kansal lähe, metälle.*
   NEG:2SG:Q 2SG LOG:GEN with leave wood:ALL
   'He$_1$ (the priest) came in the evening and asked, won't he/she go with him$_1$ into the wood.' (literally 'says that don't you go with LOG into the woods')

In High Latvian, a fixed formula used as report opener has developed out of the most general speech act verb: *soks, ka soka*, literally 'saying that he/she says', with *soka* meaning 'says' and *soks* being the present active participle of the same verb (see ex. (A2) in the appendix).

The most common complementizers, comparable to English *that*, are Finnish *että* and *jotta* and High Latvian *ka* and *lai*. The Finnish complementizers are sometimes shortened and may fuse with a preceding or following element. In neither language is a complementizer obligatory, the logophoric context may follow an introduction as a structurally independent clause:

Finnish, Suomussalmi [Kainu; Savo group] (Kuiri 1984: 118)

(9) *se   isä$_1$ sano,   kun   minä kyselin   siltä$_1$,   niin se$_1$ sano*
DET father say:PRS:3 when 1SG ask:PST:1 PRO:ABL so PRO say:PRS:3
ei   häll$_1$ oom mittääh   hätteä
NEG:3SG LOG:ADE be any:PAR problem:PAR
'Father$_1$ said, when I asked him$_1$, he$_1$ said he$_1$ didn't have any
problem.'

In the Finnish sources there are also examples where a report is opened by
a complementizer without a verb (cf. Laitinen 2005: 85).

In High Latvian, a further element with a report opening function is the
discourse particle *vot*, a loan from Russian, which may appear together with
a complementizer or alone (see example (6) above and (21) below).

Although most speech reports have some sort of opener, these may also
lack one completely. It seems that this is most often the case in fairy tales,
as in the following example:

Finnish, Nurmijärvi [Souther Häme; Häme group]
(Ikola 1960: 170, citing Kettunen 1930)

(10) *Se$_1$ otti   tulukses   ja   iski   valkiaa. Koira*
PRO take:PST:3 tinderbox and strike:PST:3 fire:PAR dog
tuli   taas.
come:PST:3 again
Hänell$_1$ on   tulluh   halu   nähräp prinssessaa.
LOG:ALL AUX:PRS:3 come:PAP:SG desire see:INF princess:PAR
'He$_1$ took the tinderbox and stroke fire. Again the dog appeared.
He$_1$ [said he] had got the desire to see the princess.'

In this example, it is mainly the logophoric pronoun itself which marks the
sentence as a speech report. The logophoric context is a formally independent clause.

3.2.2. Antecedent

The antecedent of a logophoric pronoun is semantically the source of the reported speech. Formally, it often is the subject of a speech act verb, but it
doesn't have to be expressed by a noun phrase or pronoun in the same clause as

the verb. The only generalization that could be made is that in both languages, antecedents are always third person. That is, there are no logophoric constructions when the reported speaker is a first or second person pronoun, an option that is found in some (though not many) logophoric languages of Africa.

In High Latvian, finite verbs frequently appear without formal subjects. In Finnish, this option is more restricted. In the following example from High Latvian, the antecedent is named in an earlier sentence which even belongs to a different turn, and it is not openly expressed again before the clause containing the logophoric pronoun. This clause is formally and intonationally independent:

High Latvian, speaker Anna (AA 20)

(11) *A   tu   ar redzieji   **kodus**   **mežabruoļus**$_1$?* [interviewer]
     and 2sg also see:PST:2SG some:ACC.PL partizan:ACC.PL
     Nu redzieju,   redzieju,   gondreiž īguojuši   beja
     PTC see:PST:1SG see:PST:1SG almost   come_in:PAP:M.PL aux:PST:3
     nakts   laikā   ustobā,
     night:GEN time:LOC house:LOC
     pateice   īlaist,   citaid,   soka,   slikti byus.
     say.PST:3 let_in:INF otherwise say:PRS:3 badly be:FUT:3
     Šī$_1$ *zynūši,   ka   jius asūt   nabadzeigi.*
     LOG:PL   know:PAP:M.PL COMP 2PL be:PAI poor:M.PL
     Interviewer: 'And did you also see **partizans**$_1$?'
     Anna: 'Well, yes, I did, [they] had almost come into [our] house during the night, [they] said [we should] let [them] in, otherwise, [they] said, it would turn out badly. **They**$_1$ [said they] knew that we (literally 'you') were poor.'

Examples like (10) and (11) prove that there is no formal relationship between antecedent and logophoric pronoun, only a semantic one. In those dialect texts which represent spontaneous spoken discourse it may even be very difficult for an outsider to determine which of the several persons named before the logophoric context is the antecedent of a logophoric pronoun (an example of such an intricate text is given in the appendix (A2)). Still, where the logophoric pronoun is grammaticalized, it unambiguously refers to the author whose words are reported – whatever difficulties we may have in deciding who this author is.

3.2.3. Logophoric context

As has already been shown by several examples above, the logophoric context, or more narrowly, a clause containing a logophoric pronoun, may be more or less embedded and more or less independent. Suffice it to say that dependency is not an obligatory feature of a logophoric context. There is probably a statistical preference for the pronoun to occur in embedded and dependent clauses, at least in Finnish, but much more text analysis would be needed to prove (or disprove) this thesis.

