

The Logophoric Pronoun in the Ìlàjẹ Dialect of Yoruba

JAPHET, Akintoye Samson

Department of Linguistics and Communication Studies,
Osun State University, Osogbo, Nigeria

japhetakintoye@yahoo.com; akintoye.japhet@uniosun.edu.ng; japhetakintoye@gmail.com

Abstract

While previous studies in Yoruba have associated logophoricity with *òun*, a third person singular pronoun form, there is scarcely any further detailed analysis on the implication of such features on the entire pronoun system. This paper, therefore, examined *òghun* the attested form of this logophoric pronoun in the Ìlàjẹ dialect of Yoruba with a view to describing its place in the pronominal system of the dialect. The research was based on the data from Ìlàjẹ native speakers from towns in Ìlàjẹ local government area, Ondo State. Relevant aspects of the data were extracted and analysed syntactically in basic descriptive terms. A pronominal form, *òghun*, is identified as the logophor in Ìlàjẹ, having established its pronominal status as a structurally constrained third person singular pronoun in a reported speech construction. The paper reviewed Ìlàjẹ pronominal system by incorporating therein *òghun*, the logophoric pronoun in the pronoun paradigm.

Keywords: *Logophor, antecedent, Ìlàjẹ Yoruba, long distance anaphor.*

Introduction

Ìlàjẹ, as a homogenous linguistic community, resides in Ìlàjẹ Local Government Area of Ondo State. Ìlàjẹ is one of the least studied dialects of Yoruba. However, there has been a theoretical analysis of the pronouns system of the dialect where logophoric function of the third-person singular pronoun *òghun* [òyũ] was briefly mentioned (Japhet, 2012). The current paper therefore provides a more focused description of this pronominal logophor. The paper employed a general descriptive approach with a view to creating a basis for future research on the pronoun system of the dialect.

In Yoruba, the logophor is generally believed to have the same form with the long form of the third-person singular pronoun, *òun* as in (1).

Standard Yoruba (Adapted from Manfredi (1995:92))

(1a) Jimò-ó wí pé òun-ún lọ
Jimo-SHT say COMP LOG-SHT go
'Jimo said that he (Jimo) went.'

(b) Jimò-ó wí pé ó lọ
Jimo-SHT say COMP 3S-SHT go
'Jimo said that he (someone else) went.'

In 1(a), both *òun* and *ó* have the third person singular feature but they contrast in the kind of antecedent each of them takes. The antecedent of *òun* is subject to a stringent structural condition known as logophoricity which makes the pronoun to become a logophoric pronoun (Clement, 1975). As attested in several African languages, a logophoric pronoun occurs as a morphologically distinct pronoun having in the matrix clause an antecedent of whom saying, thought or feeling is reported in an embedded clause where the logophoric form of the pronoun is used (Clement, 1975).

Logophoricity is not usually the focus in pronoun analysis in Yoruba. Adesola (2005) has even argued that *òun* is simply a pronoun and never a logophor, and that there is no

logophoric pronoun in Yoruba but logophoric effects which result from the pronouns that are inherently A-bar dependent on a null operator. In fact, what is currently viewed as logophoric use of *òun*, was merely described by Bamgbose (1986: 82) to show how Yoruba language-internal strategy of marking out co-referential index between two subjects in the reported speech. However, Pulleyblank's (1986) consideration of the third person non-clitic *òun* as logophoric brings logophoricity into the Yoruba pronominal system. Any other pronoun is considered non-logophoric or antilogophoric (Manfredi, 1995: 92). Manfredi (1995) (in his logophoric analysis of *òun*) and Lawal (2006) (who also analyses *òun* as a long distance anaphor) have claimed to have improved on Pulleyblank's Avoid Pronominal Principle; however, they have not been able to adequately define the pronoun system to accommodate the logophor, a stride the present paper attempts to achieve in the Ìlàjẹ dialect of Yoruba.

The paper has three main sections. The first section provides background information on logophoric markings. The second section identifies the Ìlàjẹ logophor in the typology of the logophoric pronouns. The third section discusses the Ìlàjẹ personal pronouns along with the logophor, as a pronoun, and proposes the adoption of this logophoric pronoun as part of Ìlàjẹ pronominal system.

Types of Logophoric Markers

Logophoric elements usually occur in embedded clauses introduced by verbs of saying, thinking or feeling. These elements are bound by antecedents whose speeches, thoughts, or feelings are being reported by the verbs (Clements 1975: 241).

The *logophoric domain* is a clause that reports someone's speech, thought, knowledge, perception or emotion. (Clements 1975; Sells 1987; Culy 1994)¹. Within a logophoric construction, three basic items are expected. They are as follows: the *report verb*² that introduces the report; the *logophor*³ which may be a pronoun or an affix that functions as the logophoric marker, and the noun phrase (NP) which functions as the *antecedent*⁴ of the logophor. This domain must have a logophoric marker which can be any of the following: a logophoric pronoun, a logophoric affix, and a long distance reflexive. Where the logophoric element also functions as a pronoun, it is often referred to as a logophoric pronoun; but when it functions as a bound morpheme on the verb, it is called a logophoric affix. The logophor has also been identified as a long distance reflexive where it occurs in a reflexive form (Chou, 2012).

¹Nau (2006) divides logophoric construction into two parts: the introduction and the logophoric context. The introduction comprises the opener and the antecedent while the logophoric context denotes the structure where the logophoric marker is found; this part has also been called 'logophoric domain' Culy (1994; 1997).

²Nau (2006) calls this verb report opener. Stirling (1993; 1994) calls the same item 'logophoric trigger.' We shall refer to the verb in this paper as logophoric verb.

³This often refers to a person whose speech or thought is represented in discourse (Crystal, (2008:392).

⁴This has been called different names. Hyman & Comrie 1981 call it 'logophoric trigger'; Stirling (1993; 1994) call it 'logocentric NP'. For syntactic reasons, the present paper adopts Wiesemann's (1986) and Nau's (2006) view, who call it *antecedent*.

Logophoric pronouns

Pronominal analysis of logophoricity is the first approach to logophoricity (Hagège, 1974; Clements, 1975). The logophoric pronoun is a morphologically distinct pronominal form as exemplified in Ewe and Igbo in (2) and (3) respectively.

Ewe adapted from (Clements, 1975: 142)

(2a) Kofi_i be e_j-dzo
Kofi say 3sg-leave.
'Kofi said that he/she left.'

(b) Kofi_ibe yè_i-dzo
Kofi say LOG-leave
'Kofi said that he left.'

Igbo (Hyman & Comrie, 1981:19)

(3a) ó_i sị_rì nà ó_j byàrà
he said that 3sg came
'He said that he came.'

(b) ó_i sị_rì nà yá_i byàrà
he said that LOG came
'He said that he came.'

In 2(a), the pronoun, *e*, cannot refer to *Kofi*, but the logophor, *ye*, must obligatorily refer to *Kofi* in 2(b) as shown by the co-indexing subscripts. A similar relationship holds between the pronoun, *ó* and the logophor, *yá* in Igbo. In such contexts where the logophor establishes obligatory co-reference with an antecedent in the matrix clause, it is expected that a blocking effect should have applied preventing the use of non-logophoric pronouns.

Logophoric affixes

Logophors can also occur as affixes. This type of logophoricity is known as *verbal logophoricity* where logophoric markings occur as bound morphemes realised as verbal affixes as found in the following languages: Akɔ̃se and Gokana presented in (4) and (5) respectively.