Apart from complementizers, which, as has been shown, are not obligatory, a possible marker of dependency is the use of mood and tense forms. Neither Finnish nor Latvian has a subjunctive mood which would be used to mark dependency. In Finnish, the conditional is sometimes used in indirect speech reports, but indicative is much more common (cf. Ikola 1960: 187–199). With regard to tense, it is most common in Finnish dialects to retain the temporal deixis of the original utterance. Relative tense is rare (Ikola 1960: 167–173).

All Latvian dialects, as well as Standard Latvian, use special verb forms to mark reported or hearsay knowledge. These forms have developed out of participles and will be called 'reportative mood' here, in analogy to the Latvian term 'atstāstījuma izteiksme'[4]. In High Latvian, there are six tense forms of the reportative, one simple and one compound for each present, future and past (cf. Cibuls & Leikuma 2003). The tense forms of the reportative are used both with a relative and an absolute meaning, that is, the past tense of the reportative mood can refer to the past from either the viewpoint of the reported or of the actual speaker, and the same holds for present and future. Compare the following examples (shortened):

High Latvian reportative, past tense, relative (speaker Anna)

(12) *teice,*   *ka*   *šys*   **grybiejs**   *nūšautīs*
     say:PST:3   COMP   LOG   want:PAP:M.SG   shoot:INF:REFL
     'said he **wanted** to shoot himself' < '**I want** to shoot myself'

---

[4] In previous publications, I used the term "evidential" for these forms (Nau 1998); other traditional terms are *modus relativus / relative mood* and *modus obliquus / oblique mood*. Whether evidentiality should be regarded as belonging to mood is of no importance here. In this article, I gloss reportative verb forms with the labels for the respective participles.

High Latvian reportative, present tense, absolute (speaker Anna)

(13) *pateics,*   *ka*   *nikuo*   *šys*   **nazyns**
     say:PAP:M.SG   COMP   nothing:ACC   LOG   NEG:know:PA:M.SG
     'said that he **didn't know** anything' < "I **don't know** anything"

High Latvian reportative, future tense, absolute (from Viļāni, Stafecka 1988: 150)

(14) *šys*   *teu*   **īdūškys**   *vīnu*   *gimini*   *atmeit*
     LOG   2SG   give:FAP:M.SG   one:ACC   family:ACC   exchange
     'he **would give** him a family in exchange' < "I **will give** you a family"

The reportative mood is very regularly used in logophoric contexts in my sources, but also in other clauses. It is not a marker of subordination but occurs in subordinated as well as independent clauses.

3.2.4. Predicates

In several African languages with logophoric pronouns, the latter are used not only in speech reports proper, but also in reports of thoughts, feelings, experiences or knowledge. It has been noted that languages and dialects vary with respect to this parameter, and the variation can be described as a hierarchy of predicates allowing (or demanding) the use of logophoric pronouns. Stirling (1993: 259; 1994: 2304) proposes the following hierarchy[5]:

communication > thought > psychological state > perception

Culy (2002: 202) proposes a slightly different hierarchy:

speech > thought > non-factive perception > knowledge > direct perception

In Finnish dialects, too, variation along this scale is found, though my data do not allow a conclusion as to how far to the right-hand side of the hierarchy the use is extended, nor how many and which dialects use logophoric pronouns outside of reported speech proper. There are some clear examples

---

[5] The hierarchy reads: If logophoric pronouns are used with one type of predicates, they are also used with predicates to the left of it on the scale.

for canonical logophoric constructions with a verb 'to think' or 'remember':

Jääski-Kirvu [Southern Karelian; Southeastern group]
(Ikola 1960: 169, after Sirelius 1894)

(15) *Pekka*₁   **muist**   *sitt,*   *jott*   *onha*   *hänell*₁
      Pekka   remember:PST:3   then   COMP   be:PRS:3:PTC   LOG:ADE
      toinekii   *vel'.*
      second:PTC   brother
      'At that moment Pekka₁ remembered that he₁ had yet a second brother.'

Laitinen (2005: 88–90) claims that Finnish *hän* is used with predicates denoting various kinds of mental states as well as perception and even cause. Unfortunately, she does not specify the varieties which allow these uses, and her article deals not only with dialects. Her example (22) (Laitinen 2005: 88), with a verb 'to hear', seems to be from Standard Finnish. Judging from the examples in SMS, in Finnish dialects only predicates of communication and thought are widespread in logophoric constructions, while predicates further to the right-hand side of the hierarchy are found only in subdialects where the logophoric pronoun is also used in various non-logophoric functions.

In High Latvian, the restriction to reported speech proper is still more pronounced. In my sources, there is no example in which a predicate denoting something other than a speech act introduces a logophoric context. The lack of examples, of course, is not proof that they are impossible. However, in the only sentence reporting a thought in a canonical construction, speaker Anna uses the anaphoric pronoun, not the logophoric:

High Latvian, speaker Anna (AA 131)

(16) *Ā, jis*₁ *grybē,*   *jis*₁ *dūmuo,*   *ka*   **jam**₁   *īnuokums byus*
      PTC PRO want:PST:3 PRO think:PST:3 COMP   PRO:DAT income   be:FUT:3
      lyls,   *ka*   *te*   *īs*   *cylvāki,* **jam**₁   *moksuos.*
      big:M.SG COMP here go:FUT:3 people   PRO:DAT pay:FUT:3
      'A, he₁ wanted, he₁ thought that he₁ would have a big income, that people would come and pay him₁.'