Akɔ̃se (Hedinger, 1984:95)

(4a) à_i-h bé a á_j-kàg
he-said RP he-should-go
'He said that he (someone else) should go'

(b) à_i-h bé a m_i-kàg
he-said RP LOG-should-go
'He said that he (himself) should go'

Gokana (Hyman & Comrie, 1981:20)

(5a) aè_x kɔ̃ aè_x dɔ̃-è
he said he fell-LOG
'He said that he fell'

(b) aè_x kɔ̃ aè_y dɔ̃
he said he fell
'He said that he (someone else) fell'

In Akɔɔse, the verbal prefix *m-* carries logophoric reference, this prefix is used in 4(b) where such reference is expressed rather than using the general third-person-marking prefix, *á-* in 4(a). In the case of Gokanna, a low-toned suffix is added to the verb to indicate logophoricity in 5(a). This verbal suffix is lacking in 5(b) where no logophoric function is attested.

Long distance logophoric anaphors

This type of logophor can occur as a reflexive outside the local clause that contains its antecedent, hence the term ‘long distance anaphor’ (LDA) employed in its description in the literature (Huang, 1994:185; Curnow, 2002). A good instance of this is the Chinese *ziji* reflexive given in (6) below.

Chinese (Chou, 2012: 18)

(6a) Zhangsan_i renwei [Lisi_j kan-bu -qi ziji_{i/j}]
 Zhangsan think Lisi look-not-up self
 'Zhangsan_i thinks Lisi_j looks down on him_i/himself_j.'

(b) Zhangsan_i renwei [ni_j kan -bu -qi ziji_{j/*i}]
 Zhangsan think you look-not-up self
 'Zhangsan_i thinks you_j should look down on *him_i/yourself_j'

In (6), *ziji* behaves as a typical logophor because it selects its antecedent in a similar way a logophor does in the reported speech construction. In 6(a), *ziji* can refer to either *Zhangsan* or *Lisi*. Where *ziji* refers to *Lisi*, it occurs in the same clause with its antecedent, *Lisi*; this is a typical anaphoric relation. However, where *ziji* refers to *Zhangsan*, it does not occur in the same minimal clause with its antecedent, yet it maintains its reflexive function. This is why *ziji* is called a long distant anaphor. In real sense, it structurally behaves as a reflexive logophor. In 6(b), the anaphoric property of *ziji* is made obvious because it can only refer to the clause-mate antecedent where logophoric relation is not required.

Syntactic Typology of Ìlàjẹ Logophor

As evident in Stirling (1993: 259; 1994: 2304) and Culy (2002: 202), reported speech is ranked higher than other predicates in logophoric construction. The verbs that trigger logophoricity are usually speech act verbs implying that logophors are more likely to occur in a reported speech than in any other expression. Reported speech is the most likely domain of logophoric pronoun.

However, the universal occurrence of reported speech does not licence universal logophoricity. From this premise, it is important to note that while languages using logophoric pronouns are likely going to exhibit logophoricity in the reported speech, the reported speech, in itself, does not necessarily trigger logophoricity. As shown in figure (1) adapted from Nau (2006), a typical reported speech, as the case is in English, does not use logophoricity. Languages lacking logophoricity in the reported speech construction will not even have any logophoric pronoun in the reported speech.

Fig. 1 Reported speech without logophoric pronoun⁵

Types	Schematic example
Direct speech	He _x said to her _y : I _x love you _y
Indirect speech	He _x said to her _y that he _x loves her _y

According to Nau (2006: 78-79), logophoric pronouns are used in different ways. They may be used as subject referents or as object referents. These are properly labelled here as follows: *subject referent logophoricity*, *object referent logophoricity* and the combination of both types as shown in figure (2) below.

Fig. 2 Different types of logophoric pronoun in reported speech Adapted from Nau (2006: 78-79)

Types	Schematic example
Subject referent logophoricity	He _x said to her _y : that LOG _x love her _y
Object referent logophoricity	He _x said to her _y : that he _x love LOG _y
Subject and object referent logophoricity	He _x said to her _y : that LOG _x love LOG _y

In subject referent logophoricity, the logophor is usually co-referent with the subject in the matrix clause. The reported speaker in the embedded clause is a logophoric pronoun while the reported addressee will retain the person features they have in the matrix clause. For the object referent logophoricity, the logophor in the embedded clause is co-referent with the object in the matrix clause while the reported speaker retains its person feature in the matrix clause (Bhat, 2004: 65)⁶. The third type has the logophoric referents of the subject and object present in the same embedded clause (Culy, 1997: 855)⁷. Following from the typology made in figure (2) above, Ìlàjẹ logophoricity demonstrates subject referent type as evident in the reported speech constructions given in (7) - (9).

(7) Ìgè_xjí ó rí òghun_x
 Ìgè say 3sg see log
 'Ìgè said he (someone else) saw him (Ìgè)'

(8) Ìgè_xjí òghun_x ri rẹ
 Ìgè say log see 2sg
 'Ìgè said he (Ìgè) saw you'

(9) Ìgè_xjí wo_x ri òghun
 Ìgè say 2sg see log
 'Ìgè said you saw him (Ìgè).'

The Ìlàjẹ logophor, òghun, though also having the third person singular (3sg) features like ó in (7), is glossed *log* (logophor) because it must be a referent of the subject of the report verb. In (7) – (9), òghun is co-referential with Ìgè, the subject of the report verb. In Ìlàjẹ, òghun does not occur as frequent as òun does in Standard Yoruba. This is evident in (10)

⁵Without the use logophoric pronouns, the reported speech will either be realised as direct or indirect as shown in figure 1 here. For the first type, the reported speaker is referred to by first person pronoun while the reported addressee is marked for second person. In the embedded clause of the second type, the reported speaker and the reported addressee will retain person features they have in the matrix clause.

⁶This is reported in Pero by Bhat, (2004: 65).

⁷This multiple use of logophors is reported in Mupun by Culy (1997: 855).

where 10(b) is ungrammatical in Ìlàjẹ though its Standard Yoruba equivalent in 10(a) is not ill-formed.

(10) (a) ó di òun
3sg become 3sg
'It turned out to be him' (Adapted from Manfredi 1995: 94)

(b)* ó dà òghun
3sg become 3sg
Intended: 'It turned out to be him'

A report verb, its third-person subject and the third person referent of this subject are the three important items required for *òghun* to be used as logophor in Ìlàjẹ. These are stated as conditions of logophoricity below:

Conditions for Ìlàjẹ logophoricity

- i. there must be a report verb in the matrix clause of a complex sentence;
- ii. the subject of the report verb in the matrix clause must have third person singular feature;
- iii. the subject of the report verb must have a referent in the embedded clause.

The first condition here is the verbal condition, which specifies the kind of verb expected to trigger the construction. The second condition is the antecedent condition, showing the features of the antecedent of the logophor. The third condition is the grammatical feature of the logophor itself.

Bond (2006) raises a grammatical hierarchy proposal of the logophors which is reproduced in (11) as logophor feature hierarchy:

(11) Logophor features hierarchy

- (a) *grammatical* hierarchy: subject > non-subject
 - (b) *person* hierarchy: 3rd > 2nd > 1st
 - (c) *number* hierarchy: sg > pl
- Adapted from (Hyman and Comrie 1981:33).

Contrary to the position expressed in 11(a), *òghun* is not restricted to the nominative case as a logophor in Ìlàjẹ. Logophoric *òghun* can also occur in accusative and genitive cases as in (12) and (14). This agrees with Nikitina's (2012) account that logophoric pronouns occupy the same syntactic positions as personal pronouns even as possessors just as found in (14).

(12)(a) Ìgè_x jí⁸ ó_y rí òghun_x
 Ìgè say SHT-3sg see LOG
 'Ìgè said he (someone) saw him (Ige).'