Note that in this sentence, the verb is in indicative mood, not reportative. This example suggests that in High Latvian, the use of logophoric pronouns

is restricted to speech reports proper, in other words, that thoughts and mental states are not treated as communication. However, in constructions without an introductory verb it is not always evident that what is reported are spoken words, rather than thoughts. Consider the following example from a fairy tale, where the hero sits alone in despair, because he has been given the task to pick out poppy seeds from the ashes:

High Latvian, Varakļāni (Jokubauska 1988: 138)

(17) *siešš   i   raudois,   kū   **šys** var   izlaseit.*
     sit:PA:M.SG and cry:PA:M.SG what:ACC LOG can:PRS:3 pick_out:INF
     '[He$_1$] sat and cried, [thinking/saying?] how could he$_1$ pick them out.'

I suppose that in High Latvian, a semantic extension of the logophoric construction towards reported thoughts or feelings appears only outside of the canonical logophoric construction or in varieties in which the logophoric function is less grammaticalized. Further research is needed here.

Summarizing the findings of this section, the following may be stated:

First, there are several formal features that characterize the typical logophoric construction. However, it is not possible to define the use of logophoric pronouns in Finnish and High Latvian in formal terms. Most important in this respect is the assignment of number and gender, where logophoric pronouns behave like first person pronouns, their use in independent clauses, and their rather loose relation to an antecedent. Second, formal and semantic characteristics of logophoric constructions derive from the fact that they represent reported discourse: the regular presence of a report-opening element (a speech act verb with a tendency to fossilize in one form, a complementizer and/or particle), the restriction to predicates of communication (in High Latvian) or communication and thought (in Finnish). Third, the formal properties of the logophoric pronouns in Finnish and High Latvian are not peculiarities of these two languages, but are paralleled in the logophoric languages of Africa, to which they are neither genetically nor geographically related. It is therefore safe to conclude that these are indeed the characteristics of logophoric constructions. A more detailed comparison of individual languages may reveal further parallels as well as differences, but this is beyond the scope of the present article. Instead, I will now turn to the place of logophoric constructions within a typology of reported speech.

4. TYPES OF REPORTED DISCOURSE AND PERSON ASSIGNMENT

The traditional binary classification of instances of reported discourse into direct and indirect speech is based on data from written standard varieties of European languages, where several grammatical and lexical features tend to cluster at two poles[6]. It has long since been noted that in spoken varieties, most notably colloquial speech and dialects, these features may combine in very different ways, making it difficult or even impossible to distinguish between direct and indirect speech (for Finnish dialects, see Ikola 1960: 235–237). As becomes evident from the discussion in section 3, logophoric constructions in Finnish and High Latvian dialects may be more similar to either of the two ideal types. In the canonical logophoric construction, they probably resemble indirect speech more, while in constructions with (more) independent clauses, absolute tense, indicative mood, and discourse particles, a speech report with logophoric pronouns is closer to direct speech. In these cases, it is only the pronoun that distinguishes a logophoric context from direct speech. Consider the following example, where the use of quotation marks is an indicator of how the linguist transcribing the text interpreted the utterance:

Urjala [Northern Häme; Häme group] (Ikola 1960: 236, citing Kannisto 1902)

(18) *Sano   "kyllä te   mennäs saatte", kyllä **häl** lapsen   kattoo.*
say:PRS:3 PTC   2PL go:INF may:2PL PTC   LOG child:ACC look:PRS:3
'[she$_1$] said: "you may leave", she$_1$ would look after the child.'[7]

Note the exact parallel of the two coordinated clauses: both contain a discourse particle and neither is formally dependent. I suppose that it was only the use of pronouns and not a significant difference in intonation that led to the use of quotation marks for the first clause as opposed to the second.

---

[6] There is vast literature on reported discourse; for a comprehensive bibliography see Güldemann 2002, for features associated with the distinction of direct and indirect speech, see contributions to Coulmas (ed.) 1986 and Günthner 2000.

[7] Translation in analogy to Ikola's German translation: 'Sagte "ihr könnt schon gehen", sie werde schon aufs Kind aufpassen'. This translation proves the interpretation of the logophoric context as indirect speech. It also illustrates the problem of translating spontaneous spoken language – the German translation reflects a rather formal register.

In a High Latvian dialect text I found the following (almost) minimal pair of reported utterances, which differ in that the original speaker is referred to by a logophoric pronoun and a first person pronoun respectively. In the transcription, both are graphically treated as direct speech:

High Latvian, Varakļāni (Jokubauska 1988: 138 and 139)

(19) *nu   i   sokute:*
PTC   and   say:PA:F.SG
*– kū   **šuos**   tāus   teu   aizlyka   šūnakt   struoduot?*
what:ACC   LOG:F.GEN   father   2SG:DAT   order:PST:3   tonight   work:INF
'And [she₁] said: What did **LOG**₁ father make you do tonight?'

(20) *– nu,   kū   teu   aizlyka   **munc**   tāus   struoduot?*
PTC   what:ACC   2SG:DAT   order:PST:3   my:M.SG   father   work:INF
'Now what did **my** father make you do?'

The rendering of the original speaker in a speech report may be taken as crucial for the distinction of different types of reported discourse and for the understanding of the nature of logophoric pronouns. This point has been neglected by those researchers who have focused on the opposition between logophoric and third person pronouns. In such accounts, emphasis is placed on the fact that logophoric pronouns as markers of coreference solve the ambiguity of third person reference that arises in indirect speech reports, where the reported speaker is treated as a third person. However, as noted in the introduction, there is another kind of potential ambiguity for which logophoric pronouns provide a solution, namely, ambiguity between the reported and the actual speaker, both of which are referred to by a first person pronoun in direct speech. This was explicitly pointed out by Stirling (1993: 257), as well as, more recently and with special emphasis, by Bhat (2004: 58–74), whose unorthodox account of logophoricity I found very inspiring. According to Bhat, the primary function of logophoric pronouns is to differentiate between the participants of the reported speech act and those of the current speech act (endophoric and exophoric speech act participants, in his terminology).

According to how reference to the **reported speaker** (S_r) is made in a speech report, we may thus distinguish three basic types:

(i) S_r referred to by a first person pronoun (**direct speech**),

(ii) S_r referred to by a third person (anaphoric) pronoun (**indirect speech**),

(iii) S_r referred to by a logophoric pronoun distinct from (i) and (ii) (**logophoric context**).

To my knowledge, only the first type is found in all languages. The second and third, therefore, are options that contrast with direct speech. In varieties where the logophoric pronoun is obligatory in a logophoric context, indirect speech as defined here is excluded. This may be an argument for Bhat's above cited claim, as both (ii) and (iii) allow the distinction between endophoric and exophoric speaker. If there is a grammaticalized logophoric pronoun, there is no need for indirect speech. On the other hand, where there is a neat distinction between direct and indirect speech, as in European written standard languages, there is no need for logophoric pronouns. Instead, languages may develop means to solve the ambiguity that arises between several third persons in indirect speech. There are also varieties where all three types are attested, that is, apart from direct speech, a reported speaker may be referred to by either a logophoric pronoun (which in this case is not fully grammaticalized) or a third person pronoun.

The next step towards a typology of reported speech along these lines is to look at the options available for reference to the addressee of the reported utterance (A_r). The picture becomes more complicated here, though there are clear preferences. In Finnish and High Latvian logophoric constructions, the addressee of the reported speech act most often is referred to by a second person pronoun, as it is in direct speech. The same phenomenon is reported for logophoric constructions in African languages (Roncador 1988: 290). Most remarkably in my eyes is the fact that, as in typical direct speech, in a logophoric context the deixis of the original message often overrides the deixis of the actual message: a reported second person remains second person even when it refers to the current speaker or includes her[8]. In the following example from High Latvian, the speaker reports an utterance made to herself:

[8] It is, however, also possible to use a first person pronoun in cases where the reported addressee is (or includes) the same person as the actual speaker.

High Latvian, speaker Anna (AA 35)

(21) […] *reitā   atīt   tāvs   i   muote,   i   jau   tur*
morning:LOC come.PRS.3 father and mother and PTC   there
taida   lauku
such:F.SG country
vecine   īt   leidza jai,   nu   i   atnas
women go.PRS.3 with   pro:DAT.F PTC   and carry.PRS:3
mozu   bārnu
small:ACC   child:ACC
*i   līk   **maņ**₂,   ka   lai*
and let:PRS:3 1sg:dAT   COMP   COMP
– *vot šī   atnazuši   bruoleiti   **tev**₂.*
PTC   LOG:PL bring:PAP:PL   brother:DIM:ACC 2SG:DAT
'in the morning, father and mother are coming, and such an old
village woman goes with her, [she/they] carries/carry a small
child and lets/let me₂ – [interrupts]
– there, LOG brought you₂ a little brother.'[9]

In an English translation of this last clause, we have to choose between the
models of direct and indirect speech: 'we brought you a little brother' or
'they had brought me a little brother'. The following example from Finnish
shows the same principle:

Finnish, Ristijärvi [Kainu; Savo group] (Kuiri 1984: 119)

(22) *(mies₁) sano   jotta **hän**₁ ei   lähej   jotta*
man   say:PRS:3 COMP   LOG   NEG:3   leave   COMP
***sinä**   ossoat   ite*
2SG   be_able:PRS:2SG self
'(the man₁) said that **he**₁ would not leave, that **I**₂ could do it
myself' or: '(the man₁) said: "**I**₁ won't leave, **you**₂ may do it
yourself".'

There are two more options for marking the reported addressee in a logo-
phoric context. First, as in indirect speech, it may be marked with a third

[9] It is not clear who is the reported speaker in this text and the subject of the verbs
'carry' and 'let': the mother, the village woman, or the group of the three adults.

person pronoun. In the following example this option is chosen in the first clause, while in the second clause a second person pronoun is used. This example thus shows a switch between two models of person assignment (such switches are far from uncommon).

High Latvian, Varakļāni (Jokubauska 1988: 138)

(23) *lai*   **jis**$_2$ *izlosa*   *par nakti,*   *a*   *ka* *nē,*
COMP PRO   pick_OUT:PRS:3 for night:ACC and if   not
teu$_2$ *reitā*   *golva byus*   *nūst.*
2SG:DAT morning:LOC head be:FUT:3 down
'[they$_1$ said] **he**$_2$ should pick out [the poppy seeds] over night, and if not, in the morning **he**$_2$ would (literally 'you will') lose [his] head'

In my sources, a reported addressee in a logophoric context is referred to by a third person pronoun only in cases where the reported addressee is not referred to by a logophoric pronoun, that is, either reference to the speaker is omitted (as in example (23)), or the reported speaker is identical to the actual speaker and therefore referred to by a first person pronoun.