(b) *Ìgè_x-é rí òghun_y
 Ìgè-SHT see LOG
 Intended: 'Ìgè saw him'

(13) Mo_x jí ọ̀nẹ̀ èyí kọ̀ ulé mi_x fẹ̀ jí mi_x mú ìwé mi_x wá
 1sg say personthat build house 1sg want that 1sg takebook 1sg come
 'I said that the person that built my house wanted me to bring my paper'

(14) Ìgè_x jí ọ̀nẹ̀ èyí kọ̀ ulé òghun_x fẹ̀ jí òghun_x mú ìwé òghun_x wá
 Ige say person that build house LOGwant that LOG take book LOG come
 'Ige said that the person that built his house wanted him to bring his (Ige's) paper'

In 12(a), the logophor is in the accusative case, being the object of the verb, *rí* 'see'. However, Ìlájẹ does not allow the non-logophoric use of *òghun* in 12(b) where the expression is ill-formed because the long pronoun, *òghun*, does not form logophoric link with any antecedent contrary to what obtains in 12(a). The data in (13) and (14) are structurally related. They vary only in the form of possessor used. In (13), the possessor *mi* 'my' is a short pronoun; in 14, the possessor is *òghun*, a long pronoun with logophoric function.

The Logophor as a Pronoun in Ìlájẹ

To establish in practical terms that *òghun* is a logophoric pronoun, its place in the pronoun system has to be verified. It is therefore necessary to have an overview of the Ìlájẹ pronoun. Ìlájẹ has both long and short forms of the pronoun. These terms are used based on the complexity of the syllable structure. The long pronoun has two syllables: The first syllable comprises a vowel and the second syllable is a sequence of a consonant and a vowel (a VCV⁹ syllable structure) as in *èmi* (1sg) and *àghan* (3pl). The short pronouns are usually monosyllabic e.g. *mo* (1sg); even where a floating tone lengthens the syllable as in short negative subject e.g. *méè* (1sg-neg).

⁸Where the reporting verb *jí* 'to say' is typical in Ìlájẹ logophoricity, other verbs are also possible. These include *fọ̀* 'speak', *mà* 'to know', *gbà* 'to accept/ agree', *rò* 'to think' *ghò-ó* 'to reason it'.

(a) Ìgè_x fọ̀-ó pé ó_y rí oghun_x
 Ìgè say-it that SHT-3sg see log
 'Ìgè said he (someone) saw him (Ige).'

(b) Ìgè_x mà pé ó_y rí oghun_x
 Ìgè know that SHT-3sg see log
 'Ìgè knew he (someone) saw him (Ige).'

(c) Akin_x gbà pé ó_y rí oghun_x
 Akin agree that SHT-3sg see log
 'Akin agreed he (someone) saw him (Ige).'

⁹VCV here denotes vowel-consonant-vowel sequence, and CV is consonant-vowel sequence.

The long pronouns

The long pronouns are only used in sentences where such pronoun is focused or combined with another pronoun or nominal to form a noun phrase. Due to this condition, (15h-j) are ill-formed.

- 15 (a) Emi òghun lọ
 1sg (conj)¹⁰ 3sg go
 'He and I went'
- (b) Adé rí emi ùwọ
 Ade see 1sg (conj) 2sg
 'Ade saw you and me'
- (c) Awa àghan mà
 1pl (conj) 2pl know
 'We and they knew'
- (d) Awa òghun ra lọ
 1pl (conj) 3sg fut go
 'He and we will go'
- (e) Àghan mo mí pè rin
 3pl/2pl 1sg prog call foc.
 'It was they/ you (pl), I was calling'
- (f) Emi wo ri rin
 1sg 2sg see foc.
 'It was me that you saw'
- (g) Awa èyí gbò lọ ibẹ
 3pl who hear go there
 'We who heard went there.'
- (h) *Ìgè-é rí òghun_y
 Ìgè-SHT see 3sg
 Intended: 'Ìgè saw him.'
- (i) *òghun-ún rí Ìgè_y
 3sg-SHT see Ìgè
 Intended: 'He saw Ìgè.'
- (j) *Àwa mà
 1pl know
 Intended: 'We knew'

A table showing the long pronouns is given in Figure (3) below.