Second, in some subdialects and non-dialectal varieties of Finnish and Latvian it is possible to use the logophoric pronoun (*hän, šys*) also for reference to the addressee of reported speech. I will call this option the 'logophoric addressee construction'. Consider the following examples:

Finnish, Lavansaari [Southern Karelian; Southeastern group] (SMS sub *hän*)

(24) *Mie mänen   sanomaa Annil   jos*
1SG   go:PRS:1SG   say:INF:ILL Anni:ALL if
hänel *olliis   aikaa   tulla   meil   kohvil.*
LOG:ADE be:CND time:PAR come:INF 1PL:ALL coffee:ALL
'I$_1$'m going to ask Anni$_2$, whether she$_2$ would have time to come to us for coffee.'

Finnish, Vihti [Western Uusimaa; Southwestern group] (SMS sub *hän*)

(25) *se*$_1$ *kysyi*   *isält*$_2$ *sit*   *osaak*   **här**$_2$ *ruattii.*
PRO   ask:PST:3 father:ABL then know:Q LOG$_2$ Swedish
'Then he$_1$ asked father$_2$ whether he$_2$ knew Swedish.'

It may seem odd that the same marker can be used with two different meanings, marking either the source or the receiver of a speech act. However, there are several factors that prevent ambiguity. First, in example (24), the reported speaker is a first person and the reported addressee is the only possible antecedent for the logophoric pronoun. Second, most often logophoric marking of an addressee is found where the reported speech act is a question or a command, that is, in a context where the addressee is more important for the speech act than with statements. It is also not common for a speaker to ask someone else questions about himself – for example, in (25) the speaker surely knows whether he himself speaks Swedish! Thirdly, this option, like the marking of the reported addressee by a third person pronoun, apparently is available only if there is no reference to the reported speaker in the same clause, or if the original speaker is identical to the current speaker and referred to by a first person pronoun. That means it is used in contexts where it is only necessary to distinguish between endophoric and exophoric addressee, while there is no ambiguity problem for reported and actual speaker. Again, this may be considered an argument for the view that the primary function of logophoric pronouns is to solve this kind of ambiguity.

I am not sure of the spread of the logophoric addressee construction in the two languages under consideration, but it is definitely much rarer than the use of *hän* and *šys* for a reported speaker and implies this use. Kuiri (1984: 122-123) states that it is not found in the dialects of her investigation (Kainuu and Northern Karelian, both in East Finland). In High Latvian, I found it only in varieties where the use of *šys* to mark the reported speaker is not fully grammaticalized.

The three options to mark a reported addressee (A_r) (second person, third person, or logophoric) are thus dependent on the marking of the reported speaker (S_r) and its relation to the actual speaker (S_a). Taking this into account, the Finnish and High Latvian data may be summarized as follows:

(i) A_r is referred to by a second person pronoun,

if S_r is marked as first person (direct speech),

or S_r is marked by logophoric pronoun (logophoric construction),

or S_r is not expressed;

(ii) A_r is referred to by a third person pronoun,

if S_r is marked as third person (indirect speech),

or S_r is marked as first person and $S_r = S_a$,

or S_r is not expressed;

(iii) A_r is referred to by a logophoric pronoun (logophoric addressee construction)

if S_r is marked as first person and $S_r = S_a$,

or S_r is not expressed.

As can be seen, the first option is least restricted, and it is also by far the most frequent in the dialects with a logophoric pronoun. It is also attested in several logophoric languages of Africa.

I will only briefly comment on further types of person marking in reported speech involving logophoric pronouns. First, some languages are less restrictive with the combination of logophors with third person pronouns: in Babungo, the reported addressee may be marked for third person when the reported speaker is referred to by a logophoric pronoun (Heath 2004: 1006); in Pero, logophoric reference to the reported addressee is compatible with third person reference for the reported speaker (Bhat 2004: 65). Second, a few languages are known to have two types of logophoric pronouns, distinguishing between reported speaker (LOG-S) and reported addressee (LOG-A). An example is Mupun (Culy 1997: 855).

With these data in mind, we may derive the following typology of reported speech based on the marking of reported speaker and reported addressee. Given that for each reported participant there are three options, nine types are logically possible. Of these, three are well attested, three are marginal, and three are probably impossible.

Table 1. Marking of reported speaker (S_r) and reported addressee (A_r) (in cases where both are distinct from actual speaker and actual addressee)

Preferred types (attested in several unrelated languages)

Type	Marking	Schematic example
(1)	S_r = 1st, A_r = 2nd **Direct speech**	He$_1$ said to her$_2$: I$_1$ love you$_2$.
(2)	**S_r = 3rd, A_r = 3rd** **Indirect speech**	He$_1$ said to her$_2$ that he$_1$ loves her$_2$.
(3)	S_R = LOG, A_R = 2nd **Logophoric construction**	He$_1$ said to her$_2$ (that) LOG$_1$ loves you$_2$.

Marginal types: Variations of the logophoric construction

(4)	S_r = LOG-S, A_r = LOG-A (Mupun)	He$_1$ said to her$_2$ (that) LOG-S$_1$ loves LOG-A$_2$.
(5)	S_r = LOG, A_r = 3rd (Babungo)	He$_1$ said to her$_2$ (that) LOG$_1$ loves her$_2$.
(6)	S_r = 3rd, A_r = LOG (Pero)	H$_{E1}$ said to her$_2$ (that) he$_1$ loves LOG$_2$.

Unlikely types, maybe impossible

(7)	**S_R = 1st, A_R = LOG**	He$_1$ said to her$_2$ (that) I$_1$ love LOG$_2$.
(8)	S_r = 1st, A_r = 3rd	He$_1$ said to her$_2$ (that) I$_1$ love her$_2$
(9)	S_r = 3rd, A_r = 2nd	He$_1$ said to her$_2$ (that) he$_1$ loves you$_2$

A functional explanation for the distribution of these types is easy to find. Given that the first type, direct speech, is basic, all other types may be considered as dealing with the reference problem that it poses, namely, the distinction between reported (endophoric) and actual (exophoric) speech act participants. In this respect, types (2) and (3) are both successful and simple, while (4) may be considered redundant. Types (7), (8) and (9) do not solve the ambiguity, but rather increase it.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND PROSPECTS

In this paper, it was my purpose to enrich the analysis of logophoric pronouns by two means. First, by introducing new data from two European languages, while former discussions had considered almost exclusively languages from Africa. Second, by following up the idea expressed by Bhat (2004) that the primary purpose of logophoric pronouns is the distinction of reported and actual speech act participants, while former approaches had focused on the distinction between reported speaker and other non-participants of the current speech act. It has been shown that the logophoric constructions in Finnish and High Latvian dialects are basically the same as in African languages, and their properties derive from the fact that they represent reported discourse. Logophoric constructions are a third type of reported discourse, opposed to direct speech in that they signal non-identity of the reported and the actual speaker.

Logophoric pronouns are a very effective means to solve the ambiguity of person reference in reported discourse. One may ask, then, why they are not more widespread among the languages of the world. A possible answer is that there are many other ways to signal that a stretch of discourse represents the text of another person, so focusing on pronouns is just one rather special variant of marking reported speech. On the other hand, the spread of logophoric pronouns may have been underestimated until now – the fact that they still could be "discovered" in variants of comparatively well described European languages should provoke suspicion.

Throughout this paper, I did not comment on the parallel between Finnish and High Latvian, two languages which are genetically unrelated but belong to the same area. Straightforward borrowing can be excluded, as Finnish and High Latvian have never been in direct contact, and the varieties that link them – Estonian and Low Latvian – do not have logophoric pronouns. Nevertheless, a closer look at the areal context will be worth further studies, which hopefully will bring new insights into the diachronic development to and from logophoric pronouns.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

1, 2, 3	first, second, third person
ABL	ablative
ACC	accusative
ADE	adessive
ALL	allative
AUX	auxiliary
CND	conditional
COMP	complementizer
DAT	dative
DET	determiner
F	feminine
FAP	future active participle
FUT	future tense
GEN	genitive
ILL	illative
INF	infinitive
LOC	locative
LOG	logophoric pronoun
M	masculine
NEG	negation (in Finnish verbal)
PA	present active participle
PAI	indeclinable present active participle
PAP	past active participle
PAR	partitive
PL	plural
PRS	present tense
PST	past tense
PRO	(anaphoric or demonstrative) pronoun

PTC   discourse particle
Q   interrogative particle or affix
REFL   reflexive (pronoun)
SG   singular

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bhat, D.N.S. 2004: *Pronouns*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Balode, L. & A. Holvoet 2001: The Latvian language and its dialects. In: Ö. Dahl & M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm, eds., *Circum-Baltic Languages. Vol. I Past and Present.* Amsterdam: Benjamins (Studies in Language Companion Series 54), 3–40.

Cibuls, J. & L. Leikuma 2003: *Latgaliešu valodas macība*. Rīga: n.i.m.s.

Coulmas, F., ed., 1986: *Direct and indirect speech*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Culy, Chr. 1994: Aspects of logophoric marking. *Linguistics* 32, 1055–1094.

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

Culy, Chr. 2002: The logophoric hierarchy and variation in Dogon. In: Güldemann & von Roncador, eds., 2002, 201–210.

Euler, W. 1993: **Ein nahdeiktisches Demonstrativum in den nördlichen indoger-manischen Sprachen – seine voreinzelsprachlichen Grundlagen.** *Linguistica Baltica* 2, 15–29.

Gāters, A. 1977: *Die lettische Sprache und ihre Dialekte*. The Hague: Mouton.

Güldemann, T. 2003: Logophoricity in Africa: an attempt to explain and evaluate the significance of its modern distribution. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 56 (4), 366–387.

Güldemann, T. & M. von Roncador, eds., 2002: *Reported discourse. A meeting ground for different linguistic domains*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Güldemann, T., M. von Roncador & W. van der Wurff 2002: A comprehensive bibliography of reported discourse. In: Güldemann & von Roncador, eds., 2002, 363–415.

GÜNTHNER, S. 2000: Zwischen direkter und indirekter Rede. *Zeitschrift für Germa-nistische Linguistik* 28, 1–22.

HAGÈGE, C. 1974: Les pronoms logophoriques. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 69, 287–310.

HAKULINEN, A. *et al.* 2004: *Iso suomen kielioppi.* Helsinki: SKS.

HUANG, Y. 2002: Logophoric marking in East Asian languages. In: GÜLDEMANN & VON RONCADOR, eds., 2002, 211–224..

HUANG, Y. 2006: Anaphora, Cataphora, Exophora, Logophoricity. In: K. BROWN, ed. in chief, *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. Second edition.* Vol. 1. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 213–237.

HYMAN, L. & B. COMRIE 1981: Logophoric reference in Gokana. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 3, 19–37.