¹⁰This is a covert conjunction. The same expression will be rendered in Standard Yoruba using the overt conjunction *ati* as shown below:

Emi ati òun lọ
 1sg conj. 3sg go
 'He and I went'

Fig. 3 Forms of Ìlàjẹ long pronoun

Person	Singular form	Plural form
First	èmi	àwa
Second	ùwọ	àghan ¹¹
Third	òghun	àghan

Although *òghun*, the logophoric pronoun and *òghun*, the non-logophoric long form of the third person pronoun have some similarities (being identical in their phonological forms and in their person and number features), they have different syntactic distributions. First, the logophor does not have any plural form because it is never used in that sense; however, the nonlogophoric *òghun* can be pluralised as *àghan*. Second, the logophor can occur where any other long pronoun cannot occur. Its occurrence is restricted to the embedded clause of a report verb unlike other pronouns.

Fig. 4. The logophoric *òghun* and the non-logophoric *òghun*

Type	Person	Singular	Plural	Domain
Logophoric pronoun	Third	òghun	---	report verb embedding
Non-logophoric pronoun	Third	òghun	àghan	focusing and phrasal domains

The short pronouns

The short pronouns vary in forms depending on their immediate syntactic environment. For the short subject pronouns, there is a broad demarcation between those used in affirmative clauses and those used in negative clauses. They are thus classified along this line: the affirmative forms occurring in positive sentences while their negative counterparts occurring in negative sentences. Instances of their occurrence are given in (16) and (17) respectively.

(16)(a) mo mà
1sg know
'I know/knew'

(b) wo mà
2sg know 'You know/knew'

(c) ó mà
3sg know
'He knows/knew'

¹¹The dialect has the same form for third-person plural and the second person plural pronoun. The context will usually show which is applicable.

(a) Ań_x jí ó rí ghan_x
2pl say SHT-3sg see 2pl
'you (pl) said he saw you(pl).'

(a) Ań_y jí ó rí ghan_x
3pl say SHT-3sg see 2pl
'They said he saw them/ you(pl).'

(b) Ań_x jí ó rí ghan_y
2pl say SHT-3sg see 3pl
'You (pl) said he saw them.'

- (d) méè mà
1sg-neg¹² know
'I do/did not know'
- (e) wéè mà
2sg-neg know
'You do/did not know'
- (f) éè mà
3sg-neg know
'He does/did not know'
- 17 (a) a mà
1pl know
'I know/knew'
- (b) án mà
2pl know
'You know/knew'
- (c) án mà
3pl know
'He knows/knew'
- (d) áà mà
1pl-neg know
'I do/did not know'
- (e) án-àn mà
2pl -neg know
'You do/did not know'
- (f) án-àn mà
3pl -neg know
'He does/did not know'

Fig. 5. Forms of the short subject pronoun

Type	Person	Singular form	Plural form
Affirmative	First	mo	a
	Second	wo	an
	Third	pro+ó ¹³	an
Negative	First	méè	áà
	Second	wéè	án-àn
	Third	éè	án-àn

¹² Negation has been incorporated into the morphology of these short singular pronouns. Ìlájẹ uses [ê] (or éè, in writing) as its sentential negative marker, but this negator often becomes merged with or totally assimilated into the subject. As a result of this, it can only be glossed by simply hyphenating the subject and the negator together in the interlinear gloss as done here.

¹³It is important to note that actual form of the third-person singular pronoun has been analysed in recent time as a different entity from the preverbal high-toned element ó. It has been extensively argued by Awobuluyi that there are positions where the third-person singular pronoun has to be covert (Awobuluyi, 1992, 2013). He had suggested *un* as the underlying form with evidence from dialects.