IKOLA, O. 1960: *Das Referat in der finnischen Sprache. Syntaktisch-stilistische Unter-suchungen.* Helsinki. (Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemian Toimituksia. Sarja B Nide 121.)

ITKONEN, E., ed. in chief, 1992: *Suomen sanojen alkuperä.* Helsinki: SKS.

JOKUBAUSKA, N. 1988: Varakļānu izloksne. In: N. JOKUBAUSKA, ed., *Augšzemnieku dialektu teksti. Latgaliskās izloksnes.* Rīga: Zinātne, 138–146.

KANNISTO, A. 1902: Lauseopillisia havaintoja läntisen Etelä-Hämeen kielimurteesta. *Suomi* III (20).

KETTUNEN, L. 1930: *Suomen murteet. I. Murrenäytteitä.* Helsinki: SKS.

KIBRIK, A. A. 2001: Reference maintenance in discourse. In: M. HASPELMATH *et al.*, eds., *Language Typology and Language Universals.* Vol. 2. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft 20.2.), 1123–1141.

KUIRI, K. 1984: *Referointi Kainuun ja Pohjois-Karjalan murteissa.* (Abstract: Reported speech in the Finnish dialects of Kainuu and North Karelia). Helsinki: SKS.

Lᴀɪᴛɪɴᴇɴ, L. 2002: From logophoric pronoun to discourse particle. A case study of Finnish and Saami. In: I. Wɪsᴄʜᴇʀ & G. Dɪᴇᴡᴀʟᴅ, eds., *New Reflections on Grammaticalization.* Amsterdam: Benjamins, 327–344.

Lᴀɪᴛɪɴᴇɴ, L. 2005: *Hän*, the third speech act pronoun in Finnish. In: R. Lᴀᴜʀʏ, ed., *Minimal Reference: The Use of Pronouns in Finnish and Estonian Discourse.* Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisunden Seura, 75–106.

MLLVG-I. 1959: *Mūsdienu latviešu literārās valodas gramatika. I Fonētika un morfoloǵia.* Rīga: Zinātne.

Nᴀᴜ, N. 1998: *Latvian.* München: LINCOM. (Languages of the World / Materials 217.)

Rᴏɴᴄᴀᴅᴏʀ, M. von 1988: *Zwischen direkter und indirekter Rede. Nichtwörtliche direkte Rede, erlebte Rede, logophorische Konstruktionen und Verwandtes.* Tübingen: Niemeyer. (Linguistische Arbeiten, 192.)

Rᴏɴᴄᴀᴅᴏʀ, M. von 2006: Logophoric pronouns. In: K. Bʀᴏᴡɴ, ed. in chief, *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. Second edition.* Vol. 7. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 312–315.

Sᴀᴜᴋᴋᴏɴᴇɴ, P. 1967: Persoonapronominien *hän : se, he : ne* distinktiivi oppositio. (Zusammenfassung: Die distinktive Opposition der Personalpronomina *hän : se, he : ne*). *Virittäjä* 71, 286–291.

Sᴇʟʟs, P. 1987: Aspects of logophoricity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18, 445–479.

Sɪʀᴇʟɪᴜs, U.T. 1894: Lauseopillinen tutkimus Jääsken ja Kirvun kielimurteesta. *Suomi* III (10: 2).

SMS = Tᴜᴏᴍɪ, Tᴜᴏᴍɪ *et al.,* eds. 1994. *Suomen murteiden sanakirja.* Vol. 4. Helsinki: Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus.

Sᴛᴀғᴇᴄᴋᴀ, A. 1988: Viļānu izloksne. In: N. Jokubauska, ed., *Augšzemnieku dialektu teksti: Latgaliskās izloksnes.* Rīga: Zinātne, 147–151.

Sᴛɪʀʟɪɴɢ, L. 1993: *Switch-reference and discourse representation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

STIRLING, L. 1994: Logophoricity and long-distance reflexives. In: R. E. ASHER, ed. in chief, *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Vol. 4. Oxford: Pergamon, 2302–2306.

VILPPULA, M. 1989: Havaintoja *hän-* ja *he-*pronominien käytöstä suomen murteissa. (Abstract: On the use of the 3rd person pronouns in Finnish dialects). *Virittäjä* 93: 389–400.

WIESEMANN, U. 1986: Grammaticalized coreference. In: U. Wiesemann, ed., *Pronominal systems*. Tübingen: Narr, 437–463.

YLIKAHRI, K. 1996: Referoinnin laajentunnat *hän-, he-,* ja *se-, ne-* pronominien käytössä siikaisten murteessa (Abstract: The use of *hän, he* and *se, ne* pronouns in extensions of reported discourse in the siikainen dialect). *Virittäjä* 100: 182–203.

APPENDIX: FRAGMENTS OF HIGH LATVIAN DIALECT TEXTS

(A1) Speaker Anna, born 1918 (text recorded in 1993) (AA 18)

This fragment illustrates the regular use of the logophoric pronoun *šys* as opposed to the third person pronoun *jis* in a longer stretch of discourse. Both pronouns are used in three different case forms:

	PRO	LOG
NOM	*jis*	*šys*
ACC	*jū*	*šuo*
DAT	*jam*	*šam*

The fragment also shows that the use of *šys* is motivated only by reported speech; it does not signal any change of perspective or point of view.

*Nu Preilim **jis** aizguo. Aizguoja iz Daugoupili,*
from Preili:DAT PRO leave.PST:3 leave.PST:3 to Daugavpils:ACC
pīzateice.
announce.PST:3
*Nu tur **jū** beja pajāmuši, padauziejuši i*
PTC there PRO:ACC AUX.PST:3 take:PAP:M.PL beat:PAP:M.PL and
paturiejuši,
keep:PAP:M.PL

a **jis** *vīnūs* *vuordūs* *pateics,* *ka* **šys** *Vuocejā*
and PRO one:LOC.PL word:LOC.PL say:PAP.M.SG COMP LOG Germany:LOC
tik *bejs* *i* *nikuo* **šys** *nazyns* *nikur.*
just be:PAP.M.SG and nothing:ACC LOG NEG:know:PA.M.S nowhere
Nu *tod* *paturiejuši,* *palaiduši* *jau* **jū** *prūjom.*
PTC then keep:PAP.M.PL let:PAP.M.PL PTC PRO:ACC away
Tikai **jis** *prasiejs,* *ka* *dūt* **šam** – *nu,* *dokumentu*
only PRO ask:PAP.M.SG COMP give:INF LOG:DAT PTC document:ACC
kaidu,
some:ACC
lai **šuo** *naizturūt* *ceļā.* *Nu* **jis** *i* *atguo* *kuojom,*
COMP LOG:ACC NEG.detain:PAI way:LOC PTC PRO and come:PST:3 on_foot
nu *i* *tod* **jis** *prasiejs,* *lai* *dūdūt* **šam** *dorbu.*
PTC and then PRO ask:PAP.M.SG COMP give:PAI LOG:DAT work
Tod *īdeve* *Jersikā* **jam** *par* *mežsorgu.*
then give.PST:3 Jersika:LOC PRO:DAT as forester:ACC
'**He** (pro) left Preili and went to Daugavpils, announced himself.
Well, there they took **him** (pro), beat [him] and arrested [him], but
he (pro) told them simply that **he** (log) had only been to Germany
and that **he** (log) didn't know anything. Well, so they kept [him]
for a while and then set **him** (pro) free. **He** (pro) only asked that
they give **him** (log) – well, some kind of document, so that **he** (log)
wouldn't be detained on his way. So then **he** (pro) came here on
foot, and then **he** (pro) asked that they give **him** (log) work. So
they gave **him** (pro) [a job] as a forester in Jersika.'

(A2) Speaker Jēkabs Stafeckis, born 1907 (text recorded in 1981)
(Stafecka 1988: 150)

This text shows the different kinds of functions of the logophoric pronoun
and the demonstrative pronouns. The demonstrative *itys*, discontinuous form
tys … ite, is used for reference tracking, to distinguish one referent from the
other. The logophoric *šys*, on the other hand, is not a reference tracking de-
vice. It is not used to show coreference with one of the noun phrases as such,
but indicates coreference to the reported speaker – exactly which of the two
gentlemen this speaker is, is not indicated at all, the listener infers this only
through the logic of the story.

The text tells the family legend of how the Stafecki family had come from Poland to Latgalia. It was recorded and transcribed by the narrator's daughter-in-law, dialectologist Anna Stafecka, who also kindly helped me to understand this intricate passage, for which I am very grateful.

Masaļskī beja tepat.   tāvaiņc sacē,   ka   senejūs   laikūs,
Masaļski was right_here father say.PST:3 COMP old:LOC.PL time:LOC.PL

ka   <u>tys kunks</u> ite₂, vot, ir   beis,   adbraucs   i
COMP DET lord   here PTC AUX:PRS:3 be:PAP.M.SG come:PAP.M.SG PTC

nu   Pūlejys   <u>vīnc kunks</u>₁ iz <u>itū   kungu</u>₂.
from Poland:GEN one lord   to DET:ACC lord:ACC

a   <u>itam   kungam</u>₂ beis   suņc, lops   beis.
and DET:DAT lord:DAT be:PAP dog   good be:PAP.M.SG

*soks,   ka   soka,   atdūt   **šam**₁ tū   suni,*
say:PA.M.SG COMP say:PRS:3 give:INF LOG:DAT DET:ACC dog:ACC

***šys**₁ <u>teu</u>₂ īdūškys   vīnu   gimini   atmeit,*
LOG   2SG give:FAP.M.SG one:ACC family:ACC exchange

i   <u>tys</u>₂ ar   mīru.   to, vot, atvec   tū   suni,
and PRO with peace:ACC PTC PTC bring:PAP.M.SG DET:ACC dog:ACC

addeus,
give:PAP.M.SG

acsyuties   vīnu   gimini, to Stapecki   beiši.
sent:PAP.M.SG one:ACC family:ACC PTC Stafeckis:PL be:PAP:M.PL

'Masaļski (a manor) was right here. My father said, in the old times, that this <u>gentleman here</u>₂, well, <u>a gentleman</u>₁ had come from Poland to <u>this gentleman</u>₂ (= of Masaļski). And <u>this gentleman</u>₂ had a dog, a good one. Now [he₁ (= the guest from Poland)] said that [the other] should give <u>him</u>₁ this dog, <u>he</u>₁ would give <u>him</u>₂ a family (of bondsmen) in exchange, and he₂ agreed. So, [he₁] brought the dog, gave it [to him₂], sent a family, and these were the Stafeckis.'

Nicole Nau
Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza
Zakład Bałtologii
al. Niepodległości 4, PL 61-876 Poznań, Polska
naunicol@amu.edu.pl