The syntactic distribution of short object pronouns depends on the tone on the last syllable of its verb. The mid-toned object pronouns are selected by high-toned verbs as shown in (17). The high-toned object pronouns, on the other hand, are selected by mid-toned or low-toned verbs as evident in (19) below.

(18) (a) Ade rí mi
Ade see 1sg
'Ade saw me'

(b) Ade rí rẹ
Ade see 2sg
'Ade saw me'

(c) Ade ri Ø¹⁴
Ade see-3sg
'Ade saw him'

(d) Ade rí wa
Ade see 1pl
'Ade saw us'

(e) Ade rí ghan
Ade see 2pl
'Ade saw you (pl)'

(d) Ade rí ghan
Ade see 3pl
'Ade saw them'

19 (a) Ade pè mí
Ade call 1sg
'Ade called me'

(b) Ade pè-é
Ade call-3sg
'Ade called him'

(c) Aso yèn yẹ ghán
Cloth that fit 3pl
'That cloth fit me'

(d) Mo ti ghò rẹ
1sg perf. look 2sg
'I have looked for you'

The summary of the object forms is given in the table in figure (6). The tone of the verb determines the tone on the object it takes. This results in two sets corresponding to the two tonal patterns which a verb can exhibit.

¹⁴ For the mid-toned third-person singular object, the high tone on the verb cannot even be realised. Hence, *rí* 'see' is produced on a mid tone here as *ri*. The object is covertly realised as symbolised here.

Fig. 6. Forms of the short object pronoun

Type	Person	Singular	Plural
Mid-toned object forms	First	mi	wa
	Second	rẹ	ghan
	Third	verbal vowel length	ghan
High-toned object forms	First	mí	wá
	Second	rẹ́	ghán
	Third	verbal vowel length	ghán

The analysis thus far has revealed some syntactic distributions of Ìlàjẹ pronouns with a focus on the logophoric long pronoun *òghun* in comparison with the non-logophoric long and short forms of the pronoun. As observed in figure (1) above, any language that marks logophoricity in reported speech must have the marker as part of its lexicon. This implies that, even in a reported speech, logophoricity will only occur if there is a lexical entry for it. The Ìlàjẹ logophor, *òghun* therefore, have to be listed in the lexicon for logophoricity to be licensed. Since this is a pronominal kind of logophoricity, the logophor has to be considered as part of the lexical entry in the pronominal system from figure (3) through to figure (6), the summary of which is reproduced in figure (7).

Fig. 7. Forms of Ìlàjẹ pronouns including the logophor

Types	Person	Singular form	Plural form
Long pronouns	First	èmi	àwa
	Second	ùwo	àghan
	Third	òghun	àghan
Short affirmative subject pronouns	First	mo	a
	Second	wo	an
	Third	pro+ó	an
Short affirmative subject pronouns	First	mée	áà
	Second	wée	án-àn
	Third	ée	án-àn
Mid-toned object pronouns	First	mi	wa
	Second	rẹ	ghan
	Third	verbal vowel length	ghan
High-toned object pronouns	First	mí	wá
	Second	rẹ́	ghán
	Third	verbal vowel length	ghán

Considering the characteristics given in this paper, the logophoric *òghun* can be described as a third person singular pronoun in an embedded clause which must have its antecedent as the subject of the report verb in the matrix clause. Like other forms of the pronoun, it maintains an exclusive complementary distribution.

Conclusion

This paper produced a descriptive syntactic analysis of the logophoric pronoun, *òghun*, with reference to other pronouns in *Ìlàjẹ*. The logophor has syntactic properties of a pronoun; it can be in any of the nominative, accusative and genitive cases, though not varying in its phonological form. However, the logophor differs from the traditional pronoun. First it has a peculiar syntactic distribution restricted to the embedded clause of the reported speech construction, where it functions as a referent to the subject of the reported verb. Second, its grammatical features are constrained to the third person singular only. The logophor is indeed a kind of pronoun that requires more attention in further studies on the pronominal system of Yoruba.

References

- Adesola, Oluseye. 2005. Pronouns and null operators – a-bar dependencies and relations in Yoruba. PhD thesis, State University of New Jersey. 271pp.
- Awobuluyi, Oladele. 1992. Aspects of contemporary standard in dialectological perspective. A. Isola. Ed. *New trends in Yoruba studies*. Ibadan: Odunjo Memorial Lectures Committee. 3:1-79.
- _____. 2013. *Èkọ Gíràmà Èdè Yorùbá*. Osogbo: Atman.
- Bamgbose, Ayo. 1986. Reported speech in Yoruba. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), *Direct and Indirect Speech*, pp. 77-97. Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bhat, D. N. Shankara. 2004. *Pronouns*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bond, Oliver. 2006. A broader perspective on point of view: logophoricity in Ogonoid language. *Selected Proceedings of the 35th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*. Ed. J. Mungabe et al. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. 234-244.
- Clements, George, N. 1975. The logophoric pronoun in Ewe: its role in discourse. *Journal of West African Languages* 10: 141-177
- Culy, Christopher. 1994. Aspects of logophoric marking. *Linguistics* 32: 1055– 1094.
- _____. 1997. Logophoric pronouns and point of view. *Linguistics* 35: 845– 859.
- _____. 2002. The logophoric hierarchy and variation in Dogon. In: Güldemann & von Roncador, eds., 2002, 201–210.
- Curnow, Timothy. J. 2002. Three types of logophoricity in African Languages. *Studies in African Linguistics* 31: 1–26.
- Güldemann, Tom & von Roncador, Manfred. Eds., 2002: *Reported discourse. A meeting ground for different linguistic domains*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Hagège, Claude. 1974. Les pronoms logophoriques. *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 69: 287–310.
- Hedinger, Robert. 1984. Reported speech in Akɔɔse. *Studies in African Linguistics* 12 (3): 81–102.
- Huang, Y. 2002: Logophoric marking in East Asian languages. In: Güldemann & von Roncador, eds., 2002, 211–224.
- _____. 2006: Anaphora, Cataphora, Exophora, Logophoricity. In: K. Brown, ed, *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. Second edition*. Vol. 1. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 213–237.
- Hyman, Larry M. & Comrie Bernard. 1981. Logophoric reference in Gokana. *Studies in African Linguistics* 3 (1):19–37.
- Japhet, Akintoye .2012. The morphosyntax of pronouns in the *Ìlàjẹ* dialect of Yorùbá. MPhil Dissertation. University of Ibadan. Ibadan. xv + 123pp.
- Lawal, Nike. 2006. Yoruba pronominal anaphor *òun* and the binding theory. In *Selected Proceedings of the 35th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, ed. John Mugane et al., 245-257. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #1314.
- Manfredi, Victor. 1995. Infection by default. *Niger-Congo and Semantics* 9: 91-112.

- Nau, Nicole. 2006. Out of Africa- logophoric pronouns and reported discourse in Finnish and High Latvian dialects. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 55 – 87
- Nikitina, Tatiana. 2012. Logophoric discourse and first person reporting in Wan. *Anthropological Linguistics* 54:280–301.
- Pulleyblank, Douglas. (1986) Clitics in Yoruba. In H. Borer (Ed.) *The Syntax of Pronominal Clitics; Syntax & Semantics* 19: 43-64. Academic Press, New York.
- Stirling, Lesley. 1993: *Switch-reference and discourse representation*. Cambridge: CUP
- _____. 1994: Logophoricity and long-distance reflexives. In: R. E. Asher, ed. *The Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics*. Vol. 4. Oxford: Pergamon, 2302– 2306.